

PRIME Program

Independent Sustainability Review (ISR)

Final Report

Philippines' Response to
Indigenous Peoples' and
Muslim Education (PRIME)
Program

October 2012

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ALS	Alternative Learning System
ALIVE	Arabic Language and Islamic Values Education
ARMM	Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BEAM	Basic Education Assistance for Mindanao
BESMEF	Basic Education Sub-sector Monitoring & Evaluation Framework
BESRA	Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda
BEST	Basic Education Sector Transformation
BIAP	BESRA Implementation and Accountability Plan
CAR	Cordillera Administrative Region
CEIP	Community Education Improvement Plan
CO	Central Office
CO-PIP	Central Office Program Implementation Plan
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability
CSEIP	Community-School Education Improvement Plans
DBM	Department of Budget and Management
DEDP	Division Education Development Plan
DepED	Department of Education
DO	Division Office
DRIP	Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
DSWD	Department of Social Welfare and Development
EBEIS	Enhanced Basic Education Information System
EDPITAF	Educational Development Projects Implementing Task Force
EFA	Education for All
ExeCom	Executive Committee
FbPO	Field-based Program Officer
FM	Financial Management
FinCom	Finance Committee
GMIS	Grant Management Information System
GoA	Government of Australia
GoP	Government of the Republic of the Philippines
IAC	Information, Advocacy and Communications
IP	Indigenous Peoples
IPsEO	Indigenous Peoples' Education Office
LRMDS	Learning Resource Management and Development System
LGU	Local Government Unit
ManCom	Management Committee
MC	Managing Contractor
MEPA	Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjustment
OME	Office for Madrasah Education
PPD	Planning and Programming Division
PDED	Project Development and Evaluation Division
RSD	Research and Statistics Division

CONTENTS

	Description of Content	Page
	Executive Summary	
1	Introduction	1
	1.1 PRIME objective and management arrangements	
	1.2 Purpose of the ISR	
	1.3 Audiences	
	1.4 Approach and methodology	
	1.5 ISR Team	
2	Achieving Sustainable Development	3
	2.1 Policy Context	
	2.2 Sustainability within this context	
	2.3 Was PRIME set up to achieve sustainability?	
3	Review Findings	7
	3.1 Increasing demand for educational services	
	3.2 Increasing DepED capacity to supply education services	
	3.3 Management approach/interface with DepED	
4	Strategies for Improving Sustainability	12
	4.1 Focus on strengthening the links and partnerships between DepED and the existing, organic networks/organizations serving IP and Muslim communities	
	4.2 Ensure that the institutional linkages and partnerships suit the environment	
	4.3 Support the current efforts of the Indigenous Peoples' Education Office to link DepED and IP Education networks, including at Regional, Divisional and school levels	
	4.4 Encourage the Office for Madrasah Education to focus on a similar linking strategy	
	4.5 Update the organization and management arrangements to maximize sustainability	
5	Continued Support to IP/Muslim Education via <i>BEST</i>	16
6	Conclusion and Recommendations	18
	Appendices	
	A Terms of Reference	
	B ISR Methodology and Implementation Plan	
	C Field Visit Schedule and List of Persons Met	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The PRIME Program was designed to improve equitable access to, and quality of, basic education for girls and boys in disadvantaged and marginalised Muslim and Indigenous Peoples' (IPs) communities. PRIME is a DepED program, supported by AusAID and facilitated by a Managing Contractor. The nature of the support is technical assistance and the provision of grants at school, Division, Region and Central levels.

The objective of the Independent Sustainability Review (ISR) was to examine the PRIME Program in order to identify those elements which have the greatest potential to be sustained. The Terms of Reference (ToR) tasked the review team to make recommendations regarding on-going implementation of the program, as well as recommendations to contribute to the final design of AusAID's upcoming program of support, the Basic Education Sector Transformation (BEST) program.

The PRIME Program aimed to test mechanisms to encourage:

- **Increased demand for education services** by IP/Muslim communities (by the introduction of community education planning approaches and grants to schools and communities to implement those plans)
- **Improved DepED capacity to respond** to the needs and demands of those schools/communities (via support the development of CO, RO and Divisional Implementation Plans and the provision of grants to implement those plans)
- **Positive changes in the attitudes and perceptions** of internal and external stakeholders towards IP and Muslim identity, culture and education.

The ISR report suggests that the PRIME program was based upon three questionable assumptions, namely: (i) the assumption that DepED systems and personnel were, more or less, 'ready' to absorb the proposed inputs; (ii) the assumption that capacity building could be sustainably achieved within a three year time frame; and (iii) the assumption that a government department is well placed to directly engage with disadvantaged and marginalised communities in order to generate demand.

The ISR team found that there is no lack of demand for education on the part of IP and Muslim communities. Nevertheless, communities clearly lack the opportunity to voice their demands for education services and they are neither strong enough, nor organized enough, to reach out and navigate a dialogue with DepED, even at the school level, without assistance. Further, there is some caution / lack of trust on the part of IP/Muslim communities that the efforts to address their needs are genuine and will be sustained.

Whilst there are varying degrees of understanding of DO62, and the Roadmap for Muslim Education, DepED personnel generally demonstrate an openness and willingness to improve the educational services to IP/Muslim communities. Despite this, the 'supply driven' approach to the provision of educational services remains dominant. IP and Muslim education concerns and issues are not yet uniformly reflected in education plans. Furthermore, in the public schools visited the PRIME grants were, in most cases, viewed as being just like a normal SBM grant to supplement the school budget for purchases of equipment. The relationship between the proposed investment and likely benefits to IP and Muslim children was not evident in the schools visited. Similarly, the ISR team observed a number of cases where PRIME grants approved at Regional and Divisional levels involved investments where the cause/effect link between the intended activity and the likely benefit for IP/Muslim children was very weak.

The Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjustment (MEPA) technology has been enthusiastically adopted. However, The ISR team observed deficiencies in data analysis and planning for IP and Muslim education at all levels. The value of the MEPA approach is constrained by this fact.

The downloading of the community grants by DepED Divisions has been very slow. There was an assumption that the existing financial systems could facilitate disbursement of grants to communities. In fact, the community grants are being treated like any other budget line item, subject to the same audit controls and this has caused the process to stall.

DepED staffs, both in OPS and the Regions, have faced major constraints in actively engaging with the PRIME program. Furthermore, the institutional landscape has changed since PRIME commenced and this is not formally reflected in the TA team structure/DepED interface. As a result, there is no structural link with the Indigenous Peoples' Education Office (IPsEO) which was established as the institutional home for IP Education after PRIME commenced. The Office for Madrasah Education (OME) appears to have been reluctant to engage with the PRIME program. However, it is understood that a proposal has been prepared by OME to increase the level of their participation.

Despite the findings, the objectives of the program to support IP Education and Muslim Education remain sound, as is the commitment to work on both the demand and supply side to improve educational services. What is lacking is a clearly defined, consistent, long-term strategy and mechanism to bridge the gap between government and communities which will allow them to agree about improved forms of IP Education and Muslim education.

The ISR report recommends a range of measures to improve sustainability including:

- An increased focus on strengthening the links and partnerships between DepED and the existing, organic networks / organisations serving IP and Muslim communities. This would involve refocusing the work of the Field based Program Officers on 'Advocacy and Partnership-building' - the third core program of IPsEO. This would also involve relocating the Information and Advocacy function from the TA office to the IPsEO office and aligning the work with the partnership building efforts.
- Support for the current efforts of IPsEO to link DepED and IP Education networks, including at Regional, Divisional and school levels.
- Encouraging the OME to focus on a similar linking strategy and maintaining 'minimum sufficient' TA support for Muslim Education at Region/Division level.
- Ensuring that the final BEST design commits to supporting the IPsEO managed, Congress approved, 'IP Education Program.'

If validation was needed, the ISR team can confirm that the focus on education as if it resides in schools and books will not enable IP and Muslim cultures to grow and be passed on to their children. If this is to occur there is a need for the mainstream education system to:

Recognise the presence of IP and Muslim learners within the student community (who are they; where are they?)

Improve understanding in respect of the nature of these communities and their aspirations (pre-service and in-service training of teachers, immersions/awareness raising initiatives for non IP and Muslim teachers)

Respect the organic leadership, networks/organisations of the IP and Muslim communities and the agencies which support them in order to jointly determine how to deliver quality IP and Muslim education services.

DO62 and the Roadmap to Muslim Education will not implement themselves. Nor can DepED implement these policies alone. The *only* way that these policies may be effectively implemented is by sustained collaboration between DepED and IP and Muslim networks/organisations and support agencies.

1. Introduction

1.1 *PRIME objective and management arrangements*

The PRIME Program was designed to improve equitable access to, and quality of, basic education for girls and boys in disadvantaged Muslim and Indigenous Peoples' (IPs) communities. The program is intended to build upon and scale up support activities for Muslim and IP education throughout the country. The program is viewed by the Department of Education (DepED) as a significant contributor to the implementation of the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA) which was developed to guide the country's efforts to address the Millennium Development Goal 2 – 'universal access to quality primary education'.

The responsibility for implementation of the PRIME program lays with DepED – specifically, the Office of Planning Service [incorporating Planning and Programming Division (PPD), Project Development and Evaluation Division (PDED) and Research and Statistics Division (RSD)]. The PPD of OPS has the lead responsibility for coordinating the PRIME Program. Regions, Divisions and Schools/Communities are responsible for assigning existing personnel to manage the implementation of the PRIME program in the field. Implementation of the Program is focused at the Regional, Divisional and school/community levels.

The PRIME Program is supported by AusAID and facilitated by an MC contracted by AusAID. The nature of the support is: (i) technical assistance, primarily at the central and regional levels, in support of improved data gathering and research, as well as the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of plans to improve IP and Muslim education; and (ii) the provision of grants at central, regional, division, school and community levels and support to DepED in effective management of these grants.

1.2 *Purpose of the Independent Sustainability Review*

PRIME was originally designed as a 60 month program. This was recognised as the minimum time required to embed a reform initiative implemented by a government department through its own systems, with donor support. It is not clear why, but support for the program was shortened to 40 months; by the time contract negotiations and mobilisation took place, the program effectively had a 39 month window in which to promote the desired reforms.

Recognising both the operational constraints imposed by the shortened implementation period, as well as the importance of ensuring that the efforts to promote universal access to primary education were not lost, AusAID and the MC agreed to conduct an Independent Sustainability Review (ISR) at the approximate mid-point of the implementation period.

The primary objective of the ISR was to examine key elements of the PRIME Program in order to make recommendations regarding:

- on-going implementation of the program
- contributions to the final design elements of AusAID's upcoming program of support to the education sector, the BEST program
- relevant adjustments to BESRA, including the implementation of the K-12 program.

The full ToR is attached as Appendix A.

1.3 Audiences

The *primary* audiences for this ISR are:

- Office of Planning Service, DepED Central (OPS)
 - Project Development and Evaluation Division
 - Planning and Programming Division
- Indigenous Peoples' Education Office (IPsEO)
- Office for Madrasah Education (OME)

The *secondary* audiences for ISR are:

- PRIME MC personnel
- AusAID Philippines Education Program staff

1.4 Approach and Methodology

In accordance with the ToR, the approach and methodology involved a desk review, stakeholder consultations, reflection / analysis and presentation of an Exit Briefing to key stakeholders to present initial findings and seek feedback. The ToR directed the Review Team to focus upon (but not be constrained to) four key elements of the PRIME program, namely, the community education planning approach, the education grants, the Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjustment (MEPA) mechanism and the management approach / interface with DepED. The ISR Review Plan is attached as Appendix B.

A field visit was conducted between September 1 and 23. During this time, discussions were held with DepED staff from five Regions and six Divisions. Visits were paid to five public schools. However, in one location school heads joined our discussions from across the Division; as a result, we were able to hold discussions with school heads and staff from eleven public schools. We also visited three tribal community schools and were able to hold direct discussions, during our field visits, with representatives from nine communities. The schedule and list of persons met is attached as Appendix C.

1.5 ISR Team

The permanent members of our team included Ma. Victoria Necesito, who provided a highly professional and technically competent input, on behalf of the Office of Planning Service, DepED and Kay Zabala, who similarly ably represented the AusAID funded technical advisory team and managed a highly complex and ever changing itinerary. In Luzon, the core team was joined by Trisha Gray, Portfolio Manager and First Secretary, Philippines Aid Program, AusAID and Regan Dagadas, Senior Program Officer, AusAID as observers.

In both Luzon and Mindanao, the core team was also joined by dedicated staff from the AusAID funded technical advisory team. These personnel selflessly contributed the results of their own reflections, based upon extensive experience. Special thanks go to Ms. Lourie Victor (Sr. Program Officer [SPO], Luzon); Ms. Stella Mendoza (M&E Officer, Luzon); Ms. Norma Gonos (SPO, Mindanao); Ms. Josephine Calag (M&E Officer, Mindanao); and Mr. Rey Macalindong, M&E Adviser.

We thank them for the efficiency of the organization of the field mission, the genuine spirit of enquiry and reflection which they brought to the whole ISR exercise and to their commitment 'above and beyond' the call of duty in meeting the demands of the mission.

2 Achieving Sustainable Development

2.1 Policy Context

Most international development agencies, including AusAID, developed their sustainability strategies and guidelines at the beginning of the decade.¹ AusAID's sustainability guideline has not been updated since then because the key elements were subsumed within the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness² and the Accra Agenda for Action³ to which Australia was a signatory. Most notable amongst these elements were the commitments (shared between partner governments and donors) to work within the context of national development plans and strategies and partner government systems; to focus on capacity strengthening to improve government capacity to lead and manage development; and to reinforce participatory approaches by systematically involving a broad range of development partners when formulating, and assessing progress in implementing, national development strategies.

In addition, the current Australian aid policy framework, and specifically AusAID's Governance Strategy, emphasizes that support for good governance underpins aid effectiveness and sustainable development. Hence:

“Support for improved administration alone is unlikely to lead to long-term improvements in services for poor and marginalised people. Governments that are open, consultative, inclusive, accountable and responsive deliver better services more closely aligned to people’s needs. Participation in government by poor and marginalised people builds citizenship and promotes equitable development. This pillar⁴ focuses on social accountability and improving relationships between the state and society, as well as governing in a socially inclusive way, to respond to the needs of all members of society.”

Whilst Australia's understanding of aid effectiveness issues was evolving, the Government of Philippines was also evolving its understanding of mechanisms to achieve effective delivery of educational services. The passage of the Governance of Basic Education Act (Republic Act RA 9155) in 2001 emphasized that “the school shall be the heart of the formal education system”. Subsequently, a package of interrelated policy actions - the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA) - was developed to change the way in which education services were delivered. The central thrusts of BESRA were Strengthened School Based Management and the commitment to change the DepED institutional culture from a prescriptive, top down culture to one that is more responsive and accountable to the community and, therefore, able to deliver more relevant school programs.

It is within this evolving policy context that the PRIME program of support was developed. With Australian support, DepED aimed to test mechanisms by which it could encourage:

- **Increased demand for education services** by IP/Muslim communities (by the introduction of community education planning approaches and grants to schools and communities to implement those plans)

¹ Refer 'Promoting Practical Sustainability' Quality Assurance Group PIA/OPRE AusAID September 2000

² Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness 2005

³ Third High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness 'Accra Agenda for Action' September 2008

⁴ This refers to AusAID Governance Strategy, Pillar 1b. Delivering services through more accountable, open and responsive governments.

- **Improved DepED capacity to respond** to the needs and demands of those schools/communities (via support the development of CO, RO and Divisional Implementation Plans and the provision of grants to implement those plans)
- **Positive changes in the attitudes and perceptions** of internal and external stakeholders towards IP and Muslim identity, culture and education.

2.2 *Sustainability within this context*

Reference has been made to the above policy context because it is important to recall what partner governments and donors – in this case the Governments of the Philippines and Australia – have been articulating over the last decade. Although the points may be expressed in different ways, all parties agree that effective, and sustained, service delivery is dependent upon the degree to which government agencies, and the communities they serve, can establish a working relationship to achieve commonly agreed outcomes.

GoP's School Based Management Program is based upon this premise; indeed, the newest advocacy program for SBM, 'A Child and Community Centered Education System' (ACCESs) expresses the premise more fully. GoA's Aid Effectiveness strategic goals and policies are also based upon this premise.

With this in mind, the ISR has not simply considered the sustainability of specific mechanisms trialled by PRIME. The ISR has also attempted to keep the broader policy context in mind and has, consequently, examined the degree to which the work of the PRIME program has been able to promote the development of:

- Sustained capacity of IP and Muslim communities to articulate their education needs and demands and to improve their capacity to work with DepED to draw down educational services that allow them to fulfil their educational aspirations for their children.
- Sustained capacity of DepED to: (a) recognise and appreciate the legitimate needs and demands of IP/Muslim communities for relevant and appropriate educational services and to (b) develop educational services which respond to those legitimate needs and demands.

2.3 *Was PRIME set up to achieve sustainable change?*

The design principles underpinning the PRIME program were, and remain, sound. The program works through government structures and systems, focuses on capacity building and aims to encourage participatory approaches designed to increase the demand for educational services. The enabling environment created by GoP is also extremely well developed and conducive to the achievement of sustainable development.⁵

⁵ There is genuine commitment on the part of the current administration and DepED leadership to address the Education for All objectives. Enabling policies are in place (DO62 and the Roadmap for Muslim Education). IP/Muslim Education offices exist at the Central level in DepED. Budget lines have been set aside for these offices within the DepED budget. Data is being collected, via the EBEIS, to improve identification of IP and Muslim learners. Under the new DepED structure, embodied in the Rationalisation Plan, Regions will have the flexibility to set the local agenda, directions and policies to improve access, equity and outcomes for marginalised children. Divisions are empowered to implement the education agenda and policies. Above all, DepED's assets are the schools which are located *in* the communities and are mandated to provide equitable opportunities for all learners and to work with a range of community, public and private stakeholders to achieve this outcome.

Despite these advantages, indeed, perhaps because of them, the expectations placed upon the PRIME program by GoP and GoA appear to have been excessive. The designated period for provision of TA and financial support to DepED was 39 months. During this period, with TA support, the Office of Planning Services was supposed to spearhead the operationalisation of the government's commitment to inclusive education for marginalised peoples in 9 Regions and 24 divisions.

This has involved a complex process of data gathering; selecting target divisions; raising awareness of DepED staff in targeted Regions regarding the provisions of DO62 and the Roadmap for Muslim Education; development and testing of mechanisms to increase multi-stakeholder demand for improved access among IP and Muslim groups to culturally appropriate education; development and testing of mechanisms for improved planning, budgeting and program implementation at Region, Division and School levels to respond to community demands; training Region level staff in these mechanisms in the expectation that the knowledge and skills would 'cascade' down to lower levels; and, finally, channelling of funds through to all levels of the system, as well as directly to communities to support educational projects designed to improve the access of marginalised children to quality educational services.

Again, this is a sound process in and of itself. However, when embodied within a 39 month program, the approach generates three questionable assumptions: (i) the assumption that DepED systems and personnel were, more or less, 'ready' to absorb the proposed inputs; (ii) the assumption that capacity building could be sustainably achieved within a three year time frame; and (iii) the assumption that a government department is well placed to directly engage with disadvantaged and marginalised communities in order to generate demand.

Assumptions about DepED absorptive capacity

At the time of the ISR, approximately 18 months have elapsed since the commencement of the program of support to DepED. It is very clear to the review team that, despite a sound enabling environment and program design, DepED systems and personnel were *not* ready to absorb the PRIME program inputs.

As mentioned above, it must be understood that the effort to improve DepED capacity to address the needs of marginalised communities is only part of a much broader attempt by GoP to transform individual and institutional capacity within the education sector via BESRA and RA9155. This transformation of the education system in the Philippines has placed substantial burdens on DepED staff and affected the degree to which they have been able to engage with the PRIME program. Key challenges faced have included:

- i. **Constrained ability of OPS to absorb TA inputs due to excessive workloads:** Since the inception of PRIME OPS has suffered from *both* a substantially increased workload *and* the loss of key staff.⁶ This has, naturally, inhibited the degree to which OPS has been able to work on the IP and Muslim education program and consequently constrained the TA team in providing appropriate levels of support.
- ii. **Many Regions/Divisions have not yet fully operationalised RA9155:** There was an assumption that targeted Regions/Divisions would have already commenced the process of

⁶ For example, OPS is expected to train all of the Regions in the ACCES approach in October, 2012.

re-engineering their approaches to be more responsive to local needs in accordance with the provisions of RA9155. It was intended that IP/Muslim concerns would be incorporated into the local education plans. In reality, many of these plans had not been produced – particularly at the Regional level; as such, both the planning and capacity building challenge was greater than previously anticipated.

- iii. **Capacity constraints and competing priorities at Region/Division levels have undermined the efficacy of the ‘cascading’ approach to TA support:** Target Regions/Divisions have been attempting to meet the challenges of the reform agenda and operationalise the roll-out of the K-12 policy at the same time that the PRIME program has been attempting to galvanise their attention to the educational needs of marginalised communities. As a result of these competing priorities, the theoretically sound emphasis on the provision of TA support at the central and regional levels, relying upon Regional staff to ‘cascade’ the knowledge and skills down to the Division and school levels, does not appear, to date, to have been operationally effective.
- iv. **Focal point confusion:** In some regions separate focal persons have been assigned for PRIME, for IP education and for Muslim education. This not only reflects lack of comprehension at lower levels of DepED’s central’s intentions with the PRIME program, but has also created confusion, duplication and waste of resources.

Assumptions about the capacity building process

It would be naive to assume that the provision of TA support to an overloaded planning office, over a three year period (two school years), via a ‘cascading’ process of immersions and training at Central, Regional and Division levels could dramatically shift the practices of a large and centralised bureaucracy.

There is an extensive range of cross-cutting, functional capacities which need to be strengthened within DepED, particularly at the lower levels. These include the capacity to engage with diverse stakeholders and create consensus around an educational plan; the capacity to articulate the mandate of the new IP/Muslim education policies; the capacity to develop a strategy, translate it into a plan and prepare a budget; the capacity to implement a plan, monitor its implementation, evaluate results and adjust the plan. These are not merely management capacities. These capacities hinge on, and are closely connected with, effective and good leadership capacity; the existence of effective and well-functioning institutions and institutional arrangements; an environment conducive to knowledge sharing and knowledge acquisition; as well as transparent and independent accountability systems.

In short, capacity building is, by its nature, holistic and long term. The PRIME program does not, and cannot, exist in a vacuum. Further, insofar as the attempt to improve educational services for marginalised communities is being undertaken entirely in and through government systems it is those systems which, ultimately, define the pace of change.

Despite the apparent flexibility of the PRIME approach, the TA contract with AusAID incorporates a range of targets including the expectation that the grant funds will be fully expended by June 30th, 2014. This has placed pressure on DepED, and the TA team, to produce rapid results (in terms of plans, project proposal and disbursements). While short term results may be achieved this way, it is unlikely that the capacity of the individuals and the organisation will be sustainably transformed without long term support.

Assumptions about the generation of community demand

Engaging communities in action planning, whether in respect of educational outcomes, or any other area of development, requires substantial, specialised skills and is best done by those already embedded in the community. Whilst this is so for all communities, an even higher level of skill and experience is required for working in marginalised communities.

For the most part, DepED staff are neither trained, nor experienced, in the process of community engagement. In many cases they do not even speak the same language as the communities in which they work. Further, it would be naive to expect that the staff of any institution, especially those who are already overworked and under resourced, will have the time and the motivation to encourage their clients to increase the demand for their services. Technical assistance provided over a limited (3 yr.) period in a 'cascading' capacity building modality is unlikely to change that reality.

Furthermore, there is a tension between, on the one hand, the need for IP and Muslim communities to be permitted to have the time they require to naturally understand the process of getting involved in planning for the education of their children and, on the other hand, the need to meet targets and produce deliverables in accordance with DepED requirements and to synchronise with broader government plans and budgeting requirements.

There are few examples anywhere in the world where a government department is expected to directly engage with communities on educational planning processes without assistance. The PRIME Program appears to have assumed that this could be done.

3 Review Findings

The previous section identified three questionable assumptions which underpinned the operationalisation of the PRIME program. These assumptions have been discussed before outlining the findings of the ISR in order to clarify the context within which DepED staff and their TA support personnel have been attempting to improve IP and Muslim education. This section presents the review team's findings regarding the results of these efforts, together with comments on the management approach/interface with DepED.

3.1 Increasing demand for educational services

The primary mechanisms employed by PRIME to increase demand for educational services are the introduction of community education planning approaches and the provision of grants to schools and communities to implement those plans.

There has been a growing awareness that although the School Improvement Plan, introduced as a key mechanism to implement School Based Management, was intended to be produced as a whole of community plan, it has tended to become a plan generated for and by the education system. The SIP is often produced by the principal, with limited outside engagement, and plans have tended to focus on the needs of children within school, not those school aged children who, for one reason or another, have not enrolled, are absent or have dropped out.

The community education planning approach, by contrast, was designed to engage the broader community in order to capture the needs of learners outside of the school system and provide a mechanism, via the community grants, for these needs to be addressed. The community education planning approach is a new way of actualising RA9155 which recognises that children have a right to

education and that planning needs to respond to their circumstances in order to ensure that they are able to exercise that right.

The community education planning approach is not a single approach. There are a range of approaches being utilised across a spectrum from the 'culturally enhanced' SIP (developed in the Luzon Cluster); to the Community Education Implementation Plan approach (developed in Agusan del Sur Division); to the Ancestral Domain based SIP approach adopted in CAR, Mt Province; to the Ancestral Domain Education Plan developed in Mindoro. Wherever the planning approach sits on the spectrum, it is intended to facilitate gathering of rich data on the cultural practices of IPs and Muslim communities as a basis for multi-stakeholder analysis and reconstruction of the whole learning system to meet the needs of learners.

The field visits of the ISR team suggest that:

- **There is no lack of demand for education** on the part of IP and Muslim communities. The review team had the privilege of meeting a number of IP community representatives who wished, above all, to convey the message that teaching and learning systems exist in their communities and are part of their lives. Despite this, communities have clearly lacked the opportunity to voice their demands for IP education services and they are neither strong enough, nor organized enough, to reach out and navigate a dialogue with DepED, even at the school level, without assistance. As result, there are a range of IP organisations and networks which are increasingly concerned with IP education. There are also a range of non-government and civil society organisations (NGOs/CSOs) which have programs or 'schools' which promote IP and Muslim education.
- **There is some caution / lack of trust on the part of IP/Muslim communities** that the efforts to address their needs are genuine and will be sustained. IP communities have experienced disappointment in not having the educational needs/demands of their communities met. Similarly, in the Muslim schools visited community representatives interviewed were dissatisfied with the ALIVE program as an adequate response to their needs/demands for Muslim education for their children. Although community respondents were interested in the idea of working with DepED on a more comprehensive approach to the Muslim education in the schools, they were doubtful that it would ever occur.

There are significant historical wounds as a result of various forms of manipulation and abuse in the past. These wounds cannot be dealt with by ignoring them. It must be recognised that these wounds represent a constraint to effective engagement of communities by DepED staff.

- **There is theoretical recognition and appreciation of the need to reach out to IP/Muslim communities by all levels of DepED staff.** Whilst there are varying degrees of understanding of DO62 and the Roadmap for Muslim Education, DepED personnel generally demonstrate an openness and willingness to improve the educational services to IP/Muslim communities. This is strongest at the school level in those schools where the enrolment is predominantly IP or predominantly Muslim. In this regard the activities undertaken by the PRIME program to facilitate various immersion / awareness raising activities for DepED staff are critical and should continue to be a major focus in the remaining 16 months of support from Australia.

- **Nevertheless, the ‘supply driven’ approach remains dominant.** Even though DepED personnel are open and willing to operationalise community engagement processes, they are attempting to do so from *within* their existing personal, professional and institutional culture.

DepED personnel are neither trained, nor experienced, in the process of community engagement and these are not skills that can be acquired quickly. Little support has been able to be provided to schools by divisions in the implementation of community education planning approaches.

To their credit, the review team met some school heads who had attempted to embark upon a genuine community engagement process. However, their evident lack of skill and experience in this area led to personal stress, to the development of plans and proposals of questionable quality and, in one case, conflict between the community and the school head.

In another case, an example was found where the rich community education planning approach had been converted to a simple questionnaire seeking yes/no answers to questions such as “Do you know how to perform rituals during harvesting?” The resulting plan, reviewed by members of the team, was produced without substantial community input, did not demonstrate any attempt to address challenges faced by IP children in obtaining an education and did not depart from mainstream practices.

In most cases, the school heads had not attempted to engage in a genuine community engagement process. This is discussed further, below.

3.2 Improved DepED capacity to respond to community demands

The PRIME program provides an opportunity for the development of Central, Regional and Divisional Implementation Plans which respond to the needs and demands of IP and Muslim communities and has introduced a Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjust (MEPA) mechanism to assist DepED to engage in a process of continuous improvement of service provision.

The field visits of the ISR team suggest that:

- **IP and Muslim education concerns and issues are not yet uniformly reflected in the education plans of DepED (SIP, DEDP, REDP).**

In most SIPs there has been an attempt to gather data on IP concerns and reflect them in the plans; the IP plans have also been integrated in some DEDPs. At the regional level, since most have no REDP, there has been no integration.

In the public schools visited the PRIME grants were, in most cases, viewed as being just like a normal SBM grant to supplement the school budget for purchases of equipment. The relationship between the proposed investment and likely benefits to IP and Muslim children was not evident in the schools visited.

DepED personnel were observed to be defining the needs/demands of IP/Muslim communities from their own perspective, rather than from the perspective of the

communities themselves. The ISR team encountered numerous examples of school plans and school grant proposals, as well as community grant proposals, being prepared without any genuine involvement of parents or traditional elders / leaders of the community.

We observed a number of cases where PRIME grants approved at Regional and Divisional levels involved investments where the cause/effect link between the intended activity and the likely benefit for IP/Muslim children was very weak. This appeared to occur as a result of inadequate efforts to obtain relevant data on IP and Muslim children and inadequate attempts to move beyond the idea of the school as the primary source of education to a broader approach which integrates IP and Muslim learning systems.

As mentioned in sub-section 2.3 above, despite the intent for Regional offices to have the flexibility to respond to the needs in their regions (RA9155), many are yet to develop the skills and capacity to do this for the mainstream, let alone for marginalised communities.

- **The MEPA technology has been enthusiastically adopted**

The ISR team observed considerable enthusiasm for, and uptake of, the MEPA technology at all levels. While this is a positive development, the value of the MEPA in improving education outcomes is dependent upon the 'up front' collection and analysis of quality data and the production of good educational plans. The ISR team observed deficiencies in data analysis and planning for IP and Muslim education at all levels. The value of the MEPA approach is constrained by this fact.

- **DepED systems lack the flexibility to easily disburse community grants.** The downloading of the community grants by DepED Divisions has been very slow. There was an assumption that the existing financial systems could facilitate disbursement of grants to communities. In fact, the community grants are being treated like any other budget line item, subject to the same audit controls and this has caused the process to stall. There are clearly underlying anxieties about the release of these funds for a range of reasons, including:

- Lack of trust of/confidence in IP/Muslim community organisations and the CSOs supporting these communities
- Inability to understand the work being proposed, and therefore to lack of confidence in monitoring that work.
- Resistance based on the notion that "this is not our function".
- Belief that if the funds are not downloaded to communities, eventually they will revert to DepED,

As a consequence, the review team encountered a number of examples where the inability of DepED to download funds for approved community proposals in a timely manner has undermined both the intent and the efficacy of the community engagement grants.

3.3 Management Approach / Interface with DepED

The PRIME program has been characterised as a DepED program, supported by AusAID with technical assistance and grant funds provided by an MC, contracted to AusAID. The PPD of OPS has the lead responsibility for coordinating the PRIME Program. Regions, Divisions and Schools/Communities are responsible for assigning existing personnel to manage the

implementation of the PRIME program in the field. The original design also envisaged an institutional link with the Office for Madrasah Education (OME).

The ToR for the ISR required consideration of the effectiveness and efficiency of this approach. The following comments must be accompanied by the disclaimer that the ISR team was not able to either conduct an institutional assessment of the relevant sections of DepED, nor an in-depth study of the way in which the TA and grant support responds to the institutional needs/demands of these sections in respect of IP and Muslim education.

The organization of the TA team largely 'shadows' parts of the DepED structure, providing for:

- a Program Director at the central level to coordinate the effective provision of TA support and utilization of the grants facility in accordance with OPS requirements
- an M&E Advisor at central level to provide support to the M&E functions and responsibilities of OPS
- Field Based Program Officers (FBPOs) to provide technical assistance at the Regional level to the IP/Muslim focal persons in the implementation of IP and Muslim education services. The FBPOs have specifically been required to focus at the Regional level in order to strengthen this level to take up their functions, particularly in light of RA1955.

The organisation of the TA team departed from the DepED structure by:

- incorporating an Information and Advocacy officer in the central TA support team;
- establishing Senior Program Officers for the Luzon/Island Groups cluster of regions and the Mindanao cluster (reflecting the unique attributes and differences in IP/Muslim Education between north and south) and by
- establishing M&E Coordinators at the cluster level to achieve coherence and strengthen M&E approaches

Whilst this TA team structure was rational, the point has already been made that DepED staff both in OPS and the Regions have faced major constraints in actively engaging with the program (refer sub-section 2.3). Furthermore, the institutional landscape has changed since PRIME commenced and this is not formally reflected in the TA team structure/DepED interface. The ISR notes the following:

- **There is no structural link with the Indigenous Peoples' Education Office** IPsEO was established as the institutional home for IP Education after PRIME commenced. The physical office was set up with the assistance of funding from PRIME and, since its inception, IPsEO has established strategic priorities for 2012-2015, developed a work program to address these priorities - 'The IP Education Program' - and received Congress approval/budget support for the implementation of this program.
 - All outputs identified within the Indigenous Peoples' Education component of the PRIME program fall within the mandate and work program of IPsEO but there is no formal institutional linkage between the program and IPsEO in the current O&M arrangements. The ISR team encountered confusion amongst DepED staff at Region and Division levels about the role of PRIME vis-a-vis IPsEO.
 - In order to both reduce confusion and increase the sustainability of TA/grant inputs the management and operational relationship between IPsEO, OPS and the MC needs to be clarified.

- **Limited participation of the Office for Madrasah Education (OME) in the PRIME Program**
 The ISR was informed that OPS has been attempting to engage OME in the PRIME program without great success to date. The ISR team was able to meet with representatives of the OME; it was noted that there appeared to be a reluctance to go beyond the current configuration of Muslim Education (limited to the ALIVE program) and to consider the potential offered both by the commitment of the current administration and DepED leadership to bring about further improvements and the possibility of receiving TA support to do so. However, it is understood that a proposal has been prepared by OME and submitted to OPS to increase the level of their participation.
- **M&E team has clearly been a substantial support to OPS** in encouraging the take up of the MEPA approach. Despite the evident achievements, however, the ISR team noted examples of inconsistencies in advice provided to Regional/Divisional staff by OPS personnel and the TA team. In order to improve efficiency and effectiveness, consideration may be given to increasing the period of time in which the M&E Advisor operates out of the OPS offices. [We are advised that the advisor has currently been spending approximately 25% of his time in the OPS office.]
- **FBPOs have carried the burden of the questionable assumptions underpinning the program.** The FBPOs have been required to provide technical assistance to Regions/Divisions that were not ready to absorb their inputs. They have been expected to build capacity within a relatively short period of time. Finally, the FBPOs have been expected to work at arm's length (via support to the Regional level to assist DepED managers to support their staff at Division and school levels) in the implementation of community engagement practices, whilst at the same time being cognizant of the fact that there are predetermined targets for plan / proposal preparation and expenditure of grant funds.

 - Each of the FBPOs have reacted to these challenges in various ways according to their personal and professional predispositions. However, it should surprise no-one to learn that on occasions they may have become frustrated with the pace of the work and adopted a more 'hands-on' role than is ideal. These matters have been dealt with appropriately by the TA management team. Nevertheless, it is necessary to consider why the problems have occurred in the first place and to consider how the role of the FBPOs may be adjusted to render it more feasible and achievable within the remaining operational period of the program.
- **No structural link for advocacy support:** There does not appear to have been an effective structural link established between the Information and Advocacy position in the TA team and an equivalent position at central or regional office levels. This has inhibited the levels of support which can be provided by this position.

4 Strategies for improving sustainability

The findings of the ISR suggest that whilst DepED personnel are developing the capacity to recognise and appreciate the legitimate needs and demands of IP/Muslim communities, they are far from having the capacity to respond to those needs and demands. Moreover, with the current level of pressure placed upon them, both by the reform agenda and the perceived need to meet PRIME grant disbursement targets, there is every chance that they may sacrifice the development of

substantial capacity to the apparent need to produce immediate results. This is an outcome which should be avoided.

The ISR findings also suggest that the erroneous assumption that DepED personnel could act as community mobilisers and motivators to generate increased demand for educational services from IP and Muslim communities may inadvertently harm the relationship between DepED and those communities.

Despite the findings, the objectives of the program to support IP Education and Muslim Education remain sound, as is the commitment to work on both the demand and supply side to improve educational services. What is lacking is a clearly defined, consistent, long-term strategy and mechanism to bridge the gap between government and communities which will allow them to come to an agreement about improved forms of IP Education and Muslim education.

The review team is of the view that the following strategies may assist in bridging this gap.

4.1 *Focus on strengthening the links and partnerships between DepED and the existing, organic networks / organisations serving IP and Muslim communities*

There are organic structures and networks within communities which help those communities to function. And in many cases there are also support agencies, many of which have been working in the communities for long periods of time, which are assisting these communities to fulfil their development aspirations, including education. Rather than focusing on strengthening the capacity of DepED staff to engage in community education planning, sustainability will be improved by strengthening the linkages between DepED and these networks/organisations.

These networks and support agencies are better equipped to conduct the community engagement and planning exercises than DepED and may be contracted by DepED to set up and implement these processes and to assist communities and school level staff to jointly prepare their plans and proposals.

The ISR team recognises that the involvement of CSOs is already happening in some Regions, but the approach needs to be elevated to the status of a critical strategy, both by DepED and AusAID and the breadth and depth of the engagement consequently needs to be strengthened.

4.2 *Ensure that the institutional linkages and partnerships suit the environment*

Sustainability will also be improved by attempts to recognise that there are a range of different educational environments in which IP/Muslim education is taking place. The type of support required from IPSEO and OME, specifically, the enabling actions which need to occur are quite different for these different circumstances. For example, during the field mission, the ISR team encountered the following different sets of circumstances and potential responses:

- Category 1: IP or Muslim *majority in public school* (potential for re-engineering the whole learning system (retraining of teachers; recognition and appointment of para teachers; curriculum development, modified teaching and learning processes; improved learning resources; modified structure and environment; and school management.
- Category 2: Tribal or Muslim *community schools* (in-service training and recognition of para teachers; advocacy for accreditation of Private IP schools)

- Category 3: IP or Muslim *minority in public school* (immersion/retraining of teachers; appointment of specialist para teachers to support the minority; potential support for cluster of schools with minority population learners)
- Category 4: *Mixed IP/Muslim/Christian communities of learners in public schools* (inter-faith curriculum; conflict resolution and peace building; in-service training and recognition of para teachers).

4.3 Support the current efforts of the Indigenous Peoples' Education (IPsEO) to link DepED and IP Education networks, including at Regional, Divisional and school levels

In accordance with its Strategic Priorities and IP Education Program, IPsEO has already initiated discussions between DepED and IP communities on the development of an IP Education Network at the central level. This is an important initiative. However, it is equally, if not more important, for IPsEO to encourage this type of initiative to take place at Regional, Division and school levels.

It is not possible to legislate for improved levels of trust between partners. Trust and respect can only be improved by working together. Efforts will therefore need to be made at Regional, Divisional and school levels to discover and develop the potential linkages between DepED and the organic networks and trusted support agencies of the IP and Muslim communities.

Over the next 16 months, the AusAID funded TA could, for example, support IPsEO to work with IP focal persons in the regions and divisions targeted by PRIME to:

- Verify with IP communities in each Division which networks/organisations or support agencies have been given the authority by that community to engage in community education planning (e.g. IP Educators Network, Bukidnon)
- Design service provider contracts which would be acceptable to both DepED and IPOs/CSOs for the facilitation of the schools and community education planning process and, by extension, proposal writing and support to schools and communities to implement and monitor grant funded activities.
- Facilitate partnership building between verified networks/organisations or CSOs and school heads to work together to carry out community education planning. The resultant plans would then influence *both* the preparation of proposals for IP/Muslim education school grants, as well as community grants.

Within this scenario, TA would be provided, via IPsEO to the IP focal point persons at Regional and Divisional levels to build the linkages between DepED and the IP networks/organisations.

- Facilitate the 'outsourcing' of the provision of community education grants by DepED to a strong and competent IP network or CSO. The latter body could be contracted to receive funds from the Division Office for IP community activities in that Division and the network/CSO would then be accountable to the Division Office but would, themselves, review proposals and release funds to small communities, monitor and report to DepED. The IP Focal point person at the Division level would need to receive TA support to be able to work effectively with network/CSO.

4.4 Encourage the Office for Madrasah Education to focus on a similar linking strategy

Although it is necessary to await the results of the Review of Muslim Education Initiatives of DepED, the principles outlined above apply in a similar way to working in the Muslim communities. For this to occur, however, it will be necessary for OME to appreciate the importance of its facilitation and partnership building role, to build links between Muslim communities, and the organisations which serve them, and DepED at Regional, Division and school levels.

4.5 Update the organisation and management arrangements to maximise sustainability

In the view of the ISR team the sustainability of IP/Muslim Education efforts will be improved by the following modifications to the O&M arrangements:

i. **Continue and strengthen TA support for OPS on the MEPA, with particular emphasis on the ‘up-front’ data collection and planning activities**

TA support for OPS on strengthening capacities in planning, budgeting and program implementation to respond to emerging demands for IP and Muslim education appears effective. However, sustainability would be strengthened by relocation of the M&E Adviser and Coordinators to the OPS office, even if only on a part time basis; this would also increase the impact of the TA support in the remaining time period and ensure consistent messages are delivered to DepED Regional/Divisional personnel by OPS staff and the TA support team.

Particular attention should be given to:

- supporting OPS to establish appropriate planning, monitoring and evaluation processes for IPSeO in the delivery of the IP Education Program
- working with OPS staff to improve the effectiveness of the ‘cascading’ training and TA approach (i.e. Region, to Division, to school) for data collection, planning and M&E within the context of IP/Muslim education.

ii. **Re-focus the work of the Field based Program Officers** on the third core program of IPSeO, namely, ‘Advocacy and Partnership-building’. This would involve:

- a) The FBPOs working directly with the DepED IP Focal Persons at Region and Division levels:

“To build an active support network of government and non-government stakeholders and support groups”.

In simple terms, the *primary* work of the FBPOs would be to assist DepED at Regional and Division levels to establish partnerships and develop institutional linkages with IPO networks and their support agencies in order to facilitate improved planning and implementation of IP education.

This would represent a *different strategic approach* to the way in which the FBPOs work with DepED IP Focal point staff but would not affect the objectives currently embodied in the PRIME program of support. However, given the change of strategic approach, consideration may need to be given to some redeployment of technical advisors according to their skill-sets. This redeployment, as well as management, accountability,

communication arrangements and work plans would need to be determined on the basis of agreements between the Coordinator IPsEO, OPS and the Program Director for the (PRIME) TA team.

At the same time that this reorientation / redeployment of FBPOs is occurring, DepED Regions/Divisions who have set up multiple focal point positions (PRIME / IP education) should be encouraged to rationalise these positions to avoid overlap, confusion and waste of resources.

iii. **Relocate the Information and Advocacy function in the IPsEO and align the TA support with IPsEO's activities**, namely, to: *'Formulate and start implementation of an IP Education Advocacy Plan'*. However, in the opinion of the ISR Team, the TA support should be bounded and focus on reinforcing the efforts of IPsEO (supported by the FBPOs) to build partnerships between DepED and IPOs and their support agencies to improve educational outcomes. At the end of the program the effectiveness of the approaches adopted could be reviewed as a basis for expanding support to advocacy programs under BEST.

iv. **Maintain 'minimum sufficient' TA support for Muslim Education at Region/Division level:** The ISR team is of the view that the apparent institutional blockages at central level are unlikely to alter in the short to medium term which tangibly affects the likelihood of achieving the intended outputs and outcomes over the remaining months of the program. Within this context, the issue of sustainability seems somewhat beside the point. However, it is possible to establish important *foundations* for improving Muslim education which may be built upon by the BEST program from 2012/13 onwards.

This would similarly involve FBPOs supporting the development of institutional linkages between DepED at Regional, Divisional and school levels with Muslim community networks/organisations and supporting agencies.

5 Continued support to IP/Muslim education via 'BEST'

The ToR for the ISR also required the results of the review to inform the final design elements of AusAID's Basic Education Sector Transformation (BEST) support initiative, due to commence in mid-2013. A brief review of relevant sections of the BEST design document raises some doubts as to the degree to which the proposed approach can, and will, follow on from, and sustain, approaches being developed by DepED for IP and Muslim Education. For example:

- It is not clear how the proposed approach will support the IPsEO IP Education Strategic Priorities and Program. Proposed support to IPsEO to "conduct policy reviews of the IP Education Policy Framework", to support "research, policy and advocacy functions" and to support the "development and implementation of different education planning models" does not appear to represent a coherent program of support for IPsEOs strategic priorities or IP Education Program.
- There is a questionable approach to providing "targeted support to improve access to context specific learning systems" in Regions with high concentrations of IP learners. The DepED Rationalisation Plan provides for Regional offices to set the agenda, directions and

policies for education to respond to local needs/demands. This will be particularly important for regions with high concentrations of IP and Muslim learners. It is highly likely that what these offices will need is support from IPSEOs and OME, perhaps via a mobile TA team, to improve the 'across-the-board' response to IP and Muslim Education. The BEST design needs to envisage the possibility of supporting IPSEOs and OME in this way, rather than implying that the TA team and Facilitating Contractor will provide targeted support to Regions with high concentrations of IP learners.

- There is a questionable focus on the development of community based education models for implementation in target sites. The community based education approach currently embedded in the ACCESs advocacy program draws heavily on work being trialled in PRIME. Rather than recommending the development of more models for community based education under BEST, it may be more appropriate to pick up from the point that PRIME has reached at the time of commencement of BEST. DepED scarcely needs more models and frameworks; what is required is support to implement and refine those it currently has.
- Unclear mechanisms for continuation of support to IPSEOs, OME and, by extension, to the partnership building initiatives between DepED and IP Education and Muslim education networks in the Regions. The arrangements for transition from PRIME to BEST appear to have a strong 'top-down', conceptual, rather than operational focus. In fact, it is likely that the key processes and mechanisms to be sustained will be the linkages and partnerships formed at Regional levels and below.
- The involvement of the PRIME Program Director in a BEST Implementation Team for one year at the height of PRIME operations is unlikely to yield effective transition arrangements and may negatively affect the management of PRIME.

In the view of the review team, the following steps need to be taken to ensure that the BEST program is able to sustain effective approaches to IP Education and Muslim Education developed under the current TA contract:

- i. During the first six months of BEST, the Chief Technical Adviser needs to update his or her understanding of current developments in IPSEOs (and other, relevant DepED offices) in order to ensure that the BEST program supports change processes already underway in DepED.
- ii. It follows that preconceived ideas about trialling of models for community education planning, etc. need to be subsumed beneath intent to support the IP Education Program and Muslim education initiatives as planned, and being implemented, by responsible DepED offices.
- iii. Transition arrangements between PRIME and BEST need to recognise the linkage and partnership building initiatives being undertaken in the Regions. In this regard, consideration needs to be given to supporting an early transition team, like the current STRIVE transition team, to facilitate the seamless continuation of support from PRIME to BEST. This cannot be done during final implementation of PRIME as this would represent a conflict of priorities.

6 Conclusion and Recommendations

If validation was needed, the ISR team can confirm that the focus on education as if it resides in schools and books will not enable IP and Muslim cultures to grow and be passed on to their children. If this is to occur there is a need for the mainstream education system to develop the capacity to:

Recognise the presence of IP and Muslim learners within the student community (who are they; where are they?)

Improve understanding in respect of the nature of these communities and their aspirations (pre-service and in-service training of teachers, immersions/awareness raising initiatives for non IP and Muslim teachers)

Respect the organic leadership, networks/organisations of the IP and Muslim communities and the agencies which support them in order to jointly determine how to deliver quality IP and Muslim education services.

DO62 and the Roadmap to Muslim Education will not implement themselves. Nor can DepED implement these policies alone. The *only* way that these policies may be effectively implemented is by sustained collaboration between DepED and IP and Muslim networks/organisations and support agencies.

Recommendations:

No.	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority
1.	Increase the sustainability of capacity building efforts by reducing the pressure to disburse grant funds by June 2013; provide for the 'roll-over' of unspent grant funds to be managed under the 'BEST' program under the guidance of a PRIME program transition team. (see recommendation 8. below)	AusAID	High
2.	In order to improve the sustainability of community engagement efforts, focus on strengthening the links and partnerships between DepED and the existing, organic networks/organisations serving IP and Muslim communities.	OPS, IPsEO, OME and AusAID TA team	High
3.	Ensure that the institutional linkages and partnerships are appropriate to the educational environments in which IP/Muslim education is taking place. (refer categories sub-section 4.2)	OPS, IPsEO, OME and AusAID TA team	
4.	Support the current efforts of IPsEO to link DepED and IP Education networks, including at Regional, Divisional and school levels.	AusAID TA team	
5.	Support IPsEO, over the next 16 months, to work with IP focal persons and FBPOs in the regions / divisions targeted by PRIME to facilitate partnership building between verified networks/organisations or CSOs and school heads to work together to carry out community education planning.	IPsEO AusAID TA team	High
6.	Facilitate the 'outsourcing' of the provision of community education grants by DepED to strong and competent IP networks or CSOs.	IPsEO AusAID TA team	Medium
7.	Encourage the Office for Madrasah Education to develop a facilitation and partnership building role, to build links		Medium

No.	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority
	between Muslim communities, and the organisations which serve them, and DepED at Regional, Division and school levels.		
8.	Update the organisation and management arrangements for PRIME as follows:	TA Program Director	High
	(a) Continue to strengthen TA support for OPS on the MEPA, with particular emphasis on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'up-front' data collection and planning activities o Development of planning, M&E processes for IPSeO o Improving the effectiveness of the 'cascading' training and TA approach for data collection, planning and M&E within the context of IP/Muslim education. 		
	(b) Relocate the M&E Adviser, at least on a part time basis, to the OPS office.	OPS, TA Program Director	Medium
	(c) Establish a formal link between the AusAID TA team and IPSeO which confirms that TA support is intended to support implementation of IPSeO's Strategic Priorities 2012-2015 and the Congress approved, 'IP Education Program'.	AusAID, OPS, TA Program Director	High
	(d) Refocus the work of the FBPOs on the third core program of IPSeO, namely, 'Advocacy and Partnership Building'. (refer recommendation 5.) and on support for the development of institutional linkages between DepED at Region, Division and School levels with Muslim community networks/organisations and supporting agencies. (refer recommendation 8 (e) below)	TA Program Director, Senior Program Officers	High
	(e) Relocate the Information and Advocacy Position to the IPSeO and align the TA support to the IP Education Advocacy Plan, with particular emphasis on reinforcing efforts to build partnerships between DepED and IPO education networks and CSOs.	TA Program Director, IPSeO	Medium
	(f) Maintain 'minimum sufficient' TA support for Muslim Education at Region/Division levels. (refer recommendation 8(c) above)	TA Program Director, FBPOs	Medium
9.	Adjust the Job Description for the Chief Technical Adviser of BEST to provide for an initial, six month, period to update his or her understanding of current developments in IPSeO (and other relevant DepED offices) in order to ensure that the BEST program supports change processes already underway in DepED.	Portfolio Mgr., Education, AusAID	High
10.	Ensure that the final BEST design commits to supporting the IPSeO managed, Congress approved, 'IP Education Program'.	Portfolio Mgr., Education, AusAID	High
11.	The final BEST design should consider providing support to IPSeO in the form of a mobile TA team to provide 'across-the-board' support to Regions/Divisions attempting to respond to	Portfolio Mgr., Education, AusAID	High

No.	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority
	the needs of IP/Muslim children.		
12.	Establish a PRIME transition team (post completion of the program) to ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) PRIME processes are embedded in BEST support mechanism and that (b) linkages and partnerships forged between DepED and IP/Muslim education networks/support agencies at Region and Division levels continue to be supported under BEST. 	Portfolio Mgr., Education, AusAID	High

APPENDIX A Independent Sustainability Review (ISR): Transition Planning of PRIME Program Interventions

1 *Rationale/Purpose of the Review*

Many IP and Muslim communities within the Philippines continue to be underserved with respect to access to essential social services in the Philippines, including access to quality basic education. While the PRIME Program is intended to provide initial support to design and implement appropriate interventions to improve access to basic education for these communities, the short duration of the PRIME Program (just over three years) presents an inherent risk that interventions will not be able to be sustained following completion of the program. The result may be the creation of a situation whereby the expectations of disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities for quality basic education are raised during the implementation of PRIME with a limited ability of the government to sustain interventions introduced as part of the implementation of the PRIME Program.

The timing of the review (mid-program) during August and September of 2012 is intended to inform decisions and actions that are required/recommended by both DepED and AusAID to ensure the sustainability of the most critical interventions of the PRIME Program. The timing of the review could inform the following:

- 2nd Annual Plan of the PRIME Program – due October 2012 (to focus on key interventions for sustainability);
- 2014 DepED Budget Preparation – which will begin in early 2013; and
- Planned and proposed interventions by AusAID – including BEAM-ARMM (start-up by mid-2012) and the Basic Education Sector Transformation (BEST) program – due for Peer Review in mid-2012.

The review will be conducted in collaboration with DepED, particularly the OPS-PDED, the Division with the mandate for program development and evaluation. The review would seek information from documentary sources as well as field visits and interviews with key stakeholders.

2 *Activity Description*

2.1 *Background*

The PRIME Program was designed to improve equitable access to and quality of basic education for girls and boys in disadvantaged Muslim and Indigenous Peoples' (IPs) communities – citing that many of these communities continue to be underserved with respect to the provision of basic education services. The PRIME Program is intended to build upon and scale up throughout the country the support activities for Muslim and IP education that were developed as part of the Basic Education Assistance for Mindanao (BEAM) project that concluded in 2009. The PRIME Program is viewed by the Department of Education (DepED) as a significant contributor to the implementation of the Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA) – the package of policy reform to assist DepED in meeting its international commitments of Education for All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). In particular, the PRIME Program is intended to focus on MDG Goal 2 – Universal access to quality primary education.

Initial discussions between the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and DepED began in the latter part of 2008 to design the PRIME Program under the title “Enhancing

Disadvantaged Groups' Education" (EDGE). The discussions resulted in the preparation of the DepED's proposal, the "Philippines' Response to Indigenous Peoples' and Muslim Education" (PRIME) in September 2009. The AusAID's Request for Tender (RFT) was issued on 18 September 2010.

The PRIME Program was designed to cover seven Regions as reflected in the original contract between AusAID and the Managing Contractor (MC), GRM International. However, during the mobilisation, DepED requested AusAID to include two additional Regions – which had been part of the original design submitted by DepED to the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA). AusAID approved the request of DepED, thus, the two additional Regions were included in early April 2011.

2.2 Goal, Objectives and Component Descriptions

Through the consultative process with DepED, there have been adjustments to the phrasing of the program goal and objective originally provided in the Request for Tender (RFT) and contract. The revised goal statement did not change the 'intent', but rather provided additional clarification. The revised statements provide direction for implementation planning processes, guide program activity, and inform revisions to the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (MEF) and the Monitoring and Evaluation Implementation Plan (MEIP).

The revised goal statement of the PRIME Program is:

To improve the quality of, and equity in, basic learning outcomes in disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities.

The original objective statement in the RFT included two statements (essentially two objectives). To provide better guidance for planning and implementation and for effective monitoring and evaluation, these two statements were separated as two distinct objectives. This approach also more clearly articulates the demand and supply side dynamics underpinning educational quality and access. The two objectives are now stated as follows:

1. *Enable DepED to provide better access to an appropriate, policy driven, sustainable and quality education for girls and boys in Muslim and IPs communities.*
2. *Stimulate demand for education services from IP and Muslim communities.*

In previous program documents, the term 'component' primarily reflected a "demand-supply" equation as the following statements demonstrate:

- i) **Component 1: Supporting the Demand Side:** Attract IPs and Muslim children to school and keep them in school;
- ii) **Component 2: Supporting the Supply Side:** Enable DepED to address access and quality issues in basic education in disadvantaged IPs and Muslim communities; and
- iii) **Component 3: GoP Management and Monitoring Capacity Building Support** was directed to supporting DepED at all levels to enable it to efficiently and effectively manage the Program and other initiatives that seek to improve the delivery of basic education services to disadvantaged IPs and Muslim groups.

In discussions with DepED, the 'demand-supply' equation appeared to reflect more of an implementation principle or approach rather than a useful way of organizing the program work outputs. The use of the word 'component' for the program has been adjusted from the RFT and the

Inception Plan and was reflected in the Annual Plan to better respond to the implementation approach DepED wishes to use. The re-organized components are:

Component 1: *Indigenous People's Education*

Component 2: *Muslim Education*

Component 3: *Capability-Building and Institutional Strengthening*

Component 4: *Program Management and Administration*

2.3 *Expected End-of-Program Outcomes (EoPOs)*

The first Annual Plan presented eleven EoPOs for the supply-side and nine for the demand side. Comments on the MEF, annexed to the first Annual Plan, provided direction to review and validate the EoPOs. The revision provided an opportunity to assess the EoPOs against four (4) criteria: i) Alignment to the Goal and Objectives; ii) Significance and Relevance; iii) Ability to Measure; and iv) Potential to Achieve.

As part of the SMPR preparation, DepED conducted a review and validation of the EoPOs. While maintaining the "demand-supply" equation as its basis for restating the EoPOs, the review resulted in: i) reducing the number of EoPOs to one each for the supply and demand sides; ii) adding an enabling EoPO that cuts across both the demand and supply sides; and iii) adding process indicators for the supply and demand EoPOs. The revised EoPOs and corresponding process indicator are as follows:

Demand-Side Outcome: *Increased demand for educational services in disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities.*

Process Indicator: *Tested models of structures, system, and mechanisms for increased multi-stakeholder demand for improved access among IP and Muslim groups to culturally appropriate basic education.*

Supply-side Outcome: *DepED continuously providing better education services and access to responsive, policy-driven and quality inclusive education in disadvantaged IP/Muslim communities.*

Process Indicator 1: *System and mechanisms in place to enable review, analysis, formulation and implementation of policies to support inclusive IP and Muslim education.*

Process Indicator 2: *System for planning, budgeting and program implementation that is responsive to the demands of disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities.*

Process Indicator 3: *System in place for gathering feedback on the delivery of basic education services for disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities.*

Enabling Outcome: *Positive changes in the attitudes and perceptions among internal and external stakeholders towards, a) IP and Muslim identity and cultures; and b) IP and Muslim education.*

Discussions continue within DepED on the validation of the EoPOs that may result in subsequent changes being introduced to the MEF and MEIP.

2.4 Validated “Menu of Outputs”

The Project Design Document (PDD) provided a ‘menu of outputs’ which were intended to guide the direction of the program without being prescriptive or dictating what the outputs of the program ought to be. There were several reasons for this approach, including:

- i) the absence of sufficient data/information to inform the definitive identification of outputs;
- ii) the recognition that the program was intended to support current and future DepED initiatives so flexibility was needed to permit DepED to decide which outputs would be important;
- iii) the design of the program as a ‘budget supplement’ which could support emerging DepED priorities; and,
- iv) a strong commitment to serving the ‘demand-side’ of the education equation wherein it would be difficult to pre-determine specific outputs without additional information as to the actual needs.

Through consultations with the nine (9) Regions, the Programming and Planning Division (PPD), the Program Development and Evaluation Division (PDED) of the Office of Planning Service (OPS) and through the previous four quarterly Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjustment (MEPA) workshops conducted (June, September, December of 2011 and March of 2012), the ‘menu of outputs’ have been reviewed, adjusted and validated. While additional information from the Baseline Survey (completed in November 2012) has yet to be analysed to reveal the need for additional outputs or revisions to existing outputs, the intent is to focus the implementation of the program in accomplishing outputs from the ‘menu’ that are relevant to the requirements of a specific program location.

The result of this approach is a Central Office Program Implementation Plan (CO-PIP) and nine (9) different Regional Program Implementation Plans (R-PIPs) recognizing the principles of decentralization of educational management - aligned with the direction provided for in the Republic Act 9155 – Governance of Basic Education (2001) in order to meet unique needs in each region, division and school.

3 Current Status of Program Implementation

3.1 Duration/Time Elapsed

The PRIME Program is a 39.5 month initiative that began implementation on 15 March 2011. At the writing of this document, over 16 months have elapsed which have included one complete school cycle (June 2011 to March 2012) with two school cycles remaining (June 2012 to March 2013 and June 2013 to March 2014). However, the ability to affect the first school cycle (2011-2102) was limited due to program start-up activities.

The proposed timing of the conduct of the Independent Sustainability Review (ISR) will be August/September 2012 – representing an elapsed program time of 18 months (approximately 50% of program implementation). This timing should allow for adjustment in remaining activities of the program to support improved sustainability of key interventions of the program.

3.2 Program Coverage – as of July 2012

The program is being implemented at present across nine (9) Regions namely: I, II, IV-B, IX, X, XI, XII and the Administrative Regions of Cordillera and CARAGA to serve disadvantaged IP and Muslim

communities. Due to the short duration of the program an initial 10 priority Divisions were identified for initial support based on available data within each of the 9 Regions. Based on the findings and recommendations of further research (Baseline Survey – Phase 1) to identify priority areas within the 9 Regions, an additional 14 Schools Divisions were added as priority Divisions for a total of 24 Divisions. DepED has received informal and formal requests to add additional Regions (Regions III) and additional Divisions (Region IV-B).

Within each of the current 24 Divisions, selection committees composed of stakeholders have identified specific communities and target locations for program support – to be provided through the grant facility. It is anticipated that the minimum number of school/community locations to be engaged with the PRIME Program will exceed 350 locations.

3.3 Major Activity Status

The three basic activity elements to the PRIME Program are:

1. a grants facility intended to provide a flexible funding mechanism to respond to the unique situations faced by IP and Muslim communities in accessing basic education;
2. a research activity to provide comprehensive baseline data on the situations of IP and Muslim communities within priority geographical and cultural locations; and
3. capacity-building for management and monitoring and evaluation.

3.3.1 Grants

A significant portion (\$ 6 million AUD) of the PRIME Program are allocated to a grant facility that provides grants to all organizational levels of DepED (Central, Regional, Division and School) as well as a reserved allocation for non-DepED proponents at the community level. Grants at the Central, Regional and Division levels are provided to support activities at this level which are aligned to the mandate of each level. Approximately 10% of the total grant amounts are allocated to each of the three levels.

A total of 70% - or approximately \$ 4.2 million AUD – is allocated to the school/community level. 65% of this allocation is for DepED schools/interventions, while 35% is reserved for non-DepED proponents to support collaboration and partnership with various stakeholders.

The grants at the school/community level follows and is aligned to the DepED SBM Grant facility – a 1 billion pesos/year allocation to support the practice of SBM.

Grants are released to the Region and Division levels (with school/community grants being managed by Divisions) in two tranches per year – one in April to enable preparation for the upcoming school year (June) and one during the middle of the school calendar in October to align with potential collaboration with local government budgets. Central Office grants are made available through the approval of specific proposals reviewed by OPS-PDED and approved by senior DepED management.

A PRIME Grant Guidelines manual has been prepared and revised to guide the development and appraisal of proposals from both DepED and non-DepED proponents.

It is anticipated that approximately 50% of the total allocation for grants will have been released by mid-2012.

3.3.2 Research

The selection of the original seven (7) Regions (subsequently nine Regions) for the RFT was based on the available data from DepED at the time of program design. The realization and understanding that limited data (aside from poverty data and basic educational performance indicators) was available upon which to design specific interventions resulted in a requirement of the program to conduct additional research. The need for additional information emerged in the program design as the requirement for a Baseline Survey. Through discussions with DepED, the Baseline Survey is being implemented in three phases – focussed on the ‘demand-side’. These phases are:

- Phase 1: Identification of Priority Divisions (completed in 2011) – 10 initial priority Divisions based on data available within DepED and Regional Offices and an additional 14 Priority Divisions within the 9 Regions identified through a more comprehensive quantitative analysis.
- Phase 2: Household Survey (administered in 2011 – final report in April 2012)
- Phase 3: Focus Group Discussions (Qualitative – to be conducted in late -2012). The FGD approach has recently been modified to use a Case Study orientation.

A parallel phase was identified to complement the three ‘demand-side’ phases noted above, which is the survey of DepED managers and staff to identify the ‘supply-side’ responses as well as to document prevalent perceptions and attitudes towards disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities/individuals.

More recently, there has been discussion to conduct a limited “longitudinal study” in selected communities to document changes over time in the demand for and provision of educational services supported by the PRIME Program.

3.3.3 Capacity Building – planning, MEPA, GMIS

The PRIME Program is required to contribute to the development of capacity within DepED and, by extension, due to the nature of the program of various stakeholders (e.g. non-DepED proponents for grants). There are three main, although inter-related areas for capacity-building – Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation and Management of Grants/Funds.

For planning, PRIME has and intends to continue to assist in advancing a community-driven approach (demand-side) to educational planning at the school-community level – currently referred to as the Community Education Improvement Plan (CEIP). PRIME has supported adjustments to the Division Educational Development Plans (DEDPs) to include planning for IP and Muslim communities. At the regional level, in the absence of Regional Educational Development Plans, PRIME has supported the development of Regional Program Implementation Plans (R-PIPs) for PRIME.

Since May of 2012, the PRIME Program – due to the unique work in educational planning at the community level – was asked to contribute to the development of the principles and indicators for “A Child and Community Centred Education System” (ACCESs) – which was launched on 1 June 2012.

Support for monitoring and evaluation involve the engagement and capability strengthening of OPS-PDED as well as the Regional and Division Monitoring and Evaluation Groups (RMEGs and DMEGs). The introduction of an adapted technology from the STRIVE Project is being utilized for regular progress monitoring and plan adjustment – the quarterly Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjustment (MEPA) workshops – at the regional and central office levels. DepED has expressed sincere interest in expanding the MEPA approach nation-wide following its successful use in PRIME supported regions.

Support to improving the management of grant funds is demonstrated by: the collaborative development and DepED issuance of the PRIME Grant Guidelines; the conduct of regular review and audit of policies and processes for grants; and the development of an Grants Management Information System (GMIS) (to be linked to the eBEIS and a future Program Management Information System (PMIS) of DepED).

3.4 Documentation Available

As of July 2012, a number of key program documents have been prepared and are available. These include:

- Project Design Document (PDD) - 2009
- Request for Tender (RFT) - 2010
- PRIME Program Inception Report - April 2011
- 1st PRIME Program Annual Plan - October 2011
- Grants Audit Report – June 2012
- Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and Plan (MEF and MEIP) – updated July 2012
- Sustainability Strategy – updated July 2012
- Risk Management Strategy/Plan – updated July 2012
- Six-Month Progress Reports (SMPR) – January 2012 and July 2012
- PRIME Grants Guidelines – revised March 2012
- Regional Office – Program Implementation Plans – updated June 2012
- Central Office – Program Implementation Plan – updated June 2012

3.5 DepED Initiatives

Since the design and start-up of the PRIME Program, DepED has undertaken a number of initiatives that will have a direct bearing on the implementation of the PRIME Program – both for the remaining duration of the program as well as having implications for sustainability. These include:

- Inclusion in the 2010 DepED budget of a line item for Madrasah Education – that appears to have addressed many of the issues identified in the design of PRIME.
- Inclusion in the 2013 DepED budget of a line item for IP Education.
- Adoption of an IP Education Policy Framework by DepED (DepED Order No. 62, s. 2011).
- Establishment of the Office for Madrasah Education (2010) and the Indigenous Peoples' Education Office (2011) – both offices reporting to the Undersecretary for Programs and Projects.
- Approval to conduct a Review of Muslim Education Initiatives of DepED – to be completed by December 2012.
- Review of the SBM Grants – with recommendations for improvement and with potential future allocation of a portion of the grants to disadvantaged communities.
- Adoption by government/DepED of a modified zero-based budget preparation for the 2013 budget that will enable divisions and regions to develop/prepare budgets that are responsive to specific requirements in their locations – predicting that budgets will be able to better respond to equity issues.
- Recent discussions to adopt a “Community-Based Education Development” model of planning at the school/community level.
- Emerging directions to require all Regions to conduct quarterly progress review and plan adjustment exercises with reports to Central Office.

3.6 *AusAID Initiatives*

Aside from the PRIME Program, AusAID is also currently engaged with two programs directed towards supporting improvements in the delivery of quality basic education. These are: 1) BEAM-ARMM, modelled on the previous Basic Education Assistance for Mindanao (BEAM) Project and will be implemented in the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM); and, 2) the Basic Education Sector Transformation (BEST) program, a new ten year program (for Peer Review in mid-2012) to assist DepED to deliver its Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA).

4 *Review Objectives and Assignment Requirements*

4.1 *Review Objectives*

With the ongoing policy and programming developments in DepED as well as in AusAID, it is important that progress in current initiatives are considered in the adjustment of current initiatives and the design of future initiatives. The review will examine key elements of the PRIME Program the results of which will inform the balance of PRIME activities as well as the planning of interventions by DepED and AusAID towards improving access to quality basic education by disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities.

Of importance is the intention of the results of the review to inform the final design elements of AusAID's BEST program as well as adjustments to BESRA, including the implementation of the K-12 program.

Specifically the review should investigate and formulate recommendations on the merits of continuing or adapting specific elements of the PRIME Program. These specific elements include, but are not limited to the following:

- **Community Education Improvement Plan (CEIP):** PRIME has introduced a 'demand-side' community-based planning model for basic education to respond to the unmet needs of IP and Muslim communities. In line with the ongoing discussion within DepED on expanding the concept of SBM into 'site-based management' approach or even a community-based education development' concept, are there significant contributions of the PRIME CEIP approach that can be sustained/ institutionalized to improve educational planning at the community level? Is there any evidence to suggest that access to quality basic education for IP and Muslim boys and girls will be improved? Is there evidence or potential for the CEIP to support better education outcomes if planning is conducted at the community level?
- **Education Grants:** PRIME has supported grants at all levels of DepED as well as reserved grants for non-DepED proponents at the community level. Is there evidence to suggest that there is merit in continuing to provide grants to all levels within DepED to support access to quality basic education for disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities? Is access to quality basic education being improved through the grants mechanism? Are better education outcomes being achieved by providing grants to schools? How are grants channelled to non-DepED proponents performing in supporting improved access to quality basic education? Are the strategies, policies and processes piloted by PRIME for grant management (Guidelines, Audit/Reviews, GMIS) effective and efficient for adoption/adaptation by government or AusAID?
- **Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjustments:** PRIME has introduced an adaptation of a quarterly Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjustment (MEPA) technology implemented in the STRIVE Project. What is the value of the quarterly MEPA towards monitoring progress

and adjusting plans for better outcomes for disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities specifically and more generally for the implementation of basic education in the country?

- **Management Approach/Interface with DepED:** PRIME has adopted a management approach/interface with DepED that is aligned to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action – which demands that the PRIME Program is a DepED Program supported by AusAID and its managing contractor. Is the approach adopted by the Managing Contractor effective and efficient in responding to the requirement of DepED for funding support and technical assistance for the priorities established by DepED?

4.2 Assignment Duration/Scheduling

The in-country portion of the review will be for a period of three weeks starting at the end of August to the first half of September 2012. An additional eleven days is provided for preparation and revision of the review report. The following are the indicative activities and corresponding input days:

- Review and synthesis of documents to inform questions for field visits, FGDs and key informant interviews (KIIs) (4 days)
- Entry Meetings and Mission Planning (4 days)
- Field work (site visits, interviews and FGDs) including travel to sites (5 days)
- KIIs (DepED, AusAID, Managing Contractor) (3 days)
- Draft Key Findings (1 day)
- Exit meetings (AusAID, DepED) (1 day)
- Preparation of Draft Review Report (4 days)
- Revision and submission of Final Review Report (3 day)

4.3 Scope of Services

A Program Review Specialist (the Contractor) shall provide services to include:

- i. Assume the lead role in the review process in collaboration with a team of reviewers from DepED;
- ii. Review and analyse relevant program documents provided by the Managing Contractor, and advise of any additional documents or information required prior to the conduct of the review in order to develop key evaluation questions;
- iii. Design the methodology and implementation plan for the review;
- iv. Lead a field mission to selected field sites that will provide information to respond to the key evaluation questions;
- v. Provide direction and/or guidance for consultations/interviews with key stakeholders;
- vi. Present major findings of the review in briefings to DepED, AusAID and the Managing Contractor after the field mission; and,
- vii. Lead the preparation and revision of the Review Report ensuring that all reports are submitted on time and to a high analytical and presentational standard.

4.4 Reporting Requirements

The Contractor will submit the following to the Managing Contractor:

- **Summary of Initial Findings and Preliminary Recommendations:** To be submitted at the end of the Field Mission covering major findings, preliminary recommendations and summary of

the review process. The summary will be presented for discussion and comments to appropriate DepED officials, AusAID staff and the Managing Contractor.

- **A Draft Review Report** of approximately 20 pages (excluding preliminary pages, executive summary, annexes, schedules) within 5 working days after completion of the field mission.
- **A final Review Report** within one week of receiving comments from DepED, AusAID and the Managing Contractor.

5 Team Composition

The Review Team will be composed of:

- Program Review Specialist/Team Leader
- Two staff from DepED OPS-PDED
- Representative of the RMEG from the field site selected
- Managing Contractor M&E Advisor

The Team Leader should possess:

- Extensive experience in international and/or community development;
- Demonstrated knowledge of the AusAID program in the Philippines and of relevant Philippine Government policies on basic education;
- Knowledge on and experience in the provision of social services to disadvantaged groups – ideally with specific knowledge on IP and/or Muslim Education issues; and
- At least five years of progressive experience in the conduct of program/project reviews.

APPENDIX B Independent Sustainability Review (ISR) Methodology and Implementation Plan

1 Background

Many IP and Muslim communities within the Philippines continue to be underserved with respect to access to essential social services in the Philippines, including access to quality basic education. While the PRIME Program is intended to provide initial support to design and implement appropriate interventions to improve access to basic education for these communities, the short duration of the PRIME Program (just over three years) presents an inherent risk that interventions will not be able to be sustained following completion of the program. The result may be the creation of a situation whereby the expectations of disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities for quality basic education are raised during the implementation of PRIME with a limited ability of the government to sustain interventions introduced as part of the implementation of the PRIME Program.

The timing of the review (mid-program) during August and September of 2012 is intended to inform decisions and actions that are required/recommended by both DepED and AusAID to ensure the sustainability of the most critical interventions of the PRIME Program. The timing of the review could inform the following:

- 2nd Annual Plan of the PRIME Program – due October 2012 (to focus on key interventions for sustainability);
- 2014 DepED Budget Preparation – which will begin in early 2013; and
- Planned and proposed interventions by AusAID – including BEAM-ARMM (start-up by mid-2012) and the Basic Education Sector Transformation (BEST) program – due for Peer Review in mid-2012.

The review will be conducted in collaboration with DepED, particularly the OPS-PDED, the Division with the mandate for program development and evaluation. The review would seek information from documentary sources as well as field visits and interviews with key stakeholders.

2 ISR Objective

The primary objective of the ISR, as outlined in the Terms of Reference (ToR) is to examine key elements of the PRIME Program in order to inform the on-going implementation of PRIME activities, as well as informing the final design elements of AusAID's BEST program and adjustments to BESRA, including the implementation of the K-12 program. Specifically, the review should formulate recommendations on the merits of continuing, or adapting, specific elements of the PRIME Program.

There are two principles which are required to underpin both the analysis and the recommendations, namely, the emphasis on:

- **Inclusive education:** all children can and have a right to learn.⁷
- **Sustainability:** proposed interventions will build upon previous interventions by DepED and AusAID and be capable of being implemented in a sustainable manner and will promote strategies, skills and mechanisms which will increase the likelihood of long term sustainability – including the use of GoP and DepED structures and systems.⁸

⁷ PRIME Gender, Poverty Inclusion and Disability Strategy pg 1

⁸ PRIME Annual Plan, 2011

The ISR objective will be addressed by considering four key elements and specific review questions within the context of each of these elements.

- **Community education planning mechanism:**
 - What are the significant contributions of the PRIME CEIP approach that may be sustained/institutionalized to improve education planning at the community level?
 - What evidence is available to support the hypothesis that the CEIP approach improves access to quality basic education for IP and Muslim boys and girls?
 - How important is planning at the community level to the achievement of better education outcomes?

- **Education grants:**
 - Is there evidence to suggest that there is merit in continuing to provide grants to all levels within DepED to support access to quality basic education for disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities?
 - Is access to quality basic education being improved through the grants mechanisms?
 - Are better education outcomes being achieved by providing grants to schools?
 - How are grants channelled to non-DepED proponents performing in supporting improved access to quality basic education?
 - Are the strategies, policies and processes piloted by PRIME for grant management (Guidelines, Audit/Reviews, GMIS) effective and efficient for adoption/adaptation by government or AusAID?

- **Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjustments (MEPA):**
 - What are the strengths and weaknesses of the quarterly MEPA as a mechanism for monitoring progress and adjusting plans for basic education?
 - What are the strengths and weaknesses of the MEPA as a mechanism for achieving better outcomes for disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities?

- **Management Approach/Interface with DepED:**
 - Is the current management approach/interface with DepED effective and efficient in providing funding support and technical assistance to DepED?

3 Audiences

The *primary* audiences for this ISR are:

- Office of Planning Service, DepED Central (OPS)
 - Project Development and Evaluation Division

- Planning and Programming Division
- Indigenous Peoples' Education Office (IPsEO)
- Office for Madrasah Education (OME)

The *secondary* audiences for ISR are:

- PRIME MC personnel
- AusAID Philippines Education Program staff

4 *Approach and methodology*

4.1 *Approach*

The Review will involve three phases as follows:

- **Phase 1: Desk Review** to examine key program documents; a list is attached as Annex A. The desk review will focus upon a preliminary analysis of each of the key elements and review questions with a view to informing the consultations with stakeholders.
- **Phase 2: Consultations with Stakeholders**
The Review Team will undertake field visits to Luzon and Mindanao from September 10th to 16th, 2012. Consultations will be carried out [using the Review Instruments outlined in 2. below] with relevant personnel from:
 - AusAID
 - DepED National, Regional, Division and school levels
 - National and Regional NCIP and NCMF
 - Tribal and Muslim community leaders
 - NGO/CSO, PTA/community
 - PRIME Project
- **Phase 3: Analysis, Feedback and Reporting**
Taking into account the results of the Desk Review, as well as a preliminary analysis of the content of transcripts of interviews with stakeholders, the Review Team will provide initial feedback on findings at an Exit Briefing on September 18th, 2012. Thereafter, the Review Team will undertake a thorough analysis of findings, incorporating Stakeholder comments at the Exit Briefing. The team will prepare a Draft ISR Report by 28th September, 2012 and a Final Draft [incorporating stakeholder comments on the draft] within one week of receiving said comments.

4.2 *Methodology*

The following instruments will provide the structure within which the Review will be conducted:

Instrument One: *Review of Key Elements*. This instrument (Attachment 2) identifies the key elements for investigation and the questions to be considered under each element.

This instrument represents a summary framework which will be used as an on-going guide and framework for Review Team members in the organisation of

their notes. This will also be the format for organisation of Phase 3: Analysis, Feedback and Reporting

Instrument Two: *Question Guide* (Attachment 3). This instrument is based on Instrument One: 'Review of Key Elements' and identifies specific questions to be answered by different stakeholders. The questions are provided as a *guide only*. Each interview will be conducted in a semi-structured, informal manner, with greater or lesser degrees of emphasis given to different questions according to the person being interviewed. No single stakeholder will be expected to address all questions. In each interview the review team members will take individual notes which will be consolidated at the end of each day. The team will meet to review these notes each evening.

4.3 *Assumptions and Limitations*

It is critical for the Review Team to consciously identify both assumptions that are being made in conduct of the ISR and limitations to the extent and quality of the review. Some of the latter will only become evident during implementation of the review. The assumptions and limitations will be reviewed during the entry meetings and will be revisited during preparation of the Draft Final Report.

Attachment 1:

The following documents were made available to the Review Team:

- Project Design Document (PDD) - 2009
- Request for Tender (RFT) - 2010
- PRIME Program Inception Report - April 2011
- 1st PRIME Program Annual Plan - October 2011
- Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and Implementation Plan (MEF and MEIP) – updated March 2012
- Sustainability Strategy – October 2011
- Risk Management Strategy/Plan – updated January 2012
- Six-Month Progress Report (SMPR) – January 2012
- PRIME Grants Guidelines – revised March 2012
- Regional Office – Program Implementation Plans – updated March 2012
- Central Office – Program Implementation Plan – to be updated April 2012
- 1st Financial Audit Report
- Longitudinal Case Study Concept Paper

Attachment 2: Review of Key Elements

Community Education Planning approach	Education Grants:	Monitoring, Evaluation and Plan Adjustments:	Management Approach/Interface with DepED:
<p>Key Questions</p> <p>1. What are the significant contributions of the PRIME community education planning approach that may be sustained /institutionalized to improve education planning at the community level?</p> <p>2. What evidence is available to support the hypothesis that the community education planning approach improves access to quality basic education for IP and Muslim boys and girls?</p> <p>3. How important is planning at the community level to the achievement of better education outcomes?</p>	<p>Key Questions</p> <p>4. Is there evidence to suggest that there is merit in continuing to provide grants to all levels within DepED to support access to quality basic education for disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities?</p> <p>5. Is access to quality basic education being improved through the grants mechanisms?</p> <p>6. Are better education outcomes being achieved by providing grants to schools?</p> <p>7. How are grants channelled to non-DepED proponents performing in supporting improved access to quality basic education?</p> <p>8. Are the strategies, policies and processes piloted by PRIME for grant management (Guidelines, Audit/Reviews, GMIS) effective and efficient for adoption/adaptation by government or AusAID?</p>	<p>Key Questions</p> <p>9. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the quarterly MEPA as a mechanism for monitoring progress and adjusting plans for basic education nationally?</p> <p>10. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the MEPA as a mechanism for achieving better outcomes for disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities?</p>	<p>Key Questions</p> <p>11. Is the current management approach/interface with DepED effective and efficient in providing funding support and technical assistance to DepED?</p>

Attachment 3 : Review Instrument 2 – Question Guide PRIME ISR

Key questions: as per TOR	AusAID Post	DepED National	National stakeholders	Regional DepED	Divisional DepED	Schools	Community PTA/	NGOs/CSOs	Sub-Questions
A. Community Education Planning Mechanism 1. What are the significant contributions of the PRIME community education planning approach that may be sustained/institutionalized to improve education planning at the community level? 2. What evidence is available to support the hypothesis that the community education planning approach improves access to quality basic education for IP and Muslim boys and girls? 3. How important is planning at the community level to the achievement of better education outcomes?		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you think should be the role of the community in education planning? • How does that work in practice? How is the IP/Muslim community represented in the planning process in your Region/Division/School?
		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been your experience with community participation in education planning? • What are the strengths and weaknesses of the approach?
			√						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What do you think the communities' role should be in education planning.
				√	√				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is your understanding of DP62? • What is your view on the value of the training/exposure programs carried out as a part of the PRIME initiative of DepED? • Which knowledge/skills do you plan to integrate in your structure, roles and

Key questions: as per TOR	AusAID Post	National DepED	National stakeholders	Regional DepED	Divisional DepED	Schools	PTA/Community	NGOs/CSOs	Sub-Questions
									functions? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any evidence of changed awareness at lower levels (e.g. ask Regional staff about Division staff; ask Division staff about school level)
				√	√	√			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What type of training/assistance have you provided to staff at lower levels (Division, school) What are your plans for follow up?
				√	√	√	√	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you see yourselves participating in and sustaining greater IP and Muslim access to education in future? What type of education system should be in place (at your level) to achieve this? What type of leadership is required? What capacities are required to achieve continued access? How do you think the logistical/overhead costs could be covered to sustain the community education planning mechanism?
				√	√	√			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What steps have you taken to engage the broader community?

Key questions: as per TOR	AusAID Post	National DepED	National stakeholders	Regional DepED	Divisional DepED	Schools	PTA/Community	NGOs/CSOs	Sub-Questions
B. Education Grants									
4. Is there evidence to suggest that there is merit in continuing to provide grants to all levels within DepED to support access to quality basic education for disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities?		√		√	√	√	√	√	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the strengths and weaknesses of the grants approach adopted by PRIME? • Did you experience any difficulties in writing your grant application / financial plan? • Are you aware of difficulties experienced at other levels (e.g. schools, communities, NGOs)? • How are the IP / Muslim communities represented in the identification/development and evaluation of grants proposals? • What is your experience in managing your own grant? (CO, Regional, Division, School, community)? • What is your experience in supervising the administration of grants at the level below you? (CO, Regional, Division) • How can a 'demand side' grants fund which gives communities access to funds be sustained?
5. Is access to quality basic education being improved through the grants mechanisms? 6. Are better education outcomes being achieved by providing grants to schools?	<i>Discussion with PRIME Program staff (DepED and MC) indicates that insufficient program time has elapsed to be able to effectively address these questions</i>								

Key questions: as per TOR	AusAID Post	National DepED	National stakeholders	Regional DepED	Divisional DepED	Schools	PTA/Community	NGOs/CSOs	Sub-Questions
7. How are grants channelled to non-DepED proponents performing in supporting improved access to quality basic education?			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the process by which grants are channelled to non-DepED proponents? • What is the role of the Region/Division in terms of the community proposals? What relationship is there between the Divisions and the communities? Who is accountable for the community proposals? • Do you have any concerns about the process? • Could you suggest any ways in which this process might be improved?
8. Are the strategies, policies and processes piloted by PRIME for grant management (Guidelines, Audit/Reviews, GMIS) effective and efficient for adoption/adaptation by government or AusAID?		✓		✓	✓	✓			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What process are you using to assess proposals/Work & Financial Plans? • What are the strengths and weaknesses of the process? • Could you suggest any ways to improve the process?

Key questions: as per TOR	AusAID Post	National DepED	National stakeholders	Regional DepED	Divisional DepED	Schools	PTA/Community	NGOs/CSOs	Sub-Questions
C. MEPA									
<p>9. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the quarterly MEPA as a mechanism for monitoring progress and adjusting plans for basic education nationally?</p> <p>10. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the MEPA as a mechanism for achieving better outcomes for disadvantaged IP and Muslim communities?</p>				√	√				<p>Same as questions 9. and 10. Also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the MEPA processes and tools be integrated in the M&E work of the RO and DO? • What technical assistance has your office been able to provide (Region to Divisions; Division to schools) to encourage the integration of the MEPA processes and tools into normal practice? • How do you monitor community grants?

Key questions: as per TOR	AusAID Post	National DepED	National stakeholders	Regional DepED	Divisional DepED	Schools	PTA/Community	NGOs/CSOs	Sub-Questions
D. Management Approach/Interface with DepED									
11. Is the current management approach/interface with DepED effective and efficient in providing funding support and technical assistance to DepED?	√	√		√	√				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In your opinion, what are the basic prerequisites required for the PRIME management approach to work? • What impact has the short time frame for PRIME had upon DepED management and staff? • What impact has the departure of key staff from OPS had upon the capacity of DepED to implement the PRIME initiative? • What are the key management issues which need to be addressed to improve the sustainability of the innovations introduced by PRIME to increase the access of IP and Muslim communities to basic education?

APPENDIX C Field Visit Schedule and List of Persons Met

Activity	Date	Offices/Persons Involved
Entry Meetings and Mission Planning	Sept. 3, 2012 (morning)	GRM International: Nelson Ireland (Program Director) Rey Macalindong (M&E Advisor) Stella Mendoza (M&E Officer for Luzon) Ermelinda Bahatan (Activities and Grants Controller) Kay Katherine Zabala (M&E Assistant)
	Sept. 3 (afternoon)	Office of Planning Service (OPS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and Programming Division (PPD) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Charlie Tayas (Educ. Program Specialist II) • Project Development and Evaluation Division (PDED) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ma. Victoria Necesito (Educ. Program Specialist II) ○ Dexter Pante (Senior Educ. Program Specialist) ○ Erwin Yumping (Senior Educ. Program Specialist) • Office for Madrasah Education (OME) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Manaros Boransing (Consultant) ○ Josefina Lacuna (Consultant)
Meeting with AusAID	Sept. 4	AusAID: Trisha Gray (Portfolio Manager and First Secretary) Regan Dagadas (Program Officer) Hazel Aniceto (Portfolio Manager-Education) Evelyn Daplas (Portfolio Manager, BEAM ARMM) Tess Felipe (Education Specialist) Rod Sollesta (Portfolio Manager)
Key Informant Interview	Sept. 5 (morning)	Mr Rozanno Rufino (IPsEO Coordinator and Adviser to the Secretary on IP Concerns, IPs Education Office) Mr Roger B. Masapol (Chief, OPS-PDED and Concurrent OIC, OPS-PPD)
Interviews	Sept. 5 (afternoon)	Nelson Ireland (Program Director, PRIME/GRM) Mark Norman Maca (Deputy Program Director, PRIME/GRM)
Key Informant Interview	Sept. 6 (afternoon)	Jesus L.R. Mateo (Assistant Secretary for Planning and Development) Jesson V. Butcon (Program Coordinator - Basic Education Sector Reform Agenda (BESRA), Office of the Undersecretary for Regional Operations)

Activity	Date	Offices/Persons Involved
Field work (site visits, interviews and FGDs)	Sept. 10-12	Luzon
	Sept. 13-14	Mindanao
	Sept. 17-19	<p data-bbox="1002 241 1374 331">} Refer informants list, below</p> <p data-bbox="826 369 1385 510">During the field visits the team also conducted interviews and meetings with GRM personnel who are based at the Central, Regional, and Division Offices.</p> <ol data-bbox="874 548 1390 1048" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Marie France Balawitan (Advocacy Officer) 2. Josephine Calag (M&E Officer-Mindanao) 3. Norma Gonos (Senior Program Officer-Mindanao) 4. Solitario Discar (FBPO Reg. 9 and 13) 5. Myrna Siose (FBPO Reg. 10) 6. Ramdino Abarico (FBPO Reg. 11) 7. Edwin Antipuesto (FBPO Reg. 12) 8. Ma. Lourie Victor (Senior Program Officer for Luzon) 9. James Lagria (FBPO Reg 1 and 2) 10. Karina Javier (FBPO Reg IV-B)
Exit Meeting	Sept. 21 (morning)	<p data-bbox="826 1086 1401 1153">DepED and community representatives (data to be provided based on the attendance sheets)</p> <p data-bbox="826 1160 1326 1227">DepED (OPS, IPsEO, OME, EDPIATF, GRM, AusAID)</p>
Key Informant Interview	Sept. 21 (afternoon)	<p data-bbox="826 1227 1390 1294">Yolanda Quijano, Undersecretary for Programs and Projects</p> <p data-bbox="826 1339 1390 1402">Rizalino D. Rivera, Undersecretary for Regional Operations</p>

Luzon and Mindanao PRIME Areas Field Visits

Review Informants/Group Discussion Participant

September 10, 2012

Cordillera Administrative Region

Divisions of Apayao and Mt. Province

Venue: Archug Hotel and Restaurant, Mt. Province

8:00AM to 3:00PM

1. Kaye Bysouth
2. Ma. Victoria Necesito
3. Trisha Gray
4. Regan Dagadas
5. Stella Mendoza
6. Karina Javier
7. Kay Katherine Zabala
8. Lourie Victor
9. Belmer Yano
10. Dir. Ellen Donato
11. Gloria Felipe (Chief, ALS Div.)
12. Nenita Olaires (Asst. Chief of Elem.)
13. Daisy Eswat (ADM Aide 3)
14. Rosalinda Tavera (M&E)
15. Danilo Cudiamat (Apayao)
16. Gilbert Villanueva (Apayao)
17. Sr. Aristeo Bautista (PAMANAKA)
18. Ric Fuguso (PAMANAKA)
19. Sr. Armi Sedilla (PAMANAKA)
20. Antonio Cayyog (Mt. Province)
21. SDS Sally Ullalim – Mt. Province
22. Jasmin Ay-yato– Mt. Province
23. Annie Wallang– Mt. Province
24. Irene Bakisan– Mt. Province
25. Norberto Gonsoden – Admin. Assistant
PRIME CAR

Sept. 11, 2012

Region 1

Division of Ilocos Sur

Venue: Zigzag Pines Elementary School

Started at 9:00 and ended at around 1:00 in the afternoon

PTCA

1. Samson Payan – Barangay (Brgy.) Kagawad
2. Jona I. Gando – Treasurer
3. Domingo Anang – Brgy. Kagawad
4. Ma. Elena Yageza - Brgy. Kagawad

5. Sandie Gasigas – Secretary
6. Simona C. Lag-asan – Barangay Health Worker (BHW)
7. Gloria Bacuiga – BHW
8. Lilibeth Anamas – PTCA Treasurer
9. Edwin Gando - Brgy. Kagawad
10. Mgangue
11. Blanco Agnila
12. Heraldo Pedro
13. Simeon Abales
14. Mario Ananey - Brgy. Kagawad
15. Baltazar Yagyagen – Brgy. Captain
16. Rosita Albog
17. Renato Paredes – leader
18. Elma M. Pureti – ABC president
19. Junnifer A. Fecha – Teacher 1
20. E. Del Rosario – Administrative aid
21. Mayolo L. Berioso –Brgy. Kagawad
22. Solomon Dalaya – Brgy. Kagawad
23. Lorenzo Atiwa – PTCA President
24. Christine Tienda – PTCA
25. Cresencia P. Maggay – Head Teacher
Region and Division Office
26. Sanlos Bal-yang – Principal I
27. Jonathan Pintor – Admin. Assistant
28. Edwin M. Rapacon – Teacher in Charge
29. Feliciano Tumacdag – Superintendent
30. Corazon Luquingan – EPS II
31. Marino Baytec – Superintendent
32. Arnel Doctolero – Principal IV/Focal Person
33. Trisha Gray – First Secretary, AusAID
34. Estrella O Soria – Superintendent
35. Luzviminda S. De Guzman – EPS II
36. Gemma Tacuycuy – Superintendent

September 13, 2012

Regional Office XIII

1. Dr. Rebecca V. Delapuz, OIC Assistant Regional Director
2. Dr. Gilda G. Berte, Regional PRIME Focal Person
3. Ms. Fely Auguis, IP and Muslim Education Coordinator

***Division of Agusan del Sur, Patin-ay,
Prosperidad, Agusan del Sur***

DepED and non-DepED stakeholders (LGU, NCIP, community representatives)
11:00AM to 4:00PM

1. Adelaida Buyog, TAA II
2. Kristine Quismundo, Admin. Aide III
3. Henry Morcady, Tribal Leader
4. Crucita Taala, Superintendent
5. Gilda Berte, PRIME Focal Person
6. Estefania Nonan
7. Jaime Durango, Jr., Teacher in charge
8. Elizabeth Osigan
9. Hilgen Margadez
10. Henry Morgadz, tribal leader
11. Becky Barrios
12. Solitario Discar, FBPO Reg
13. Carlos Niepes, Admin. Assistant (PRIME, Reg
14. Mirasol Buslon, Provincial Social Welfare and Development staff
15. Hans Amable, Admin. Assis. (PRIME, Reg 11)
16. Vicente Pasquito, Division IP Ed
17. M. Paulino
18. Josephine Calag, M&E Officer PRIME
19. Norma Gonos, SPO PRIME
20. Gemma de Paz, OIC-Superintendent/Division PRIME Focal Person
21. Kay Zabala
22. Kaye Bysouth

September 14, 2012

Datu Molod Integrated School

10:30AM to 1:00PM

1. Imelda Dujenañas – school head
2. Juditha Alabarca – Teacher
3. Ma. Fe Apolinario – Teacher
4. Joannah Jane Cañeda – PSB
5. Mariel Villanueva – Teacher
6. Linette Alberca – Teacher
7. Juvy Loquias – Teacher
8. Maribel Didal – Teacher
9. Sauda Usman – PSB
10. Krislyn Tabion – PSB
11. Rebecca Gregorio
12. Bedaria Musa
13. Ma. Shirley Cardinal – EPS I
14. Norman Valeroso - EPS II

15. Abdul Kadon – Admin. Assistant PRIME Reg. 12
16. Hans Grayson Amable - Admin. Assistant PRIME Reg. 11
17. Edwin Antipuesto – FBPO PRIME Reg 12
18. Ma. Victoria Necesito – EPS II
19. Norma Gonos – PRIME SPO Mindanao
20. Josephine Calag – M&E PRIME
21. Kay Katherine Zabala – PRIME M&E Assistant
22. Kaye Bysouth – Team Leader, ISR Team
Pupils and School children
23. Norsaida Molod
24. Cazmera Dialil
25. Mohammad Owis Amir
26. Jose M. Shayra
27. Norhaya Bahasuan
28. Rosemary Ilod
29. Samira Jabonillo
30. Rayna Malawar
31. Marilyn Matugas
32. Jhon Panagas
33. Bairin Nakan
34. Monisa Baon
35. Anabel T. Solaiman
36. Jayvie Gonsheres
37. Elvira Badana
38. Mansor Molod
39. Nori-ain Asdale
40. Annaliza Kasem
41. Saidin Jalil
42. Bainory Ibrahim
43. Fatima Dulaham
44. Nanet A. Panagas
45. Edelen B. Olarte
46. Nem'ra Bansalao
47. Norbai Davd
48. Juvilur M. Pakil
49. Razel A. Panagas
50. Bainor K. Adam
51. Bailyn K. Adam
52. Bohare I. Jalil

September 17, 2012

Dagumbaan Elementary School

DepED and community stakeholders
11:00AM to 1:30PM

1. Marie Balawitan – PRIME

2. Nathaniel Cahuan – ESP I
3. Patimbangan M. Ali – PTCA
4. Sulficia T. Nanolan – Tribal Chieftain
5. Rollen Sumooy – DALSC
6. Mencho S. Moreno – Teacher
7. Merlyn Lappang – Teacher
8. Marycris A. Ragandang – Teacher
9. Lucila C. Baldo – Teacher
10. Mylene M. Maraguinot – Teacher
11. Glea May Moca – Teacher
12. Esperanza Advinada – Teacher
13. Lolita Curan – Teacher
14. Aniceto Aparicio – Teacher
15. Junalyn Picut – Teacher
16. Brian Jey E. Arcay – Brgy. Kagawad
17. Raphy Boy P. Alunan
18. Bernadita M. Abanacion – Brgy. Treasurer
19. Patimbangan Raali - Brgy. Kagawad/PTCA President
20. Aisah S. Tumana – astaza, private madrasah
21. Kay Katherine Zabala – PRIME M&E Assistant
22. Parling Linog – Muslim/Parent
23. Minnie Capal
24. Salima Gorigao
25. Rayza Lungsiman
26. Mae Jay Rasoman
27. Esperanza Advincula – Preschool teacher
28. Juliet Mardan
29. Glea May Moca – Preschool teacher
30. Sittieffamerah Mardan
31. Lili Amoran - Parent
32. Samia Amal
33. Thelma Lusiman
34. Cristy Ampoan
35. Edwin Gurrea – Educ. Program Specialist/Regional Office representative
36. Norma Gonos – SPO Mindanao
37. Rey Macalindong – M&E Advisor
38. Marizel Barton – Teacher I
39. Ime Cahuan – Teacher I
40. Gemma Ragas – Teacher
41. Lucila Baldo – Teacher I
42. Leticia Ga – Superintendent (PSDS)
43. Hans Amable – Admin. Assist. PRIME Reg. 11

44. Regan Aglegar - Admin. Assist. PRIME Reg10
45. Lara Ramos
46. Kaye Bysouth
47. Ma. Victoria Necesito – Educ. Program Specialist, DepED CO

September 17, 2012

Daraghuyan Community

5:45pm to 7:30pm

1. Elizabeth Bon - Tribal Secretary
2. Melinda Tulba - AO-IV NCIP
3. Joannah Dumaquim - AA-I NCIP
4. Reyna Mae Ranario - Intern NCIP
5. Datu Bodilio Dacenos - Tribal Leader
6. Belly Lumigoy - Tribal Leader
7. Ignacio Docenos - Tribal Elder
8. Josefina Omaul - Co-Elder
9. Rowins Omarol - Co-Elder
10. Yamie Omarol - Co-Elder
11. Concordio Pinohan - Co-Elder
12. Sonel Sihagan - Youth
13. Ronald Gamay - Youth
14. Arian Lindaban - Youth
15. Bryan Docenos - Youth
16. Ronaldo Docenos - Elder
17. Neting Omarol - Elder
18. Cecil Omarol - Youth
19. Ariel Omarol - Youth
20. Marex Lipay - Youth
21. Joylyn Omarol - Youth
22. Jan Brian Lesionan - Youth
23. Sharon Lumalang - Youth
24. Gamay Inanlagan - Youth
25. Saney Nantong - Youth
26. Anabel Docenas - Youth
27. Gamay Tugdaan - Youth
28. Aiza Cartagienna - Youth
29. Secel Daplon - Youth
30. Rena Jaen Gamay - Youth
31. Maryjoy Docenos - Youth
32. Anna Janea Docenos - Youth
33. Angie Omarol - Youth
34. Jerald Sihagan - Youth
35. Benchard Torino - Youth
36. Jhuno Lagawan - Youth
37. Editha Pensahan - P-4 Chairman
38. Precel Gamay - P-4 Balignao
39. Julia Cacay - P-4 Balignao
40. Benicio Docenos - P-4 Balignao
41. Lourdes Ruiz - Member

42. Marina Jean Idagan - Member
43. Carileza Omarol - Member
44. Ruben Docenas - Kagawad
45. Dominador Decano - KIN Proj. Coord.
46. Adelina Tarino - CADT Halder
47. Jaime Tarino - Council of Elder
48. Jane Danuco - R/A KIN
49. Kay Zabala - M & E Assistant
50. Bryant Industan – KIN (Kitanglad Integrated Network)
51. Rey Macalindong - M & E Adviser
52. Kay Bysouth - ISR Team Leader
53. Ma. Victoria Necesito - EPS II
54. Hans Grayson Amable - AA-RXI
55. Norma Gonos - SPO-Min.
56. Marie Balawitan - Advocacy officer
57. Regan Aglegar - AA-RX
58. Myrna Siose - FBPO RX

September 18, 2012

Taba Elementary School

1:00PM to 4PM

1. Adelfa Yaras – Teacher
2. Aime Paglinawan – Teacher
3. Ellen Valenzona – Teacher
4. Mercedita Concha – Teacher
5. Ria May Bancon – ALIVE Teacher
6. Pelagia Cuevas – Teacher in charge
7. Gina Baclay – Teacher
8. Vicente Loria – Teacher
9. Marie Balawitan – PRIME
10. Norma Gonos – PRIME SPO
11. Rey Macalindong – PRIME M&E Advisor
12. Ma. Victoria Necesito – EPS
13. Ramdino Abarico – FBPO Reg. 11
14. Kay Katherine Zabala – M&E Assistant
15. Kaye Bysouth – Team leader ISR
16. Shiela Lubama – Secretary
17. Baysor Loses – Treasurer
18. Cader Braem – Manager
19. Maisa Pandian – Member
20. Rashid Abdullah – Board of Director
21. Pepito Macagube – Vice President
22. Rolly Maguate – PTA President
23. Akmad Galmac – Brgy. Captain
24. Rasim Galulong – Chief Tanod

9:00AM to 12:00noon

1. Kaye Bysouth
 2. Ma. Victoria Necesito
 3. Kay Katherine Zabala
 4. Marie Balawitan
 5. Norma Gonos
 6. Rey Macalindong
 7. Cresencio Dinangayan, Jr. – Teacher
 8. Juvic Saguing – Teacher
 9. Gina Daabay – Teacher
 10. Perlas Astorga – Teacher
 11. Maricel Dangayan – Teacher
 12. Salvacion Donado – Teacher
 13. Girlie Limbadan – Teacher
 14. Ronnie Macadangdang – Teacher
 15. Mary Joy Paran – Teacher
 16. Rutchelle Caballero – Teacher
 17. Jim Mariamon – Teacher
 18. Bren Colita – Head Teacher
 19. Elsie Lucino – School Head
 20. Genesesly Tahoy – School Head
 21. Arnel Labasan – School Head
 22. Jose Melendres – District Head
 23. Erlyn Paco – Teacher in charge
 24. Reynaly Santos – ESP I
 25. A. Yuon – Parent
 26. Bryan Abella – Parent
 27. Marlyn Libayao – Parent
 28. Paromla Antulad – Parent
 29. Montog Manulogan – Parent
 30. Jerry Tibag – Parent
 31. Emma Onana – Parent
 32. Janette Agay – Parent
 33. Ruguyon Canapcios – Parent
 34. Miriam Manatagoan – Parent
 35. Maningga Andilong – Parent
 36. Helyn Olayan – Parent
 37. Eya-an Sigan-a – Parent
- Gabriel Sayad – IPS R

September 19, 2012

Tibi-Tibi Elementary School