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# LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARDC</td>
<td>Assistant Resident District Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECCAD</td>
<td>Basic Education, Child Care and Adolescent Programme - UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT</td>
<td>Coordinating Centre Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECORE</td>
<td>Centre for Conflict Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDMC</td>
<td>District Disaster Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDMC</td>
<td>District Disaster Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDP</td>
<td>District Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office (-r?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESIP</td>
<td>Education Strategic Investment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESIP</td>
<td>Education Sector Investment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDA</td>
<td>Gulu District Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPTC</td>
<td>Gulu Primary Teachers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSCO</td>
<td>Gulu Support the Children Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEK</td>
<td>Institute of Teacher Education Kyambogo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCs</td>
<td>Local Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRA</td>
<td>Lord’s Resistance Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOES</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoFPED</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoLG</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDC</td>
<td>National Curriculum Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMS</td>
<td>National Minimum Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRA</td>
<td>National Resistance Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAF</td>
<td>Poverty Action Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAF</td>
<td>Poverty Action Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEAP</td>
<td>Poverty Eradication Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parents Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDC</td>
<td>Resident District Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRG</td>
<td>Regional Resource Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFG</td>
<td>School Facilities Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNE</td>
<td>Special Needs Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDs</td>
<td>Sexually Transmitted Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDMP</td>
<td>Teacher Development and Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDMS</td>
<td>Teacher Development Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDF</td>
<td>Uganda People’s Defence Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPDM/A</td>
<td>Uganda People’s Democratic Movement /Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPE</td>
<td>Universal Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background and context

The 1999 Agreement between the Government of Uganda and the Government of Norway mandates the Gulu District Administration (GDA) and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) to implement an emergency education project (hereafter "the project") in Gulu District. Total Norwegian support amounts to NOK 28 Million for the three-year project period, starting late 1999 to 2002. A separate Implementation Contract regulates responsibilities and division of work between the implementing parties. The Agreement states that the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) is represented by GDA.

The population of Gulu suffers by an internal conflict that has lasted for more than 15 years. The rebel group Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) has continuously attacked villages, abducted children and committed other atrocities against the Acholi, the main ethnic group in the area. In 1996 the Government took steps to move village people into camps where the Uganda People’s Defence Force (UPDF) protected them. At the time of the review more than 50% of the population in Gulu had spent more than six years of their life in the camp, and not the six months that people thought they would stay in the beginning. This way of living has hit people hard. Not only is their poverty extreme, but the absence of traditional community structures and family ties, and a high level of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) and HIV/AIDS, threatens to tear the whole fabric of society apart.

At the same time, the Gulu district is part of the mainstream development framework in Uganda. As far as education is concerned, the Government introduced a Universal Primary Education (UPE) policy in 1997. UPE significantly enhanced enrolment and has led to a steep rise in the need for teachers. As a result of UPE and a massive recruitment initiative by the government, the number of teachers in the district has increased significantly since the start of the project in early 2000. The national Education Strategic Investment Programme (ESIP) is an important operational part of this policy. ESIP is the main programme for external support to the education sector in Uganda.

Project Objectives

The project aims towards providing minimum school facilities for the benefit of internally displaced and local children in Gulu district, and also aims to improve learning environment and teaching quality. Reducing the gender gap features central in the project document (PD). The same goes for increasing the capacity of teachers to respond to the needs of children who have been affected by the war.

---

A note on the terms "project" and "programme": Both are used in the basic documents, see e.g. in Agreed Project Summary attached to the Contract dated Nov. 1999, pg. 8, Outputs 1 and 2. This team's conception is that though both terms may be relevant, the project term seems most suitable, i.e. in relation to the broader national picture. Consequently the term "project" is used below about the NRC/GDA activities in Gulu, except when referring to the "Program Document" and other fixed terms.
The teacher-training project is furthermore to be integrated into the training programmes of the primary teacher training colleges in the district. The Gulu Primary Teacher College is to be the main partner in this endeavour.

Main findings and conclusions

The NRC Gulu project comprises of three components: construction of classrooms, teacher training and support activities.

A. School construction

The project includes construction of both temporary and permanent schools. The location of all schools is decided according to priorities set by the Gulu District Administration. Permanent schools have been constructed all over the district. The project is well ahead of its targets. NRC’s way of working, i.e. procedures related to contract arrangements with entrepreneurs and quality control during the building process, is much appreciated in the district. Despite lack of security, this has enabled the project to move forward very fast and at the same time maintain a high quality profile. The school construction element represents the main part of the project budget.

There are also some problems. While the School Management Committees have usually managed to contribute with their share in provision of material etc, the Gulu District Administration (GDA) has not always fulfilled its obligation to provide latrines to the schools. This is assumed to be an obstacle for girl students in particular. It is also a concern that due to displacement of people into camps, five of the first 19 schools constructed are still not in use. These are built in areas that will not be populated until the government eventually permits people to return to their villages, or to new camps closer to their homes. The latter solution seems to be preferred by the government.

B. Teacher training

By late September 2001 more than half of the primary teachers in Gulu had participated in NRC training workshops. The workshop content appears to be tuned in to the specific problems which teachers in Gulu face in their daily practice. The theoretic framework is kept at a minimum, and the workshop is basically geared towards changing the teachers’ perception of their own behaviour, and towards their understanding of the learning context in the classroom. The workshop modules include gender issues, human rights, psychosocial traumas, participatory teaching methods and learning environment.

The training appears to be enthusiastically received and district authorities praise NRC highly for the quality of the training project. A wide partnership network has been built around the teacher training activities, comprising of all relevant non-governmental organisations (NGOs), government authorities, resource persons and institutions in Gulu. Gulu Primary Teacher College (PTC) plays a central role in providing tutors and facilitators to conduct the training.

However, as of late the “parallel” use of resource persons from Gulu PTC in NRC workshops has not worked so well. The reason is that Gulu PTC staff is rather heavily charged with teaching activities in order to meet requirements set by MOES for the national teacher-training scheme. MOES has taken measures to secure that PTC staff nation wide is utilised in the approved mainstream programme, rather than in NGO training projects outside of the mainstream national programme.

In retrospect, certain targets set by the project seem unrealistic or hard to assess. The
represents such a problem. The target related to a net increase in the enrolment of pupils in primary schools in Gulu exemplifies a target that will not be assessable, due to external factors, i.e. government measures eventually leading to the same result.

The main aim of the NRC project is to improve the Gulu teachers’ ability to cope with affected school children in the district. This aim seems to be highly consistent with national aims for teacher capacity development in Uganda. However, the structure and macro organisation of the NRC project as a "traditional" emergency related activity seems to hamper a close communication and cooperation with the national teacher development programme. The reason may in part lie in the established lines of reporting: the NRC project relates to GDA, while its main partner, i.e. Gulu PTC, communicates mainly with the MoES.

In an extension and sustainability perspective, relations and integration with MOES and the UPE programme will be important conditions for replication.

C. Support activities

In order to stimulate local community and parent participation, several activities were set up to support the project. These activities were related to food or income generation, training of kindergarten assistants and teaching methods in selected subjects. In addition they included scouting, sensitisation workshops for committees, organisations and representatives at school and local level, and other activities.

The adjoined projects related to food or income generation (agro-forestry and fishing) seems to work well. These projects reportedly have become popular with the parents and with the students, who can actually make a small income from a part of their crops.

The sensitisation workshops have been conducted with mixed results. Again this seems to be caused by the circumstances under which people live. Furthermore, this project component is teacher-focused, and has not involved itself directly with the school-community relationship.

In addition to the challenges related to organisation and communication with MoES, the long-term sustainability of the project may also be at stake because the local community is not always sufficiently involved. In Gulu the vitality of the School Management Committees is definitely questionable, due to the detrimental living conditions as a result of the conflict.

Finance

The review team noted that NRC has experienced some delays in release of funds. This is mainly due to the delays and bureaucratic hurdles attached to country programmes (mainly on the Ugandan side), as compared to humanitarian grants. Part of the problem seems to be that the requisition takes too long to reach the Embassy. Administration, management and financial control of the project run smoothly and no specific problems in this area were reported to the team.

Summary of recommendations

1. The team advises that the project seek finance from NORAD for one to two years beyond the planned project completion date. In an eventual continued project, the main focus should be integration and mainstreaming of valuable "NRC/GDA" project components into the UPE and TDMS framework.
2. Institutional links with GPTC need to be firmly established so that the teacher-training project can be harmonised with the national education programme. Maximum efforts should be put into facilitating this harmonisation.

3. The project should make deliberate efforts to strengthen the planning capacity of the GPTC, DEO and CCT. This group is responsible for training of teachers in the regular teaching force and carries with it the greatest potential for bringing the project forward in the future.

4. The links between NRC, GDA and MOES should be strengthened. Steps should be taken to include the workshop elements into the national teacher-training curriculum and to make the project part of the national education development efforts, i.e. UPE and ESIP, if convenient with special reference to national plans related to marginalised and disadvantaged children and youth.

5. Schools should not be built in areas with low security. Rather, they should be relocated within the specific county. Alternatively, existing permanent schools in safe areas may be strengthened with additional classroom blocks.

6. HIV/AIDS prevention should be added on as a module in the teacher-training project, but only in close cooperation with relevant Ugandan authorities and resource personnel.

7. The support activities should be strengthened. Community-based early childhood activities should be introduced in as many camps as possible. Later investments in schooling may be thwarted unless urgent measures are taken to provide at least some stimulation to the younger children.

8. Latrines should be added to all schools built by the project.

9. Community participation should be given more attention in the project.

10. It is recommended that all relevant project documentation is gathered, systematised and secured for the benefit of related future projects.

---

Part of the main street of Gulu town
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

In 1999, the Government of Uganda and the Government of Norway, through its Embassy in Kampala, signed an agreement to finance a three-year emergency education programme in Gulu District, Northern Uganda under the Country Framework. The total Norwegian financial support amounts to NOK 28 Million for the three-year period. According to the agreement the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) is represented by the Gulu District Administration (GDA). The Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) is mandated to implement the project at local level in partnership between GDA. An Implementation Contract (signed 12 Dec. 1999) between NRC and GDA outlines the details of plans and the division of roles and responsibilities.

Uganda and Norway agreed to carry out a joint mid-term review of the project in September 2000. In 1999, the Government of Uganda (GoU) and the Government of Norway agreed to support emergency education in Gulu.

The review team was originally set up with three members, two from Norway and one representing the GoU. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the Ugandan team member was not able to participate.

1.2 Comments to methodology and Terms of reference

This project review faced some methodological challenges. The Gulu case is in many ways a pilot project. It is neither a conventional emergency project, nor a conventional development project. Conceptually this type of project belongs to what in NORAD’s terminology is a Gap project. It is to be found in the interface between humanitarian emergency response and development, as it should also harness longer-term developmental potential for impact. NORAD’s guidelines for project reviews do not
cover emergency aspects and typically “emergency“ guidelines do not cover development.

It is difficult to determine how external assistance becomes integrated or is positioned to enhance a process of recovery and rehabilitation in a situation where peace is far out of sight and the recovery process not yet started. In Gulu, the uncertainties about prospects of peace sometimes make the links between relief, rehabilitation and development difficult to understand. In a persistent emergency not all activities may have longer-term effects of bridging the gap, but many short-term rapid responses, such as construction of temporary classrooms in IDP camps, are still justified. Some activities, e.g. teacher training, are on the other hand intended to bring about changes in the education system in a longer-term perspective.

Still, with prospects for peace and expectations regarding resettlement being so remote, it seems complicated and perhaps unfair to judge the effects on the system. The emergency situation was pervasive and omnipresent, and people were very tired of war. At the same time, Gulu is not only an emergency area; it is also part of the mainstream educational development. Hand in hand with the emergency, many things appear to function reasonably well – such as the district educational bureaucracy. The government also continues to implement national education policies and programmes in the district. Although, due to the conflict the articulation of these at local levels may be different in Gulu than in other parts of the country, the existence of these programmes makes it possible to place the project in a mainstream context in parts of our discussion below.

On this multi-faceted background – politically, culturally and organisationally, one week in the field is not much. Though time will always run short on missions, the very complexity in the Gulu project including its contextual relations might have made a longer field visit beneficial. The team believes that some of this challenge was neutralised by the fact that the two Norwegian team members had a complementary background that suited this specific context well.

In addition, time was spent well before take-off. A lot of project information was gathered in Oslo, saving time during the project visit and also allowing for more in-depth talks with project staff.

However, based both on the above-mentioned complexity and on a principal basis, the team regretted strongly the absence of an Ugandan team member. Towards the end of the mission it became clear that the absence of the Ugandan team member was in fact directly related to the poor link between the Gulu project and MOES.

This also seems to account for insufficient review preparations within the Ministry. Not only the review, but the project and even the MOES itself might have benefited from taking part in the Mid Term Review of the Gulu project. It is strongly recommended that the MOES will take the necessary measures to partake in later evaluations.

**Being "on track"**

Following up the requirements in the Terms of Reference basically means using a two-tier approach. First, the project was to be assessed against the specific objectives for which NORAD has provided funds and to find out if the project was reasonable “on track“. Goals and indicators formulated in the original project document (PD) combined with interviews with stakeholders and “reality checks” from the field would under normal circumstances suffice as the basis for the team’s conclusions in this regard. As indicated from the above, the emergency context has come into play in all the activities.
It should be kept in mind, therefore, that conclusions are not necessarily totally as firm or clear-cut as they might have been anticipated in the design phase for the project.

Over the years, the conflict in Gulu has shifted in intensity of violence towards the population and frequency of ambushes on food convoys and/or vehicles by the rebels. At times it has not been possible for staff to travel in the district and this may temporarily mean some stagnation in project implementation. As if the war itself was not enough, one should also bear in mind that Gulu was the epicentre for the outbreak of Ebola last year. The staff had to move for a while to Kampala until the disease was brought under control.

Not all changes in the project have been results of unexpected circumstances. The shift from distribution of emergency kits to a more quality-oriented teacher-training component was a result of deliberate policy changes among key stakeholders within the district administration. All this makes the active checking on project achievements against the project document a less straightforward matter.

**A complex broader context**

The second approach was to assess the project against some broader criteria e.g. how the project has been integrated in the national educational mainstream. It should be mentioned that some of the current apparent weaknesses regarding this might stem from circumstances that could not be adequately addressed by the team. Some commentators claimed that this was a result of historical-political circumstances that had created antagonist relations between the Acholi people and other ethnic groups in Uganda. This is supposed to have meant that the Gulu district authorities have less interested in strong relations with the centre and therefore also various aspects of integration into national programme. Others claimed that the centre has always showed less interest in the three districts constituting the Northern Region, and pointed to the low-level stream of public investments in the north to substantiate this view.
This review team did not obtain sufficient information to confirm any of these arguments, and bases its discussion on the assumption that integration is the desirable goal from both the district and central levels’ perspectives. In practice this means that the above mentioned point is assessed with regards to active efforts taken by either party, to move the project forwards in context with the educational mainstream programme.

Some additional points about requirements of the terms of reference (TOR) have to be made. Consistent with NORAD’s guidelines, the team was requested to address issues such as impact and sustainability. However, in emergencies external factors come into play and influence project performance. Consequently, it becomes difficult to judge how the project as an isolated measure has to improve the lives of the population in Gulu. Furthermore, the whole issue of community ownership to schools enters into a different mode when family ties break up and traditional mechanisms for community mobilisations indeed become very fragile.

**Emergencies and financial sustainability**

In addition, it may not be so relevant to talk about financial sustainability of projects when the fundamental basis for the district local revenues has eroded. Most people are so poor that they are dependent upon external relief supplies and therefore are exempted from contributing tax to the district. Community mobilisation and a steady increase in the district tax revenues were important preconditions laid down in the PD for prospects of sustainable impacts of the activities. When the majority of the population is still displaced and defined as IDPs, it goes without saying that “normal” relatively stringent criteria for assessing impact can hardly be used.

It should also be noted that because of lack of baseline data and quantitative data at district level, progress in reaching some of objectives was difficult to assess. The project seeks for example to reduce the drop out rate for girls with 35%. But there is, and has probably never been, any reliable system for tracking drop out rates at all in Gulu district. Figures used by the DEO’s office varied between 8% and 29% as far as drop-outs are concerned, and information about school enrolment in general was also not consistent. More accurate figures were said to exist at the level of the individual schools, but that these were not aggregated.

**The HIV/AIDS issue**

The team was asked to assess how HIV/AIDS is being addressed in the project. The team found that HIV/AIDS was not specifically focused in the project, and that beyond anecdotal information on the HIV/AIDS situation in Gulu, there was little information about the problem. At the same time, the team is aware that many aspects of the teacher-training component actually focus on behavioural changes, in relations between the genders, interaction between adults and children, and in a human rights context. All this may have positive bearings on the sexual relations between people, but the team is not confident that enough information was disclosed during the review to make such a judgement.

**Delay in OCHA's study of Uganda**

The team was expected to acquaint itself with the ongoing UN-initiative in Gulu. The driving force behind this initiative is the UN Office for the Coordination of
Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), which has designed terms of reference for a study to analyse the causes for the conflict situation in Gulu as well as suggesting solutions for resettlement of the displaced population. The original plan was to finalise this study already mid-2001, and had it been carried out it would probably have provided an excellent source of information for this review team. But the study has been postponed and will most likely not to be carried out until well into 2002.

Given these caveats, however, the team believes it has addressed most of the issues in the TOR. The team spent one week in Gulu and met with a wide range of stakeholders within the Gulu district administration, military, teachers and tutors, the archbishop, students and representatives of school management committees. Meetings were also held in Kampala with international organisations and government representatives (see Annex 1).

2. THE EMERGENCY CONTEXT IN GULU

2.1 The dynamics of the conflict

Gulu district has been in a state of conflict for the last 15 years. The current pattern of massive displacement began in 1996; a year that most Acholi people (a national minority, but a majority population in Gulu district) remember as the one in which the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) descended to its worst depths of brutality. Civilians were killed or tortured almost everywhere on a daily basis and children were abducted in thousands.

When NRC started the education project in Gulu in October 1999, there was a lull in the rebel activities more or less throughout the year. This was a very positive change. Serious troubles started again in 2000, and there were numerous reports of attacks both on people and food convoys. At times there are promising signs for peace, but soon people’s hopes are again shattered.

At the time of the review there was no peace in sight. On and off there have been attempts to move forward to peace, only to be followed by a new ambush, killing or abduction of children again crushed any optimistic. The rebels are not responsible for all incidences. Other groups, such as armed gangs of criminals and those who want revenge also thrive under the prevailing circumstances, too.

Since May 2001, peace talks have been going on between the rebels and the district authorities. So far, little has been achieved. The security situation has been relatively calm. This is partly attributed to the heavy deployment of Uganda People’s Defence Forces (UPDF) at the border, which hampered rebel movement in the area. Information about rebel activity did, however, vary. From UPDF’s side, the review team was informed that only a small group of 30 LRA soldiers were operating in the district. Others believed there were many more.

2.2 Internally displaced people

In the three districts constituting the Northern Uganda, Gulu, Kitgum and Pader more than fifty per cent of the total population (460,000) have been displaced. As far as Gulu is concerned, the Resident District Commissioner (RDC) estimated the internally
displaced population to be around 80% of the total. Not all the displaced live in camps. Some have moved in to relatives in the town, where security is believed to be better.

There are 32 camps for the internally displaced (IDPs) in Gulu. Verified population figures exist only for the 20 of these that receive food relief through the World Food Programme, an operation mandated to NRC. The total population of these 20 camps is 292,160. The camp population has a higher number of females than males, with 150,890 women compared to 141,270 men. The number of households is 63,019.

The camp population is generally much poorer than the town population. Some 12 camps are not included on the list for food aid. These people face hardship there live under extreme conditions, as they have to go out of the camp to find food every day. Young children are left behind to fend for themselves throughout the day.

People lack more than food. Clothes, tools, utensils and most things associated with normal family life are all gone after years of displacement. The young children’s health status was strikingly poor, as could be directly observed by the review team. Children suffer the most. Girls are particularly vulnerable and defilement and rape is a problem in the camps, STDs are flowing, including HIV/AIDS.

---

2 This is a result of a verification exercise carried out by WFP/NRC. This exercise showed that methods used to register IDPs have not been good enough before. As a result the number of IDPs in the camps decreased by 48,000. Earlier there have been people who have been registered twice, and people not living in camps have also been registered.
In most camps the population live with their families and neighbours as before. People have tried to keep family structures, but traditions, values and family patterns are difficult to maintain. The population is generally very tired of war and wishes for peace. Every family in Gulu has been affected in one way or another. One of their children may have been abducted, or voluntarily joined the rebels, and then later returned home.

Location and size of camps vary. There are large camps with close to 40,000 inhabitants and smaller camps with a few hundred. The team was informed that camps are often located only a few kilometres away from people’s homesteads. The government has not yet lifted the ban preventing people from moving back to the homesteads, but as of late actual following up of this has been relaxed.

The district is now talking of resettling IDPs. A good example of this is a meeting called by the Gulu Assistant Resident District Commissioner (ARDC) and the Chairman of the District Disaster Management Committee. All NGOs were invited to attend the “consultative meeting for the resettlement strategy for the internally displaced”. At the meeting two scenarios were presented:

1. **Decongestion**: This Plan/scenario is a top-down design where Pabbo camp has been used as an example, breaking the big camp into smaller units closer to the parishes. Basically it seems to be the creation of new, but smaller IDP camps. (It was likened to Ujamaa.) It is a huge project with the creation of new schools, health units etc in those new “regroupments”. It has to be noted that that there has been criticism of this plan by the community and other stakeholders.

2. **Resettlement**: this scenario is to move people back to their own land, without trying to group them. NGOs were also asked to present their ideas for resettlement.

During the mission, the team got the impression that from UPDF’s point of view, plans were underway to “decongest” people. Some 3,000 civilians were being trained as community police with the purpose of protecting them in the new smaller camps. In
addition to the already 1,000 UPDF already deployed in the area, it was felt that this would be sufficient as a protection measure.

The news about the government plans to decongest people, have been received with mixed feelings. While it appears that most people want to get out of the camps as soon as possible, they also fear that they will simply be moved to another camp, where again their freedom and mobility would be at stake. UPDF envisaged that the decongestion process would be gradual and that in most cases people would be moved rather close to their original home.

It is yet unclear which strategies will be pursued and NGOs await a decision by the district so that specific needs and resource gaps are identified.

3. THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

3.1 Introducing Universal Primary Education

Major changes have taken place in the education system in Gulu district in recent years. These are partly attributed to the government’s introduction of the national policy of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in 1997. The main goal of UPE is stated as "to provide the minimum necessary facilities and resources to enable Ugandan children of school-going age (6-12) to enter and remain in school and complete the Primary Cycle of Education." According to UPE, the government is to provide free education for four children per family. The Education Strategic Investment Programme (ESIP) represents the national education programme for education reform, and is implemented in partnership between the GoU and the donor community. Parallel to this reform is the ongoing process of decentralisation, which also has changed the way that education services are provided to the public. According to the District Development Plan (DDP) the total number of primary schools in Gulu district is 202. The official enrolment figure for Gulu in 2001 presented to the team was 147,000. This is a significant gain from the 95,000 that were enrolled in 1999/2000.

Available educational statistics seem unreliable. Numbers vary much from one document to another. The District Education Office (DEO), for example, gave the team a document that showed a drop out rate of 8%. The DDP operates with a drop out rate of 29%. Girls drop out more often than boys do and according to NRC the gender gap starts to widen dramatically from P4 (primary school grade 4). In 1999 in Gulu District, 33% of the boys remained in P7 compared to 14% of the girls. There are many reasons for girls dropping out, but early marriages and pregnancies as well as a high prevalence of child-headed household seem to be the main reasons.

The District Education authorities had good knowledge of the national policy on Universal Primary Education (UPE). In contrast, the key staff within the district education office did not know the specific national education strategic investment programme, ESIP, and programme documents related to ESIP were not available in the district.

For Gulu district, UPE has meant an increase in government funding to the primary sector over the last few years. These grants were either from the Central UPE funds or
from the Special Facilities Grant (SFG). 460 new classrooms have been built with funds from SFG. Some classrooms have been funded under the Classroom Completion Grant.

As a result of the new government initiatives to promote education, the share of the district budget for education has increased from 7.6% in 1998/99 to a projected 16.2% for 2001/2002. This is attributed largely to the external funding, as locally generated funds are nearly non-existent. Revenues of the district have continued to decline from 3% of the total revenue estimate in 1998/99, to less than 1% in 2000/2001. It is a general concern in the district that local revenue is a very unreliable source to finance the district education budget. This is a reflection of people’s poverty. From people who have nothing, such as IDPs, there are no revenues to collect.

Leisure time – cleaning corn at Koro Abili school

As a result of the national campaign to recruit more teachers, Gulu district has recently recruited 639 new teachers, out of whom 337 are qualified. Still, the teacher-student ratio is high, especially in P1 and P2. A 1:60 ratio appears to be common, but there are examples of 1:200. It should be noted that compared to Uganda at large these figures are not on the extreme side, and they are under the official norm for ESIP investments of 1:80 for the lower classes.

Improving the qualifications of teachers is seen as a key to improve the quality of the education system in Uganda. Under the national education programmes considerable efforts are being made to introduce quality changes both for newly recruited teachers who have qualified directly for admission to the Primary Teachers’ Colleges (PTCs). In Gulu there are two PTCs, the Gulu Primary Teacher College (GPTC) and Christ the King Teachers’ College.

An ordinary teacher education has duration of two years. Unqualified teachers upgrade their qualifications through a combined system of in-service teaching and participation at special courses conducted at the PTCs. The combined training programme lasts for three years and most training courses take place during school vacations. Decisions pertaining to both types of teacher education are centralised at the level of MOES.
Ceiling for number of teachers to a district is also centralised, whereas decisions regarding the initial screening of candidates are decentralised to the district.

As a follow up of the ESIP, the Teacher Development and Management Scheme (TDMS) has placed the district as the key level for developing and implementing programmes to upgrade qualifications of the existing teaching force. In principle plans for this should be coordinated by the District Inspectors of Schools (DIS), but it should be noted that this is not yet fully evolved in Gulu. The institutional framework in which this training is going to take place was, however, put in place in the year 2000. In Gulu district, 19 Coordination Centres (CCs) have been established. Each Centre has a Coordinating Tutor (CCT) responsible for the monitoring of a varying number of schools at county or sub-county level.

### 3.2 Emergency aspects in education

It is evident that both teachers and students are affected emotionally by the conflict. In addition, displacement of people has also dislocated village schools and in the sense that the school as an institution has been moved to either a camp or to the town. Because many school children have been abducted during school hours, there is much fear among the children around the school itself.

When the rural population was displaced, the village schools were also displaced. Not in a physical sense, but in an institutional sense. Since whole neighbourhoods were moved into one place, existing School Management Committees (SMC) were moved to the new settlements. The same teachers continue to be teachers for the same group of students. The SMCs continue to be responsible for mobilising the community to contribute in various aspects of the school.

In most displaced communities this will involve mobilising the community to build up a temporary structure to be used while waiting for the government’s permission to return to their village. In others, existing permanent schools may be opened for the IDP students. Of particular concern is that traditional community structure and mechanisms for collaboration deteriorate after some time in the camps.
Affected children

Children who in one way or another have been part of the rebels’ army risk being met with social exclusion when they return. They may have been child soldiers or abducted. In Gulu there are an estimated 15,000 children who have been abducted. Educating this group of children make additional demands on teachers. The children have not only missed out of their classes during the time they have been away, but they have also missed out on their childhood. They have been forced into a brutal way of life, which makes adapting back into normal life very difficult.

Many of the abducted children are also in a psychological state. The traumatic events they have been part of or witnessed mean that they are more or less unable to cope with the school system without extra help. These children often face social harassment and discrimination from other children or from the teachers. Organisations such as GUSCO try their best to restore these children into normal village life and link them up to their families.

Exclusions from school

But children are excluded for many reasons. Gender is traditionally a main variable determining school attendance. Girls are more often excluded than boys. In emergency situations the gender gap tends to widen, as chances for girls to attend school diminishes under unsafe conditions. So also in Gulu, where additional problems caused by the extreme poverty in the IDP camps forces many young girls into early marriages.

There are children with physical or learning disabilities for whom very little special support is available, despite statements in the government’s Universal Primary Education Programme (UPE) about disabled children having priorities before others. There are children affected by HIV/AIDS, either as orphans or because they themselves may be infected. These children are extremely vulnerable for stigmatisation.
As pointed out by Sister Viola, principal of Christ the King Teacher College in Gulu, most children orphaned by the war is met by sympathy and support in the local community. This is reportedly generally not the case for AIDS orphans, who are often met with despise and fear. In other words, children orphaned by AIDS would be as much in need of support as the formerly mentioned group. Finally, the one does not exclude the other; some orphans have experienced both types of family member loss.

The schools themselves seem to have no functioning system vis à vis children who do not attend school. It is up to local leaders or parents to enrol their children. There is no exact overview of how many children belong to this group, but it was pointed out to the review team that as many as 40% of the children actually were not enrolled in school at all. The team had no means to verify this figure independently. The point to note is, however, that information about who are and who are not in school appears to be inadequate in Gulu.

4. THE PROJECT IN BRIEF

4.1 Goals and objectives

The Agreement between Norway/NORAD and Uganda/MoF (the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development) was signed in November 1999. According to the agreement, the goal of the project is to provide the minimum necessary facilities and resources to enable Ugandan children of school-going age to enter and remain in school and complete the Primary Cycle of education, i.e. grades 1 through 7 (cf. the Agreement, pg. 1).

The Objective of the project is to improve the learning environments and the teaching quality for the benefit of internally displaced and local children in Gulu District. NRC defined the outputs as follows (indicators for the project period in brackets):

(i) Increased number of children attending primary schools in the district (15% increase)

(ii) Increased percentage of girls finalising each grade (Girls’ part of dropouts reduced from 90 to 55%)

(iii) Increased capacity of teachers to recognise and respond to needs of children affected by insecurity and armed conflicts. (70% of the teachers to feel that they manage the teaching situation better after being trained in Emergency Education. 50% of the pupils feel that their school situation have improved with specially trained teachers)

(iv) Parents are participating in school-connected activities. (Parents running school feeding projects when needed, pre school activities when needed and necessary maintenance and construction).

(v) The teachers emergency training program is integrated in teachers training programs in the district. (Training modules and skilled tutors are available at Gulu Primary Teachers College (GPTC) when the program has finished. Emergency training appears in teachers training plans).
4.1.1 A comment on goals and indicators

The PD also describes some of the methods of information collection for the various types of indicators to monitor progress towards the objectives. Some examples of qualitative information are to interview stakeholders and monitoring exercises based on follow up what is happening in the field. There is less information about how the quantitative indicators are to be collected. As has been noted earlier in the report two fundamental problems relating to the assumptions of the relevance of the indicators might be mentioned:

In order to monitor progress towards the goal of reducing dropouts or increased attendance rate, not only must baseline levels be established but also changes from these levels over time must be measured. The need to measure change rather than absolute levels (which in principle could be made available at school level) puts a greater demand upon the accuracy of the data sources than seems to be the case in Gulu.

The second problem relates to indicators (iii-v) as they apply to very general statements about parents, student and teachers’ feelings and capacity etc. Feelings are very imprecise and may affect the feasibility to generalise findings with sufficient reliability to draw conclusions about the outputs of the project. In the particular circumstances in Gulu monitoring of progress towards improvements in the education system would require disaggregation into more specific issues.

The percentages set in the indicators seem unrealistically high. In addition, the mere setting of the indicators points to a limited acknowledgement and overview of the project context, i.e. the ongoing development of the national educational system at macro level. The review team also notes that there are no indicators related to the integration of the project into the national education programme.

4.2 The project activities

School construction

The school construction component of the project aims to provide the minimum necessary facilities and resources for children to enter and remain in school. During the project period this includes:

- construction of 50 school buildings spread out in the four counties of Gulu District
- construction of 100 temporary schools connected to “protected villages” for IDPs
- supply of school desks for 18,000 children, and desks and chairs for 190 teachers.

Teacher training

The teacher-training component of the project aims to provide the minimum necessary facilities and resources for children to enter and remain in school. In a 3-year span, the activities comprise:

- production of modules for Emergency Education
• training of 10-20 tutors in Emergency Education principles and methodology
• production of 1,500 teacher kit boxes
• training of 1,500 teachers in Emergency Education
• implementation of follow-up plans for teachers.

Support activities
In order to improve the quality of teaching and stimulate local community and parent participation, several support activities were planned. Some activities are related to teaching methods, others (co-curricular activities) to food or income generation and general sensitisation.

The support activities of the project are the following:
• Agro-forestry, fish farming and environment
• Kindergarten training of O-level school leavers (a limited number of pre-schools or kindergartens proposed in June to prevent the presence of under-aged children in schools, disturbing educational activities)
• Music and dance methodology
• Basic reading and writing methodology in Lou language
• Physical education
• Boy scouts and girl guides
• Workshops for School Management Committees, PTAs and Head teachers
• Workshops for Local Councillors I, II and III and sub-county chiefs
• Student Leadership (eliminated at a later stage).

4.3 Implementation

In the Agreed Project Summary attached to the Agreement, the Government of Uganda’s contribution is stated as “Human resources, technical and administrative support, training and supervision expertise, administrative and physical facilitation of training and material input, not quantified.” The team also notes that there is no further specification of what technical and administrative units and levels are to be responsible for contributing to the project. As the responsible government partner, the PD nevertheless makes clear that GDA is to render technical and administrative support to the project.

According to the PD the project is also to be implemented according to official guidelines such as

- Guidelines on Policy, Roles and Responsibilities for implementing the Universal Primary Education programme
- Implementing guidelines on School Facilities Grant for Primary Schools (SFG)
- Teacher Development Management System (TDMS).
5. **ASSESSMENT OF THE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION COMPONENT**

5.1 **Progress**

The District Council and District Education Office have set targets for this component. All on the list of 50 permanent schools feature in the District Development Plan for Gulu. Schools are being constructed all over the district according to the priorities set by the authorities themselves. 42 of the 50 schools are displaced, i.e. the school buildings are put up in connection with camps or "trading centres" for displaced people. Often whole villages have been deserted or moved, and a school building is put up in the "new village" in order to replace the old one.

At the beginning of the project, the district authorities wanted as many permanent classrooms as possible, and that the building of temporary schools should be kept at a minimum. However, the security situation changed dramatically at the end of 1999, and it become necessary to address the need for temporary structures as well. The GDA/NRC project has thus contributed to the erection of approx. 450 temporary classrooms in close to sixty sites. The average cost of a temporary classroom is a little bit more than 82 000 Ugandan shillings (USH), and so far the project has spent approx. 25 000 US$ for temporary structures, e.g. much less than budgeted for.

On the permanent school buildings the project is ahead of targets. At present the project has constructed, (or are about to complete) 170 classrooms (clr) in 36 schools (19 x 4 clr = 76 clr plus 14 x 5clr = 70 clr plus 3 x 8 clr = 24 clr). In addition, 10 classrooms are so far renovated to an acceptable standard. Three schools are at the moment under construction, and have reached different stages, but most of them have already passed the ring beam stage.

NRC received a list of 116 schools amalgamated into 35 camps/centres. Temporary schools are still constructed, and goal will be reached. It should be noted that temporary schools are of a total different quality as compared with permanent schools. They are constructed by the IDPs themselves and the project responsibilities are mainly to assist with the materials needed and technical advice.

Some technical improvements have taken place in the construction of temporary schools, such as the coverage of the polythene roofs with grass so make more durable structures. As the project buys grass locally, this has at least provides some incentives for women in the camp to collect grass as an income generating activity.

There are no new indicators, and this project component is ahead of the targets indicated in the monitoring calendar in the PD.

Most of the materials are from Uganda, but sometimes the cement is imported from Kenyan factories. The iron-sheets for the first 20 classrooms blocks were imported, since the project decided to use a type of sheets called “Super Economy”. Since January 2001, the iron-sheets are all supplied from district stores; these sheets are originating from a Japanese donation, or else locally produced iron-sheets, which have been given to the district by the Government.
5.2 Relevance of approaches

5.2.1 Division of responsibilities between the partners

The responsibilities for school construction are shared between NRC, the DEO and the communities.

NRC handles the various arrangements involved in construction of a four or five classroom building, including sub-contracting to entrepreneurs and monitoring the quality of the construction. NRC is also responsible for a minimum level of desks, tables and chairs for each classroom, including a blackboard. The DEO is supposed to ensure that each school has the necessary sanitation facilities and that the community takes its share of the responsibilities to produce bricks and contribute with other materials. The communities are responsible for establishing a School Management Committee, which in addition to contributing to school construction also should ensure that the community is involved in decision-making processes.

Information obtained during the review confirmed that NRC fulfilled its roles and functions in construction very convincingly. The organisation was praised for its effectiveness, ability to work under difficult circumstances and for having introduced systems for monitoring and quality control from that there was much to be learned.

5.2.2 The construction process

As far as contractors of entrepreneurs are concerned, NRC started the formal pre-qualification late 1999. Each contractor had to buy a tendering document for 25,000 USH per school to reflect seriousness in the bid. All in all 72 contractors participated in the bidding round, and after a careful screening of the contractors’ former merits and qualifications in school construction and financial liability, 22 were finally selected. NRC has made it a point that all contractors are locally based. No advance money is given to the contractors. Per today, 31 contractors are pre-qualified.

School under construction in Patek Bar
During implementation the NRC Project Manager carefully monitors what is going on in the field. Payment to contractors is made only after quality checks at three different stages: the first when the slab is completed, the second when the rim beam is finished and the third after roofing is checked. After this the school is handled over to the DEO.

The district authorities contrasted these arrangements with those implemented under other regular government-funded schemes. In construction activities under the SFG scheme, for example, there was an advance payment to contractors and no actual quality checks at field levels during the course of construction. The district authorities admitted that this might open for corruption, but claimed that the district was short of staff with technical competence to perform quality checks and that the security situation often prevented staff from moving around in the district.

To this one might add that the fear of one’s security is very real in the area, and that the NRC staff goes to considerable length to try to find innovative solutions for moving around such as joining the food convoys that are protected by the military.

**The uncompleted schools**

The district has been slow in building latrines in the same pace as the schools are constructed. Thus some schools have been opened without the essential sanitary requirements. NRC has pushed the district authorities very hard on this issue, because they know from teachers and parents that lack of latrines is in particular detrimental to girls’ education. At the time of the review 15 schools were still lacking latrines and 11 of these lacked them extremely urgent.

**5.3 Cost-effectiveness**

Because of their superior quality, the NRC schools are slightly more expensive than other schools. But they are constructed to last long. Government standards are adhered to, and ramps to facilitate access for the disabled are always part of the design.
The question of savings has come up from time to time. The need for teachers’ houses have not been met in the project at all. It appears that the community should bear most of the costs for teachers’ houses, but again their capacity and ability to meet even further requirements are limited under the present circumstances. The District has therefore decided that they want to address this question.

The idea of saving money in construction process has grown out of experience from what other NGOs has been doing. The Save the Children DK has for example constructed five teachers’ houses from funds saved by using unused iron sheets that had been donated by the Japanese government. These sheets were just lying unused in large piles. GDA has recommended this for all school construction schemes. So far a total of 40,000,000 USH have been saved in NRC accounts and the project has a further prospect of saving additional USH 2,300,000 per five-classroom building blocks for the twelve remaining schools. One teacher house would cost approximately USH 16,000,000 and at present these savings would be adequate for only 2,5 new teachers’ houses.

NRC is concerned that there might be friction between the various school communities if one school receives teachers’ house and others not. In the organisations’ view, access of girls is also more directly linked to the latrine issue than teachers’ houses and they would therefore prefer using the savings for this purpose instead. Solutions to how to use the savings were not met during the time of the review.

5.4 Impact

5.4.1 Community participation and local ownership

It is recognised that GDA sometimes has had problems in fulfilling its obligation to ensure that the community is mobilised and contribute with at least the minimum requirements to ensure that construction could go on as planned. The team was told that under the given circumstances this was not always a simple task, but that community contribution was obtained in most cases. But also in the cases where it is obvious that the community is committed to the school, it is reportedly not easy get hold of poles and other materials when mobility of people is so restricted. The extreme poverty conditions under which people live prevent them from hiring lorries or buying materials on the market. Bricks on the other hand seem relatively easy to obtain as these can be moulded all over Gulu.

One should bear in mind that in situations of emergency and persistent conflict, community mobilisation is affected. When people live in extremely adverse conditions as they presently do in the camps in Gulu, it is difficult to organise a dynamic community network between school construction and the community. This is the case where large numbers of IDPs from various parts of Gulu have been congested in one camp (e.g. Pabbo). The longer people stay in camps, the more fragile the family ties and traditional community values. Even in cases where the camp population was recruited from one single neighbourhood and the original SMC was also moved to the new site, it proved difficult to maintain a functioning community-school relationship.

On the other hand, the fact that the communities do contribute something, reflects at least a minimum of commitment. NRC sees the importance of this also in terms of rebuilding community structures. The process of mobilisation and participation of the different communities sustain ownership to their school. This feeling of ownership is usually shattered in the camps.
5.4.2 Improved access

Both permanent schools and the temporary schools have provided access to schooling in Gulu district. All stakeholders confirmed this. The project has, however, also faced some unexpected difficulties and out of schools built so far, five are not being used. NRC builds schools in all 19 sub-counties in the area and some of the school sites lie in areas, which are not populated because of the security situation. The issue of those schools is raised by NRC in any possible context, and has become an argument regarding the further implementation of the project.

In the beginning it was very important for the project to show that NRC could do the constructions if the local communities had been able to mobilise the local materials. But after some time one has begun questioning whether GDA’s priorities should always be followed, if the security situation is tense and when it is uncertain whether people will be allowed to move back there. The issue is of serious concern for the future development in this component. It should be noted that the five schools hitherto unused belonged to the first group of 19 schools being built. How many schools from the second group of 15 that will be left empty for a period of time for this reason still remains to see. Only 2 have been handed over yet, and to NRC’s knowledge these have got latrines and both are populated. A conclusion on this point is that the GDA is trying to address the issue, but that the process is a bit slow.
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UPE states that disabled children are to be prioritised in education. Patek Bar Primary School now, in principle, has physical access for movement impaired pupils.

**Time schedule and pressure on GDA**

The time schedule is an important factor, and there is a lot of pressure upon the GDA to solve the problems. This will be an even stronger factor in the months to come. Within ten months, NRC must have completed another 60 to 70 classrooms, because the retention period for built buildings is 6 months. This is viewed as a challenging task.
GDA, because in about 10 of the remaining 12 sites the security is not good enough to commence a construction. It is now the GDA’s challenge how to provide security. From NRC’s side the problems were formally raised in January this year.

The schools were the insecurity is high at the moment are located in Awach sub county (2), in Paicho (4), in Odek and Lalogi (3), and in Palaro (1), all in the east of the district. NRC has at the moment been able to construct four classrooms in Paicho, five in Awach. It will be very difficult for the GDA to leave out four schools (20 classrooms) in Paicho sub county and 2 schools (10 classrooms) in Awach. Both of the sub counties are in Aswa County, which so far has received 30 classrooms and 3 renovated classrooms. The county was supposed to receive two times this according to the initial selection of schools.

At the moment it seems that one of the two mentioned schools in Lalogi can be constructed. Two other schools in other sub counties are not so accessible at the moment, but we think this will not be a very big obstacle. When the schools were selected, it was realised that the need for classrooms was closer to 350, not 250 as the PD requires. 40 of the 50 schools have literally nothing but the school bell ream, no structures at all, some places the reminiscences of a burned down school, overgrown with grass and bush. The need for schools is unquestionable, but where is the peace that can justify the investment of construction of a school?
A possible revision of plans

There is a way out of this; the GDA can readdress the selection of schools, and request NRC to complete (that is to build a full seven classroom primary school) some of the schools, which by now have got four or five classrooms. The issue was brought up at the debriefing meeting with the district administration at the end of the fieldwork. The argument from the administration was that the local politicians usually are very reluctant to change already approved plans. Each wanted to satisfy his/her own constituency. It was, however, maintained that it might be possible to change locations within the sub-county and move the originally planned school to a safer place.

It should be noted that NRC has all the time argued that 50 schools spread all over the district would be too complicated under the present restrictions of mobility and with the uncertainties involved in the resettlement of people. But it appears that the selection of the 50 schools is more politically guided than practically guided in Gulu, and that profound changes in this strategy would not be received well among local politicians.

Relation to other activities in the district

This debriefing shed light on the lack of coordination between the school construction project and other public works projects such as water and feeder roads within the district administration. Many roads and bridges have been destroyed during the conflict and in some cases it may be difficult to bring materials and workers to the site. So far construction of schools has never been a subject for discussion in the District Disaster Management Committee that was established precisely to facilitate coordination and streamlining of different projects with each other.

6. ASSESSMENT OF THE TEACHER TRAINING COMPONENT

The NRC teacher training started in May 2000. Prior to the first workshop, a workshop for trainers (a TOT workshop) was arranged. Both types of workshops follow the organisation described below.

The review team observed parts of the Gender module and the Human Rights module of the NRC Teacher-training Workshop no. 4, arranged in August-September 2001.

6.1 Organisation of the workshops

The teacher training workshops are organised in units of 15 days, divided into the following five modules:

1. Learning environment
2. Participatory methods
3. Psycho-social support to pupils
4. Gender issues
5. Human rights, conflict resolution, peace and reconciliation.

Each module lasts for three full days. A handbook with listed activities and advice for facilitators is prepared for each module.

The key staff for the organisation and conduct of the teacher-training workshops is the Project Manager, the Deputy Project Manager and the Project Secretary. The two
former implement, with the assistance of attached staff, teacher training and support activities. The Project Secretary prepares the materials in addition to handling contact and correspondence.

**Workshop Venue**

The venue for the workshops is St. Joseph’s College, Layibi; a secondary school in Gulu. Prior to each training, college staff paints the rooms and drains the latrines before each training. The Gulu PTC was originally pointed out as the venue for the training sessions, but the infrastructure was not up to standard. Gulu PTC has now acquired new buildings. Still the location of classrooms, group rooms and feeding facilities at the Layibi College are seen as more convenient and practical by the project staff. The dining room is situated straight across from the classrooms, which makes transfers quick. The participants sleep in the college dormitories.

![Workshop participants in the Human Rights module](image)

**Participants, selection and commodity**

During the observed modules, the around 200 participants were divided into four classes, and the same topic was run parallel in two classes. A team of three to four facilitators ran each class. These facilitators divided workshop duties between themselves. One facilitator was given the role as matron, another as a nurse, one facilitator was in charge of materials, and still another was in charge of the kitchen, assisting the school’s regular cook. This system seemed to work efficiently.

The DEO’s office together with NRC selects schools from all over the district to take part in the teacher training. The project aim was initially to train all teachers in Gulu. However, since the number of teachers has risen substantially since the implementation, schools are currently being selected. The selection is done by GDA, and the criteria would partly be the need of the school, and partly the security issue, i.e. mobility and transport.
The whole school is encouraged to attend the training from head-teacher down to untrained teachers. Since the everyone is invited to take part, gender is not a direct issue – all teachers are invited. Some schools however, have less or no female teachers.

Since the training is residential, the teachers are given mattresses, basins and lamps for the duration of training. Soap and toilet paper is also handed out. During the training each teacher receives a pen, paper, box file and training manuals for each topic.

6.2 Support structures, staff and facilitators

As a follow-up of the Implementation contract, a Core group or Sub-committee for education was established. In addition to project staff, the group consisted of representatives from the DEO’s office, Gulu PTC, GUSCO and Save the Children Denmark.

In addition to the core group for education, a number of collaborating organisations and institutions has been involved in the facilitation of the workshops (see Annex 2). External staff is also used in monitoring and evaluating the workshops, with a special emphasis on monitoring the facilitators in action.

These observers are selected individuals with relevant qualifications, from neighbouring countries, from ITEK or other qualified institutions in Uganda. Their reports are of high quality and prove valuable input at project management level, identifying the well-functioning elements as well as challenges, i.e. elements and functions with a potential for improvement.

6.2.1 Collaboration at district level

Also outside of the Sub-committee for education, the project has established a close cooperation with the District Education Officer (DEO) and District Inspector of Schools (DIS). The role of these representatives is

- to approve activity plans and changes of projects,
- to be a member of the Core group for education (DIS),
- to select schools for training (DEO/DIS),
- to participate in monitoring.
- to attend teacher training,
- to provide advice and guidance on educational matters.

At an early stage, the project established partnership with Gulu PTC, Save the Children and Gulu Support the Children Organisation (GUSCO). These NGOs handle topics related to psychosocial aspects in the Teacher Training.

In addition, NRC has supported another local NGO, the Gulu Women Empowerment Network (GWENET), in their training of women in the areas of gender, human rights and agriculture/agro-forestry.

### 6.3 Achievements, impact and lessons learned

The number of teachers trained by September 2001 was approximately 1,100. The target indicator for teacher-training was 750 teachers trained in the first year and 750 in the second year. Another workshop is planned for the vacation period at the end of the year. In other words, also the teacher-training component is ahead of schedule. With the current capacity approximately 2,000 teachers will be trained by the end of the project period. However, the current number of teachers in Gulu, steadily growing due to UPE, is now close to 3,000 teachers.

The report of the teachers after completing the five modules were unanimously positive. The most common remarks were "Good", "Very good", "Educative", "Very beneficial" etc. This equivocal praise by the Gulu teachers might be interpreted as solidarity with the NRC project staff. However, the team did not find this interpretation likely, as the participants were often specific and even critical about certain features or parts of the five modules they had attended. Many also seemed clear in their reaction to the length of the course – 15 days with very few breaks is no doubt a tough match.

Plan of action for follow-up work on Gender issues in Mary Immaculate school

**Impact: how has teacher improvement been achieved?**

During the workshop, thorough daily planning meetings were held among the facilitators and the staff of the school to identify and address challenges.
going through the participants final evaluation. There seemed to be a strong insistence on self- and team evaluation in the facilitators' group. The impression of quality was underlined by the presence of external facilitators to support, evaluate and strengthen all professional aspects. There was a heavy stress on quality work during the training, which resulted in some tutors from GPTC who were less competent being excluded from the list of facilitators. However, in general, we experienced an atmosphere of encouragement and development of teamwork and team spirit.

The teacher participants showed enthusiasm about going back to their schools and practice. New facilitators reported good experiences in class after their first workshop. They also made remarks on their own experiences related to having arranged pupil evaluations of themselves as teachers, after the NRC training. Though some admitted that the pupils' assessments had not only been positive, they stated that they had thereby received clear directions as to why they needed to improve as teachers. The teachers insisted that their students had noted an improvement in their attitude and teacher performance after attending the TOT workshop.

Discussing how the teacher may improve children's learning environment, in one of the new classrooms at Patek Bar Primary school

**Lessons Learned**

The average teacher in an average school in Gulu indeed has very little resources. He or she will need a certain amount of backing and encouragement, in order to keep inspired and remember the input given during the workshop. It would also seem that for some teachers that have practised for many years in a teacher-centred way, one workshop is
Consequently, the main lesson learned at micro-level is that the five modules should be included as fast as possible in the *pre-service* teacher training. Their impact will be even stronger on young teachers, who have not yet settled in "the old ways" of teaching.

A strong message from the participants' evaluation was related to the Psychosocial support training module. This module seemed to serve a double function. Many participants stated that they felt better equipped to identify and understand war-affected pupils. However, to some participants, this module was clearly the most painful one. Many had previous war-related experiences themselves and had to re-encounter these memories during the workshop module.

### 6.3.1 Relevance of approaches, content and methodologies

The quality of the project was highly visible in the cultural approach taken in the Gender workshop. The starting point was taken in the local culture, and commonly known songs and nicknames were brought forward as illustrations by the facilitators and the participants. The difficult topics and elements were presented with humour and often with sympathy, and this combination proved very productive in terms of creating a safe, and at times even an easy, atmosphere.

Furthermore, the facilitators succeeded in highlighting the dynamic *changes in culture* – for better or for worse – as one of the immanent *traits of culture*. This rather complex element of cultural theory was highlighted for the participants in a straightforward, but gentle, way. The Ugandan Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development delivered the main input for this workshop module. The ability of cross-sector cooperation is another positive trait of the project.

The manual used for the Human Rights module was based on a NRC produced teachers’ handbook, which has been thoroughly tested in various settings and environments. The manual consists of methodological elements (examples, images and simple educational remedies) that proved transferable, enlightening and effective in the Gulu environment. The facilitators took an obvious pleasure in the methodology, and this enhanced the impact of the contents.

As mentioned, certain project components were changed after implementation. The most significant one is the decision not to develop the Teacher Education Kit planned for in the PD, but instead to use the available resources on longer-lasting investments, i.e. teacher-training, as this was seen as more relevant. The Gulu District Authorities have approved all changes in plans and indicators.

### 6.3.2 Efficiency, outreach and impact

As stated above, the overall impression of the review team of the contents and the methods of the teacher training is highly positive. The conduct of the training seemed to be a demonstration of appropriate use of financial, human, as well as material, resources.

The Review team also visited schools that had not yet been included in the teacher training activities. In some of these schools, we overheard questions put to the visiting project staff relating to when training could take place. There were also reports of teachers having "sneaked into" training sessions, because they wanted rather badly to have the same experience as their colleagues reported to have had.
The unanimous report from all stakeholders is that the teachers in Gulu wants to have this training, that they are convinced of its value – both in a personal and educational perspective. Several teachers stated that they perceived themselves, their colleagues and their pupils in a new way as a result of the training. After the first couple of training workshops, follow-up procedures and plans for school activities were included in the training sessions. In several of the schools we visited, plans and schemes were worked out and put on the wall of the head-teacher’s office or in the staff room.

Teachers approached us to report on how they had implemented systematic pupils’ evaluations of their own performance as teachers after attending the training workshops. They reported that the class evaluations clearly indicated that their capacity for teaching, their acknowledgement of female pupils, and their capacity for empathy with war-affected children in class, had improved.

We also observed, however, that for several teachers and headmasters, fifteen days of training is not enough to change established routines and practices. In order to be able to change their patterns of behaviour, many will need a close follow-up. This is no surprise, and by no means a trait exclusive for teachers in Gulu. However, it does underline the sustainability aspect of the project.

The project aimed at training 1,500 teachers in Gulu District. At the time of the review, 1,100 were trained. However, since the implementation of the project, the number of teachers in Gulu has increased, due to the ongoing efforts of UPE. This causes a dilemma: should the project halt at the originally set number of trained teachers, or should the number of teachers to be trained in the project be adjusted and the project be prolonged for e.g. a one year period? And if so, what would be the solution if the number of teachers continues to increase during 2002 and 2003?
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6.4 Follow-up plans and activities

Instead of organising follow-up workshops, the training project aims at reaching as many of the newly recruited teachers as possible within the project period. However, some time after the implementation of the project, the need came up for a structured follow-up strategy at school level. The capacity of the Coordination Centres alone has not been strong enough to secure a good follow-up, and if the training would turn out to have no actual effect on the school life, this would be disappointing for all parties.

Consequently, the workshops integrated plans for follow-up, often in the form of posters written out on specific topics (gender, psycho-social support etc). The review team observed several such posters during school visits.

6.4.1 Personnel needs and recruitment

As a consequence of our need to realise Participatory Methodology all through the teacher training, the need for further personnel arose. Consequently observers have been invited to join as facilitators. They first act as observers and gradually develop skills as teacher trainers. The total number of facilitators is now 25.

New facilitators are recruited among promising participants in the Teacher Training workshops. From the Teacher-training workshop in March 2000 and up to now, the tutors who were trained, and who are still active in the teacher-training have developed remarkably and they have improved professionally as teacher trainers. They also stated that they gained a lot of new knowledge.

The Program Document lists the Gulu Primary Teachers College as main partner besides Gulu District Authorities. The Training of Tutors Workshop in March 2000 was aimed at training the tutors of this institution. The whole staff (32) underwent training. Twelve of these are at present key facilitators during the Teacher Training workshops.

Christ the King Primary Teachers’ College has become more involved. In the last training in May five tutors participated in training and will be invited to facilitate at later teacher training workshops.

National Teachers’ College (NTC) Unyama has been somewhat involved on the facilitator side. One tutor from this college has been facilitator at the Physical Education training as part of Support Activities.

6.5 Teacher training perspectives in Gulu related to the Gap situation

The teacher training is well on track and seems to fill a vital qualitative gap in the Gulu teacher training. The main features of the teacher training would probably benefit any district in Uganda, especially in the 10 other districts that are reportedly affected by internal unrest or conflict for one reason or another.

The question is how to facilitate a maximum of benefit from the project in the Ugandan mainstream education system. Though the start has not been optimal in terms of perspectives of smooth integration, we trust that the Ugandan government sees the situation as an opportunity to draw on external resources to support the valuable forces that are indeed already present in the Ugandan system. In this sense, the present sense of urgency to complete all projects according to plan is unfortunate, because it may work against longer terms objectives that can secure a sustainable process.
Based on this possible framework, the team would advise that the project seek finance from NORAD at least one year beyond the planned project completion date. However, it should be stressed that in a continued project, the main focus should be integration and mainstreaming of valuable "NRC/GDA" project components into the UPE and TDMS framework.

One possibility could be to combine an extension in time with an extension in space. This would mean including a new district as a pilot, to give at least part of the progress responsibility to MOES (to be further delegated) and to use the Gulu experience and training staff as a springboard to gradual systemic integration.

It would eventually be up to the final project evaluation in 2002/2003 to judge to what extent the project is well on track according to the above mentioned goal. If that evaluation proved positive, it would in our view be less crucial whether the project, in order to fulfil its mission, needed still another year or not.

It seems to make sense to structure and plan project activities in "Gap settings" with a main focus on the existing macro structure and government plans, and a side glance to a possibly heated emergency scenario – as opposed to the other way around. The team believes this to be a possible central feature of Gap situations.

In addition, more should be done to implement support activities more widely in Gulu. In particular, as many of the IDP camps as possible should be targeted. Activities such as agro-forestry and other activities geared towards creating alternatives for young school-leavers could be strengthened. It is highly realistic to assume that many adolescents will not be absorbed in the secondary school system, and consequently would be in a rather desperate need of structured activities (the alternatives being drug abuse, crime, child soldier activities, or a combination). The team recommends that the project addresses these or similar activities more directly through support activities, for the benefit of the IDP population.

7. **TRENDS AND PROCESSES IN SUPPORT ACTIVITIES**

According to NRC reports, each of the support activities has been handled by a resource group from Gulu district that prepared a manual on the topic in question, developed a training module and pointed out target groups. The strengthening of co-curricular activities was welcome and the partners reportedly highly motivated.

The review team had time to visit only the agro-forestry component. The project gets technical support from the Gulu District Production Department. Experts in agriculture, forestry, fisheries and environment from this department run the agro forestry/fisheries training and monitoring which are part of Support Activities.

People who were asked to assess the relevance of this initiative pointed to the fact that the number of young people going out of primary schools has increased, but continued progress to higher educational levels was very limited for most of them. Hence some training in how to make a living was very valuable.

Because of the difficult and unsettling times many young people also grew up in camps, in which traditional role models in agricultural production were lacking. The school had to a large extent replace parents as role models.
Whether activities such as agro-forestry actually will increase people’s own interest in schooling remains to be seen. These components have been partly implemented. As far as surroundings of many camps are concerned, there is no land available for pilot schemes. It was also the impression of the team that not all support activities were initiated in schools that were targeted as part of the mainstream educational programme. However, many schools (172 out of 202 according to NRC) have sent teachers to be trained in scouting, also involving IDP camps and formerly abducted children.

Some steps have been taken, on the other hand, to try to address some of the problems facing younger children living in the IDP camps. These have included attempts to establish parent-driven child-centres in the camps. There is clear limit to how much the NRC staff can involve themselves in the practical implementation of this activity, but the attempts are nevertheless very important. It appear meaningless to assume that once they have reached school age, children will appear as school motivated and ready for academic achievements, if they have hardly been stimulated at all in the camps. It should be kept in mind that many very young children are left alone the whole day, while their parents are out searching for food. If they are so lucky as having an older sibling who brings them along to school, they might receive some food under the school-feeding programme, which NRC carries out on behalf of WFP.

7.1.1 Co-curricular, supporting activities

In 2000, the Commissioner for Education Inspectorate in the MoES, Mr Fagil Mandy, advised on the following:

- to address co-curricular activities - this has been done and has been warmly welcomed in the district.

- to establish a closer link to the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Education and Sports. This was realised in February 2001. Since then, the Permanent Secretary has received monthly reports on the NRC teacher training activities.
- to avoid involvement of too many participants who are not primary school teachers (e.g. representation from women’s groups) in the teacher-training activities.

The Commissioner for Education Inspectorate also encouraged further training in Basic Reading and writing methodology for teachers. This was based on a recommendation from NRC concerning poor teaching skills in this subject.

This support activity has proved a success and may be the most important one, as poor academic performance among teachers probably can be seen in direct relation to the drop out rates.

8. ORGANISATION AND COORDINATION

8.1 Governance

The Agreement (in item 3) states that MoF through the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) has the overall responsibility for the implementation of the project, and Gulu District Authority (GDA) shall represent that MoES. At the implementing level GDA has entered into a contract with NRC through NRC’s Uganda office in Gulu, and the two parties share the responsibility for project implementation.

It is important to note that this project represents a new model for NRC’s relationship also to both NRC and NORAD. NRC usually receives funding for their projects within the humanitarian sector from the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and not from NORAD as in this case. Apparently this is also the first example of NRC being an implementing partner in a government-to-government programme, and this places the organisation in a new type of relationship to both the national government and the funding agency, NORAD.

These challenges are exacerbated by the fact that so far NORAD’s financial support to Uganda has not emphasised primary education. Due to this it seems reasonable to suggest that within the Norwegian Embassy, to which the administration of the project is delegated, knowledge of mainstream educational development processes in Uganda is scant. NRC, on the other hand, has little previous experience with requirements and conditions set in a state-to-state development programme.

The overall governance of the project takes place at the annual meeting. This is called upon by the Ministry of Finance, and is formally a meeting between that ministry the Norwegian Embassy (to which the responsibilities for the project is delegated on the Norwegian side). The education line ministry, MOES, is always invited and so are NRC staff and Gulu district authorities. As implementing partners the latter two only hold status as observers.

8.2 Financial flow

Release of funds have to be approved during the annual review meeting comprising the Uganda Ministry of Finance, Gulu District Authority (GDA), the Norwegian Embassy (NORAD) and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC). The requisition for funds originates from NRC to the GDA and then from the GDA to the Ministry of Finance and then finally to the Norwegian Embassy (NORAD). The process has not functioned quite smoothly yet. First of all problems arise when there are delays in reporting and in arranging the annual meetings.
The first Annual Meeting was supposed to take place in April year 2000, but eventually took place at the end of August, four months later. The Agreed Minutes were out 3rd October, and the project could not request for transfer of funds before that. This year, in June /July the local government in Gulu caused a delay of several months because they simply forgot to request for the money. All this has created frustration in the project. Shortage of funds has at times made it necessary to borrow money temporarily from NRC's headquarters in Oslo.

Thus the main problem encountered is in the delay for the remittance of funds and that the requisition process takes too long to reach the Embassy. Another frustration has been the exceptionally poor representation at the Annual Meetings from the MOES. The two formal Annual Meetings have either seen low-level representation or none at all. Furthermore a problem has been fluctuations in the exchange rate of Norwegian currency (NOK) to the dollar and then the Ugandan Shilling also to the dollar. Requisition is in dollars, NORAD pays in NOK and then NRC receives the same in dollars and utmost the final receipt will be less than the amount requested.

Figure 1 shows the main flow of formal communication and finance in the Gulu project.

Figure 1. Macro structure of the NRC project, based on the state-to-state agreement of cooperation between Norway and Uganda. The figure represents the formal project map. (In comparison, the map shown in Annex 4 could be said to represent the field scenery at project activity level.)
another decision-making body was involved, one could probably expect even further delays in the processes.

8.3 Relationship between NRC and local institutions and education authorities

8.3.1 A broad-based partnership model

At the time of its design, the project concentrated much on working out a horizontal structure, which clarified the relationship, division of roles and functions at district level. Most of these original roles are maintained, but some have also been further expanded and developed into new partnerships over time. On the other hand, not all issues are solved locally. As far as education is concerned, a responsibility for school construction is decentralised to district levels. Teacher training remains, however, centralised at MOES with the exception of parts of the in-service training project to upgrade the qualifications of the already existing teaching force.

During the review, NRC was asked to list its partners and actors with whom the organisation collaborates at activity level. A total of 68 entries were finally made, but this does not mean that as many as 68 different partners are involved. One organisation or agency may be linked to all components in the project, cf. Annex 2. This illustrates the width of NRC’s network, but it is also an illustration of the interest of others to participate in the project. The extent and type of partnership arrangements vary.

Some relationships and networks are “obligatory” such as working with government agencies at district and local levels. Since this is a governmental project, planning for all activities converge at the level of the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). As far as school construction is concerned, partners are not limited to the District Education Office but also the district officers for health, water and Engineer. For support activities such as agro forestry and fisheries, the District Production Department is central.

For teacher training, on the other hand, one should bear in mind that the partnership incorporates government agencies at national levels: the MOES, the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, the two teacher training colleges in Gulu and the Institute of Teacher Education in Kymbogo. For all of the activities NRC has needed to institutionalise and sustain links up with the district politicians ranging vertically from the district (LC V) to the village level (LC I) and all the levels in between.

In addition, comes the whole range of “voluntary” partners. These are partners that have been mobilised to facilitate project implementation in one way or another, as resource persons in the teachers’ training workshops or in helping building capacity of future key resource persons in the Training of Tutor’s (TOT) project. NRC has solicited the assistance of international NGOs such as Forum for African Women Educationalists (FAWE) and Nordic partners within the Save the Children Alliance. NRC Norway has through its extensive network assisted in developing the training modules. One should also not forget the national Ugandan NGOs and institutions that have been drawn upon both in construction and teacher training.

8.3.2 Relevance and impact

From a review point of view the immediate questions that spring to mind are whether all this networking is really necessary and whether it is facilitating or hampering the project.
is nevertheless inclined to conclude that indeed such broad networking is necessary. Some verification of the benefits of the broad-based partnership already exists:

- The cross-sectoral content of the training approaches requires that expertise from all sectors beyond the limited sphere of education have been actively engaged in project implementation. This seems to have contributed to some cross-fertilisation of ideas between hitherto compartmentalised administrative sections at district level. But co-ordination between various development activities remains weak. This is particularly reflected in the District Disaster Management Committee, in which NRC chairs the Sub-committee on education with the DEO. Most meetings here are cancelled because lack of broad based attendance.

- Rumours about the usefulness of the project seem to run fast in the district. Involvement of many partners probably increases the need to maintain quality in the training activities.

- A certain degree of international expertise has been a motivating factor for future resource persons in the district. It appears, however, that the project has made many efforts to use local and national expertise when this was available.

The review team is of the impression that due to its broad network and wide partnership, NRC operates in a very supportive environment in Gulu. The team found a high level of goodwill everywhere, from NGOs met to district administration. It was particularly maintained that the broad collaboration contributed was essential if efforts were to be sustained in the future.

Not all relations have been smooth. It is questionable if the project has facilitated the communities in terms of participatory approaches and activities. It appears that the district has focused more on the contribution of the communities to construction, and less on other "softer" aspects of networking, which could sustain a community interest for schooling in the long run. The project has done some attempts to organise workshops with community leaders, SMCs and politicians, but these appear to a somewhat lesser degree to be part of a continuous process.

Some district staff had a tendency to push overall responsibility for project performance into NRC’s court. They talked about the project as a NRC project and so forth, and seemed also more than willing to push issues such as latrine construction over on NRC, despite having clear responsibilities for this as far as the agreement was concerned.

The overall conclusion is, however, that this broad partnership has actually contributed to building considerable capacity at critical levels in the district. All possible sections of stakeholders have participated and feel proud of what has been achieved in this project. The project has taken on like-minded and not like-minded partners. As a result there seems to be a broad understanding within the district of what the project is all about.

8.4 Coordination with national education authorities

The MOES has a clear agenda of seeking as much programme support from donor agencies to ESIP as possible. Although programme support is the preferred financial modality, MOES permits a variety of mixtures of other support mechanisms, including project support, at least as temporary measures.

The whole success of this quest for programme support from various donor agencies rests on MOES’ accountability in reaching the commonly agreed targets for school...
construction, quality of education system management, improved performance of teachers etc. This includes support to the assistance provided by a number of NGOs. But the GDA/NRC project is not reported to or accounted for in the MOES. Progress in terms of classrooms or quality performance will therefore not be calculated as part of the ESIP progress.

The project’s lack of thorough integration in the national programme ESIP and lack of involvement at the level of MOES raises key strategic issues as far as replication and sustainability is concerned. The GDA/NRC has already faced problems related to utilisation of tutors from the GPTC in their training, because the same staff has been designated by MOES for other teaching purposes in the regular ESIP implementation. During the review, problems related to use of college staff as facilitators in the project were openly discussed.

The immediate cause for concern appeared to be a circular letter from MOES to all inter alia all Primary Teachers’ Colleges in Uganda the following quotation is of relevance:

“….it is out of order for any Organisation to introduce programmes or for any reason engage or release teachers or tutors to activities such as workshops organised by Non-Governmental Organisations outside their official routine without the permission of the Director of Education”.

To this both GDA and NRC argue that the project is not to be characterised as a NGO project. If the Project is really seen as a project based within the country programme, the restrictions above would not be applicable. In addition, the agreement between the parties states clearly that GPTC is to supply the project with its staff. The GPTC argues on its side that while the project is highly commendable, national teacher training requirements have to be prioritised.

The review team got the impression that much of the current problems hampering a smooth relation between GDA/NRC and GPTC, could be traced back to the manner in which the project had been incepted. The somewhat informal initial contact led to bypassing of the key resource persons within the MOES. But information was not totally clear on this point, since the Inspectorate Commissioner within the MOES had been involved from the start and received all reports regarding the project. Further distribution of these reports has nevertheless not taken place within the ministry. The critical technical departments (teacher training and curriculum development) insisted that they were not even aware of the project's existence.

According to representatives from these departments during the review, this had negative implications:

1. Reports on ESIP could not incorporate progress and achievements from the GDA/NRC project as part of national progress in the education sector. If a lot of projects took place outside this mainstream framework, the end-result could be that the donors found that ESIP was not progressing fast enough, and hence halt new releases of funds.

2. The prospects for replicability were reduced. In order for this to happen, the MOES would have to know more about the details of the experiences. It was stated that the process of mutual learning which until now had not been possible, could have also benefited the project as there were other examples of gender training, human rights projects etc, from which the GDA/NRC could have learned.
3. Integration of the GDA/NRC specific teacher-training curriculum in the teacher training colleges, which is one of the objectives of the project, would be hampered if changes were not authorised from the central level.

4. Opportunities for influencing other policies will be missed. The team was informed that in particular two emerging policies within the ESIP framework were being worked out. One was a new policy for Disadvantaged and Marginalised Children, aimed at meeting the needs of the more than 20% of the school-aged population that currently is not reached under the ESIP. The other policy was on education for refugee children displaced in various parts of Uganda. It was felt that both of these polices might have benefited from the GDA/NRC experience in Gulu.

8.5 **A complex interplay of toothed wheels**

In conclusion, and looking back on what was said on governance at the start of this chapter, the interplay of actors in the NRC Gulu project, and perhaps also in other "Gap projects", may be illustrated as an interplay between what could be labelled three big “wheels” of international cooperation – perhaps even toothed wheels, with different sets of teeth or levels of teeth:

- a) the government and civil society in Uganda,
- b) the international development agency network, and
- c) the international emergency and relief agencies network.

Figure 2. The three main types of actors directly or indirectly involved in education in Uganda. In each of the "wheels", measures, practices, organisational agenda and culture differ to a smaller or larger extent. Each category of actors has bilateral and trilateral relationships with the others. The sum is a rather complex interplay. (An attempted map of the actors at project level is shown in Annex 4.)
Though it should be underlined that all "wheels" have both the experience and skills, the good will and the need for cooperation, it seems that they are all challenged by the complexity of the full picture. Looking at today's world, the need for interplay and cooperation between three such parties, often with different cultural frames of reference, is likely to rise again. This is why we would like to underline that some of the lessons learned from the NRC Gulu project lies at macro management level.

9. ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

9.1 Financial matters

NRC uses one common financial accounting system, “Agresso”, for all its projects in Norway and internationally.

The advantage of the system is that NRC HQ has direct control of the system that eliminates manipulations of the system as they hold the system password. Reporting has been simplified. It takes an attachment to an e-mail to submit reports to the HQ (hard copies are mailed through DHL). Technical support is always at hand when needed.

The disadvantage is that one is not allowed to make alterations that suit individual or project needs due to password limitations. Also, the Windows NT operating system that the package uses is sensitive to power fluctuations.

The internal financial control procedures have been adhered to and functioning.

A yet unresolved problem has to do with transfer of capital investments after the project period. Equipment has been purchased for each project that goes to vehicles, computers, copy machines etc. According to the overall agreement between GoU and GoN, such equipment is to be transferred to the national partners at the end of the project. It is not stated how this is to be done and to whom. The Implementation Contract includes no reference to this problem.

NRC has not yet started to the process of negotiating the transfer, but expects that the process may cause some frictions between the potential beneficiaries at national and district levels, since the agreements are relatively unclear on this point.

9.2 Management

An organisational structure detailing who does what in the NRC Gulu project is available. Each section draws up its work plan.

The project-leaders are responsible for their projects’ day-to-day running. In 1999 the NRC representation moved to Gulu. Communication and cooperation between the Resident Representative and the Education project staff is easy, as physical distances are small. Vehicles are allocated on different budgets but is generally looked upon as a pool serving the project as a whole. The same goes for the guards, who are utilised on a flexible basis. According to NRC this is a practical arrangement due to frequent instability and emergency situations, with a corresponding need to change plans from one day to the other.

The Resident Representative is the overall security responsible for NRC and therefore handles situations and security issues with the authorities and partners, in cooperation with the project leaders. The representative has generally not been involved in the
running of the school construction or teacher training activities (however, see 9.3 below on the effect of shared office premises).

The Resident Representative reports having spent relatively little time on networking vis à vis the educational government representatives at district or central level. On the other hand, the two education project senior staff members appeared to have a close professional relation and made frequent use of their opportunity to discuss technical, practical and policy-related issues.

9.3 Monitoring and reporting

Each project section prepares regular reports, which are compiled as one report from the Gulu project. Quality objectives are documented when required. Monthly reports contain a report of the main progress regarding achievements. By agreement with the DEO’s office, reports are submitted to the local counterparts and partners (to the DEO and the Principal of Gulu PTC, to the Ministries involved, the Norwegian Embassy and to the NRC desk and Education department at the HQ in Oslo.

The two project leaders send monthly reports to the resident representative, who sends a monthly report to the HQ NRC in Oslo. The monthly reports are sent to Gulu district authorities, with a copy to the Norwegian Embassy and the MOES. All monthly reports and other reports could readily be presented to the team.

The education project shares premises with the Resident Representative. This has the dual advantage of reducing costs and enhance the day-to-day knowledge of local conditions because the other NRC project in Gulu is to operate the food relief project on behalf of WFP.

The semi-annual and annual reports go somewhat deeper than the monthly reports. They also to a certain extent take an analytical view. However, the team found that these reports would benefit from being less descriptive, less cautious of posing problems, challenges and dilemmas encountered in the project, and more analytical.

It is believed that reports written in a more analytical mode would serve the institutional and cross-institutional learning and thus facilitate the necessary mutual development of experience in this type of projects. This view was also conveyed to NRC before the field visit.

9.4 Staff Resources

It appears that NRC has qualified and experienced human resources in all staff positions. No post was vacant. The two project leaders are Norwegian staff posts and so is the 50% Res. Rep. posts. The remaining staff members are recruited within Gulu district. All staff have job descriptions but two of these are still tentative. New issues to be addressed are still coming up and the responsibility for those needs to be formalised. This does not mean that the issues are not taken care of. In both components the members are working very close together, and some times it is the section, which has to agree on who is responsible for what. The employees in education are too few.

All staffs have contracts, and there is a law firm, Sebale & Lule, to advice and assist us if there are questions etc. with regard to these.

The team is of the impression that staff competencies were well utilised within the project and that the working relationship between various sections of the projects was good. In general, project staff seemed quite overloaded with work. This has created
clear limits to taking up more subjects and activities. The two project co-ordinators should in principle be less directly involved in the implementation process, but in the case of the teacher-training component a substantial part of the Project Manager's time is devoted to active teaching and facilitating functions during the workshops.

This active involvement appears to have been necessary during the initial phases of the project, in order to secure quality. It should be noted here that quality in this component has been a moving target. Each workshop brings new lessons and new ambitions with regards to a better performance. In the future, however, it will be necessary for the project to release more of the coordinator's capacity to activities that are geared to institutionalise the training aspects within the two teacher training colleges.

10. CONCLUSIONS

Relevance

- The GDA/NRC project is implemented under a persistent conflict and emergency situation in Gulu. Its emergency components to try to restore access to schools in the districts through construction of schools twinned with efforts to build long-lasting quality in the education system through teacher training, fits well into a GAP framework which links relief to rehabilitation and development. Preconditions for long lasting impact in a conventional development context are not present in Gulu, as peace is not in sight.

- The review team is reasonable convinced that project strategies are relevant responses towards reaching the project objectives. There has been a certain debate within the project on how to balance between temporary schools and permanent schools. The district authorities originally have wanted more of the latter. But then nobody knew that people would be displaced in camps for more than six years and not six months as one had first assumed. If no temporary provisions had been made, children in Gulu would have had their education disrupted for years. The combined approach of temporary and permanent school construction seems relevant in the sense that the first type of structure meet emergency demand and the second is necessary to meet permanent demands for schooling. The original focus on emergency kit distribution was changed to more focus of training of the teachers, as this was assumed to have prospects for lasting effects. The review team finds this change to be a sound one.

- The project is, however, also responding to new challenges as a result of the Uganda mainstream education policies, in particular the introduction of UPE that has resulted in need for more classrooms and more teachers. The district authorities are well acquainted with all UPE requirements, but appear to have little knowledge about the national strategic investment programme, ESIP, which has been designed to follow up the national policies.

Organisation, administration and management

- The GDA/NRC organisational structure is innovative in the sense that NRC has no previous experience as an implementing agency under a NORAD country programme. The arrangement is generally unproblematic, with the exception of some
to be met to release funds. It has been noted that the present agreement does not bring MOES central distinctively into the organisational structure. MOES has not participated actively in the Annual Meetings between the government parties.

- Administrative systems are good. Financial control follows internationally agreed procedures under NRC’s system for financial management “Agresso”. Monthly reports provide excellent information about progress and obstacles met, although the reporting are not always related to objectives and progress towards stated indicators.

- Activities are managed within the two sections; one for school construction and the other for teacher training. The two are not totally streamlined in the sense that only the teachers in schools that are being constructed would be selected for training. It is up to the district authorities make these decisions. The review team could not identify any particular management problems in the project.

**Linkages and co-ordination**

- NRC’s relationship with GDA appears to work very well. Project implementation depends on the effective use of a wide partnership and inclusion of the key actors within district administration, local politics, other NGOs, institutions and general resource persons. NRC seems to cope well with this broad partnership and does not seem to be burdened by its complexity.

- This does not mean that coordination of all activities is running smoothly in the district. The district administrative capacity to coordinate effectively is still weak, as illustrated by the fact that the District Disaster Management Committee is not functioning to the extent envisaged when OCHA made attempts to revitalise this committee.

**Efficiency and effectiveness**

- The project is well ahead of targets set for all components. NRC has proved its ability to implement a relatively comprehensive project under very difficult circumstances. NRC was generally highly praised for its contracting arrangements as far as school construction is concerned. These arrangements put clear demands on the entrepreneurs to perform and produce. The strategy of withholding payments until all parts of the building process have met with the agreed quality criteria has given results.

- Extensive use of available key resource persons outside the narrow sphere of the education sector must be said to have contributed much to the efficiency in development of a good teacher training project. International experts have to a limited extent been used in the initial phase. In addition to technical advice during the course of the development of the training modules, they have also stimulated personnel and motivated people on the ground. Without personal commitment it is not possible to teach in a project like this.

- It takes time to produce a quality-training project. Ambitions are moving and people tend to increasingly demand more of themselves with each workshop held. This team was not been able to assess whether alternative use of funds and human resource would have produced a different or even better training. As the project was highly praised and demand for participation very great, the current level of inputs seems justified.
Effects and impact

- In terms of impact, the project has been very positively received in Gulu district. It is probable that reconstruction of schools will increase the access to schooling for Gulu children. It is also probable that many teachers trained by NRC will perform better and thereby contribute to the motivation and retention of girl children in the schools. Nevertheless, at the end of the day it will not be possible to isolate the effects of these two variables from the effects of other features related to UPE and ESIP in Uganda.

- Since 1998, UPE has in itself resulted in a boost in the gross enrolment rate (which is still assumed to be only around 50% in the Gulu district). On the other hand, the internal monitoring of the project’s impact did show that most schools had benefited from having been trained to prepare school-based action plans for changes they want to see, and that teachers have stopped their previous punitive behaviour of former child soldiers or abducted children.

- The review team also noted that some of the indicators originally set to measure changes as a result of the project, in some cases were too optimistic and that absence of accurate data makes progress in this direction impossible to prove. The project intended to reduce the dropout rate for girls from 90 to 50% within the project period, but this would have need baseline data and indeed also data on the current situation, which do not exist.

- Addressing issues such as gender, human rights and participatory methods are very important all over Uganda. The team has, however, noted that specific issues related to HIV/AIDS were not included in the original project design. This topic is not addressed systematically in the project. The gender content in the project was commendable and very tuned into teachers’ own experience and to the Gulu cultural context.

- The team shares the view of NRC that there is reason for concern as far as schools in hitherto unpopulated areas are concerned. The desired use of these structures will depend on the Government’s final decision on where to resettle the displaced population. Such a decision is not yet made, and five schools are not in use. District authorities make all decisions regarding the location of schools.

- Support activities such as agro-forestry projects in schools has potential for having wider benefits for those really in distress than seem to the case at present. These projects have hitherto been attached to schools on a small-scale pilot base in relatively more resourceful areas where land is available. But given their small scale, these projects have limited outreach, in particular to those children who live in IDP camps and who have since long lost their exposure to agricultural production. The same may be the case for activities such as e.g. girls scouting.

- The project has involved the communities only to a modest extent. Involvement in construction is usually in place. The fact that the community is willing to contribute demonstrates interest, but living in a persistent emergency situation seems also to have eroded traditional mechanisms for community participation. The teacher-training project has not involved the communities much. This is primarily a teacher-focused project, not a school-community based activity. There have been attempts to train School Management Committees and local politicians, but the team got the impression that the results of these workshops were mixed. It is questionable whether the communities themselves have been significantly empowered on account of this.
The project has done much to work out the horizontal collaborative relationship with GDA. As a result, the project is well integrated into the district plans. This is particularly true for construction, which under the new policy of decentralisation is part of the district’s responsibilities.

On the other hand, the project is not integrated in the national education programme, ESIP. The linkages established between the project and the Inspectorate at MOES have not resulted in any visibility in ESIP. Key sections of the MOES, such as Curriculum and Teacher Training, were not aware of the project's existence. This has implications.

One implication is that the project has not been streamlined within the Gulu Primary Teacher College, which is responsible to central MOES level. This has resulted in competing demands on how to use college’s staff resources. In September 2001 the project had entered into a situation where it proved difficult to draw upon college staff resources, which in its turn would make it difficult to run the workshop as comprehensive as intended.

External relations to the central education machinery are closely bound up with some of the bigger issues such as replication and sustainability. Clearly replication cannot occur without strong external relations, because replication is proven by the fact that elements of the project can be used in other connections in Gulu or even beyond this district.

Consequently, opportunities for influencing other educational policies seem lost. During the years 2000 and 2001, the MoES increasingly addresses the situation of marginalised, disadvantaged children, including war-affected IDP children as well as refugee children in Uganda. It is hard to tell whether this will have any direct effect on enrolment and retention of pupils in Gulu in the NRC project period, but it cannot be ruled out. Thus, it would be more realistic, though less accurate, to refer to an eventual combined effect.

**11. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. **Project extension for one to two more years with integration as a main concern**

To facilitate a maximum of benefit from the project into the Ugandan mainstream education system, the team would advise that the project seek finance from NORAD at least one year beyond the planned project completion date. In an eventual continued project, the main focus should be integration and mainstreaming of valuable "NRC/GDA" project components into the UPE and TDMS framework.

It would eventually be up to the final project evaluation in 2002/2003 to judge to what extent the project is well on track according to the above mentioned goal. If that evaluation proved positive, it would in fact, in our view, be a smaller topic whether the project needed still another year or not in order to fulfil its mission.

In a continued project, more should also be done to implement the support activities more widely in Gulu. In particular, as many of the IDP camps as possible should be targeted.

Activities such as agro-forestry and other geared towards creating alternatives for young
will not be absorbed in the secondary school system. The team recommends that the project addresses these or similar activities more directly to the advantage of the IDP population.

The NRC project management should start the process of deciding how and to whom transfer of capital investments in the project is to take place.

2. Better institutional links with Gulu PTC

Links with Gulu PTC need to be firmly established so that the teacher-training project can be harmonised with the national education programme. Maximum efforts should be put into facilitating partial or full harmonisation, which might perhaps be planned as a two or three step exercise. If possible, more teachers should also be recruited from the other teacher training college in Gulu, Christ the King College, to expand the pool of available tools and facilitators.

3. Improved planning capacity of the GPTC, DEO and CCT

The project should make deliberate efforts to strengthen the planning capacity of the GPTC, DEO and CCT. This group is responsible for training of teachers in the regular teaching force, and carries with it the greatest potential for bringing the project forward in the future. The strengthening of structures and enhancement of this group’s capacity to plan future training in the district (with the issues brought to the forefront in the current NRC/GDA teacher-training) is critical for future sustainability.

The team recommends that this issue be given priority, also if it means that less focus is put on the project’s ability to reach out to all the 3,000 teachers in the district.

GDA has stated that it wants to reinforce the integration of the project into District Development Plan 2001-2004 through holding a workshop on how to sustain the benefits of the project even further. Care should be taken to ensure that participants are recruited among all stakeholder groups, including representatives from the community and from MOES central.

4. Strengthened relationship between NRC, GDA and MoES

The components and the methodology of the project should be strengthened in the national curriculum, including the plans for TDMS and in-service training /distance education materials. This could be facilitated by the National Curriculum Development Committee (NCDC) and the commissioner for Curriculum development.

The above requires a pro-active approach from the GDA and NRC to ensure that the project becomes integrated in the national education programme. This includes reporting to MOES Planning Department, which keeps a central archive for all education projects. The contact point in the ministry should no longer be limited to the Inspectorate but be changed in accordance with regular procedures established for development assistance projects and programmes within MOES.

There seems to be a need for clarification of the level of aspiration. If GDA wishes all teachers to go through the Emergency Teacher-training component, substantial efforts should be put into the organisation of a well-functioning integration of the project; both into the national in-service training and into the national pre-service training programme.
This would indeed be a valuable and important contribution to the mainstream teacher-training efforts in Gulu. In the long run, this would also be the determining factor for sustainability and for possible duplication in the other (reportedly 11) Ugandan districts with related problems.

The links with MoES should be strengthened as soon as possible. Steps should be taken to make the project part of the national education development efforts, i.e. UPE and ESIP, if convenient with special reference to the plans related to marginalised and disadvantaged children and youth.

5. **Schools built in safe areas**

Schools should not be built in areas with low security. Rather, they should be re-located within the specific county. Alternatively existing permanent schools in safe areas may be strengthened with additional classroom blocks. NRC should, in partnership with GDA and the local politicians, work out plans to ensure safety of school locations. If needed, some of the remaining schools may have to re-locate to other safer sites or alternatively funds set aside for new schools should be channelled into upgrading those already built to a full primary school.

6. **Inclusion of HIV/AIDS prevention**

The use of HIV/AIDS-relevant examples in some workshop modules, as well as in some of the support activities, could be strengthened. A separate module on this topic would be highly relevant to the project. If the project period is extended, additional financial resources should be sought to ensure that HIV/IDS become duly integrated in the teacher-training component. Existing budgets would not be adequate for introducing this as a topic in the training project. The issue is very important because living conditions in Gulu make people extremely exposed to risks of being affected.

However, there is hardly a country in Africa that has addressed the HIV/AIDS issue more successfully than Uganda. Thus it would be important to start eventual activities only in close cooperation with relevant Ugandan authorities and resource personnel.

7. **Strengthening of support activities**

The support activities should be strengthened. This seems especially important for young children. Many children in the camps grow up without any knowledge about e.g. agricultural production. At the same time it is from these areas most of them would have to find a living later in life. Investments in children at a later age might be lost when young children grow up in the circumstances they currently do.

Community-based early childhood activities should be introduced in as many camps as possible. Early childhood activities should be primarily be community-based, in order to keep costs down and make as wide a coverage as possible.

8. **Latrines built in all project schools**

Latrines should be given priority as a possible area for NRC engagement when the utilisation of the savings in the project is being discussed. The issue of latrines seem to be an important factor related to full access for girls to education.
9.  **Securing community participation**

The support of the parents and local communities through the possibility to benefit from project activities should be secured. It is important to recognise and seek to overcome the limits to community participation that currently exist in the project. Community participation will be reinforced if the capacity of local organisations such as the School Management Committees to relate to the school directly is strengthened. The DEO should identify ways and means by which this capacity could be strengthened, and how one might better respond to a weak community structures in the IDP camps.

The role of communities to become engaged in issues regarding teachers’ performance and pupils attendance should be strengthened. One workshop for SMCs is not sufficient. There is a need for following up with more training.

10. **Providing and securing project documentation**

It is recommended that all relevant project documentation is systematically gathered and secured for the benefit of related future projects. This would go for written communication with the government; administrative working tools; organisation charts; monthly reports describing foreseen and unforeseen challenges and attempted solutions; workshop agendas; observation forms; job descriptions; instructions for teachers; codes of conduct for workshop facilitators; summaries; statistical information and documents of analysis. The project already has an excellent documentation practice. This recommendation is mainly done to secure information for possible related future projects.

---
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- District Council (Chairman LC V)
- Secretary of Education (LC V)
- Chairman Education Committee (LC V)
- Other secretaries (LC V)
- LC III s & LC III Secretaries at Sub County level
- LC II & LC I (Parish & village level)

International NGOs
- Save the Children Fund Sweden (SCF-S) & Denmark (SCF-D) - Teacher Training
- NRC Norway
- NFF (NFA- Norwegian Football Association)

National NGOs
- Centre for Conflict Resolution (CECORE)
- Gulu Support the Children Organisation (GUSCO)
- Uganda Child Rights NGO Network (UCRNN)
- Madrasa

(Cont.)
2. Teacher education (workshops, preparations etc.)

**Government agencies**
- Ministry of Education and Sports, Commissioner for Education Inspectorate
- Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development
- Gulu Core Primary Teachers’ College (GPTC)
- Christ the King Primary Teachers’ College (CKPTC)
- Institute of Teacher Education Kyambogo (ITEK)

**Government agencies at district and local levels**
- (RDC Regional District representative - representing central Government)
- Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)
- District Education Officer (DEO)
- District Inspector of Schools (DIS)
- District Production Department (agro-forestry and fisheries)

**District politicians (Local Councillors)**
- District Council (Chairman LC V)
- Secretary of Education (LC V)
- Chairman Education Committee (LC V)
- Other secretaries (LC V)
- LC III s & LC III Secretaries at Sub County level
- LC II & LC I (Parish & village level)

**International NGOs**
- Forum for African Women in Education (FAWE)
- Save the Children Fund Denmark (SCF-DK)
- Save the Children Fund Sweden (SCF-S)
- NRC Norway
- UNICEF (Material
- Regional Resource Group (RRG)

**National NGOs & Institutions**
- Centre for Conflict Resolution (CECORE)
- Gulu Support the Children Organisation (GUSCO)
- Uganda Child Rights NGO Network (UCRNN)
- Gulu Women Empowerment (GWENET)
- Girl Guides and Boy Scouts Movement

(Cont.)
3. Support activities

Government agencies
- Gulu Core Primary Teachers’ College (GPTC)
- Christ the King Primary Teachers’ College (CKPTC)
- Institute of Teacher Education Kyambogo (ITEK)

Government agencies at district and local levels
- (RDC Regional District representative- representing central Government)
- Chief Administrative Officer (CAO)
- District Education Officer (DEO)
- District Inspector of Schools (DIS)
- District Production Department (agro-forestry and fisheries)

District politicians (Local Councillors)
- District Council (Chairman LC V)
- Secretary of Education (LC V)
- Chairman Education Committee (LC V)
- Other secretaries (LC V)
- LC III’s & LC III Secretaries at Sub County level
- LC II & LC I (Parish & village level)

International NGOs
- NRC Norway
- NFF (NFA- Norwegian Football Association)

National NGOs
- Gulu Support the Children Organisation (GUSCO)
- Uganda Child Rights NGO Network (UCRNN)
- Gulu Women Empowerment (GWENET)
- Girl Guides and Boy Scouts Movement
- Madrasa
Appendix 4. Attempted overview of actors and structures at project level *)

Sub Committee for Education consists of the District Education Officer (DEO), the District Inspectorate of Schools (DIS), NRC, Save the Children Fund Denmark, and Vision, Gulu Support the Children Organisation (GUSCO) and Gulu Primary Teacher College (GPTC).

It should be duly noted that this figure is not authorised and does not in any way pretend to display a correct overview of actors and structures in the Gulu project. The intention is merely to give an impression of the complex multitude of roles and relations.