

18.1 Performance on Health Sector Performance Measures

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings																												
(A) Human resource planning and management (Maximum 26 points)	1.	LG has substantively recruited primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage (Maximum 8 points)	Evidence that LG has filled the structure for primary health workers with a wage bill provision from PHC wage for the current FY (2018/2019) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 80% filled: score 8 points, • 60 – 80% - score 4 points • Less than 60% filled: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the LG Performance Contract: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Check the LG approved structure ✓ Check wage bill provision ✓ Establish the positions filled <i>If there is evidence of effort to recruit (e.g. advertisement etc.) but LG has failed to attract provide the score.</i> 	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soroti MLG has five public health facilities. Our review of a staff deployment letter dated 10th July 2017 and titled “deployment list of all health workers within Soroti Municipality FY 2017-18” revealed the staffing below in the five public health facilities under the MLG: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health facility</th> <th>Positions filled</th> <th>Staff norms</th> <th>Percentage</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Princess Diana Health Center IV/</td> <td>39</td> <td>48</td> <td>81.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kichinjaji Health Center III</td> <td>15</td> <td>19</td> <td>79.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastern Division Health Center III</td> <td>18</td> <td>19</td> <td>95.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Western Division Health Center III</td> <td>16</td> <td>19</td> <td>84.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Morupapur Health Center II</td> <td>5</td> <td>9</td> <td>55.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>93</td> <td>114</td> <td>81.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Overall, 81.6% of the primary health workers positions are filled.</p>	Health facility	Positions filled	Staff norms	Percentage	Princess Diana Health Center IV/	39	48	81.3%	Kichinjaji Health Center III	15	19	79.0%	Eastern Division Health Center III	18	19	95.0%	Western Division Health Center III	16	19	84.2%	Morupapur Health Center II	5	9	55.6%	Total	93	114	81.6%
	Health facility	Positions filled	Staff norms	Percentage																														
Princess Diana Health Center IV/	39	48	81.3%																															
Kichinjaji Health Center III	15	19	79.0%																															
Eastern Division Health Center III	18	19	95.0%																															
Western Division Health Center III	16	19	84.2%																															
Morupapur Health Center II	5	9	55.6%																															
Total	93	114	81.6%																															
2.	The LG Health department has	Evidence that Health department has	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Performance Contract, review 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We were provided with a letter dated 4th July 2017, by the Municipal Health Officer to the 																													

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings																		
		submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan for primary health care workers to the HRM department (Maximum 6 points)	submitted a comprehensive recruitment plan/request to HRM for the current FY (2018/2019), covering the vacant positions of health workers: score 6 points	recruitment plan to determine whether the vacant positions of primary health care workers have been included in the current FY (2018/2019)		Town Clerk that indicated the following critical positions for recruitment in the health department during the financial year 2018/2019 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Principal Medical Officer – 1 - Dispenser – 2 - Anaesthetic officer – 1 - Principal health inspector – 1 - Theatre assistant – 1 However this recruitment request does not exhaust all the vacant positions indicated in the above table																		
	3.	The LG Health department has conducted performance appraisal for Health Centre IVs and Hospital in-charge and ensured performance appraisals for HC III and II in-charges are conducted. (Maximum 8 points)	Evidence that all health facility in-charges have been appraised during the previous FY (2017/18): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100%: score 8 points • 70 – 99%: score 4 points • Below 70%: score 0 	From the LG HR department, obtain and review a sample of in-charge personnel files to determine whether they were appraised during the previous FY (2017/18).	8	We reviewed the personnel files for all in charges of the five health facilities in the MLG and noted that they were all appraised for the financial year 2017 /2018. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health facility</th> <th>In-charge</th> <th>Appraisal date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Princess Diana HCIV</td> <td>Dr. Anyonga Alfred</td> <td>14th August 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kichinjaji HCIII</td> <td>Irene Aguti Jennifer</td> <td>3rd July 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastern Division HCIII</td> <td>Cuthbert Emili</td> <td>30th July 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Western Division HCIII</td> <td>John Bosco Ojor</td> <td>30th July 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Morupesur HCII</td> <td>Simon Elianu</td> <td>30th July 2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Health facility	In-charge	Appraisal date	Princess Diana HCIV	Dr. Anyonga Alfred	14 th August 2018	Kichinjaji HCIII	Irene Aguti Jennifer	3 rd July 2018	Eastern Division HCIII	Cuthbert Emili	30 th July 2018	Western Division HCIII	John Bosco Ojor	30 th July 2018	Morupesur HCII	Simon Elianu	30 th July 2018
Health facility	In-charge	Appraisal date																						
Princess Diana HCIV	Dr. Anyonga Alfred	14 th August 2018																						
Kichinjaji HCIII	Irene Aguti Jennifer	3 rd July 2018																						
Eastern Division HCIII	Cuthbert Emili	30 th July 2018																						
Western Division HCIII	John Bosco Ojor	30 th July 2018																						
Morupesur HCII	Simon Elianu	30 th July 2018																						
	4.	The Local Government Health department has equitably deployed health workers across health facilities and in accordance with the staff lists submitted together with the	Evidence that the LG Health department has deployed health workers equitably, in line with the lists submitted with the budget for the current FY 2018/2019, and if	From the MHO, obtain and review a sample of health facilities (rural and urban) verify whether the health workers as indicated in the staff lists are actually deployed in	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We obtained and compared staff lists for Princess Diana HCIV and Morupesur HCII with the staff list at the MHO. We noted that the staff list at Morupesur HCII was consistent with that provided by MHO. However the staff list for Princess Diana was not. We noted that Dr. Adakun Moses was still listed as a Senior Medical Officer at the health center as well as a 																		

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(B) Monitoring and supervision <i>(Maximum 32 points)</i>	5.	The MHO has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities <i>(Maximum 6 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the MHO has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From MoH obtain guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to health facilities (MoH to prioritize the documents to be reviewed) From the MHO obtain evidence that s/he communicated guidelines, policies, circulars to health facilities (e.g. through meetings, submission letters, etc). From the sample of health facilities, check whether the guidelines, policies, circulars were received. <p><i>If all guidelines of the previous year are still applicable and no new ones have been issued, then score 3</i></p>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We were not provided with any evidence during the assessment to indicate that the MHO has effectively communicated any guidelines, policies and circulars issued by the national level in the financial year 2017/2018. Discussions with the Principal Medical Officer indicated that the guidelines, circulars and policies from national level are either sent directly to the health centers through implementing partners or through the District Health Office.
		budget in the current FY (2018/2019). <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i>	not provided justification for deviations: score 4 points	the health facilities.		<p>Medical Officer at the MLG administration. In addition Mr. Opolot Emmanuel, a laboratory assistant at Princess Diana does not appear on the municipal health staff list.</p>

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	6.	The LG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to district health services (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the MHO has held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the MHO obtain and review minutes and/or other evidence of meetings with health facility in-charges in the previous FY (2017/18). ▪ Check from a sample of 5 health facilities 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We were not provided with any evidence during the assessment to indicate that the MHO held meetings with health facility in-charges and among others explained the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that MHT has supervised 100% of HC IVs and district hospitals (including PNFs receiving PHC grant) at least once in a quarter: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the MHO obtain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The LG support supervision reports (quarterly) ▪ Minutes of MHT meeting. ▪ Facility records 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was no evidence to indicate that the MLG Health Department has effectively provided support supervision to the district health services. During the assessment we noted that the Municipal Health Department did not have any support supervision and monitoring reports for 2017/18. ▪ In addition, a substantive Municipal Health Team has not yet been formed.
			<p>Evidence that MHT has ensured that HSD has supervised lower level health facilities within the previous FY (2017/18):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If 100% supervised: score 3 points • 80 - 99% of the health facilities: score 2 points • 60% - 79% of the health facilities: score 	<p>From the MHO obtain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The LG support supervision reports (quarterly) ▪ Minutes of MHT meetings ▪ Facility records ▪ Review and check a sample of minimum 5 facilities 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was no evidence provided during the assessment to confirm that the Municipal Health department ensured that HSD supervised lower health facilities. ▪ Our review of support supervision records (support supervision - book) at Moruapesur HCII did not reveal any record of support supervision and monitoring from the HSD.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 60% of the health facilities: score 0 			
	7.	The LG Health department (including HSDs) have discussed the results/ reports of the support supervision and monitoring visits, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and follow up (Maximum 10 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that all the 4 quarterly reports have been discussed and used to make recommendations (in each quarter) for corrective actions during the previous financial year (2017/18): score 4 points • Evidence that the recommendations are followed up and specific activities undertaken for correction: score 6 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MHO obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support supervision and monitoring visit reports ▪ Minutes of quarterly meetings ▪ Minutes of monthly MHT meetings ▪ From the sampled health facilities, determine whether the Health department provided recommendations from the supervision visits and followed up. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As indicated above there was no evidence of any supervision and monitoring reports during the assessment. Accordingly there was no evidence that support supervision/ monitoring reports had been discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions. ▪ In the absence of any support supervision/ monitoring reports, we could not verify whether there were any recommendations resulting from supervision/ monitoring reports that were followed up and specific actions taken.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings							
(C) Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability <i>(Maximum 14 points)</i>	8.	The LG Health department has submitted accurate/ consistent reports/ data for health facility lists receiving PHC funding as per formats provided by MoH <i>(Maximum 10 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has submitted accurate/ consistent data regarding list of facilities receiving PHC funding, which are consistent with both HMIS reports and PBS - score 10 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MoH obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HMIS reports for the current FY (2018/2019) The performance contract for the current FY (2018/2019) Check whether the lists of health facilities submitted are consistent/ similar 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment team was not provided with the HMIS reports for the current FY 2018/2019 and consequently could not assess this area. 							
	9.	The LG committee responsible for health met; discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the committee responsible for health met and discussed service delivery issues including supervision reports, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc. during the previous FY (2017/18) - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the Council has approved the sector implementation plan and discussions by the committee Review the MHO's reports to the committee 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the assessment, we noted that health sector issues were presented to the "Social Services Committee" for discussion. The committee held 5 meetings during the financial year 2017/18. The health sector issues discussed during the social services committee meetings are highlighted in the table below; <table border="1" data-bbox="321 1486 641 2011"> <thead> <tr> <th>Meeting Date</th> <th>Health Sector Issues Discussed.</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>17th October 2017</td> <td>Discussed fencing health facilities and toilets in health facilities.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30th January 2018</td> <td>Vetting of HUMC committees by council</td> </tr> <tr> <td>24th May 2018</td> <td>Discussed challenges to service provision at princess Diana HCIV</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> However we noted that discussions by the 	Meeting Date	Health Sector Issues Discussed.	17 th October 2017	Discussed fencing health facilities and toilets in health facilities.	30 th January 2018	Vetting of HUMC committees by council	24 th May 2018
Meeting Date	Health Sector Issues Discussed.												
17 th October 2017	Discussed fencing health facilities and toilets in health facilities.												
30 th January 2018	Vetting of HUMC committees by council												
24 th May 2018	Discussed challenges to service provision at princess Diana HCIV												

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings												
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the health sector committee has presented issues that require approval to Council - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review health sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the sector committee has presented issues that require approval. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Services Committee did not include supervision reports, performance assessment results and LP PAC reports. During the assessment we could not clearly establish whether the Social Services Committee that handles issues from the health sector had presented to the council issues that require approval. The meeting minutes were poorly documented could not identify any health issues forwarded to council for approval. 												
	10.	The Health Unit Management Committees and Hospital Board are operational/functioning (Maximum 6 points)	<p>Evidence that health facilities and Hospitals have functional HUMCs/Boards (established, meetings held and discussions of budget and resource issues):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If 100% of randomly sampled facilities: score 6 points If 80-99 %: score 4 points If 70-79: %: score 2 point If less than 70%: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check files of HUMCs and minutes of HUMCs (Check list for all and sample 5 to review) Study files from 5 randomly sampled health facilities to confirm whether they have HUMCs and review whether they have held 4 mandatory meetings 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the assessment we were provided with HUMCs files for four out of the five sampled health facilities. Our review of these files established that only two health facilities (Kichinjaji HCIII and Moruapesur HCII), held the mandatory 4 meetings as indicated in the table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Health facility</th> <th>Number of meetings held</th> <th>Meeting dates</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Princess Diana HCIV</td> <td>2</td> <td>6th October 2017 11th May 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kichinjaji HCIII</td> <td>4</td> <td>14th December 2017 23rd March 2018 13th April 2018 21st June 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Eastern Division</td> <td>3</td> <td>29th September 2017</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Health facility	Number of meetings held	Meeting dates	Princess Diana HCIV	2	6 th October 2017 11 th May 2018	Kichinjaji HCIII	4	14 th December 2017 23 rd March 2018 13 th April 2018 21 st June 2018	Eastern Division	3	29 th September 2017
Health facility	Number of meetings held	Meeting dates																
Princess Diana HCIV	2	6 th October 2017 11 th May 2018																
Kichinjaji HCIII	4	14 th December 2017 23 rd March 2018 13 th April 2018 21 st June 2018																
Eastern Division	3	29 th September 2017																

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	11.	The LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has publicised all health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check the LG Notice Boards and LG budget website to establish if the Health department publicised all health facilities receiving non-wage recurrent grants Check a sample of health facilities 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that the MLG had displayed health facilities receiving PHC non-wage recurrent grants on the noticeboards. Furthermore, none of the health facilities that we visited had displayed PHC non-wage recurrent grants.
(D) Procurement and contract management (Maximum 8 points)	12	The LG Health department has submitted input to procurement plan and requests, complete with all technical requirements, to PDU that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted input to procurement plan to PDU that cover all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30, 2018 for the current FY (2018/2019) - score 2 points Evidence that LG Health department submitted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Municipal Health Officer (MHO) obtain and review submissions to DPU; From PDU crosscheck submission from DHO 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Health department prepared and submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covered all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on 3rd July 2018 and it was received by PDU on 6th July 2018. The Health department submitted the approved work plans to PDU after the deadline of 30th April 2018. At time of the assessment the health department hadn't submitted procurement request form (Form PPS) to the PDU by 1st Quarter of the current FY (2018/19).

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(E) Financial management and reporting <i>(Maximum 8 points)</i>	13	The LG Health department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i>	procurement request form (Form PP5) to the PDU by 1 st Quarter of the current FY 2018/2019 - score 2 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the CFO obtain a sample of contracts, review and determine whether payment requests were certified and recommended on time 	4	We reviewed one contract; Repair of two Computers for the health department. A requisition was raised on 1 st January 2018 amounting to Ushs. 380,000. The principal medical officer forwarded the requisition for consideration to the Head of finance on the same date. A payment voucher (PV-S03943) dated 28 th March 2018 was raised. The service provider acknowledged receipt of the funds on 9 th April 2018.
	14	The LG Health department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY - 2017/18 (including all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by mid-July for consolidation - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Planning Unit, obtain and review performance report files From the MHO check annual and quarterly reports for the previous FY (2017/18) 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Health Sector prepared and submitted the 2018/19 quarterly reports and annual performance report that included progress in the execution of the planned activities to the Planning Unit for consolidation. Discussion with the Municipal Economic Planner indicated that the performance reports were prepared using the PBS system where each Sector populated its section in the system and the planning unit made the consolidation. Online submission of the consolidated quarterly reports were then done by the Municipal Economic Planner. Our review of the submitted reports indicated that the performance reports contained sections on the health sector. However the Economic Planner did not keep record of the date on which

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings															
	15	LG Health department has acted on Internal Audit recommendations (if any) (Maximum 4 points)	Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If sector has no audit query - score 4 points If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Internal Auditor obtain copies of sector audit reports from the internal audit and Management responses for the previous FY (2017/18) 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We obtained quarterly audit reports for 2017/18 and noted that the internal auditor raised the following queries in the health department: <table border="1" data-bbox="279 1459 1096 2005"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Audit Query</th> <th>Online Submission date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Delayed accountabilities amounting to USHS. 921,000 for NWSC water bill payment.</td> <td>23/02/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Delayed accountabilities amounting to USHS. 2,088,400 for electricity bill payment at Diana HC 1V.</td> <td>06/04/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Delayed accountabilities for business advances amounting to USHS.</td> <td>No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.go.ug/budget/individual-g-budgets-and-performance-reports)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>03/09/2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> 	Quarter	Audit Query	Online Submission date	1	Delayed accountabilities amounting to USHS. 921,000 for NWSC water bill payment.	23/02/2018	2	Delayed accountabilities amounting to USHS. 2,088,400 for electricity bill payment at Diana HC 1V.	06/04/2018	3	Delayed accountabilities for business advances amounting to USHS.	No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.go.ug/budget/individual-g-budgets-and-performance-reports)	4		03/09/2018
Quarter	Audit Query	Online Submission date																			
1	Delayed accountabilities amounting to USHS. 921,000 for NWSC water bill payment.	23/02/2018																			
2	Delayed accountabilities amounting to USHS. 2,088,400 for electricity bill payment at Diana HC 1V.	06/04/2018																			
3	Delayed accountabilities for business advances amounting to USHS.	No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.go.ug/budget/individual-g-budgets-and-performance-reports)																			
4		03/09/2018																			

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings																
(F) Social and environment safeguards (Maximum 12 points)	16	Compliance with gender composition of Health Unit Management Committee (HUMC) and promotion of gender sensitive sanitation in health facilities. (Maximum 4 points)	audit findings for the previous FY (2017/18) - score 2 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If all queries are not responded to - score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the number and gender of committee members is as per required composition 	0	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3,330,000</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>None</td> </tr> </table> <p>Our review of the subsequent internal audit reports and discussion with the internal auditor indicated that the health department later provided information to the internal auditor on the status of implementation of the specific audit findings mentioned above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We sampled three health facilities that included Princess Diana Memorial health center IV, Kichinjaji health center III and Moruapesur Health center II. The HUMC compositions at the facilities were as indicated in the table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Facility</th> <th>Females</th> <th>Males</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Princess Diana Memorial health center IV</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kichinjaji health center III</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Moruapesur Health center II</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The gender composition at Moruapesur Health center II does not meet the gender composition requirement of at least 30% women. There were no guidelines on sanitation provided at the time of assessment at the sampled health facilities. However, we noted that facilities for men and women were well separated. 	3,330,000		4	None	Facility	Females	Males	Princess Diana Memorial health center IV	3	3	Kichinjaji health center III	3	3	Moruapesur Health center II	0	5
			3,330,000																			
4	None																					
Facility	Females	Males																				
Princess Diana Memorial health center IV	3	3																				
Kichinjaji health center III	3	3																				
Moruapesur Health center II	0	5																				
Evidence that the HUMC meet the gender composition as per guidelines (i.e. minimum 30% women) - score 2 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage sanitation in health facilities 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the LG has issued guidelines on how to manage 																			

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	17	LG Health department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with. (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all health facility infrastructure projects are screened before approval for construction using the checklist for screening of projects in the budget guidelines and where risks are identified, the forms include mitigation actions: score 2 points The environmental officer and community development officer have visited the sites to check whether the mitigation plans are complied with: score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Environmental officer obtain and review filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether risks mitigation plans were developed. From the Environmental officer and CDO obtain and review Site visit reports to establish whether they checked compliance to the risk mitigation plans 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There were health infrastructure projects among the projects screened in 2017/18. However, none of them was implemented in the financial year 2017/18. There were no site visits or monitoring done because none of the health infrastructure projects was implemented under the health department.
	18	The LG Health department has issued guidelines on medical waste management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has issued guidelines on medical waste 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled health facilities, find out whether the LG has issued guidelines 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We noted that there were medical waste management guidelines in form of medical waste segregation charts at the 3 facilities visited.

Performance Area	No.	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedures	Score	Detailed assessment findings
		(Maximum 4 points)	management, including guidelines (e.g. sanitation charts, posters, etc) for construction of facilities for medical waste disposal - score 4 points.	on medical waste management		
Total					38	

18.2 Performance on Education Sector Performance Measures

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings																		
(A) Human resource planning and management (Maximum 30 points)	1.	The Municipal LG education department has budgeted and deployed teachers as per guidelines (a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school) (Maximum 8 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG has budgeted for a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY (2018/2019) - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Municipal LG Performance Contract: (i) review the list of schools; and (ii) the staff lists and validate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Municipal LG has budgeted for at least a Head Teacher and a minimum of 7 teachers per school. 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We obtained and reviewed the Performance contract vote 763 for Soroti MLG, staff lists of schools and the quarterly budgets. We noted that Soroti MLG has a total of 18 primary schools and 330 primary school teachers. There was therefore evidence indicating that Soroti MLG budgeted for at least a head teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school. 																		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers per school (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) for the current FY (2018/2019) - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO obtain and review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers' lists to determine whether Municipal LG has deployed a Head Teacher and minimum of 7 teachers (or minimum of a teacher per class for schools with less than P.7) per school for the current FY (2018/2019). From the sampled schools (urban and rural), verify whether the teachers as indicated in the staff lists are actually 																				
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO, we obtained and reviewed teachers' lists to determine the deployment status. From the 5 sampled schools, we established that deployment of teachers at the schools, and the number indicated in the staff lists are shown in the table below: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Staff List</th> <th>Deployment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pioneer Primary School</td> <td>17</td> <td>18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Swaria Primary School</td> <td>27</td> <td>22</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kichanjaji Primary School</td> <td>26</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Soroti Demonstration Primary School</td> <td>23</td> <td>23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Madera Girls Primary School</td> <td>15</td> <td>17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Since each of the sampled schools had one head</p>	School	Staff List	Deployment	Pioneer Primary School	17	18	Swaria Primary School	27	22	Kichanjaji Primary School	26	27	Soroti Demonstration Primary School	23	23	Madera Girls Primary School	15	17
School	Staff List	Deployment																						
Pioneer Primary School	17	18																						
Swaria Primary School	27	22																						
Kichanjaji Primary School	26	27																						
Soroti Demonstration Primary School	23	23																						
Madera Girls Primary School	15	17																						

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
				deployed in the Schools.		teacher and more than 7 teachers the score is 4.
	2.	Municipal LG has substantively recruited all primary school teachers where there is a wage bill provision (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG has filled the structure for primary teachers with a wage bill provision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ If 100% - score 6 points ✓ If 80 - 99% - score 3 points ✓ If below 80% - score 0 	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Check the Municipal LG approved structure ▪ Check wage bill provision ▪ Positions filled. <p><i>If there is evidence of effort to recruit (e.g. advertisement etc.) but Municipal LG has failed to attract, provide the score.</i></p>	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The MLG filled its approved structure for primary teachers at 97%. As per the HRM staff register for teachers, the MLG has 330 teachers out of the 340 teachers on the approved structure with a wage bill provision of USHS. 2,326,718,256 per year for FY 2017/2018. We established that the vacant 10 positions were submitted to the HRM for consideration.
	3.	Municipal LG has substantively recruited all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision. (Maximum 6 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors as per staff structure, where there is a wage bill provision - score 6 points 	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Check the Municipal LG approved structure ▪ Positions filled. 	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The approved structure for school inspectors in Soroti MLG is two inspectors. We established that the MLG has substantively filled all positions of school inspectors. These are Mr. Emokur Patry as the Municipal Inspector of Schools and Mr. Imaingat Francis as the Assistant Inspector of schools.
	4.	The LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan covering primary teachers and school inspectors to HRM for the current FY (2018/2019).	<p>Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has submitted a recruitment plan to HRM for the current FY to fill positions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Primary Teachers - 	<p>From the Municipal LG Performance Contract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review recruitment plan to determine whether the vacant positions of teachers and inspectors have been included. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As indicated above, we established that the two positions of school inspectors in the MLG's approved structure had been substantively filled. Therefore there was no need to include the inspectors' positions in the recruitment plan. ▪ We further noted that the vacant ten positions of the primary school teachers had been included in the recruitment plan submitted to HRM for the

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
		(Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ score 2 points School Inspectors - score 2 points 			financial year 2018/2019.
	5.	The Municipal LG Education department has conducted performance appraisal for school inspectors and ensured that performance appraisal for all primary school head teachers is conducted during the previous FY (2017/18). (Maximum 6 points)	<p>Evidence that the MLG Education department has ensured that all head teachers are appraised and has appraised all school inspectors during the previous FY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 100% school inspectors - score 3 points ▪ Primary school head teachers 90 - 100% - score 3 points ✓ 70% and 89% - score 2 points ✓ Below 70% - score 0 	<p>From the Municipal HR department obtain and review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel files for school inspectors and a sample of head teachers to determine whether they were appraised during the previous FY (2017/18). 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We reviewed the personnel files from the MEO and established that the two school inspectors in the MLG were not appraised in the previous financial year 2017/18. • We further noted that none of the head teachers in the five (5) sampled head teachers was appraised during the year ended December 2017.
(B) Monitoring and inspection (Maximum 35 points)	6.	The Municipal LG Education Department has effectively communicated and explained guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY to schools (Maximum 3 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has communicated all guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools - score 1 point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From MoES obtain guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY (2017/18) to schools ▪ From the MEO obtain evidence that s/he communicated guidelines, policies, circulars to schools. 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We obtained the policies, guidelines and circulars issued at the national level in FY 2017/2018 and noted that the municipal LG Education department communicated guidelines, policies and circulars issued by the national level in the previous FY 2017/18 as indicated below: - On 1st/12/2017, MLG Education department communicated guidelines on school charges and - On 24th/4/2018, communicated guidelines on Early closure and opening of schools

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has held meetings with primary school head teachers and among others explained and sensitised on the guidelines, policies, circulars issued by the national level - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO obtain and review minutes and/or other evidence of the meetings with Head Teachers From the sampled schools, check whether the guidelines, policies, circulars were received. 	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the assessment we were provided with evidence from MEO in form of meeting minutes indicating that the education department sensitized schools on policies, circulars & guidelines issued at the national level as shown below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On 6th/2/2018, Under Min 02/EDUC/2018, the MEO discussed with head teacher's issues of licensing schools, Music dance and Drama (Performing Arts Festival Syllabus 2017/18, and pupils' athletics); On 24th/05/2018, Under Min 04/EDUC/2018, the MEO sensitized head teachers on e-registration of PLE candidates; and On 14th/12/2018, discussed with school head teachers circulars on corporal punishments and school feeding programmes.
	7.	The Municipal LG Education Department has effectively inspected all registered schools (Maximum 12 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that all licenced or registered schools have been inspected at least once per term and reports produced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 100% - score 12 ✓ 90 to 99% - score 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO, obtain and review school inspection reports and inventory of schools inspected in the previous FY (2017/18) From sampled school verify the number of times they were 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A sample of 5 government aided schools and 5 private schools was randomly selected. We reviewed the school inspection reports that we received from the MEO, to ascertain number of time the sampled schools were inspected. <p>Government aided schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pioneer Primary School was inspected on 09th August 2017, 26th March 2018 and 07th June

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	8.	Municipal LG Education department has	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 80 to 89% - score 8 ✓ 70 to 79% - score 6 ✓ 60 to 69% - score 3 ✓ 50 to 59 % - score 1 ✓ Below 50% - score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inspected during the previous FY (2017/18) 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2018 - Swaria Primary School was inspected on 20th July 2017, 15th February 2018 and 21st June 2018 - Kichanjaji Primary school was inspected on 17th July 2017, 12th October 2017 and 14th June 2018 - Madera Girls Primary School was inspected on 20th October 2017, 13th February 2018 and 20th June 2018 - Soroti Demonstration Primary School was inspected on 15th August 2017, 02nd November 2017 and 13th March 2018. <p>From the above, only Madera Girls P/S and Soroti Demonstration P/S were inspected per term in FY 2017/18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ During the assessment, the MLG education department did not provide us with evidence of inspection of the 5 sampled licensed private schools that included Soroti Parents Primary School, St. Martha Primary School, Life Way Primary School, Jamelot Primary School and Trinity Junior Primary School. We could not also verify from the schools whether inspections had been conducted since the schools were closed for school second term holidays. ▪ It was validated that only 2 schools i.e. Pioneer and Madera Girls P/S had their Schools inspected 3 times in a year (once per term) and reports produced. ▪ Since only 4 out of 10 sampled schools were inspected at least once per in 2017/18. ▪ We were not provided with any evidence to indicate that the MLG Education Department

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
		discussed the results/reports of school inspections, used them to make recommendations for corrective actions and followed recommendations (Maximum 10 points)	department has discussed school inspection reports and used reports to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY (2017/18) - score 4 points	departmental meetings to determine whether school inspection reports were discussed and used to make recommendations for corrective actions during the previous FY (2017/18).	2	held meetings to discuss inspection reports in FY2017/2018.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG Education department has submitted school inspection reports to the DES in the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the DES obtain and review a list of LGs that have submitted school inspection reports • From the MEO check whether the MEO has letter of acknowledgement from DES 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We were provided with information indicating that the education department provided recommendations from the inspection reports as illustrated below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kichinjaji Primary school, the school administration was to intensify internal support supervision and embrace departmental scheming and marking. - Swaria Primary School, the school was to improve on garbage disposal.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the inspection recommendations are followed-up - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the sampled schools, determine whether the education department provided recommendations from the inspection reports and followed-up. 		

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Soroti Dem. Primary school, teachers were to improve on classroom environment/displays and ensure regular lesson planning. - Madera Girls primary school, the head teacher was to ensure timetable adherence and improve on sanitation. ▪ We were also provided evidence inform of reports indicating that the above recommendations were followed up by the education department.
	9.	The Municipal LG Education department has submitted accurate/ consistent reports/ date for school lists and enrolment as per formats provided by MOES (Maximum 10 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the Municipal LG has submitted accurate/ consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ List of schools which are consistent with both EMIS reports and Programme Budgeting System (PBS) - score 5 points • Evidence that the Municipal LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS - score 5 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From MOES obtain and review EMIS reports for the current FY (2018/2019) ▪ Obtain and review the performance contract for the current FY (2018/2019) ▪ Check whether the list of schools submitted are consistent/similar. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The team obtained and reviewed the performance contract vote 763 Soroti Municipal Council and established that there were 18 primary schools. ▪ The EMIS reports from MOES for the FY 2018/19 were not availed for review. ▪ Basing on that we could not validate whether the lists of schools submitted were consistent/similar.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that the Municipal LG has submitted accurate/consistent data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Enrolment data for all schools which is consistent with EMIS report and PBS - score 5 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From MOES obtain and review EMIS reports for the current FY (2018/2019) ▪ Obtain and review the performance contract for the current FY ▪ Check whether the enrolment levels are consistent/similar. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We obtained and reviewed the performance contract for Soroti MLG vote 763 from MLG Senior Planner and we noted that the enrolment data was 13,932 pupils as at July 2018 at the beginning of the FY 2018/19. ▪ The EMIS reports from MOES for the FY 2018/19 were not availed for review. ▪ Basing on that we could not establish whether the enrolment levels were consistent/similar.

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
(C) Governance, oversight, transparency and accountability (Maximum 12 points)	10.	The Municipal LG committee responsible for education met, discussed service delivery issues and presented issues that require approval to Council (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the council committee responsible for education met and discussed service delivery issues including inspection, performance assessment results, LG PAC reports etc...during the previous FY (2017/18) - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review education sector standing committee meeting minutes – check if the Council has approved the sector implementation plan and discussions by the standing committee MEO's reports to the committee 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We reviewed the Education Sector Standing Committee meeting minutes and noted that the committee had met and discussed service delivery issues as evidenced below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On 17th October 2017, under Min 4/SSC/SMC/2017, the committee presented to council for approval procurement of O-desks instead of wooden ones for Majengo Primary School and promotion of teachers who have attained the necessary qualifications to fill the vacant positions of Deputy head teachers On 27th March 2018 under Min 8/SSC/SMC/03/2018; the committee presented to council for approval the construction of a fence at Pioneer P/S On 24th May 2018; under Min 20/SSC/SMC/05/2018, the committee presented to council for approval the construction of a staff house at Pioneer P/S and construction of toilets at Madera P/S However, there was no evidence provided at the time of assessment indicating that the Council met and discussed inspection, performance assessment results, and LG PAC reports.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the education sector committee has presented issues that requires approval to Council - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Clerk to Council obtain and review minutes to check if education issues have been presented to the Council. 		

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings																		
	11.	Primary schools in a Municipal LG have functional SMCs (Maximum 5 points)	Evidence that all primary schools have functional SMCs (established, meetings held, discussions of budget and resource issues and submission of reports to MEO) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% schools: score 5 80 to 99% schools: score 3 Below 80% schools: score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check files from MEO if head teachers have submitted reports to SMCs and minutes of SMCs (check the entire list and sample 5 reports) Study files from 5 randomly sampled primary schools to confirm whether they have SMCs and review whether they have held 3 mandatory meetings 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We sampled five schools to ascertain the functionality of SMCs. It was validated that only Swaria P/S held the mandatory SMC meetings as shown in the table below; <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School Name</th> <th>Meeting date</th> <th>Contents of discussions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pioneer Primary School</td> <td>15th March, 2018</td> <td>Budgets, mid-day meals, performance and discipline</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Swaria Primary School</td> <td>29th September, 2017, 20th March 2018 and 20th June 2018.</td> <td>Budgets and performance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Madera Girls Primary School</td> <td>24th October, 2017 and 6th February, 2018</td> <td>Budgets, performance and school discipline</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kichinjaji Primary School</td> <td>26th September 2017 and 10th February 2018</td> <td>Discipline, budgets and performance.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Soroti Demonstration Primary School</td> <td colspan="2">Inspection reports were not provided to us by the MLG education department and the school had closed for holidays</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School Name	Meeting date	Contents of discussions	Pioneer Primary School	15 th March, 2018	Budgets, mid-day meals, performance and discipline	Swaria Primary School	29 th September, 2017, 20 th March 2018 and 20 th June 2018.	Budgets and performance	Madera Girls Primary School	24 th October, 2017 and 6 th February, 2018	Budgets, performance and school discipline	Kichinjaji Primary School	26 th September 2017 and 10 th February 2018	Discipline, budgets and performance.	Soroti Demonstration Primary School	Inspection reports were not provided to us by the MLG education department and the school had closed for holidays	
School Name	Meeting date	Contents of discussions																						
Pioneer Primary School	15 th March, 2018	Budgets, mid-day meals, performance and discipline																						
Swaria Primary School	29 th September, 2017, 20 th March 2018 and 20 th June 2018.	Budgets and performance																						
Madera Girls Primary School	24 th October, 2017 and 6 th February, 2018	Budgets, performance and school discipline																						
Kichinjaji Primary School	26 th September 2017 and 10 th February 2018	Discipline, budgets and performance.																						
Soroti Demonstration Primary School	Inspection reports were not provided to us by the MLG education department and the school had closed for holidays																							

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	12.	The Municipal LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants (Maximum 3 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the Municipal LG has publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants e.g. through posting on public notice boards - score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Check the Municipal notice boards to establish if the Education department publicised all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants for public viewing Check a sample of schools for postings of non-wage recurrent grants 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was evidence that the MLG publicized all schools receiving non-wage recurrent grants. We noted that the MLG had posted the non-wage recurrent grants on the MLG's notice boards for public viewing. According to the displays, non-wage recurrent grants for the 5 sampled were as below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pioneer Primary School received Ushs. 1,972,965 in the 3rd term of 2017, Ushs. 1,972,962 in term I of 2018 and Ushs. 1,972,965 in term II of 2018; - Swaria Primary School received Ushs. 2,125,517 in term I and II of 2018; - Soroti Demonstration Primary School received Ushs. 2,597,443 in term I and II of 2018; - Madera Girls Primary School received Ushs. 2,291,365 in term I and II of 2018; and - Kichinjaji Primary School received Ushs. 3,712,493 in term III of 2017, Ushs. 3,712,493 and Ushs. 3,957,090 in term I and II of 2018.
(D) Procurement and contract management (Maximum 7 points)	13	The LG Education department has submitted input into the LG procurement plan, complete with all technical requirements, to Procurement Unit that cover all items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the sector has submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30, 2018 - score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Municipal Education Officer (MEO) obtain and review submission to Procurement Unit; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From DPU crosscheck submission from MEO 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We were not provided with evidence during the assessment indicating that the Education department submitted procurement input to Procurement Unit that covers all investment items in the approved Sector annual work plan and budget on time by April 30, 2018.

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
	14	The LG Education department has certified and initiated payment for supplies on time (Maximum 3 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education departments timely (as per contract) certified and recommended suppliers for payment: score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the CFO obtain a sample of contracts, review and determine whether payment requests were certified and recommended on time 	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We sampled two contracts and these included; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of a five stance drainable Pit Latrine at Akisim Primary School: Contract was signed on 6th June 2018 between Soroti Municipal Council and M/s Ominya Enterprises and the contract amount was Ushs. 17,816,400 inclusive of taxes. The contractor requested for Payment of Ushs. 17,816,400 on 18th June 2018. The senior assistant engineer prepared the payment certificate on 19th June 2018 and they were certified by the Municipal Engineer on the same date. The Principal Education officer recommended for payment and forwarded the request for payment to Head of Finance on 19th June 2018. Payment was effected on 25th June 2018 vide payment voucher PV\WK0402. Re-construction of four class room block with office at Hilders Primary school; Contract was signed on 21st June 2018 between Soroti Municipal Council and M/s Sharona Uganda Limited and the contract amount was Ushs. 49,548,104 inclusive of taxes. The contractor requested for Payment on 21st June 2018. The senior assistant engineer prepared the payment certificate on 25th June 2018 and they were certified by the Municipal Engineer on the same date. The Principal Education officer recommended for payment and forwarded the request for payment to Head of Finance on 21st June 2018. Payment was effected on 25th June 2018 vide payment voucher PV\WK0403.

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings								
(E) Financial management and Reporting <i>(Maximum 8 points)</i>	15	The LG Education department has submitted annual reports (including all quarterly reports) in time to the Planning Unit <i>(Maximum 4 points)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the department submitted the annual performance report for the previous FY - 2017/18 (with availability of all four quarterly reports) to the Planner by 15th July for consolidation: score 4 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Planning Unit, obtain and review performance report files From the MEO check annual and quarterly reports for the previous FY (2017/18) 	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Education Sector prepared and submitted the 2018/19 quarterly reports and annual performance report that included progress in the execution of the planned activities to the Planning Unit for consolidation. Discussion with the Municipal Economic Planner indicated that the performance reports were prepared using the PBS system where each Sector populated its section in the system and the planning unit made the consolidation. Online submission of the consolidated quarterly reports were then done by the Municipal Economic Planner. Our review of the submitted reports indicated that the performance reports contained sections on the education sector. However the Economic Planner did not keep record of the date on which the education sector completed populating its section in the system. Nevertheless we confirmed that the online submission of the quarter1, quarter2 and quarter 4 reports were done on the dates indicated in the table below. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Online Submission date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>23/02/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>06/04/2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.go.ug/budget/individual-lg-budgets-and-performance-reports)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Quarter	Online Submission date	1	23/02/2018	2	06/04/2018	3	No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.go.ug/budget/individual-lg-budgets-and-performance-reports)
Quarter	Online Submission date													
1	23/02/2018													
2	06/04/2018													
3	No proof of submission per PBS (http://budget.go.ug/budget/individual-lg-budgets-and-performance-reports)													

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings												
	16	LG Education has acted on Internal Audit recommendations (if any) (Maximum 4 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evidence that the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year (2017/18) ✓ If sector has no audit query - score 4 points ✓ If the sector has provided information to the internal audit on the status of implementation of all audit findings for the previous financial year (2017/18) - score 2 points ✓ If all queries are not responded to - score 0 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From the Internal Auditor obtain copies of sector audit reports from the internal audit and Management responses for the previous FY (2017/18) 	2	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>03/09/2018</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our review of the quarterly internal audit reports revealed that the Internal Auditor raised the queries in the table below on the MLG education department: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Quarter</th> <th>Audit Query</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Delayed accountabilities amounting to Ushs. 10,139,300 by the Ag. Principal Education Officer.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>Absence of payment acknowledgement receipt from New Chapter Investment for the construction of 2 teacher houses at Soroti Islamic P/S</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>Delayed accountabilities amounting to Ushs. 2,806,000 by the Ag. Principal Education Officer and delayed confirmation of primary school teachers.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Delayed accountabilities amounting to Ushs. 5,351,596 by the Ag. Principal Education Officer</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> ▪ Our review of the subsequent internal audit reports and discussions with the internal auditor indicated that the education department later provided information to the internal auditor. 	4	03/09/2018	Quarter	Audit Query	1	Delayed accountabilities amounting to Ushs. 10,139,300 by the Ag. Principal Education Officer.	2	Absence of payment acknowledgement receipt from New Chapter Investment for the construction of 2 teacher houses at Soroti Islamic P/S	3	Delayed accountabilities amounting to Ushs. 2,806,000 by the Ag. Principal Education Officer and delayed confirmation of primary school teachers.	4	Delayed accountabilities amounting to Ushs. 5,351,596 by the Ag. Principal Education Officer
4	03/09/2018																	
Quarter	Audit Query																	
1	Delayed accountabilities amounting to Ushs. 10,139,300 by the Ag. Principal Education Officer.																	
2	Absence of payment acknowledgement receipt from New Chapter Investment for the construction of 2 teacher houses at Soroti Islamic P/S																	
3	Delayed accountabilities amounting to Ushs. 2,806,000 by the Ag. Principal Education Officer and delayed confirmation of primary school teachers.																	
4	Delayed accountabilities amounting to Ushs. 5,351,596 by the Ag. Principal Education Officer																	

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings						
(F) Social and environment safeguards (Maximum 8 points)	17	LG Education Department has disseminated and promoted adherence to gender guidelines (Maximum 5 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in consultation with the gender focal person has disseminated guidelines on how senior women/ men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc.... score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Municipal Education Officer (MEO) obtain evidence on dissemination of gender guidelines on how senior women/ men teachers should provide guidance to girls and boys to handle hygiene, reproductive health, life skills etc. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no documented evidence provided by the MEO, at the time of the assessment of dissemination of sanitation guidelines and awareness raising on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools. 						
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that LG Education department in collaboration with gender department have issued and explained guidelines on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools - score 2 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the MEO obtain evidence on dissemination of sanitation guidelines and awareness raising on how to manage sanitation for girls and PWDs in primary schools 	0							
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the School Management Committee meet the guideline on gender composition - score 1 point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the sampled schools, check whether the SMC meets the guideline on gender composition 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We sampled five primary schools and established that the compositions for the SMCs for the schools were as follows; <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>School</th> <th>Females</th> <th>Males</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Pioneer Primary School</td> <td>6</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	School	Females	Males	Pioneer Primary School	6	6
School	Females	Males										
Pioneer Primary School	6	6										

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings												
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the details in the above table, it is evident that all the sampled schools had at least 2 females on their School Management Committees which conforms to the guidelines in the Education (pre-primary, primary and Post Primary)/ Act, 2008 <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Swaria Primary School</td> <td>6</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Madera girls Primary School</td> <td>4</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Soroti Demonstration Primary School</td> <td>3</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kichinjaji Primary School</td> <td>6</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </table>	Swaria Primary School	6	7	Madera girls Primary School	4	8	Soroti Demonstration Primary School	3	9	Kichinjaji Primary School	6	6
Swaria Primary School	6	7																
Madera girls Primary School	4	8																
Soroti Demonstration Primary School	3	9																
Kichinjaji Primary School	6	6																
	18	LG Education department has ensured that guidelines on environmental management are disseminated and complied with (Maximum 3 points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that the LG Education department in collaboration with Environment department has issued guidelines on environmental management (tree planting, waste management, formation of environmental clubs and environmental education etc.): score 3 points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From MEO obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Circulars to schools ✓ Minutes of meetings with teachers ✓ Sample of schools ✓ Inspection reports to schools From the Environmental officer obtain and review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Filled screening forms to ascertain whether screening was done and whether risks mitigation plans were developed. 	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was no evidence that the Municipal Education Officer in collaboration with the Environment officer had issued guidelines on environmental management to the schools. However, there were 'environmentally friendly school compound' charts and NEMA brochures found at the sampled schools. 												

Performance Area	No	Performance Measures	Scoring guide	Assessment Procedure	Score	Detailed assessment findings
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> From the Environmental officer and CDO obtain and review: Site visit reports to establish whether they checked compliance to the risk mitigation plans 	45	
Total						