

Natural Disasters Affected School  
Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Programme

*Report of An In-Depth Study Of DANIDA  
Direct Funding for Rehabilitation of Disaster-  
Affected Schools*

***Submitted to***

BPEPII/DANIDA Office  
Keshar Mahal, Kathmandu

***Submitted by***

Badri Dev Pande, Ph.D., Team Leader  
Govinda Raj Devkota, Researcher  
Biswambhar Shrestha, Researcher  
Rom Prasad Bhattarai, Researcher

April 2003

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
	1.1 Background	2
	1.2 Objectives	2
	1.3 Methodology	
	1.4 Organization of the Report	4
<b>Chapter II</b>	<b>FIELD EXPERIENCE AND STAKEHOLDER RESPONSE</b>	<b>5</b>
	2.1 Response from CDOs	6
	2.2 Response from LDOs	7
	2.3 Response from DEOs and Section Officers (Primary)	8
	2.4 Response from District Level Engineers/Overseers	10
	2.5 Response from District Education Office Accountants	14
	2.6 Response from RPs/SSs	15
	2.7 Response from SMCs/SCCs	16
	2.8 Response from Head Masters/teachers	20
	2.9 Data from School Evaluation Form	22
<b>Chapter III</b>	<b>MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>26</b>
	3.1 Major Findings	26
	3.2 Conclusions	29
	3.3 Recommendations	30
<b>Appendices</b>	i. Terms of Reference	
	ii. Survey Instruments	
	iii. Summary from School Evaluation Format	
	iv. List of Persons Contacted	
	v. List of Sample Schools not Yet Receiving Last Installment	
	vi. List of Sample Schools	

## Chapter I

# INTRODUCTION

### **1.1 Background**

Schools in Nepal's hills are often constructed on hilltops or by the side of a cliff reserving better plots of land for agricultural purposes. In the terai also schools are not located in the best plots of land. Moreover, most school 'buildings', are poorly constructed making them unable to withstand pressure of student population and classroom furniture. There is hardly any landscape planning and school ground is usually devoid of greeneries as a result of which school premises are directly hit by rain and wind. In short, school buildings are most vulnerable to natural disasters. Every year many school roofs are blown by gusty wind, tornadoes and storm. Incessant rains and floods also damage school premises partially. At times they make the whole school building collapse. Occasionally, earthquakes result in extensive damage to school buildings in some districts.

In response to request made by the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) to support rehabilitation and reconstruction of schools damaged by various natural disasters during 2001, Programme Advisory Team (PAT) Danida provided direct funding support. This amount was used for rehabilitation and reconstruction of 297 schools from 38 districts. The Physical Services Section (PSS) of the Department of Education (DOE) was primarily responsible for management of the rehabilitation/reconstruction (RR) activities at the center, while District Education Office (DEO) and School Management Committee (SMC) were responsible at the district and school level respectively.

Following the visits of PAT staff to some schools and a survey of RR activities in Gorkha, Nawalparasi and Morang districts, Pat commissioned a team of four researchers to conduct an in-depth study of the process and impact of Danida support to the three districts where a survey was already conducted (Please refer to Annex 1 for Terms of Reference for the researchers).

## **1.2 Objectives**

The overall objective for the study was to evaluate decision making process and implementation at school level of Danida direct funding to MOES in rehabilitation of schools damaged by natural disasters during 2001. Specific objectives included were to:

- Assess and evaluate arrangements between DoE and DEO with regard to implementation, monitoring and evaluation,
- Assess local stakeholder involvement, community contributions and quality of work completed,
- Assess deviations in the work agreed and reasons for those deviations, and
- Assess flow of fund and procedures followed in their disbursement.

## **1.3 Methodology**

### *a. Pre-field Visit Activities*

After a preliminary briefing at the PAT office the researchers had an interview with the staff of Physical Services Section (PSS) of the DoE at Sano Thimi, Bhaktapur. The researchers collected relevant documents including the followings from that office:

- PSS directives to DEOs with classroom RR survey forms
- RR work procedures and agreement
- Summary of Cost Estimates and Progress
- Monitoring report prepared by Dipak Babu Aryal

Before departing for field study the following set of interview schedules and survey form were prepared:

- School Survey Form
- Interview Schedule for Headmasters
- Interview Schedule for School Management Committee members

- Interview Schedule for Resource Persons (RPs)
- Interview Schedule for District Education Officer/DEO Section Officer
- Interview Schedule for DEO Engineer/Overseers
- Interview Schedule for Local Development Officer
- Interview Schedule for Local Development Officer
- Interview Schedule for Chief District Officer

These research instruments were revised after a discussion with BPEPII/DANIDA School Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Physical Planning Adviser.

*b. Field Visit*

The four-member research team divided itself into two groups. One group headed towards Gorkha while the other group visited both Nawalparasi and Morang. In each of the district visited the researchers first approached DEO to explain the purpose of the study and to solicit necessary assistance. After a review of documents including measurement books and extensive discussions with the DEO engineers and overseers, the researchers identified schools for in-depth study. The criteria followed in selecting these schools were to ensure that a good number of schools where deviations were believed to have occurred are included. Other criteria were to visit both urban and rural area schools ranging from lowest amount of Danida support recipients to those receiving higher amount. Attention was paid also to ensure that primary schools, lower secondary schools with primary level classes and secondary schools with primary classes are included. The table below gives an overview of the number of schools visited in three districts.

**Table 1.1: Schools Visited for In-depth Study**

<i>District</i>	<i>No. of Schools Visited*</i>
Gorkha	15
Nawalparasi	6

Morang	6
Total	27

- In Gorkha in-depth study was conducted in 11 schools. Simple physical observation was made of the remaining 4 schools.

Since each of the study team included an experienced engineer, keen observation of the qualitative aspects of the RR work completed was possible. In each school headmasters extended their full cooperation in providing relevant documents such as survey form procedural and agreement form, and work completion certifications, if available. The School Management Committee and Construction Committee members also were found willing to share their experiences with regard to RR activities.

As the Chief District Officer is the Chairman of District Natural Disaster Relief Committee, he was interviewed in all the districts and were the Local Development Officers.

*c. Post-field Activities*

Upon return from the field the researchers discussed with PAT office and Physical Services Section staff to get clarifications on some issues arising from field experience.

## **1.4 Organization of the Report**

This report is organized into three chapters. The first chapter provides background of the study, objectives as stated in the TOR and methodology followed. The second chapter analyses data and information collected. The final chapter highlights major findings and recommends measures for improvement in possible future support to schools affected by natural disasters.

## Chapter II

### FIELD EXPERIENCE AND STAKEHOLDER RESPONSE

Although a total of 297 schools from 38 districts received Danida direct funding for rehabilitation and reconstruction work, this study could cover only three of the most affected districts. There too the team could undertake in-depth study of only 23 schools. A brief description of these schools with student's enrollment and teachers is given in Table 2.1

Table 2.1: Number of Students and Teachers in Sampled School

Name of School/Address	Number of Students			Number of Teacher		
	Boys	Girl	Total	Male	Female	Total
Gorkha						
Gorakhkali PS, Thingureswara			215	6	2	8
Shiva Shakti PS, Amarang	65	55	120	3	1	4
Chandika LSS, Bunkot	240	240	480	6	3	9
Shahid Smriti SS, Bunkot	596	284	880			
Jana Kalyan PS, Paslang	31	21	52		1	1
Bhagabati Himalaya SS, Batase			645			
Jana Jagriti PS, Makai singh	34	24	58	2		2
Rainas PS, Taklung	73	71	144			4
Jana Jagriti PS, Tangli Chowk	40	42	82	1	1	2
Ratna Laxmi LSS, PN Mun.			337	6	3	9
Gorkha Campus, PN Mun.						

Nawalparasi						
Nepal Ra. Sa. A. SS, Jajuwa, Gaidakot	404	433	837	10	8	18
Nepal SS, Dibyapuri, Kaureni	59	59	118	4		4
Pancha Jyoti LSS	224	246	470	9	2	11
Jana Jyoti HSS, Pragatinagar	584	427	1011	26	3	29
Gyanodaya SS, Kawasoti	349	331	680	16	3	19
Sidha Jyoti PS, Sidhanagar, Daunnedevi	118	136	254	2	3	5
Morang						
Bal Lower Secondary School, Jatuwa, Biratnagar	213	206	419	11	2	13
Gurukul Secondary School, Aryanagar, Biratnagar	269	33	302	12	1	13
Janata Higher Secondary School, Rangeli	16	12	28	19	19	38
Ganesh Lower Secondary School, Chopraha, Rangeli	374	247	621	9	0	9
Janata Secondary School, Gandiashram, Amardaha	NA	NA	NA	7	7	14
Panchayat Secondary School	398	415	813	17	3	20

In addition to study of documents available at the Physical Services Section of the Department of Education, documents available at the District Education Office were examined rather thoroughly. Many of the schools also had relevant documents, mainly the agreement form, for the study team to look at. Most of the week-long stay in Morang, Nawalparasi and Gorkha was spent in interviewing stakeholders and observation of school construction and rehabilitation work. In the following sections of this chapter analyses of the response received and findings from the observations of the researchers themselves are presented.

## 2.1 Response from Chief District Officers

The Chief District Officers (CDO) were asked to state their experience about the nature of natural disasters in their respective districts. Floods, land slides, soil erosion, submersion of land due to excessive rain and accumulation of water, river cutting, storm, tornadoes and fire were mentioned as significant natural disasters which would damage school premises. As the Chairmen of District Disaster Relief Committees the CDOs had to take care of many people in their districts affected by various calamities.

The CDOs were aware of the Danida direct support to schools affected by natural disasters in their districts. However, the District Disaster Relief Committee was not involved in selection of schools. The CDOs were very appreciative of the direct funding for school rehabilitation. They felt that the schools in much need have received financial support. One CDO pointed out that one of the strengths of the Basic and Primary Education Project is the presence of the resource person to supervise educational activities including construction work within the area covered by a resource centre.

Asked if they thought there were any weaknesses of the BPEPII/Danida direct funding, one CDO expressed the opinion that the disbursement of financial support was not in tune with the decentralization principles. Another CDO commented that local participation is limited to contribution of labour only. Local people should not be expected to provide cash for school rehabilitation or reconstruction.

The CDOs provided a number of suggestions towards improvement of school construction in future. One CDO advised that estimates for rehabilitation or reconstruction should not be based on the amount of budget available. It should rather be guided by actual needs of a school. One CDO was emphatic in the need for using local materials for construction work. He said use of cement and iron rods should be avoided as far as possible. He was particularly against furniture made of steel. Provisions for ventilation and ample light in classrooms were also emphasized. Two of the three CDOs stated that the task of setting priorities should be left to the local people themselves. Local government should monitor construction. Each DEO should have a technician.

CDOs also suggested for dissemination of research findings and their implementation. The CDO from Morang emphasized on quality construction work. He said schools that do not carryout construction work as agreed should not be released the remaining

amount. He said the amount of grant should be based on whether a school has other sources of income.

## **2.2 Response from Local Development Officers**

The Local Development Officer (LDO) plays a very important role as a key staff of the District Development Committee (DDC) and also as a member of the District Natural Disaster Relief Committee in matters relating to rehabilitation and reconstruction activities in a district. In a brief interview with them the LDOs gave much insight about the state of natural disasters and rehabilitation work in their districts.

In the experience of the LDOs floods seemed to be the most common natural disaster in all three districts. In the Tarai districts submersion of land, river cutting, fire and gusty winds and storm were reported as the principal form of natural calamities. The DDCs have their own limited fund to help schools in rehabilitation work when they are badly damaged by natural calamities.

The LDOs informed that they were aware of DANIDA direct funding support to schools affected but had no detail knowledge of it as the District Education Office handled the fund. They were much appreciative of this fund as they themselves were not in a position to provide substantial support to schools in need.

While they were appreciative of support from external sources, some of the LDOs raised sustainability issue. All of them emphasized the need for involvement of DDCs and VDCs in the allocation of relief fund. They also emphasized regular monitoring of work in progress and coordination among all concerned agencies.

## **2.3 Response from District Education Officers and Section Officers (Primary)**

The District Education Office has been responsible for management of Danida direct funding support to schools affected by natural disasters. Both District Education Officers (DEO) and supervisors responsible for primary schools were interviewed for assessment

of their opinions with regard to process and impact of BPEPII/Danida support. In all, three DEOs and three supervisors were interviewed.

Both the DEOs and the supervisors held similar opinions about the nature of natural disasters affecting their districts. Floods, fire, soil erosion and storm were mentioned as common disasters. Asked as to who initiated the process for securing fund for disaster affected schools, the respondents mentioned a number of agencies involved including the schools affected, DDCs and VDCs. In one instance the then government minister was reported to have initiated the process.

About the nature and extent of relief for schools as a result of BPEPII/Danida support, the DEOs and Supervisors expressed the opinion that at a time when the schools were desperate for financial assistance, the fund provided great support. They said the money worked as seed money for it because leverage for many schools to secure additional fund. It was Danida fund which made it possible to construct new classrooms. This fund provided impetus to contribute themselves towards reconstruction and rehabilitation of schools in their communities.

There were some weak points also of Danida support in the opinion of DEOs and supervisors. First, the amount of support to a school was too small. Second, in a number of instances fund was allocated prior to actual survey of the damage by natural disaster. Third, money allocated to some schools was too inadequate given the magnitude of the damage incurred. Fourth, many schools in need of support were not covered by Danida direct funding. Because money was not released on time from the centre, sincerity of the donor was in question. This was the opinion expressed by a school supervisor.

Asked what were the bases for selection of schools for funding support, the respondents expressed the opinion that they included approach by the schools themselves and survey of those schools thereafter. Efforts were made to select schools on a need basis but in some cases names of schools recommended from the 'centre'.

There were no substantial comments on the agreement form by the DEO or supervisor. Two of the supervisors thought that the form made communities conscious of their obligations to achieve quality work on time.

Asked about the role played by the DEOs in rehabilitation and reconstruction of damaged schools, the District Education Officers and Supervisors maintained that their role in survey of the damage, technical advice for RR activities and regular monitoring and supervision of the work in progress was significant. They were also responsible for channeling of fund.

The supervisors maintained that there were no deviations in the work completed. However, some of the DEOs acknowledged that there were some deviations in some schools but for good reasons. They were emphatic in making their point for the amount of support made available, achievements made were significant. The reasons for deviation of work, according to DEOs, included decisions by SMCs and headmasters for a change in original plans, lack of regular monitoring of work in progress and inability to arrange for community contributions as originally envisaged.

Asked about other sources of funding made available for RR activities the DEOs explained that labour contributions by the community members were the main source of additional funding. The supervisors, however, mentioned a number of agencies which contributed financial assistance to schools. They included Plan Nepal, Luthern World, school's own fund, VDCs, DDCs, District Education Fund and parliamentarians' fund.

As for community participation in RR activities, the response was mixed. DEOs felt that the contributions mainly consisted of labour and some contributions in kind.

Finally, The DEOs and supervisors were asked to give their suggestions towards improvements in rehabilitation and reconstruction work. The DEOs emphasized the need for selecting natural disaster affected schools on the basis of survey, recommendations and cost estimates. The supervisors made the point that the amount of relief assistance should be based on the needs of a district and a particular school in that district. The final installment should be released on the basis of site inspection and proof of work completion.

## **2.4 Response from District Level Engineers/Overseers**

There were no engineer or overseer in the District Education Office in Nawalparasi as no replacement of the newly transferred engineers/overseer was made yet. Since there were seven overseers and one engineer at the DEO in Gorkha, focused group discussion was made with these technicians in that district. One engineer and one overseer were interviewed in Morang using the interview schedule.

### **Process of Rehabilitation/Reconstruction Activities**

All of the technicians contacted were aware of the natural disasters in their districts. The technicians in Gorkha received the list of schools damaged by earthquake in 2001 from CDO and headmasters as well while in Morang DEO itself compiled the list of schools damaged by natural disaster. Those lists were attached with detailed scope of work to be carried out in each school with cost estimates. In all schools affected by natural disasters physical survey was conducted following the instruction given by the District Education Officers.

The technicians received necessary documents and instruction materials from the Physical Services Section of the Department of Education but they received no orientation from that office with regard to effective implementation of the rehabilitation activities.

The technicians followed the implementation schedule of RR activities as specified in the agreement form. For the purpose of physical survey Rs. 500 was provided to the technicians. For supervision of the work in progress they received DSA of Rs 1,500 per school. The amount given for survey and supervision was to cover extra traveling cost and daily allowances. Asked whether they took photographs of damages to school building from natural disasters, the technicians said “no” as the DEO possessed no cameras.

The design of the rehabilitation and reconstruction work was prepared by the technicians from DEO (one school), Prithivi Narayan Municipality (two schools) and British Gorkha Welfare Society (one school) in Gorkha and by District Development Committee overseer in Morang. The technicians in Gorkha confirmed that communities made labour

contributions towards RR activities but such contributions were not made in Nawalparasi and Morang. In both districts community contributions were less than what was anticipated by the technicians.

Apparently, district education engineer and overseer verified and recommended approval of RR cost estimates of schools to the District Education Officer. The District Education Officer in turn forwarded the estimates to PSS/DOE for their approval.

Except for Morang, no orientation training was provided to SMC/SCC members with regard to RR activities. All three district RR schools did not receive scope of work. In all the districts close monitoring and supervision of maintenance and construction work were reported to have been carried out by the DEO technicians, school supervisors and resource persons. In Gorkha technical instructions were provided verbally while in Morang they were both verbal and written. The technicians maintained that there was follow-up of the instructions provided.

The technicians had instructed SMC/SCC to maintain ledger book of expenditures incurred.

### **Deviations in the Work Anticipated**

Technicians in all the districts acknowledged that there were some deviations in the work approved but for good reasons. An examination of the agreement forms signed by the District Education Officer, DEO Engineer/Overseer, SMC/SCC Chairman and school headmaster revealed that deviations were primarily from rehabilitation work (as entered into agreement) to reconstruction of a classroom or school building as a whole (actual work). In a school in Nawalparasi fund was approved for rehabilitation but used for school compound wall.

As is indicated by the table below then technicians cited several reasons for deviations. One of the reasons was that it would be costlier to undertake repair work than to create a new structure.

**Table 2.2: Reasons for Deviations as cited by the Technicians**

Reason	Gorkha	Nawalparasi	Morang
Repair costlier than reconstruction*	√		

Reconstructed building would be more durable than repair work	√		
Fund received from other sources also	√	√	

- This was more emphasized in Gorkha on the ground that during repair additional breakage would result in school buildings.

The technicians informed that in most cases in Gorkha SMC/SSC as well as community leaders would decide on the nature of final RR work to be completed. Once a decision was made they would approach DEO for reestimation and approval of the deviations. The DEO in turn would contact DOE/PSS by telephone to get approval of the request made by SMC/SCC. There seem to be no written requests made for deviations. All communications were verbal. In Nawalparasi and Morang the SMC/SCC did not approach DEO for approval of work deviated. Deviations were approved before the reconstruction work took place. The technicians visited schools before recommending for release of fund.

According to the engineer and overseer in Gorkha all construction works were completed on time. However, delays in completion of work were experienced in Morang. The main reasons for delay were late start of the work and additional work in contrast to the work originally envisaged. While there were no delays in releasing the first installment to schools, delays were experienced in releasing second and final installments. As explained by the technicians this delay was the result of money not released from the centre or work remained to be completed. Money advanced amounted to 50% - 75%, of the contributions committed. In all districts the technicians visited schools to assess quality of the work completed before releasing final installment.

The technicians themselves did not prepare running bills in Gorkha but in Morang they did. All of them prepared final bills after completion of all RR work.

The technicians reported to have faced a number of difficulties in implementing RR activities. They are summarized in the table below:

**Table 2.3: Difficulties Faced by Engineers/Overseers in Implementation of RR Activities**

Difficulties Faced	District		
	Gorkha	Nawalparasi	Morang
Curfews due to Maoist insurgencies	√		
Lodging problem in school communities	√		
Lack of field appliances	√	√	√
Deviations in work agreed	√	√	√
Pressure from SMC/SCC to evaluate work	√		
Inability on the part of SMC/SCC to manage construction materials and labour	√		
Delay in construction work	√		√
Lack of transportation facilities for supervision	√		
Delay in fund release from the centre	√	√	√

In spite of the difficulties encountered the technicians were unanimous in stating that BPEPII/Danida fund was very helpful in improving teaching learning situation of schools assisted.

## 2.5 Response from District Education Office Accountants

The accountants from Gorkha, Nawalparasi and Morang were interviewed by using the pre-prepared interview schedule. All of the accountants interviewed had the experience of managing fund received for disaster-affected schools. However, none of them received any specific instructions or orientation with regard to management of BPEPII/Danida fund.

The DEO accountants informed that Danida direct fund was channeled from the Department of Education. Cheques were issued in the name of recipient schools which were collected by concerned school headmasters.

The accountants had necessary documents at their disposal. The basis for release of fund was engineers'/Overseers' evaluation of the work completed. Although the accountants

were aware of the deviations they were not informed of such deviations by the technicians.

The accountants confirmed that there were delays in release of funds to some schools. In most cases the delay was due to fund not being received from DoE. In some cases (e.g. in Morang) the delay was due to school's failure to complete work on time.

It was found that all accountants kept up to date record of BPEPII/Danida fund disbursement. No time was taken in disbursing fund to schools once the papers were in order. Four schools in Morang, two in Gorkha and one school in Nawalparasi were not released fund for not completing of work on time.

The accountants suggested orientation for themselves in future about any specific requirements or procedures of PBEPII/Danida when similar direct funding is made available. They suggested also for costing of local contributions for any RR activities.

## **2.6 Response from District Resource Persons**

A total of five Resource persons (RP), two each from Nawalparasi and Morang and one from Gorkha were interviewed. The RPs from all three districts confessed that school buildings in their clusters were damaged by natural disasters although the nature and degree of damage differed from district to district. The damage was reported to have been extensive in Nawalparasi whereas in Morang the damage was not so extensive. The nature of damage included cracks in school building walls, blown roofs and building totally collapsed.

Asked about the role they played in survey estimates, supervisions and evaluation of the work completed, they said since they were the nearest authorities of the education sector, they were first in turn informed DEOs of the damage through their monthly reports. They also accomplished DEO technicians during the survey.

Asked about the base for the selection of their schools for Danida direct funding, most of the respondents replied that it was in response to their recommendation for support. Others said that DEO technicians decided to support a particular school when they

assessed the extent of damage to the schools surveyed. Two RPs replied that the schools were recommended for support from the center.

Two of the Five RPs interviewed confessed that the Reconstruction/Rehabilitation work in their schools was different from what was stated in the agreement document. At the same time they were quick to add that a substantial amount of work was accomplished through there were deviations in the strict sense. Since SMCs were allowed to make decisions with regard RR activities, there was a sense of ownership on the part of these committees.

All of the RPs informed that they had the opportunity to observe and supervise construction and rehabilitation work during routine supervision of schools within their jurisdiction. As many as four RPs informed that the schools affected by natural disasters in their areas had received fund for maintenance and reconstruction work from various sources. These sources included British Gorkha Welfare Society, NGOs, INGOs, Parliament's fund, VDC and community contributions.

All of the technicians informed they suggested that the RR activities had received input from technicians. Several of them stated that some schools had difficulties in getting fund released from DEO for lack of required documents in order. They said the schools managed to continue RR activities by borrowing construction materials and even cash in some cases. Community contribution in the form of labors was also an important source in meeting some expenses.

With regard to the quality of the work accomplished, the RPs were generally satisfied. In their opinion replacement of mud plaster by cement plaster had positive impact on making school premises stronger.

On the whole the RPs felt that Danida direct funding had contributed towards achieving quality education. They added that classrooms that were not at all unusable have now become usable. However, they expressed the opinion that such assistance also increases dependency. Some of them resented for not being fully informed of the RR activities.

Some of the RPs suggested that in future only those schools genuinely requiring supports for RR work should be assisted. Bureaucratic procedures should be simplified for those schools requiring immediate relief.

## **2.7 Response from School Management Committee/ School Construction Committee Members**

A total of 19 schools Management Committee (SMC) and School Construction Committee (SCC) were interviewed in the three districts. It included seven from Gorkha, and six individuals from Nawalparasi and Morang. The SMC members were aware of the damage done to schools in their communities by natural disasters. Asked about the basis of Danida direct funding allocation to their schools, as many as seven individuals felt it was in response to their application for assistance to the DEO while five schools had directly approached the Ministry of Education and Sports. The other five schools applied to District Development Committee. Three of the schools, one each from a district, approached the parliamentarians from their constituencies.

In almost all schools in Gorkha the responsibility for rehabilitation and reconstruction was entrusted to the existing SMCs. In Nawalparasi and Morang SCCs were formed from among the SMC members for implementation of RR activities. In all the schools minute books of SMC meetings were maintained. Asked as to how the damage in their schools was evaluated the response was not uniform. The most frequent response was DEO technicians and DDC technicians carried out the evaluation but in a number of cases SMC\SCCs themselves carried out the evaluation work.

With regard to time lapsed between the day schools were damaged by natural disaster and survey by district level technicians, the response given by 9 of the 19 SMC\SCC members interviewed was “in about a month”. In other cases the survey was conducted in less than a month.

The SMC members had no comment on the appropriateness of the agreement document. They did not hesitate in signing the document prepared. When probed for their comments the document they would say “it is ok”. Asked as to who prepared estimates of damage to their schools the answer again was multiple with most respondents mentioning

technicians from DEO and DDC. Nearly a half of the respondents said DEO had release fund as per estimates, nearly a third said they did not know and the remaining respondents thought money was not released.

The SMC\SCC members were found to be very satisfied with the construction work completed. Nearly a half of these respondents reported that the work accomplished was more than originally agreed. When asked for the reasons for deviations in the original understanding, the respondent emphasized that the change was warranted to meet their school's needs. In most cases the decision to alter RR work from what was agreed earlier was that of SMCs\SCCs themselves.

Asked to explain about the nature of gains for their schools as a result of alternations in the originally agreed activities a large number of respondents said their schools were able to add additional classrooms. Other gains included toilet facilities, cleaner environment and rooms for library, office and nursery classes.

When asked to state whether their schools had received fund from other than BPEPII\Danida for RR work, five of the 19 respondents said "no" while the rest cited such other sources as District Education Committee, municipalities, DDC, Parliamentarian Development fund and school fund.

During the construction period technicians from DEO, DDC and municipalities visited the schools for inspection of work in progress. Additionally, cluster school resource persons also were reported to have visited their schools.

Asked about the nature of SMC of those suggestions received from those inspecting the schools, the respondents replied that a number of technicians advised for completion of work on time. Other suggestions related to use of quality construction materials, technical advice for construction and not to be too ambitious.

Majority of the SMC\SSC members were not sure as to whether their schools received Danida direct fund as agreed. Only about a third replied that they had received the money. Asked how they managed in the event of fund not being released from the DEOs, the most frequent response was that materials were acquired on loan and payment of wages to construction workers was deferred (refer to the table below:

**Table 2.4: Management of RR Activities in Absence of Money Released from DEOs**

Description	Districts		
	Gorkha	Nawalparasi	Morang
Acquired construction materials on loan	2	1	3
School fund	-	3	1
Provident fund and salary of teachers	1	-	1
Work yet to be completed	2	-	3

Nearly a half of the respondents reported that no contributions of any kind were received from the school community members for RR work. About the same number informed that contributions in the form of labour were received. Two individuals said contributions were received in kind and one informed of receipt of cash.

Asked about the nature of difficulties encountered during RR work, lack of fund on hand was the most frequent problem cited. Four of them replied that they are having difficulties in getting fund released from DEOs. For some respondents getting the required construction materials transported to construction sites had been a problem.

As for the completion of work on time, over two third of the respondents said "yes". Four of the interviewees confessed that the work was not completed on time. Two did not about timely completion of the work stipulated. The reasons cited for the delay were shortage of fund on hand and money not being released from DEO.

Asked as to who evaluated the completion of work about a half of the respondents replied that it was the technicians from DEO, DDC and municipalities. As many as five SMC\SCC members confessed about their ignorance about who evaluated the work completion. Nearly a half of the respondents said they did not know when such evaluations were conducted.

The respondents were asked to express their opinion about the strengths of Danida direct funding. A third of them replied that quality work was completed for a limited amount of

money. The other third expressed the opinion that direct funding made it possible to complete the work very satisfactorily. Several of the respondents replied that construction of new building was possible because of Danida funding. Others maintained that the fund had helped to improve learning in their schools in many ways.

**Table 2.5: Strengthens and weakness of BPEP II/Danida Direct Funding**

SN	Description	Gorkha	Nawalparasi	Morang	Total
	<b><u>Strengthens</u></b>				
1	Hard cash contribution	5	2	3	<b>10</b>
2	Encouraged to construct new class room	3	1	2	<b>6</b>
3	Generated community participation	5	1	1	<b>7</b>
4	More congenial physical facilities for students	3	2	2	<b>7</b>
	<b><u>Weakness</u></b>				
1	Delay in release in installment	7	-	4	<b>11</b>
2	Insignificant amount of financial contribution	3	3	-	<b>6</b>

Asked about the weaknesses relating to Danida funding the largest number of respondents mentioned delay in release of installments from DEO. Among the three districts, Morang seems to have faced this difficulty most acutely. Three of the respondents said the grant amount was too small. Others mentioned inadequate monitoring and delay in release of fund.

In response to request made for additional comments and suggestions the SMC\SCC members emphasized the need for continuity of such assistance and regular monitoring and follow up (see table below).

**Table 2.6: Suggestions for Similar Support in Future**

	Districts
--	-----------

Suggestions	Gorkha	Nawalparasi	Morang
Amount of direct grant should be increased	2	2	3
Continue funding support	-	2	2
Regular monitoring and followu-up	-	1	3
Release of installment should not be stopped	-	-	2

## 2.8 Response from Headmasters/Teachers

The Headmasters/Teachers were asked about the damages occurred due to the various types of disasters in their schools. Twenty seven percent of schools in Gorkha explained the extent of damages showing photographs while seventy three percent gave oral explanation about the nature of damages. Among them eighteen percent of school buildings were totally collapse, nine percent of school's longitudinal walls were collapse and eighteen percent of school's gable walls were collapsed whereas fifty five percent of school's walls were cracked vertically and diagonally. In Nawalparasi one out of six schools roof was blown away by the wind. While in Morang one out of six schools was damaged by the earthquake of BS 2045.

The headmaster informed in written to the DEO about the damages, while some headmasters through VDC, RP communicated to DEO about the damages. Personnel relation of the headmaster benefited for the selection. In Gorkha district schools were selected on the basis of survey evaluation report of DEO Engineer/Overseer while in Nawalparasi and Morang most of the schools were selected through the direct approach of Headmasters with high officials MOES.

Physical survey of the affected schools were conducted within a month time by the technicians of DEO, DDC, the damaged components of the building were evaluated and detail cost estimate of each school was prepared

The headmasters of the Schools were responsible for the overall management of the rehabilitation work however in few schools School Construction Committee was formulated under the chairperson of SMC for the special purpose of this program.. On behalf of the schools and agreement paper was signed to receive the grant fund and to execute rehabilitation work as the terms and condition mentioned in the agreement.

All damaged schools received fund from PAT/DANIDA however in Gorkha 82 % of damaged schools received additional fund from DEC and 9 % of schools from municipality for the same purpose. There was separate contract agreement signed to receive the fund. In Nawalparasi and Morang schools also collected fund from others sources. The Headmasters organized meetings among the members of SMC, teachers and social leaders, shared their opinion about proper utilization of fund received from various sources and finality decided to construct a new building. The fund generated from various sources encouraged them to deviate the work;(especially new construction from rehabilitation).. They minute the decisions in the minute book. The HM informed orally to DEO and DEO technicians about the deviation and oral approval received to proceed further. These deviated work benefited the schools with new standard classrooms, compound wall etc.

The Technicians of DEO, DDC monitored the rehabilitation work two to there time providing oral instruction about quality and quantity of work. They evaluated the work accomplished and forwarded to DEO for the release of grant fund. All the schools received the first installment as agreed time however many of them not able to receive the II and III installment as the progress of work they made.

Lack of fund for management of construction materials and daily payment of the labors were the problem faced by the headmasters; however their personal relations with local marketers assist them to get materials in credit. The Headmaster of some schools drew their dividend fund and used for the school construction. Most of the schools mobilized community for the transportation of construction materials.

**Table 2.7: Nature of Problems Faced By HM (in %)**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Gorkha</b>	<b>Nawalparasi</b>	<b>Morang</b>
No Design Drawings	78	-	-
No Detail Scope of Work With Cost Estimate	78	67	50
Transportation of Construction Materials	36	-	17
Low fund allocation	36	67	17
Communication With Technicians	64	17	-
Delay In Evaluation of Completed Work	18	17	33
Fund Not Released As The Progress of The Work From DEO	18	17	33

Most of the schools completed the "rehabilitation" work in stipulated time, but two of the eleven schools in Gorkha did not complete the work within the agreed period. In Nawalparasi one out of the six schools did not receive the grant fund even after the completion of work. In Morang two of the six schools did not receive the last installment even after the completion of work and the other two schools in Morang and one in Gorkha have not completed the construction work yet for the lack of fund. Lack of frequent supervision, low fund allocation, delay in fund release, and detail scope of work not attached with the contract agreement were the negative factors of the program. However grant fund contributed to improve the teaching/learning environment of the schools. The continuation of grant fund would be better if need of the schools identified, criteria for the selection of schools, detail work plan, fund allocation as the need of the school, effective supervision and monitoring from center as well as from the district would be effective suggestions for the future planning and implementation.

## **2.9 Data from School Evaluation Form**

### *Summary of Evaluation*

The research team contacted District Education Offices and visited the location sites of the disaster affected sample schools and noted down the detail information by interviewing the individuals and taking down the photographs of the progress achieved by communities. The District Education Offices had maintained the records of physical survey and the contract agreement signed by DEO and SMC representatives. The date of agreement signed, completion date, fund allocations were clearly mentioned in the contract document and one copy each was found in each school. While visiting location sites 60 percent of the sample schools had accomplished the deviated work from the agreed and the quality of work in an average was satisfactory. The evaluation report of each school (measurement book and work completion report) was well maintained by the accountants. During the field visit it was observed that three schools had completed the work but the fund was not released from the DEO.

The research team noted that in few schools the reconstruction rehabilitation work accomplished by the school were not needed by the school. The technicians did not properly identify and prioritized the repaired work to be executed in the schools. Standard educational norms were not followed while constructing the new classrooms.

The Danida grant fund distributed to the schools has substantially improved the learning environment in the schools. The SMC/SCC have requested additional fund to complete the remaining works of the schools see appendix III.

One of the objectives of the study was to evaluate the RR activities and to assess the quality of RR under the Danida direct support programme. Information relating to the quality of RR were collected visiting each of the sample schools. There were 23 sample schools in three districts, which were supported for reconstruction/rehabilitation under the BPEPII direct funding. In Gorkha 100 percent of the schools (11 schools) agreed to rehabilitate the schools but only 27.3 percent of the schools (3 schools) have been rehabilitated and 72.7 percent of the schools (8 schools) were newly constructed. Similarly in Nawalparasi and Morang nearly 66 percent of the schools (4 schools) did agreement for the rehabilitation work but 1 school (17%) in each district did the rehabilitation work as agreed. Among the schools undertaking new construction in

Nawalparasi, 17 percent of the schools (1 school) constructed the office block and another one (17%) added RCC floor on existing building. 34 percent of the schools (2 schools) constructed toilets and 17 percent of the schools (1 school) constructed the compound wall in Nawalparasi.

In Morang district 66 percent of the schools (4 schools) constructed the new classrooms and 17 percent of the schools (1 school) constructed the administrative building (Refer to the tables below).

**Table 2.8: Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Work by District (in %)**

Activities	Gorkha		Nawalparasi		Morang	
	Agreed	Actual	Agreed	Actual	Agreed	Actual
New construction	0	72.7	34	83	34	83
Rehabilitation	100	27.3	66	17	66	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table 2.9: Actual Work Accomplished Against Originally Agreed (in %)**

Activities	Gorkha		Nawalparasi		Morang	
	Agreed	Actual	Agreed	Actual	Agreed	Actual
Class room construction	0.0	72.7	0.0	0.0	17.0	66.0
Office construction	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0	17.0	17.0
Toilet construction	0.0	0.0	33.0	33.0	0.0	0.0
Compound wall construction	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0
Rehabilitation	100.0	27.3	67.0	17.0	66.0	17.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

Of the 11 schools in Gorkha, 9 schools (82%) were found completed at the time of school visit. In case of one school there was shortage of fund while in case of the other school construction was delayed for a number of reasons. In Nawalparasi 6 schools (100%) completed the construction work and in Morang 2 schools (34%) completed construction of new classroom building up to lintel level. Rest of the schools have completed the construction work.

With regard to orientation and ventilation of the newly constructed classroom and office block in Gorkha, four of the eleven schools are found well orientated, but in Nawalparasi and Morang the orientation of newly constructed classrooms were found to have no problems.

### ***Quality of the Rehabilitation/Reconstruction Work***

The quality of construction work depends upon the quality of construction materials and the workmanship of skilled labors. There were hardly few designs provided for new construction and the specification of the materials were not specified and attached with the scope of the work and without this the judgment about the quality of work would not be appropriate. However, when the research team observed that the quality of brick/stone work in wall construction was found good. The reinforced cement concrete work was satisfactory. The joints of timber trusses and anchorage on wall were not done properly and the CGI sheets were just nailed on trusses. In one of the rehabilitated schools from Danida fund in Morang roof was blown away by the storm (see attached photograph). The cement plastering, pointing and flooring work were quite satisfactory. In a few schools only a few windows were fixed on the wall and there was no cross ventilation. In a few buildings there were no white washing inside the classroom. The classrooms were quite dark. The table below shows the detail information about quality performed in the sample districts.

**Table 2.10: Quality of construction work completed by component (in %)**

Description	Gorkha			Nawalparasi			Morang		
	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Good	Satisfactory	Poor
<b>New Construction:</b>									
Location	36.4	27.3	9.1		66.7		83.3		
Ventilation	36.4	9.1	27.3	33.3	33.3		83.3		
<b>Wall:</b>									
Brick Wall in cement mortar	27.3	9.1	9.1		66.7			83.3	
Stone wall in mud mortar		18.2							
Concrete block in cement mortar		9.1							
<b>Roofing structure:</b>									

Concrete flat roof					16.7		16.7		
CGI sheet roof		18.2	9.1		33.3			16.7	16.7
<b>Wall Plaster:</b>									
Internal wall cement plaster		36.4			50.0			16.7	16.7
External wall cement plaster					50.0			33.3	
External wall cement pointing		18.2							
<b>Flooring:</b>									
Concrete flooring		36.4	9.1		50.0			16.7	
Mud flooring		18.2							
<b>Painting:</b>									
White washing in wall		18.2			16.7				
<b>Rehabilitation</b>									
<b>Wall:</b>									
Gable Wall		18.2							
<b>Roofing structure:</b>									
Concrete flat roof	9.1								
CGI sheet roof	9.1				16.7				
<b>Wall Plaster:</b>									
Internal wall cement plaster									16.7
External wall cement plaster		9.1						16.7	

## Chapter III

### MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On the whole, the impact of Danida direct funding on teaching learning situation of the natural disaster affected schools was found positive. All of the respondents interviewed at the district headquarters and school communities were found enthusiastic to state some positive aspects of the funding. This chapter highlights major findings and provides recommendations for more effective utilization of possible future funding.

#### **3.1 Major Findings**

The following findings are significant in the opinion of the study team:

- The major player for management of Danida direct funding is DOE/Physical Services Section, MoE at the central level, District Education Office at the district level and School Managing Committees and School Construction Committees at the community level. District line agencies seem to be aware of the Danida funding support but had no detail knowledge of it. They were highly appreciative of this support.
- In a number of cases direct funding was made available not on technical basis or actual needs of the schools but on the basis of requests made or recommendations of influential authorities. In Nawalparasi, for example, all schools received a flat amount of Rs. 25,000.00 each. In Gorkha, some schools in dire need of support received only a small amount whereas some other schools had surplus money at their disposal, which was used for cement plastering of floors and outside walls. This surplus was the result of estimates, which did not reflect actual needs of the school.
- With a few exceptions, the nature of natural disasters in Morang and Nawalparasi were not intensive so as to require immediate relief.

- Some of the schools receiving direct funding support sustained minor damage from natural disasters or sustained no damage at all. They used the support received for addition of classrooms in the existing buildings or for construction of a new building.
- Schools were found to have paid more attention to external look of a school than for the comforts of students inside classrooms. While classroom floors had incomplete construction work and inside walls remained rough, not plastered and dark, some schools preferred to spend the assistance received in cement plastering outside walls and cementing pavements.
- Schools were rarely found to have consulted DEO technicians or technicians from other offices for advice in construction of their buildings as a result of which most newly constructed classrooms or buildings have poor ventilation, flooring, and weak roofing structure/covering. The study team was explained by Danida/PAT authorities that the grant fund was not intended for new construction work.
- New buildings and classrooms were found to have been constructed by connecting with existing buildings and without considering any standard norms, which makes them vulnerable to natural disasters
- Technicians have not made much effort to convince local communities to make use of locally available construction materials. The schools were found to have spent much money and efforts in transporting sand and cement from distant locations. Some schools in remote villages have plastered their building floors and walls, which makes it easy for political dissidents to write their slogans.
- When funding permitted, schools seemed to prefer constructing concrete structures. The notion very strongly ingrained in the minds of local communities was that use of sand and cement, however, expensive and difficult to transport

they may be, make structures strong and lasting. Use of local construction materials appeared to be least choice of the community.

- Many schools preferred to construct new classrooms or a new building rather than repairing or rehabilitating them. The opportunity provided by BPEP II/DANIDA fund and other sources of fund was strong incentive for construction of new buildings.
- Multiple sources of fund to the same school have created confusion. It is hard to separate which fund was used for what purpose. In some cases money was not used for what it was intended for. This may be due to lack of adequate coordination.
- Danida direct funding helped many schools to secure additional fund from other sources and also in getting community support in the form of labour. This encouraged schools to be ambitious at times. The result was that these schools either could not complete the construction work undertaken at all or were able to complete the work started with great difficulties.
- The survey form prioritizes rehabilitation of toilets and drinking water facilities whereas schools' preferred RR of classrooms or school buildings.
- Clause 2 of the agreement document indicates that no fund will be released if the work agreed is not initiated within 15 days after signing of the contract. However, 50 to 75 percent of the agreed amount is found to have been released within three days of signing the contract as indicated in clause 9 of the same contract document. It seems there is the controversy in between clause 2 and clause 9.
- The DEO technicians do not seem to have strictly adhered to Clause 6 of the agreement document, which warrants stoppage of relief assistance in the event of schools not following agreed conditions.

- A few inconsistencies in the agreement document provided room for deviations in the school improvement work anticipated. Moreover, there were no strict adherences to the clauses outlined in the document. Survey form is designed only for rehabilitation whereas the agreement document is designed for rehabilitation and new construction.
- The agreement document does not include detailed scope of work with required quantity of construction materials.
- Final measurement of work completed by the technicians is the same, as the amount estimated which does not reflect work actually completed.
- SMC members seemed to be unaware of details relating to rehabilitation \construction work.
- The small fund provided to DEO technicians was found effective in ensuring timely survey of schools damaged by natural disasters and frequent monitoring of rehabilitation and reconstruction work.
- Communications between schools and DEO and between DEO and PSS for approval of deviations seem to be verbal only. For lack of written communications the question as to who authorized deviations in the original agreement remains unresolved.
- Community participation in the form of cash or contributions in kind has been low. However, in many school communities labour contributions provided much relief in achieving the objectives set.
- The school rehabilitation and reconstruction work suffered as a result of a delay in the release of last installment. Schools tried to manage their work by acquiring construction materials on credit and by deferring payment of wages to construction workers.

## **3.2 Conclusions**

- In view of the fact provided by public schools, the lack of fund for rehabilitation or construction work, grant such as BPEP II/DANIDA becomes big relief to school.
- Seed money from donors provides impetus to communities to contribute their own labor, construction materials or cash for rehabilitation and construction of school buildings. Such seed money also works as leverage for securing more resources from other agencies.
- Orientation about the objectives and expected outcomes of any rehabilitation grant should be given to all concerned at the central, district and community levels.
- Specific survey and agreement forms should be developed for rehabilitation (disaster relief) work alone. If it is new construction, separate forms should be developed for that purpose.
- Grant should be based on realistic estimates, reuse of construction materials by district level technicians. Measurement of work completed should be based on actual work completed.
- In order to ensure transparency and effectiveness of grant fund, in addition to DEO, line authorities like CDO, DDC, other agencies like selected NGOs should also be involved in coordination of grant fund administration.
- Communication at all stages of grant fund should be written. No verbal communication should be the basis for any decisions, including any deviations in the work agreed.

## **3.3 Recommendations**

The study team is convinced that implementation of the following recommendations will resolve many of the problems and issues associated with Danida direct funding.

- In the case of natural disaster affected schools communities should not be expected to make cash, kind or labour contributions since the schools need

immediate relief. Moreover, the homes of residents in the school communities may have been damaged making the residents involved in maintenance and repair of their own homes.

- Fund to the schools, which have not received last installment, yet should be released after fulfilling the required formalities. Formalities for severely affected schools should be simplified.
- In order to make more effective use and transparency of relief assistance, coordination with district level line agencies and concerned NGOs is important.
- Relief assistance should be based on technical assessment and actual needs of schools.
- While undertaking rehabilitation and reconstruction work more attention should be given to classroom requirements than for improvement of external looks of the schools.
- Use of local construction materials should be encouraged. DEO technicians can play a significant role in this regard.
- Agreement documents should be free of ambiguities. They should have provisions for detail scope of work with required quantity of construction materials.
- Schools should be provided with standard guidelines for rehabilitation and reconstruction work. Orientation programme for SMCs and SCCs should be organized followed by regular supervision of the work in progress.
- Communications for any deviations in the agreement documents should be in written form.



## **Appendix I**

### Terms of Reference

## **Appendix II**

### Field Survey Instruments

#### ***Questionnaire for the Interview of CDO***

1. What types of natural disasters are you experiencing in this district?
2. What sorts of problems you are facing as a chairperson of district disaster relief committee?
3. Are you aware of the BPEP/DANIDA financial support for the disaster-affected schools in this district?
4. Was district disaster relief committee involved in selection of schools?
5. What are the positive factors of the BPEP/DANIDA assistance?
6. Have you seen any weaknesses in distribution and utilization of fund?
7. What sorts of effective steps were necessary for the effective implementation of such program in the future?
8. Any suggestions and recommendations?

## **Questionnaire for the Interview of LDO**

1. What types of natural disasters you are experiencing in the districts?
2. When did Earthquake or any other disaster happen by bringing the damages in the building in the latest time in the district?
3. Was there any financial support from DDC for the reconstruction/rehabilitation of the schools?
4. If yes please mention the type of supports?
5. How did you realize the BPEP/DANIDA support for the disaster-affected schools?
6. Was disasters relief committee involved in selection of schools?
7. What are the positive factors of the BPEP/DANIDA fund?
8. What are the weaknesses faced in distribution of direct fund?
9. What sorts of effective steps are necessary for the effective implementation of such program in the future?
10. Any suggestions and recommendations?

***Questionnaire for the Interview of DEO/Section Officer (Primary)***

1. What types of natural disasters you are experiencing in the district?
2. Who initiated the school reconstruction / rehabilitation work?
3. How are you releasing BPEP/DANIDA direct fund support in disaster-affected schools?
4. What are the positive factors of the assistance?
5. What are the negative factors of the assistance?
6. What were the criteria's adopted in the selection of the schools for the BPEP/DANIDA grant fund?
7. Do you have any suggestions and recommendation about procedures and terms and condition of contract agreement document?
8. How was the role of DEO for the monitoring of the reconstruction/ rehabilitation of the selected schools?
9. Are there any schools not utilizing the grant fund?
10. Is there any deviation in reconstruction/rehabilitation from the agreed?
11. What are the reasons for the deviations?
12. Are there any sources of assistance for the reconstruction/rehabilitation of the disaster-affected schools?
13. How was the community contribution at local level?
14. What sorts of effective steps need to be adopt for the effective implementation of such program in the future
15. Any suggestions and recommendations?

### *Questionnaires for Engineers/Overseers*

1. Since when the Engineers/Overseers were assigned to work in the districts?
2. Are you aware of schools affected by the various disasters in the district?
3. Who provided you the name list of disaster-affected schools?
4. Was that list attached with detail scope of work to be carried out in each school with cost estimate?
5. Have you conducted the physical survey of affected schools?  
If yes, who requested?
6. Did you receive the necessary documents and instruction materials from DOE/PSS to execute the work?
7. Was there any orientation given from DOE/PSS for planning and implementation of disaster affected schools?
8. Did you provide any implementation schedule to execute the work?
9. What logistics were provided from DOE/PSS to execute the work?
10. Did you take photographs of damaged parts of each school while conducting the Physical Survey?  
\* No camera in DEO office.
11. Who prepared detail design of reconstruction/rehabilitation work of each affected schools?
12. Were there disaster resistant measures adopted while preparing different design for the reconstruction/rehabilitation work?
13. Who prepared detail cost estimate of reconstruction/rehabilitation work of each affected school?
14. Was there any community contribution envisaged for the construction work?  
If Yes, in what form:
15. To what extent was the anticipated contribution realized?
16. Who verified and recommended for the approved of cost estimate of each school?



33. Did you prepare Final bill, MB and work completion report of each school and were they approved by DEO?
34. Did you find or observed any difficulties to implement construction work?
35. Did this program improve the teaching-learning environment in the school?
36. Any suggestion and recommendation for the future implementation of such program

### *Questionnaires for DEO Accountant*

1. When did you start to work in DEO office?
2. Were you involved in planning and implementation of disaster affected schools?
3. Was there any orientation given from PAT/DANIDA, DOE about direct funding procedure, record keeping and release of grant fund?
4. Where did you receive the direct fund from?
5. Who received the grant fund on behalf of the school?
6. Did you receive all necessary and proper documents (RB, MB) from Overseer/Engineer to release the direct fund?
7. What was the basis for release of the fund for the work, if it was deviated from the agreed work?
  - \* Fund released on the basis of Engineer/Overseer's evaluations.
8. Were you well informed by Engineer/Overseer about the deviated work?
9. Who approved the deviated work?
10. Was there any delay in releasing the grant fund?
  - If yes, from where it was delayed?
11. Did you face any problems to release the fund?
  - If yes, what were the problems?
12. Did you have proper record keeping?
13. Did all school receive allocated grant fund?
  - If no, how many schools?
14. Do you have any suggestion and recommendation for future implementation of such program?

### *Questionnaire for Resource Persons/School Supervisors*

1. Were there any disaster-affected schools within your cluster
2. If yes mention nature of damages in the school?
3. Did you play any role for the conduction of physical survey and damage evaluation of the schools?
4. What were the selection criteria's of the school for the BPEP/DANIDA grant fund?
5. Are reconstruction/rehabilitation work implemented as agreed within your cluster?
6. If the reconstruction/rehabilitation is deviated from the agreed give their detail description?
7. Did you monitor the reconstruction/rehabilitation work  
If yes how frequently did you monitor?
8. Were there any other sources of fund for reconstruction/rehabilitation except BPEP/DANIDA?
9. Give detail description about the technical support provided by the technicians in time reconstruction/rehabilitation?
10. Have the school received the allocated fund in time?
11. If not why?
12. How did you complete the work and there was no fund released from DEO?
13. Are the work completed as agreed time?
14. If not what are the reasons?
15. How did you evaluate the quality of reconstruction/rehabilitation work?
16. Explain the nature of community contribution for reconstruction/rehabilitation?
17. Explain the positive and negative factors of reconstruction/ rehabilitation program
18. Any suggestions and recommendations to make such program more effective?

### *Questionnaires for SMCs/SCCs*

1. Was your school damaged by Earthquake, floods, tornadoes etc?  
If yes, mention Type of damages?
  2. What were the bases for the selection of your school for reconstruction/rehabilitation?
  3. Who receive the responsibilities for reconstruction/rehabilitation?
  4. If SMC/SCC is responsible for reconstruction/rehabilitation of damaged school, are the minutes of meeting recorded?
  5. How the damaged components of your school were evaluated?
  6. How long afterward of damage your school was surveyed?
  7. Do you have any suggestions, recommendations about the agreement document?
  8. Who prepared the cost estimates of damaged components of your school?
  9. Did you receive the allocated grant fund from DEO office?  
If no, how much did you receive?
  10. Did you complete the work as agreed?
  11. If there are any deviations from the agreed work, then describe briefly?
  12. Who advised to do the deviations and who gave the final decisions?
  13. What were the advantages from the deviations?
  14. Did you receive grant fund from other sources for reconstruction/rehabilitation except BPEP/DANIDA?
  15. Who supervised and monitored the reconstruction/rehabilitation work during the construction period?
- Frequency of visit
16. What type of suggestions and recommendation provided by Observers?
  17. Did you receive the grant fund in agreed time?
  18. If the grant fund was not received in time how did you manage to complete the work?

19. How was the community participation anticipated?

Cash:

Materials:

Labor:

20. Describe the problems, which you faced during the construction?

21. Did you complete the work in agreed time period?

22. If not, Why?

23. Who evaluated the reconstruction/rehabilitation?

24. When did the final work completion report was prepared?

25. How did you evaluate quality of the reconstruction/rehabilitation work?

26. What are the positive factors of reconstruction/rehabilitation?

27. What are the negative factors?

28. Your suggestions, recommendations for the effective implementation in future?



17. What type of suggestions and recommendation provided by Engineers/Overseers?
18. Did you receive the grant fund in agreed time?
19. If the grant fund was not received in time how did you manage to complete the work?
20. How was the community participation anticipated?
21. Describe the problems, which you faced during the construction?
22. Did you complete the work in agreed time period?
23. If not, Why?
24. Who evaluated the reconstruction/rehabilitation?
25. When did the final work completion report was prepared?
26. How did you evaluate quality of the reconstruction/rehabilitation work?
27. What are the positive factors of reconstruction/rehabilitation?
28. What are the negative factors?
29. Your suggestions, recommendations for the effective implementation in future?

## School Evaluation Format

District		Types of School / Students			Teachers		
Name of School		Boys	Girls	Total	Male	Female	Total
VDC/Municipality		PS					
Ward/Tole:		LS					
		SS					
		HSS					

Physical survey completed by DEO (\_\_\_\_) SMC (\_\_\_\_) If yes, properly done or not \_\_\_\_\_

Does the school have written agreement? Yes (\_\_\_\_) No (\_\_\_\_) If Yes, properly filled out \_\_\_\_\_

Photograph showing the extent of damages Available (\_\_\_\_) Not available (\_\_\_\_)

Nature of rehabilitation/reconstruction work Agreed \_\_\_\_\_

Actual work \_\_\_\_\_

Completion date as agreed \_\_\_\_\_

Actual date of completion \_\_\_\_\_

Quality of work completed (by components) \_\_\_\_\_

School monitored by DEO Yes (\_\_\_\_) No (\_\_\_\_) If yes, how many times? (\_\_\_\_)

Does the DEO have measurement book of repaired works? Yes: (\_\_\_\_) No: (\_\_\_\_)

Cost Estimates Estimated Amount Rs. .... Fund allocated Rs. ....

Fund received Valuation amount of completed work Rs. ....

Amount Released Rs. .... Local contribution Rs. ....

Amount yet to be received (PAT/PSS ) Rs. .... Community contribution: Rs. ....

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Other features observed \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix III

Summary from School Evaluation Format

Name of School/Address	Physical survey completed by	Does the school have written agreement?	Photograph showing the extent of damages	Nature of reconstruction/rehabilitation		Completion date		General impression about quality of work	School monitor by DEC
				Agreed	Actual	Agreed	Actual		
<b>Gorkha</b>									
Gorakhkali PS, Thingureswara	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	New Construction	058/12/30	Not available	Satisfactory	Yes
Shiva Shakti PS, Amarang	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	Rehabilitation	059/3/20	NA	Satisfactory	Yes
Chandika LSS, Bunkot	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	New Construction	058/12/30	NA	Good	Yes
Shahid Smrity SS, Bunkot	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	Rehabilitation	059/2/25	NA	Satisfactory	Yes
Jana Kalyan PS, Paslang	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	New Construction	058/12/30	NA	Satisfactory	Yes
Bhagabati Himalaya SS, Batase	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	New Construction	059/12/2	NA	Good	Yes
Jana jagriti PS, Makai singh	DEO	Yes	Yes	Rehabilitation	New Construction	058/12/30	058/12/30	Satisfactory	Yes
Rainas PS, Taklung	DEO	Yes	Yes	Rehabilitation	New Construction	059/1/2	NA	Satisfactory	Yes
Jana Jagriti PS, Tangli Chowk	DEO	Yes	Yes	Rehabilitation	Rehabilitation	058/12/12	NA	Satisfactory	Yes
Ratna Laxmi, PN Mun.	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	New Construction	059/5/6	NA	Poor	Yes
Gorkha Campus, PN Mun.	DEO	Yes	NO	Rehabilitation	New Construction	059/6/5	NA	Satisfactory	Yes
<b>Nawalparasi</b>									
Nepal Ra. Sa. A. SS, Jajuwa, Gaidakot	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	New RCC Floor constructed	059/3/2/15	059/3/32	Satisfactory	Yes
Nepal SS, Dibyapuri, Kaureni	DEO	Yes	No	Construction of toilet	Construction of toilet	059/3/2/15	059/3/32	Satisfactory	Yes
Pancha Jyoti LSS	DEO	Yes	No	Construction of toilet	Construction of toilet	NA	059/3/32	Satisfactory	Yes
Jana Jyoti HSS, Pragatinagar	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	Compound wall constuction	NA	059/3/32	Satisfactory	Yes
Gyanodaya SS, Kawasoti	DEO	Yes	No	Rehabilitation	New Construction	059/3/2/15	059/3/32	Satisfactory	Yes
Sidha Jyoti LSS, Sidhanagar, Daunnedevi	DEO	Yes	Yes	Rehabilitation	Class room rehabilitation	NA	059/3/32	Satisfactory	Yes
<b>Morang</b>									

Bal Lower Secondary School, Jatuwa, Biratnagar	DDC Overseer	Yes	No	Class room rehabilitation	Classroom rehabilitation	059/3/15	059/3/15	Poor, Curing not done	Yes
Gurukul Secondary School, Aryanagar, Biratnagar	DDC Overseer	Yes	No	New classroom construction	New classroom construction	059/3/15	059/7/15	Satisfactory	Yes
Janata Higher Secondary School, Rangeli	DDC Overseer	Yes	No	Administrative building construction	Administrative building construction	059/3/15	059/6/15	Satisfactory	Yes
Ganesh Lower Secondary School, Chopraha, Rangeli	DDC Overseer	Yes	No	Class room rehabilitation	New classroom construction	059/3/15	Not completed	Satisfactory	Yes
Janata Secondary School, Gandiashram, Amardaha	DDC Overseer	Yes	No	Classroom rehabilitation	New classroom construction	059/3/15	Not completed	Satisfactory	Yes
Panchayat Secondary School	DDC Overseer	Yes	No	Classroom rehabilitation	New classroom construction	059/3/15	Not completed	Satisfactory	Yes

Appendix IV  
**List of the Persons Contacted**

Centre

1. Mr. Ivan Arnbjerg, School Maintenance, Rehabilitation and Physical Planning Advisor, BPEPII/DANIDA
2. Mr. Suman Adhikari, Program Officer, PAT/DANIDA
3. Mr. Shambhu Prasad Uprety, Deputy Director, PSS, DOE, Sanothimi
4. Mr. Uddhav Nepal, Overseer, PSS, DOE, Sanothimi

Gorkha

1. Madhav Pd. Ojha, CDO
2. Tara Bd. Baniya, LDO
3. Gyani Yadav, DEO
4. Mr. Laxman Kumar Thapa, Engineer
5. Mr. Mahendra Karmacharya, Overseer
6. Mr. Chiz Kumar Shrestha, Overseer
7. Mr. Kiran Ghimire, Overseer
8. Mr. Data Ram Joshi, Overseer
9. Mr. Raju Baniya, Section Officer for Primary Section
10. Mr. Laxman Poudel, Accountant
11. Mr. Rishi Ram Khanal, Resource Person
12. Mr. Min Prasad Avasti, Campus Chief, P.N. Campus
13. Mr. Kapil Babu Kattel, H.M. Gorakhkali P.S.
14. Mr. Jhalak Singh Basnet, Chairperson, SMC
15. Mr. Sadhana Tripathi, H.M. Jana Kalyan P.S.
16. Mr. Anjana Bhattarai, H.M. Jana Kalyan P.S.
17. Mr. Mohan Bahadur Bohara, Chairperson, SMC
18. Mr. Chandra Kant Pokhrel, H.M. Shiva Sakti P.S.
19. Mr. Janardan Pokhrel, Chairperson, SMC
20. Mr. Prem Bahadur Shrestha, H.M. Chandika L.S.S.
21. Mr. Dil Bahadur Shrestha, Chairperson, SMC
22. Mr. Ishwori Bahadur Thapa, Teacher, Sihid Smrit S.S.

23. Mr. Nanda Prasad Dhakal, H.M. Bhagawati Himalaya S.S.

Nawalparasi

1. Mr. Madhav Raj Sharma, CDO
2. Mr. Narayan Prasad Kafle, LDO
3. Mr. Laxman Khanal, DEO
4. Mr. Dolraj Pandey, Section Officer, Primary Education
5. Mrs. Laxmi Pandey, Resource Person
6. Mr. Tika Ram Sapkota, Resource Person
7. Mr. Bal Govinda Chaudhari, Accountant
8. Mr. Ganesh Bishokarma, Headteacher, Siddhajyoti P.S.
9. Mr. Krishna Raj Poudel, SMC Chairperson, ,,
10. Mr. Kapildev Bhusal, Headteacher, Gyanoday S.S.
11. Mr. Kedhar Nath Sharma, Teacher, ,,
12. Mrs. Mithumaya Giri, SMC Member, ,,
13. Mr. Laxmi Prasad Sapkota, SMC Chairperson, ,,
14. Mr. Prakash Chandra Sharma, Headteacher, Jana Jyoti H.S.S.
15. Mr. Naresh Raj Lamsal, Teacher Representative, ,,
16. Mr. Buddhinath Koirala, Headteacher, Panchajyoti L.S.S.
17. Mr. Meghnath Subedi, Teacher Representative, ,,
18. Mr. Bamdev Sharma Lamsal, Headteacher, Nepal S.S.
19. Mr. Krishna Bahadur K.C., SMC Chairperson, ,,
20. Mr. Prem Lal Regmi, SMC Member, ,,
21. Mr. Dilli Raj Ghimire, Headteacher, NRSASS
22. Mr. Devi Prasad Dhakal, SMC Member, ,,

Morang

1. Mr. Dolakh Bahadur Gurung, CDO
2. Mr. Anil Kumar Thakur, LDO
3. Mr. Hira Prasad Dhakal, DEO
4. Mr. Tanka Prasad Gautam, Section Officer, Primary
5. Mr. Raj Kumar Chaudhari, Engineer, DEO Office
6. Mr. Binod Ojha, Overseer, DDC

7. Mr. Rhishikesh Koirala, R.P.
8. Mr. Narendra Prasad Neupane, R.P.
9. Mr. Tribhuvan Shrestha, Accountant
10. Mr. Rajesh Prasad Yadav, Headteacher, Bal L.S.S. Jatuwa
11. Mr. Muneshwor Yadav, Member, SCC, Bal L.S.S. ,,
12. Mr. Pitambar Sharma, Headteacher, Gurukul S.S., Aryanagar
13. Mr. Kamala Kanta Aatriya, Member, SCC, Gurukul S.S., Aryanagar
14. Mr. Lochan Prasad Khotiwada, Campus Chief, Janata Campus, Rangeli
15. Mr. Ram Narayan Mandal, Parents, Janata Campus
16. Mr. Mangalchanda Agrawal, Member, SCC, ,,
17. Mr. Shila Nanda Mandal, Headteacher, Ganesh L.S.S., Chopraha
18. Mr. Rajendra Prasad Mandal, Member, SCC, ,,
19. Mr. Bishnu Prasad Dulal, Teacher, Janata S.S. Gandhiashram
20. Mr. Govind Bahadur Thapa, SMC & SCC Member, Janata S.S. ,,
21. Mr. Tom Bahadur Shrestha, Headteacher, Panchayat S.S. Gothgaun
22. Mr. Nagesh Pokhrel, Member. SMC
23. Mr. Gopal Prasad Dhungana, Member SCC

## Appendix V

### List of Sample Schools not Yet Receiving Last Installment

Name of School / Address	Amount
<b>Gorkha</b>	
1. Chandika Primary School, Lakhedada, Gunkot	50,000.00
2. Bhagabati Himalaya SS, Ghairung, Batase	1,08,000.00
<b>Nawalparasi</b>	
1. Janajyoti Higher Secondary School, Pragatinagar	6,250.00
<b>Morang</b>	
1. Gurukul Secondary School, Aryanagar	50,000.00
2. Janata Secondary School, Gandhi Ashram	1,00,000.00
3. Panchayat Secondary School, Gothgau	25,000.00
4. Ganesh Lower Secondary School, Chopraha	25,000.00

Appendix VI  
**List of the Schools in the Sample**

**Gorkha**

1. Gorakhkali P.S., Thingureswara
2. Ratna Laxmi L.S.S., Dumredanda
3. Prithivi Narayan Campus. P.N. Municipality
4. Jana Kalyan P.S., P.N. Municipality, Pasland
5. Shiva Sakti P.S., Marang
6. Chandika P.S., Lokhedanda, Bunkot
7. Shahid Smriti S.S., Khaddi Bhanjayan Bunicot
8. Bhagawati Himalayas S.S. Batese Ghairung
9. Raina P.S., Rainas, Taklung
10. Jana Jagriti P.S., Butatar Makaising
11. Jana Jagriti P.S. Gorditar, Tanglichowk
12. Saraswoti P.S., Ahaledanda Ranijung
13. Ganesh P.S. Jyamire, Gharivung
14. Janasakti S.S. Nanijung
15. Dhungadada L.S.S. Phinam

**Nawalparasi**

1. Siddha Jyoti Primary School, Daunnedevi-6, Siddhanagar
2. Gyonodaya Secondary School, Kawasoti-5, Kawasoti
3. Jana Jyoti Higher Secondary School, Pragatinagar-3, Pragatinagar
4. Panchajyoti Lower Secondary School, Amarapuri-1, Amarapuri
5. Nepal Secondary School, Dibyapuri-2, Kaureni
6. Nepal Rastriya Shamsher Adarsha Secondary School, Gaidakot-1, Jausuwa

**Morang**

1. Bal Lower Secondary School, Biratnagar-18, Jatuwa

2. Gurukul Secondary School, Biratnagar-18, Aryanagar
3. Janata Campus, Rangeli-2, Rangeli
4. Ganesh Lower Secondary School, Rangeli-7, Chopraha
5. Janata Secondary School, Amardaha-7, Chopraha
6. Panchayat Secondary School, Dulari-9, Gothgaun