

Improvement of the teaching and learning environment
In primary schools
(A report of the first monitoring and evaluation conducted
In
Doti, Kanchanpur and Humla)

Submitted to

The Department of Education, Sanothimi
And
PAT Office, Keshar Mahal
January 2003

Prepared by

Saraswoti Bharati
Sushan Acharya

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	3
Methodology	3
District wise field situation	7
Doti.....	7
Kanchanpur	9
Humla.....	12
Indications	14
APPENDIX 1	16
APPENDIX 2	17
APPENDIX 3	18
APPENDIX 4	19
APPENDIX 5	20
APPENDIX 6	21
APPENDIX 7	22
APPENDIX 8	23
APPENDIX 9	25

Improvement of the teaching and learning environment in primary schools

Background

With the objective of improving the teaching and learning situations of primary schools through physical facility and educational material supports a pilot project has been launched in three districts. The Department of Education (DOE) and Program Advisory Team (PAT) of DANIDA jointly initiated the project in three remote districts of the far western development region. The indicators developed by National Planning Commission (NPC) to categorize districts were used to select the pilot districts- Doti, Humla and Kanchanpur. One hundred and fifty schools from these three districts were selected. Forty schools out of 112 in Humla, 50 out of 300 in Doti and 60 out of 254 in Kanchanpur were selected for the piloting. (See the 1st report of this pilot project for detail).

Nine different packages consisting of 5 hardware and 4 software packages were introduced from which the schools could spend allocated budget to purchase items from hardware and software packages. (See appendix I for the contents) It was mandatory that the schools select from both hardware and software packages with at least two packages from the software only.

The piloting began with the project introduction/orientation in all three districts. The schools were however already selected on the basis of the girls and disadvantaged children's enrollment alone with the survival rate of the schools. After the orientation the schools returned to their catchment areas with the list of the packages. They were expected to organize a school community meeting and select the packages in a participatory way. The lists of the selections were sent to the DOE and PAT office through District Education Offices (DEOs).

The project had a provision of monitoring of the intervention at two stages. One is right after the schools sent their selections and another was towards the end of the implementation of the selected packages. The first monitoring was conducted during the first two weeks of November 2002 in all three districts. Five local researchers one for Kanchanpur, two for Doti and two from Humla were selected and hired. In the case of Kanchanpur the field team leader from Kathmandu joined the field researcher in school monitoring visits. A woman selected for Humla withdrew at the last moment. Thus unfortunately no one from among the local researchers was a woman. The researcher of Humla was given the responsibility to hire and orient one partner, which he did.

This report is the second one among three to be produced during the project period. The first one documented the introductory part of the project, whereas the third one would consist of the status of implementation of the hardware and software packages in the schools. Nevertheless the last monitoring will try to observe the impact as well though it will be too early to see the changes.

Methodology

Two field researchers in each of the three districts gathered the information. In Kanchanpur however the field team leader herself visited the schools with the locally hired field researcher. Thus five field-researchers- one in Kanchanpur, two in Humla and two in Doti were assigned for the fieldwork.

Sample

Twenty-five percent of the intervened schools from each district were selected for monitoring. Those 25 percent of the schools consisted of both the better ones and the worse ones. The rating was completely based on the DEO personnel's perception and observations. This category was used in order to understand the differences in the needs and requirements between good and not so good schools. Another category used in the selection was the types of schools (i. e. pure primary, primary attached with lower secondary and primary attached with secondary). However in Humla all primary were selected because in this district security condition had also to be considered. The following table presents the sample.

District	Intervened schools	Schools selected for monitoring			
		Pure Primary	Primary attached to Lower secondary	Primary attached to Secondary	Total
Doti	50	6	3	4	13
Humla	38*	10	-	-	10
Kanchanpur	60	7	4	5	16

* Initially 40 schools were selected for piloting. But two schools withdrew . Since they did not participate in the orientation they were dropped from the recipients' list. The DEO personnel were also not informed about the reason for there withdrawal. The field researchers could not enquire about them, as those schools were not identified.

Respondents

The respondents of the discussion and interview were SMC members, teachers, parents, DEO personnel, head teachers and students.

Instrument/guideline preparation

The field team leader together with a consultant prepared a questionnaire for the monitoring visits. The questionnaire for both qualitative and quantitative information collection was prepared. The questionnaire was based on the schools' selection of the packages and the introductory meeting held at all three districts.

Orientation

A one-day orientation was organized for the field researchers in Kanchanpur on the on 27th of October. The field team coordinator facilitated the orientation. The purposes of this orientation were to familiarize the field researchers with qualitative data collection process and overall fieldwork, solicit their comments/suggestions on the guidelines, and finalize the questionnaires. Only one field researcher was present from Humla for the reason mentioned earlier. He was given the responsibility to assign one partner if needed, and orient her/him to do the job. Next day of the fieldwork in Kanchanpur began. The field team coordinator and the Kanchanpur field researcher went to the selected schools. Researchers from Doti also joined the team. This was deliberately planned so that they would get an opportunity for clarification as well as a sense of the field. Researcher from Humla however could not stop for field visit because he had to catch the flight back home. He could not wait because there was no certainty of next flight.

Record review

The school record on student enrollment, student attendance and teacher status was reviewed. The purpose of this review was to examine the connection between the school situation (student number, student composition, teacher training) and the hardware and software packages selection trend. The second set of record reviewed was the package selection forms that individual schools submitted to the DEO and DOE.

Discussion

Discussions were held with parents and teachers. The purposes of the discussion was to examine their understanding and perception of the direct support that their respective schools were getting for improved teaching learning situation, and the package selection and prioritization process. The discussions also helped to understand the outcomes that this group of stakeholders expected to achieve from the intervention.

Interview

DEO, head teachers and SMC members were interviewed. The purposes of the interview were to examine their understandings and perceptions of the direct support, process adopted in package selection, and their commitment to the implementation and follow up of the intervention.

Student teacher ratio, student and teacher compositions, status of the package selection by individual schools and cross checking of the demands were derived from three sources. One the schools' records, two the forms or information sheets sent to the DEO/DOE from the schools and three the observations. Charts were prepared to collect these quantitative information.

Limitation

The fieldwork could not be completed in the agreed time because of Tihar festival and unexpected close down called by the Maoists.

District wise field situation

District wise field situation

Doti

In Doti 13 schools were selected for monitoring. Among them six were pure primary, three were primary attached to lower secondary and 4 were primary attached to secondary schools.

Package selection process

In order to make the intervention more realistic and to set the norm for a democratic practice the head teachers, teachers and SMCs were oriented to make the selection process participatory. They were expected to organize a community meeting with full participation of parents, local elite, SMC members, teachers, head teachers and other concerned people. Accordingly in Doti most schools organized meeting to prioritize and select the packages. Some schools invited primary level teachers, SMC members and all the parents. Not necessarily all of the invited parents joined the discussion. In other schools besides teachers and SMC members, limited numbers of parents were invited. However in some remote schools parents were not included at all due to possible threat from both the Maoist and the government security forces while organizing a gathering.

Two designs were found in the prioritization and selection of the packages in this district. They were (a) teachers and head teachers selected the packages prior to the community meeting. In this process the SMCs and parents were informed and were asked to finalize the selections in the meeting, (b) SMCs asked the teachers about their needs. In this process the teacher identified needs were prioritized and selected in the meeting. In both designs either head teachers or SMC chairperson were active. According to the parents it was natural because a head teacher and to some extent SMC chairperson knew about the existing condition of the school more than others do. Hardly any tension was experienced in the selection process. Before completely understanding the nature of the packages some participants did argue for classroom construction. However, since the packages were pre-determined and/or fixed there was no reason for conflict in the selection and decision-making said one of the respondents. Regardless of the selection processes all the respondents found the decisions relevant to their respected schools.

Stakeholders' knowledge and perception

Parents, teachers, head teachers and SMC members linked the intervention with educational quality enhancement and improvement of the physical facility. In other words all of them viewed the packages to be useful in improving the teaching learning situation of the schools on one hand and physical facility on the other. Support of this kind was not available previously so the respondents found it more relevant to the resource poor schools of Doti. All of them agreed that such support would make the teaching learning more effective, and children more enthusiastic towards learning. With added educational materials and furniture they hope that the students would also be more regular. Students compelled to sit on the floor would be sitting on a

bench and this makes a difference said a parent. Some parents perceived the support as a relief from the donation that schools collect from them. Since they were forced to donate to the Maoists as well support of this kind would give them a break to some extent they said.

Interestingly some respondents viewed the intervention useful to both the teachers and students but for some it seemed more helpful to the students as it would improve their learning habits. Not much difference was found in the perception of stakeholders belonging to pure primary, lower secondary attached primary and secondary attached primary schools. All the selected schools except Shree Mahendra Primary School were in the same level in terms of resources so all reacted in the same line. Shree Mahendra Primary School with a female head teacher has received supports from other agencies as well for physical facility development. So this school was slightly better off in this sense. But this time the head teacher found the design of furniture more durable and the software package completely new and more beneficial.

All of the respondents were satisfied with the selection. However teachers, the key players in students learning, were more satisfied because they would receive what they suggested for.

Package selection pattern

The package selection pattern of the sample schools (13) very well reflects the selection pattern of all the schools (50) receiving the supports. For example almost all of the schools selected for the pilot project have asked for furniture. Followed by this the next popular item in the hardware package is black board. The same is true of store facility. Regarding light improvement none of the sample schools and five of the total targeted schools asked for it. One of the reasons was that most schools had double story buildings with permanent roof. Similarly about half of the target schools have asked for door and window package. This trend is true among other target schools as well (see appendixes 2 & 4).

The software package is found to be more popular in Doti. Most target schools have asked for all four packages. Learning by playing item is demanded by 92% of the target schools. But among sample schools other items are more popular than this one. Those who have room for library have certainly asked for library books as well. Nevertheless, those without extra room have also asked for library books and have started constructing rooms mobilizing the local resources. The project has assured that the schools would receive books if the rooms were completed by the time the packages were delivered (see appendixes 3 & 4).

Interestingly, the selection patterns of pure primary, lower secondary attached primary and secondary attached primary schools showed no significance difference. All of them have selected similar types and almost equal quantity of the packages. However, in Doti the primary school that has asked for highest quantity of furniture is the one attached to secondary school.

Concerns

- Since the program is out of the regular system or out of the DOE assigned activity the District Education Office is finding it difficult to depute its staff to guide and supervise the program. Though this program can be supervised in regular school visits they still think it as something added to their defined responsibilities. The district level staff is so much tuned to following the formally defined or written job description that they feel hesitant to adjust any activity beyond their pre-defined roles.
- The design of the furniture, though all the participating schools found appropriate and durable had difficulty in explaining it to the local carpenter. In one case the furniture had to remade because it did not meet the given standard. The overseer had to help the school and carpenter.
- Parents expect this kind of support to be continued. This indicates that either they did not properly understand the nature of the program or due to never ending conflict in decision-making and possible misuse of resources they found it more convenient and/or appropriate to have direct support from outside.
- Most SMC members are less active in decision-making. One of the reasons is that since most of them are not as qualified as the teachers the SMC members felt less confident and less powerful.
- Students lived realities, which is terror; conflict, economic hardship and family disintegration have impacted their learning very much. Even those who attend classes may not be mentally present. Thus a large number of youths particularly boys rather leave for India for livelihood.
- How the obtained materials will be utilized, whether knowledge and skills obtained from existing teacher training are enough for teachers to utilize educational materials, and which group of children (boys, girls, Dalits) will benefit most are also genuine concerns here.

The concerns raised above will be probed during the third monitoring visit.

Kanchanpur

In Kanchanpur 16 schools were selected for monitoring. Among them seven were pure primary, four were primary attached to lower secondary and five were primary attached to secondary schools.

Package selection process

As oriented in the introductory workshop the head teachers, teachers, and SMC members organized meetings in their respective schools. Discussions were held with parents and community elites while selecting the packages. In Kanchanpur as in Doti three designs worked in the prioritization and selection of the packages. They were (a) meeting was organized in

which teachers, head teachers, SMC members and local individual donors¹ identified the needs, and selected the packages. The discussion was held and everybody agreed to the decision. (b) Teachers and SMCs identified the needs and selected the packages. Then a meeting was organized to inform the parents about the project, possible supports and the decision made with regard to the package selection. and (c) teachers informed about the school's needs. This was followed by prioritization exercise. Parents were more inquisitive in one of the schools that applied this design. In this design a consensus was built with regard to the needs and the selection of packages. In all three designs teachers and head teachers were more active than other participants. This was taken for granted partly because they were the ones who participated in the orientation workshop and were more knowledgeable about the school conditions. Here also tension was not observed for the same reason as in Doti.

Stakeholders' knowledge and perception

Parents, teachers, head teachers and SMC members were consulted to understand their perception about this support program. Most of them viewed the software packages added to the physical facility support as a positive move towards children's cognitive and/or intellectual development. According to them traditionally focus was given only to infrastructure building but this hardly made any difference in quality improvement. Unlike the respondents from Doti the Kanchanpur ones emphasized on the proper utilization of the supports for better results. Some said that if properly used the packages would increase children's knowledge and wisdom. This expression could be related to DEO's concern. According to him supervision should be in place to bring desired changes.

In Kanchanpur the perception of primary attached to secondary school community was different from that of pure primary school. Responses of most secondary school communities selected for monitoring reflected this. For example Saraswoti Secondary School and Ghatal Secondary School found the support negligible. They also equated this with NGO type support. In their opinion one or two schools would have been selected and given maximum resource thereby developing those schools as model schools rather than distributing little amount of money to several schools. Nevertheless other types of school did not share this opinion. Since many of them were poorer than these schools they thought they could do a lot even with little money.

Most respondents were satisfied with both the selection process and the packages. They found the packages and the selection processes need based. Some parents were more satisfied because they were also involved in the decision-making. Because of this they also felt responsible for monitoring the use of materials. The DEO however was concern over the potential challenges in the utilization of the materials with high student teacher ratio.

Package selection pattern

The package selection pattern of Kanchanpur follows Doti's trend. As in Doti almost all the target schools asked for furniture. Given the student population the high demand for furniture

¹ Local individuals who have contributed to the schools either in cash or kind. This practice is still found in Nepal.

was obvious in Kanchanpur. Black board and store facility were also in high demand among the sample schools. In total also more than sixty per cent of the 60 target schools asked for black board. More than half of the target as well as sample schools asked for door and window improvement package. Light improvement package was the least popular one in Kanchanpur. Only three of the sample school selected this. Since the light improvement package involved material susceptible to heat most schools did not find it appropriate (see Appendixes 3 & 5)

As in Doti most schools from Kanchanpur have selected all four of the software package. The less popular package among the software was supplementary reader. Less than half of the sample schools have asked for it. The same is true among total target schools. More than 85 per cent of the target schools and sample schools have selected geometry aid and learning by playing materials. Since not all the target schools had rooms for library only forty of them asked for library books. (See Appendixes 2 & 5)

No significant difference was observed in the package selection patterns of pure primary, lower secondary attached primary and secondary attached primary schools. As in Doti here also a primary level attached to Secondary School has asked for highest quantity of furniture. Several assumptions can be derived from this. For example many parents prefer to send their younger children to primary attached to secondary schools because their older ones may have been studying in the same schools, and/or they don't want to go through the hassle of admitting their children to another school just after few years. As a result the primary levels of secondary schools are over populated. The tendency however needs further examination.

Concerns

- Like in Doti the District Education Office of Kanchanpur also showed some concerns. Their concern was also about monitoring and supervision of an activity that has not come from the DOE channel. They view this as traditional projects, which usually came with additional monetary benefits.
- Those schools that did not participate in the orientation found it difficult to follow the design of the furniture.
- In some schools the construction supported by VDCs has remained incomplete. This issue was raised during the package selection meeting. It took some time to make people understand about the situation and the authenticity of the DANIDA support program.
- Influence of the then minister made it difficult in school selection. As a result many schools from his constituency were selected. Nevertheless, the DEO also included schools from the list he sought from the RPS. Selecting schools that are closer to the system (e.g. DEO staff) could not be ruled out either, though it is not found in the case of this district. Thus the forces from different ends do influence the selection process, be it a school or local facilitator. As a result schools that need least support also get selected, as is the case in Kanchanpur.
- It is a known fact that the student teacher ratio is high in Kanchanpur. This raises concern about the proper use of educational materials.
- Parents who are paying for their children's education despite the governments' free education policy are skeptical about this support as well. They are afraid whether this

would just be another slogan. It is understandable because the local people have hardly experienced any tangible change in their children's lives through the educational interventions. So they are doubtful about this one also.

- SMCs are not sufficiently functional. Since they are less qualified than the teachers they feel less confident and less informed in school matters.
- The buildings of some target schools are about to crumble. In this situation what is the school priority and who is going to support them rebuild their building is a concern. Though the issue may not be relevant to Teaching Learning Pilot Project this definitely impacts the proper utilization of the packages.
- As in Doti here also how the obtained materials will be utilized, whether knowledge and skills obtained from existing teacher training are enough for teachers to utilize educational materials, and which group of children (boys, girls, Dalits) will benefit most are genuine concerns.
- The nature of light improvement material particularly the roofing material reveals that the decision makers did not gather enough information about Kanchanpur before making the decision. In this district as mentioned before the material was not suitable for the climate.

Humla

In Humla 10 schools were selected for monitoring. All of these were pure primary schools. Initially 40 schools were selected for intervention but two did not show any interest and did not participate in the orientation workshop as well. Thus the total number of target schools in Humla is 38.

Package selection process

In Humla also two designs were used while selecting the packages. In one design head teachers and teachers identified the needs, selected the packages and have the community endorse it in a meeting. In the second design head teachers and teachers identified the needs selected the packages, submitted the list to the SMCs for approval. In this design also a meeting was called and the parents endorsed the list. In a school parents insisted on adding classrooms but when teachers explained what were available they agreed to the selections. In most cases the participating parents were silent spectators. The head teachers, teachers and some SMC members were obviously active in selecting and finalizing the packages. The parents found it natural and acceptable. Some of them said that the teachers played active roles because they are educated and more aware of the problems.

Stakeholders' knowledge and perception

There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the stakeholders of Humla and other districts. Most viewed the support program as important for quality teaching learning. Some also stated that the supports would help in children's physical, mental and intellectual development. Since the support was solid and tangible there is a hope for successful

implementation. Interestingly, in Humla respondents stated that since the delivery mechanism was different from the previous ones it would be more transparent. They all agreed that the nature of packages address real problems. Some respondents also viewed that program was brought to narrow the gap between private and public schools. However the DEO was indifferent about this program. Though all three DEOs of the target districts were informed early ahead the DEO of Humla denied any knowledge about the intention of the program so did not give any opinion. The minute of the meeting held between the DOE personnel, DEOs of the three target districts and PAT representatives indicates that a detail discussion was held about the project. However the DEO rather said that the program was brought to Humla to increase their (PAT's) access to district level. He suggested that any queries regarding the program should be asked to either PAT office or schools. There is a contradiction between the PAT personnel's argument and the DEO's argument with regard to whether the project followed the DOE's normal practice. According to the DEO since it did not follow the regular system or channel he felt bypassed by PAT. This will be probed further in the third monitoring visit. Despite DEO's resentment most stakeholders were satisfied with the support program. Some of them said that the DEO never responded to their problems. If implemented it would be beneficial to the children and would address the real problems of their schools they added. In general people appreciated software packages more than the hardware. One of the reasons was that many schools have received physical facility improvement support from other agencies such as USC Canada.

Package selection pattern

In Humla also almost all of the target schools have asked for furniture. Obviously the same is observed among sample schools. The main reasons behind this were the durable structure of the furniture and the unavailability of timber in upper part of Humla. Package containing doors and windows were also quite popular. However the selection pattern reveals that very the light improvement package was the least popular one in Humla. This is because the material provided in this package was not appropriate for winter. The roofing material could not stand heavy snowfall. Interestingly very few selected black boards. Store facility was in high demand among the target schools with 95 per cent asking for it. As in other districts almost all schools have asked for the entire items from the software package. Among them most popular ones were supplementary readers and geometry aid (see Appendixes 2, 3 & 6).

Concerns

- The lower level of education among parents and SMC members did impacted their participation in prioritization and selection process.
- Children's lived realities, which are family displacement; terror, food crisis caused by economic hardship, and insurgency outweigh their educational needs.
- Concern over the teachers' ability to use the materials, and utilization and possible beneficiaries of the supports is there in Humla's case as well.

- The indifferent attitude of the DEO is a concern when it comes to monitoring the implementation. Unless the DOE intervenes in this matter it is unlikely that the DEO of Humla will cooperate.
- Many classrooms in Humla are made in a traditional design, which resist snowfall and protect people from chilly weather. In this situation the material selected for light improvement package did not suit the local need unless the entire building was rehabilitated. But this is not the purpose of the project. Thus with regard to the hardware package what is appropriate in Humla's case need further examination.

Indications

Indications derived from the above deliberations lead towards several aspects. In this section those indications are grouped according to the discussion areas used in all three districts' situations.

The participation trend during prioritization and selection indicated that (a) people are basically concerned with the relevancy and usefulness of the decision rather than decision-making process itself. This is pretty much cultural. (b) the fixed (predetermined) selection items avoided argument. People would have difficulty in creating consensus if the selection was non-binding and (c) the permanent and formal structure promoted by the formal education system has helped create certain image about school in people's mind. As a result parents from Doti demanded for classroom and building constructions as in many other instances.

The package selection process has also drawn attention towards some important aspects of people's participation and decision-making pattern. The processes indicated that cultural, political, community dynamism, historical context, did influence the participation and decision-making. How modern structures such as school management committee hinder some and assist others to voice their opinion/concerns, etc. is also something that needs attention. Thus before deciding one approach or design above other knowledge about how society/community operates in a particular district and sub district and who listens to whom and why are necessary to understand. Additionally, consultation with school community with regard to how for example can classroom situation be improved in a particular district/cluster in terms of light, ventilation, etc. is required. Similarly, in the case of Humla enough needs to be known about the direction of the wind and intensity of snow while proposing a design for improvement. The locals (parents, community chief, students) can tell us more about this than anybody else. Children's learning styles and connection between school culture and home culture, and how these hinder or facilitate the learning are equally important to understand because the result of the intervention very much depends on these aspects as well.

The Stakeholders' knowledge and perception about the packages and support in general indicated that (a) there is a growing realization of the necessity of educational materials along with physical facilities to improve quality and (b) school community is tempted or excited to possess something that has not been obtained before irrespective of the purpose. However the utilization aspect needs examination to be able to draw any conclusion. This aspect will be covered in the third monitoring visit.

The package selection pattern indicated that (a) the resource poor schools are in position to accept anything that would presumably add on to their facilities in assumption that their schools will perform better than others. Since nobody raised any concern about the possible problems while using the packages in the classroom with different ability and language levels, learning style, and mixed classroom in terms of gender, culture and ethnicity led to this assumption.

The above deliberations indicated that (a) the material supports, which are very essential for improved teaching learning, are not enough in difficult circumstances. Where students feel threatened to come to school and economic hardship deter them from being regular additional software such as counseling may be needed in order to ensure quality learning. Additionally, children's learning styles, cultural practices, values, gap between school culture and home culture need to be explored. If required alternative approaches should be identified to cater different groups of children within one classroom (b) Teacher preparation approaches need to be revisited. The existing teacher training is more geared towards theoretical knowledge and content knowledge. It hardly prepares teachers to face the realities of Nepali public school classrooms. Moreover the use of additional materials and learning by playing concept has also been limited to theory so further orientation is needed in this area. (c) More homework in the part of central level decision makers and donors with regard to nature of the support is required. The similar kinds of intervention packages may or may not be appropriate to all the districts. For instance in Humla about fifty per cent of the teachers are from out of district and teacher absenteeism is very high (ref. communication with DEO staff). Thus problem may lie somewhere else than on lack of physical facility and educational materials. Nevertheless schools do need direct support. Thus an extensive consultation with school communities would be more fruitful while determining what is needed and how could they be achieved in a particular district and schools.

Appendix 1

Teaching learning improvement Packages

The 5 hardware packages intended for the physical environment improvement includes:

- Proper sitting arrangement
- Light arrangement in the classrooms.
- Making and repairing of the blackboard.
- Secure classroom.
- Provide secure store facilities.

The 4 software packages intended for the actual teaching learning improvement includes:

- Enhancement of children's reading abilities and visual learning.
- Improvement of school library by adding books that support teachers and pupils.
- Improvement of children's mathematical skills through necessary teaching aid.
- Promotion of creativity in children through play, games etc.

Appendix 2
Distribution of target schools in terms
of the
hardware and software packages selection

District	Hardware package					Software package				No. Of schools
	Furniture	Light improvement	Black Board	Window & door	Store facility	Supplementary readers	Books for library	Geo Aid	Learning by playing	
Doti	49 (98%)	5 (10%)	39 (78%)	26 (52%)	43 (86%)	38 (76%)	44 (88%)	39 (78%)	46 (92%)	50
Humla	34 (89.5%)	11 (29%)	4 (10.5%)	23 (60.5%)	36 (95%)	37 (97.5%)	36 (95%)	38 (100%)	38 (100%)	38
Kanchanpur	58 (97%)	8 (13.3%)	39 (65%)	37 (62%)	60 (100%)	32 (53.3%)	40 (67%)	52 (87%)	56 (93.3%)	60
Total										

Appendix 3
Distribution of sample schools in terms
of the
hardware and software packages selection

	Hardware package					Software package				No. Of schools
District	Furniture	Light improvement	Black Board	Window & door	Store facility	Supplementary readers	Books for library	Geometry Aid	Learning by playing	
Doti	13 (100%)	-	10 (80%)	6 (46%)	11 (85%)	11 (5%)	11 (85%)	11 (85%)	10 (80%)	13
Humla	8 (80%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	7 (70%)	8 (80%)	9 (90%)	9 (90%)	10 (100%)	10 (100%)	10
Kanchanpur	15 (94%)	3 (19%)	14 (87.5%)	8 (50%)	15 (94%)	6 (37.5%)	10 (62.5%)	15 (94%)	14 (87.5%)	16
Total	36 (91.3%)	5 (19.5%)	25 (59%)	21 (53.3%)	34 (86.3%)	26 (71%)	30 (79%)	36 (93%)	34 (89%)	39

Appendix 4
Package selection pattern of the sample schools of Doti

S. No	Name of Schools	Location	NNo.1 Furn.	No.2 Light impr.	No.3 Black b.W/w	No.4 Win./ Door	No.5 Store Facility	No.6 Supple. Readers	No.7 Library Books	No.8 Geo.Ai d
1	Shree Bal Mandir Pra.Vi	Silgadhi	13	0	1	0	2	1	1	1
2	Shree Mahendra Pra.Vi	Bagthata	21	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
3	Shree Devsthal Pra.Vi	Phaledi	17	0	2	1	1	1	1	1
4	Shree Chhatreshwor Pra.Vi	Phaledi	25	0	2	1	1	1	1	0
5	Shree Bageshwor Pra.Vi	Baanfi	14	0	2	0	1	1	1	1
6	Shree Durga Pra.Vi	Dehimandu	27	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
7	Shree Arunodaya Ni.ma.Vi.	Uditola	15	0	2	1	1	1	1	1
8	Shree Kumalikote Ni.Ma.Vi.	Kumalikote	10	0	2	1	2	1	1	1
9	Shree Durga Ni. Ma. Vi.	Pakari	0	0	2	1	3	1	1	1
10	Shree Mahakali Ma. Vi.	Madhugaun	24	0	2	0	1	0	1	1
11	Shree Maglekh Ma.Vi.	Tikha	22	0	2	1	1	1	1	1
12	Shree Dilpeshwor Ma.Vi.	Dipayel	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
13	Shree Harihar Ma.Vi.	Talkot	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1
Total piece			260	0	19	6	15	11	11	11

Appendix 5
Package selection pattern of the sample schools of Kanchanpur

S.N	Name of Schools	Location	Furniture	Light impr.	Black board	Window Door	Store Facility	Supple. Readers	Library Books	Geo. Aid	lea by]
1	Shanti Pra. Vi.	Jhalari	12	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
2	Saraswoti Ma .vi.	Ultakham	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	2
3	Ghatal Ni . Ma. Vi.	Daiji	20	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
4	Prem Singh Dhami Pra. Vi.	Gauji	15	0	2	1	1	1	0	1	1
5	Malikarjun Pra. Vi	Mtaina	18	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1
6	Mahakali Pra.Vi.	Tumadani	16	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
7	Nand Ma. Vi	Dekhatabhuli	10	0	0	0	5	0	1	1	0
8	Ghatal Ma. Vi	Suda	32	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1
9	Saraswoti Ni Ma. Vi.	Krishnapur	12	0	1	6	1	1	1	1	1
10	Bhubaneshwori Ma. Vi	Shisaiya	26	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
11	Udaydev Ni Ma. Vi.	Sundarpur	20	0	3	0	1	0	1	1	0
12	Samaiji Pra. Vi.	Krishnapur	25	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1
13	BP koirala Pra. Vi.	Odali	20	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1
14	Mahakali Ni. Ma Vi	Krishnapur	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
15	Ganesh Pra. Vi.	Chadani	5	4	2	5	1	0	1	1	1
16	Laxmi Ma. Vi.	Dodhara	21	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1
Total piece			261	6	21	17	21	6	9	15	15

Appendix 6
Package selection pattern of the sample schools of Humla

S.No	Name of Schools	Location	Furniture	Light impr.	Black board	Window/ Door	Store Facility	Supple. Readers	Library Books	Geo. Aid	Learn by Play
1	Kalasilta Pra. Vi.	Simikote	19	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1
2	Kanti Pra. Vi.	Kholsi	0	5	0	1	5	1	1	1	1
3	Bhimsen Pra. Vi.	Tallogoun	16	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
4	Budha Pra. Vi.	Hepka	17	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	Balabhadra Pra. Vi.	Sanda	14	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	1
6	Balmandir Pra. Vi.	Simikot	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
7	Balbikas Pra. Vi.	Hildum	13	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	1
8	Tatopani Pra. Vi.	Kermi	16	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	Ramdev Pra. Vi.	Maila	15	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	Himgiri Pra. Vi.	Limatang	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	2	2
Total piece			141	8	2	7	16	11	9	11	11

Appendix 7
Design used by the schools in package selection
Doti

Name of the sample school	Participation design
Shree Bal Mandir Primary School	SMCs asked the teachers about their needs
Shree Mahendra Primary School	SMCs asked the teachers about their needs
Shree Devsthal Primary School	Teachers and head teachers selected the packages prior to the community meeting
Shree Chhatreshwor Primary School	Teachers and head teachers selected the packages prior to the community meeting
Shree Bageshwor Primary School	SMCs asked the teachers about their needs
Shree Durga Primary School	Teachers and head teachers selected the packages prior to the community meeting
Shree Arunodaya Lower Secondary School	SMCs asked the teachers about their needs
Shree Kumalikote Lower Secondary School	SMCs asked the teachers about their needs
Shree Durga Lower Secondary School	Teachers and head teachers selected the packages prior to the community meeting
Shree Mahakali Secondary School	Teachers and head teachers selected the packages prior to the community meeting
Shree Maglekh Secondary School	SMCs asked the teachers about their needs
Shree Dilpeshwor Secondary School.	Teachers and head teachers selected the packages prior to the community meeting
Shree Harihar Secondary School	Teachers and head teachers selected the packages prior to the community meeting

Appendix 8
Design used by the schools in package selection
Kanchanpur

Name of the sample school	Participation design
Shanti Primary School	Meeting was organized in which teachers, head teachers, SMC members and local individual contributors identified the needs, and selected the packages. The discussion was held and everybody agreed to the decision.
Saraswoti Secondary School	Teachers and SMCs identified the needs and selected the packages. Then a meeting was organized to inform the parents about the project, possible supports and the decision made with regard to the package selection
Ghatal Lower secondary School	Teachers and SMCs identified the needs and selected the packages. Then a meeting was organized to inform the parents about the project, possible supports and the decision made with regard to the package selection.
Prem Singh Dhami Primary School	Meeting was organized in which teachers; head teachers, SMC members and local individual contributors identified the needs, and selected the packages. The discussion was held and everybody agreed to the decision.
Malikarjun Primary School	Teachers informed about the school's needs. This was followed by prioritization exercise
Mahakali Primary School	Teachers informed about the school's needs. This was followed by prioritization exercise
Nand Secondary School	Teachers and SMCs identified the needs and selected the packages. Then a meeting was organized to inform the parents about the project, possible supports and the decision made with regard to the package selection.
Ghatal Secondary School	Meeting was organized in which teachers; head teachers, SMC members and local individual contributors identified the needs, and selected the packages. The discussion was held and everybody agreed to the decision
Saraswoti Lower Scndary School	Teachers and SMCs identified the needs and selected the packages. Then a meeting was organized to inform the parents about the project, possible supports and the decision made with regard to the package selection.
Bhubaneshwori Secondary School	Teachers and SMCs identified the needs and selected the packages. Then a meeting was organized to inform the parents about the project, possible supports and the decision made with regard to the package selection

Name of the sample school	Participation design
Udaydev Lower secondary School	Teachers informed about the school's needs. This was followed by prioritization exercise
Samaiji Primary School	Teachers informed about the school's needs. This was followed by prioritization exercise
BP Koirala Primary School	Teachers and SMCs identified the needs and selected the packages. Then a meeting was organized to inform the parents about the project, possible supports and the decision made with regard to the package selection.
Mahakali Lower secondary School	Teachers informed about the school's needs. This was followed by prioritization exercise
Ganesh Primary School	Teachers and SMCs identified the needs and selected the packages. Then a meeting was organized to inform the parents about the project, possible supports and the decision made with regard to the package selection.
Laxmi Secondary School	Teachers informed about the school's needs. This was followed by prioritization exercise

Appendix 9
**Design used by the schools in package selection
Humla**

Name of the sample school	Participation design
Kalasilta Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs selected the packages, submitted the list to the SMCs for approval
Kanti Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs, selected the packages and have the community endorse it in a meeting.
Bhimsen Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs, selected the packages and have the community endorse it in a meeting.
Budha Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs selected the packages, submitted the list to the SMCs for approval
Balabhadra Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs, selected the packages and have the community endorse it in a meeting
Balmandir Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs selected the packages, submitted the list to the SMCs for approval
Balbikas Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs, selected the packages and have the community endorse it in a meeting.
Tatopani Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs selected the packages, submitted the list to the SMCs for approval
Ramdev Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs, selected the packages and have the community endorse it in a meeting.
Himgiri Pra.Vi.	Head teachers and teachers identified the needs selected the packages, submitted the list to the SMCs for approval