

## **End of Project Evaluation**

A Safer Tomorrow - Institutionalizing disaster preparedness  
in education sector (*STDP 3*)

ECHO/AS/BUD/2015/91016

Conducted by H&H Consulting  
For  
HOPE'87

**December, 2016**

## Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....	ii
TABLES AND FIGURES .....	iv
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	v
1. INTRODUCTION .....	10
1.1. Context of the Project .....	10
1.2. Project Description.....	11
1.3. Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation.....	12
1.4. Evaluation Process .....	13
1.5. Evaluation Methods .....	13
1.6. Limitations .....	14
2. RELEVANCE.....	14
3. EFFICIENCY .....	18
4. EFFECTIVENESS.....	19
4.1. Challenges.....	30
5. IMPACT .....	32
6. SUSTAINABILITY .....	37
7. COORDINATION.....	39
8. Lessons Learnt .....	41
9. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	41
10. ANNEXES .....	45

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

AKPBS	Aga Khan Planning and Building Services
ADC	Austrian Development Cooperation
ADEO	Assistant District Education Officer
ADP	Annual Development Plan
CBDRM	Community Based Disaster Risk Management
CADR	Civil Alliance for Disaster Resilience
DCTE	Directorate of Curriculum and Teacher Education
DDMA	District Disaster Management Authority
DIPECHO	Disaster Preparedness ECHO
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DSE	Director School Education
E&SE	Elementary and Secondary Education
EC	European Commission
ECD	Early Childhood Development
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
EDO	Executive District Officer
EMIS	Education Management Information System
ERT	Emergency Response Teams
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
FATA	Federally Administered Tribal Areas
IDEA	Initiative for Development & Empowerment Axis
KAP	Knowledge Attitude Practice
KP	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
LEA	Law Enforcement Agencies
MOFE&PT	Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NDMA	National Disaster Management Authority
NDMP	National Disaster Management Plan
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organization
NOC	No Objection Certificate
PED	Provincial Education Department
PDMA	Provincial Disaster Management Authority
PEACE	Provincial Education Assessment Centre
PITE	Provincial Institute for Teacher Education
PMT	Provincial Master Trainers
PSSF	Pakistan School Safety Framework
PWG	Project Working Group
PTC	Parent Teacher Committee
RITE	Regional Institute of Teacher Education
RST	Review and Standardization of Tools
SBDRM	School Based Disaster Risk Management
SC	Steering Committee
SDM	School Disaster Management
SDMC	School Disaster Management Committee

SIP	School Improvement Plan
SMC	School Management Committee
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SOI	Specific Objective Indicator
SSP	School Safety Plan
STDP	A Safer Tomorrow – Institutionalizing disaster prepares in education
TOT	Training of Trainers
UDMC	Union Council Disaster Management Committee
UN	United Nations
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
VDMC	Village Disaster Management Committee
VDMP	Village Disaster Management Plan

**TABLES AND FIGURES**

Table 1-1: Project Results and Activities..... 12  
Table 4-2: Number of Clusters Covered by the Training by District and Gender..... 28  
Table 4-2 Number of Teachers Trained at Cluster Level in Each District ..... 28

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document presents the end of project evaluation of “A Safer Tomorrow - Institutionalizing Disaster Preparedness in the Education Sector.” The project was implemented by HOPE’87 in four districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP) province, including Chitral, Malakand, Nowshera and Peshawar. The project is co-funded by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid for Civil Protection (ECHO), YOU Foundation – Education for Children in Need, Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC) and HOPE’87. The project spanned 21 months, from April 1, 2015 to December 31, 2016, including a three months no-cost extension period.

The objective of this evaluation is to assess the project’s relevance, efficiency effectiveness, impact, sustainability and coordination. It is also expected to draw lessons learnt and recommendations that could be used to improve similar actions in future. The primary method used for evaluation was qualitative. The data collection methods used included a desk review, key informant interviews, group interviews, and observation visits, as well as on-site discussions with beneficiaries and staff, and informal discussions with the project staff. The fieldwork for the evaluation was conducted from 14<sup>th</sup> December to 25<sup>th</sup> December 2016.

## Key Findings and Conclusions

**The overall objective and specific objective of the project were relevant and consistent with each other.** The overall objective of the project, “to reduce vulnerability of rural and urban populations in Pakistan living in areas most affected by natural disasters by increasing preparedness and the response capacities of local communities and authorities to potential and frequent natural disasters” remains highly relevant. Pakistan is one of the most disaster-prone countries in the world, evidenced by a history of large-scale natural disasters over many years. The specific objective of the project i.e. “to strengthen the capacity of government institutions, vulnerable communities and schools in KP for addressing disaster risk in a sustainable manner through inclusive Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) and School Based Disaster Risk Management (SBDRM) methodologies” is consistent with the overall objective of the project.

**The project is also aligned with international and regional policy frameworks including the Sendai Framework and the UNISDR Safe School Initiative.** Increasing capacities to respond to multi-hazards is also in line with National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP) developed in 2013 by National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA). Even though the KP Government’s Road Map for disaster management lacks a sharp enough focus on school safety, particularly on the non-structural side, the project is broadly aligned with Provincial Disaster Management Authority’s (PDMA) priorities.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Road Map for Disaster Management 2014-19. Provincial Disaster Management Authority, Government of KP 2014. [http://www.pdma.gov.pk/sites/default/files/drm\\_road\\_map\\_2014-19.pdf](http://www.pdma.gov.pk/sites/default/files/drm_road_map_2014-19.pdf)

**This project, being a sequel of DIPECHO-funded 7<sup>th</sup> Action, was partly informed by the needs assessment carried out by HOPE'87 at the beginning of the 7th Action Plan and partly by HOPE'87's experience of implementing STDP II under 7<sup>th</sup> Action.** Key stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation e.g. officials of Education Department, District Master Trainers and school teachers confirmed the relevance of the interventions arguing that the areas where the project was implemented face multiple hazards and schools often bear the brunt of natural disasters.

**The efficiency of the project was significantly compromised by the non-availability of Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) and No Objection Certificates (NOC).** In the absence of these, implementing project activities proved to be extremely challenging, so much so that at the time of the Mid-Term Review, conducted in February 2016 only five percent of the programme cost was utilized, compared to 85 percent of the personnel cost, indicating the notable under-utilization of personnel time.

Against the target of training 48 officials of Education Department, the project trained 59 officials, including 22 female and 37 male officials from four target districts, including Peshawar. **The results of KAP survey and the qualitative data collected for the evaluation show that the project has contributed to increased knowledge and improved practices on SBDRM.** Education Managers are now better informed about different risks, vulnerabilities, building codes, drills for evacuation and different strategies that can be adopted in case of disasters.

**Ensuring the allocation of funds for proposed replication of SBDRM model in 25 districts under Project Cycle-1 (PC1) has remained a challenge, largely owing to shifting priorities in the Education Department,** which in turn is caused by transfer of senior staff. Although the PC1 for replication of SBDRM model is under consideration or approval, Education Department's priorities more tilted towards provision of missing physical facilities, such as classrooms, toilets, boundary walls.

The project identified a number of linkage points between SBDRM and CBDRM and proposed six models for vertical and horizontal integration of SBDRM and CBDRM under various conditions. The project also piloted three models for horizontal integration in a village context. While the efforts for integrations were well received at community level, **the absence of a legally sanctioned institutional framework at the village level and the de-facto absence of the Union Council Disaster Management Committees (UDMCs) at the UC level presents challenges that makes establishing linkages between CBDRM and SBDRM, although desirable, challenging.**

#### **Achievements Related to Result 1**

**The project improved the SBDRM model developed under STDP II and developed number of tools for implementation of SBDRM model.** The tools included training manuals for education managers, templates and guide notes for developing education sector provincial, district, school Disaster Risk Management (DRM) plans, Revision of

PTC guidebook (DRR Sensitive), PTC Awareness raising materials, literature review, study on testing linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM and Standard Operating procedures (SOPs) for schools on natural and man-made disasters.

**The project successfully replicated the SBDRM through the cascade training system.** At the provincial level, 23 Provincial Institute of Teacher Education (PITE) faculty members (17 men and six women) were trained as Provincial Master Trainers. They, in turn trained 81 District Master Trainers representing four districts (including Peshawar) and 59 (37 male and 22 female) District Education Managers from four three districts. The District Master Trainers then trained 1,892 teachers (1121 men and 771 women) in 121 different clusters spread over three districts using a two-day training manual: this manual was an abridged version of the five-day training module used for training District Level Master Trainers. The participants found the trainings to be relevant and useful. Key limitations of the trainings identified were limited practical exercises and a few challenges related to translation of the manuals in Urdu.

## **Achievements Related to Result 2**

**A number of civil society organizations and UN Agencies including UNICEF, UNESCO endorsed the model.** The model was also presented to networks like the Pakistan Coalition for Resilience, the Pakistan Humanitarian Forum (PHF) and Civil Alliance for Disaster Resilience (CADR) the National Humanitarian Network (NHN) endorsed the model. Pakistan School Safety Framework (PSSF), which, inter alia, drew on experiences of HOPE'87 and the SBDRM model, is endorsed at national level and once converted to policy, will be binding on all, including private schools.

The project also developed a number of useful documents in support of the SBDRM model including, but not limited to, a literature review on linkages, a study on linkages between CBDRM, and SBDRM, and an SBDRM advocacy strategy. The project also developed training manuals and useful templates with necessary guidance notes for developing provincial and district Education Sector Disaster Risk Management (DRM) plans. School Disaster Risk Management plans were also developed by the project (NDMA has included SDMP Plan template part of PSSF).

## **Other Achievements**

**Contributing to the development of PSSF and the establishment of a School Safety Network are two other important accomplishments of the project.** HOPE'87 provided technical assistance in the form of expert input to refine the draft PSSF, and also provided financial support to organize a national level consultative meeting on school safety organized under the aegis of NDMA. HOPE'87 and UNESCO (as co-leads) reactivated the school safety group, where UNICEF, NDMA, Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training (MoFE&PT), World Food Programme, Plan International and Save the Children are the members.



## **Impact**

**Increased sensitization of the Education Department at multiple levels is the most important impact of the project.** The increased sensitization is almost palpable, because the current action built on the gains made under STDP I and STDP II (in the case of Chitral, STDP I and II, and in the case of Malakand STDP II). At the provincial level, increased sensitization of the Education Department is also evidenced by the sustained support HOPE'87 received from the Education Department. The current project has contributed significantly to sensitizing the PITE on SBDRM. Having gone through a second cycle of training the Provincial Master Trainers appeared to be at ease with the SBDRM philosophy and approach. District Education Managers, District Master Trainers and teachers trained at the cluster level shared a number of examples that show they are more sensitized as a result of participating in SBDRM trainings.

There is sufficient evidence to suggest that some trained teachers shared SBDRM related messages with students and fellow teachers. In a few cases, they went beyond sharing information and conducted mock drills, developed school safety plans and displayed emergency contact numbers. There is some evidence of changes in practices as well, at both professional and personal levels. Changes in practice are somewhat more pronounced in Chitral. Reported changes included students' participation in school safety plans, identification of safe spaces in school, mock drills and displaying emergency contact numbers.

There is also some evidence of changes in personal lives, including examples of being cautious in handling potential hazards (e.g. boiling water and gas heaters) and constructing earthquake resistant structures. Increased confidence was reported as an important impact, particularly by District Master Trainers, who not only participated in SBDRM training, but also got opportunities to replicate the training at the cluster<sup>2</sup> level

## **Key Recommendations**

Cascade training model could be further strengthened by training school principals/head teachers on SBDRM, in addition to District Education Managers, District Master Trainers and school teachers. This would enhance ownership of the model at school level.

Keeping in view possible bias for allocation of resources for provision of missing facilities in the next Annual Development Plan Education, HOPE'87 should build on opportunities presented by construction of missing facilities. It should design an action that focuses on linkages between missing facilities and school safety, so that those missing facilities that maximize school safety are prioritized. It can also use missing facilities as an entry point, and then gradually spiral out to cover other areas of school safety.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cluster represents a group of schools. Education Department Divide schools a different cluster roughly around a High School. All the schools located with the catchment area of a high schools form one cluster. The high school is called cluster lead school.

The limitations of the cascade training can be addressed by the following strategies: 1) organize regular refresher trainings at each level; 2) organize experience sharing sessions at the cluster level for teachers, at the district level for District Master trainers, and at the provincial level for District Education Managers and Provincial Master Trainers. Developing a web-based training module on SBDRM can be another strategy.

HOPE'87 is aiming to convince the Independent Monitoring Unit (IMU) to include school-safety related indicators in the independent monitoring system established by the KP government to seek real time feedback on school performance. This is an excellent target. HOPE'87 should pursue this further.

A wider network for teachers trained in school safety should be also developed using social media such as Facebook, WhatsApp, Viber or any other appropriate platform.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

This report presents the end-of-project evaluation of “A Safer Tomorrow - Institutionalizing Disaster Preparedness in Education Sector.” The evaluation was commissioned by HOPE’87. The project was implemented by HOPE’87 in four districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK) Province: Chitral, Malakand, Peshawar and Nowshera. The project was funded by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO), with co-funding from the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC), YOU Foundation – Education for Children in Need and HOPE’87. The total budget for the project was € 629,333.00 of which € 472,000.00 (75%) was to be contributed by ECHO, €125,867.00 (20%) by ADC and € 31,466.00 (5%) by HOPE’87 and the YOU Foundation. The project was implemented from April 1, 2015 to December 31, 2016, including a three months no-cost extension period.

The agreed duration of the project was 18 months, from April 1, 2015 to September 30, 2016. Upon completion of the agreed duration, a three-months no-cost extension was granted, making the actual duration 21 months. The no-cost extension made it possible to complete some of the activities, which had been delayed owing to the lack of Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and No Objection Certificate (NOC) for HOPE’87.

The fieldwork for the evaluation was conducted from 14<sup>th</sup> December to 25<sup>th</sup> December 2016. Additional interviews were conducted in Islamabad and Peshawar during the last week of December 2017.

### **1.1. Context of the Project<sup>3</sup>**

In recent years, Pakistan has suffered a series of natural disasters, including the 2005 earthquake and major floods in 2010 and 2011. These calamities killed thousands and cost millions by destroying large-scale infrastructure, housing, livestock, agriculture, equipment, other assets and livelihoods. Since Pakistan is situated on major earthquake fault lines, the likelihood of similar tragedies in the future remains significant

The main causes of vulnerability to hazards in Pakistan include; poor quality of construction of housing stock, buildings and infrastructure (particularly rural), fragile natural environments, poor livestock and agricultural management practices, weak early warning systems, lack of awareness and education, and poverty. Lack of communications infrastructure and critical facilities further aggravate vulnerabilities of communities in post- disaster situations

Most of the rural schools in Pakistan are adobe/stone constructions, which are extremely vulnerable to hazards like earthquakes, floods and landslides. In Kashmir, Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), Gilgit-Baltistan (GB) and KP, many primary rural school buildings are piled stones without any reinforcement with minimal cement mortar. The indigenous practice of light-weight, timber-laced construction has given way to more

---

<sup>3</sup> Drawn from the ToR.

massive masonry and cement mortar construction which provide adequate protection against harsh weather but are susceptible to damages during earthquakes.

The frequency of natural disasters in Pakistan in general and Malakand, Chitral and Nowshera Districts in particular shows that there is an urgent need for disaster preparedness in the schools and communities. There is a need for training the communities and school children in rescue and relief operations, awareness creation in safety measures and other techniques to cope with disastrous situations in the future. The schools situated in these areas are also at great risk, as teachers, students and the communities are not trained to deal with the after-effects of disaster.

### **1.2. Project Description**

The project is effectively a sequel of the project implemented by HOPE'87 from April 2013 to December 2014, under DIPECHO 7<sup>th</sup> Action Plan. Under this project HOPE'87 had developed and pre-tested a model for institutionalizing School Based Disaster Risk Management (SBDRM). While the 7<sup>th</sup> Action involved four partners, for the current action ECHO awarded two contracts, one for SBDRM (implemented by HOPE'87) and the other for refining and implementing a model for Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction (CBDRM), implemented by CARE International. Additionally, it was expected that the two partners would work together to identify and test the potential linkages between CBDRM and SBDRM. Addition to the linkages study, the partners were also required to work through common approach to implement their projects at respective locations.

## **RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

The **principal objective** of the project was to reduce the vulnerability of rural and urban populations in Pakistan living in areas most affected by natural disasters and conflicts, by increasing the preparedness and the response capacities of local communities and authorities to potential and frequent threats.

The **specific objective was** to strengthen the capacity of government institutions, vulnerable communities and schools in KP for addressing disaster risks in a sustainable manner through inclusive CBDRM and SBDRM methodologies.

Indicators for the specific objective were:

1. # of targeted district and provincial education department officials with 70% increased knowledge and practice on school and community disaster management by the end of the action.
2. Amount of funds allocated for inclusive Education Department DRM plans through ADP 2015-16 and ADP 2016-17 by the project end.
3. # of districts in KP where SBDRM activities are replicated by the Education Department by the end of the project.
4. Elements of convergence between CBDRM and SBDRM are identified, tested and documented by the end of the action.

**Table 1-1: Project Results and Activities**

<b>Results</b>	<b>Activities</b>
<p><b>Result 1:</b> An improved inclusive SBDRM model with approaches and tools is institutionalized into the government workflow in a supportive environment in KPK province.</p>	<p>1.1. Revise and improve the SBDRM model for Pakistan to make it more accessible and aligned with DRR and development planning processes</p> <p>1.2. Review and update as well as develop a set of materials on SBDRM for use and field testing in KPK.</p> <p>1.3. Strengthen and streamline the role of the DRR steering committee for mainstreaming DRR in the education sector in KP.</p> <p>1.4. Rolling out and field testing the SBDRM package of materials through mentoring and coaching of Education Department officials in KP.</p> <p>1.5. Monitoring of school safety activities by the Education Department in KP.</p>
<p><b>Result 2:</b> Enhanced coordination, advocacy and awareness for inclusive and mutually reinforcing CBDRM and SBDRM at all levels.</p>	<p>2.1. Organize dialogue, advocacy, and consultation with national, provincial and district government and non-governmental stakeholders for raising awareness and capacity with regard to policy and strategy on DRM, using existing humanitarian advocacy forums or networks.</p> <p>2.2. Participation of DRM and education authorities staff (provincial and federal) in the policy dialogue and preparation of recommendations for integration of CBDRM and SBDRM in policies and frameworks.</p> <p>2.3. Test, study and document linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM, and strengthen the links between the two models.</p> <p>2.4. Document the learning of the project through publication and diffusion of lessons learnt and support materials.</p>

The project was intended to benefit a minimum of 323,154 individuals and 28 organizations belonging to government, NGOs, and public and private schools.

### **1.3. Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation**

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the project’s relevance, efficiency effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and coordination.

As per the Terms of Reference for the evaluation, the objective of the evaluation is to

“review the achievement of the project’s results and indicators, the short and medium term impact and the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation process to record lessons learnt and practical recommendations to improve future actions and to provide ECHO, ADC, YOU Foundation – Education for Children in Need and HOPE’87 with sufficient information to make an informed judgment about the past performance of the project. Moreover, the study is intended to assess project interventions and the project management structure and to make specific, actionable, and practical recommendations for improved programme and strategic actions and directions for similar actions in future.”

#### **1.4. Evaluation Process**

The process of evaluation began with an inception meeting with the Senior Management of HOPE’87 in Islamabad on December 2, 2016. It was followed by a desk review of project documents (see Annex 2). Fieldwork began on 14<sup>th</sup> December 2016 and was completed on 25<sup>th</sup> December 2016. It began with interviews in Peshawar on December 14, 2016 with a group of three Provincial Master Trainers (PMT) at the Provincial Institute of Teacher Education (PITE), representatives of the Provincial Disaster Management Authority (PDMA) and the Provincial Department of Education. On 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> December the evaluation team, comprising a lead consultant and a female field researcher, visited Malakand District and held interviews with District Education Managers, District Master Trainers, and teachers trained at the cluster. The team also visited 10 schools, in order to assess whether messages had been delivered to students. The same process was repeated in Nowshera District from December 20<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> 2016. Since Chitral was inaccessible owing to severe winter weather conditions, the fieldwork in Chitral was conducted by a consultant residing in Chitral, who had taken part in the final evaluation of STDP1.

The evaluation team also interviewed a representative of the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), one representative of Plan International, and two representatives of IDEA, the local implementing partner of Care International. A planned interview with a UNESCO representative had to be cancelled because of a clash with data collection activity in the field. The meeting could not be rescheduled. A follow-up meeting with the Country Director of HOPE’87, Director Operations and project team was held in January 2017.

#### **1.5. Evaluation Methods**

Qualitative methods were used for the evaluation. These comprised a review of secondary data, key informant interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), and observation visits, on-site discussions with beneficiaries and staff, and discussions with project staff.

Key documents reviewed included, inter alia, the project proposal, the School Based Disaster Risk Reduction (SBDRM) model, the budget, work plans, monthly progress reports, Project Working Group (PWG) meeting minutes, Pakistan SBDRM training manuals (5-days & 2-days) with handouts and power point presentations, Education

Managers Training Manual, a study on the linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM models, Mid-term review report, Knowledge Attitude Practice (KAP) Study report the exit strategy report and evaluation report of previous project.

The evaluation team explained the purpose of the evaluation to all the respondents they met, including school teachers, education managers, and district master trainers. They were informed that they were under no obligation to participate in the evaluation. They were also assured that there would not be any negative consequences if they chose not to participate.

### **1.6. Limitations**

- Girls' schools in Malakand could not be visited because it was Friday and schools closed early. Instead, three female teachers who had received training were interviewed at the District Education office.
- Expenditure reports were not available. These were being finalized at the time of writing this evaluation report.

## **2. RELEVANCE**

### Project Design

The overall objective of the project, “to reduce vulnerability of rural and urban populations in Pakistan living in areas most affected by natural disasters by increasing preparedness and the response capacities of local communities and authorities to potential and frequent natural disasters” remains highly relevant. Pakistan is one of the most disaster-prone countries in the world, evidenced by a history of large-scale natural disasters over many years. The specific objective of the project i.e. “to strengthen the capacity of government institutions, vulnerable communities and schools in KP for addressing disaster risk in a sustainable manner through inclusive CBDRM and SBDRM methodologies” is consistent with the overall objective of the project. The specific objective also includes a reference to CBDRM because this specific objective is the same as that of the Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) 2015 (DP/DRR) also because the project design included linkages with CBDRM model implemented by Care International. Also, because the project proposal was developed in close coordination with Care International.

The two results identified for the project are consistent with the specific objective of the project. The first result is related to the institutionalization of an improved model into the government workflow, and the second is related to enhanced coordination, advocacy and awareness for inclusive and mutually reinforcing CBDRM and SBRDM at all levels.

Focus on SBDRM is relevant because school safety in Pakistan does not receive sufficient attention, particularly regarding non-structural measures (measures which do

not involve physical construction<sup>4</sup>). As discussed below, lack of attention to school safety highlighted the limited focus given to school safety in the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP) developed by NDMA and the Road Map for Disaster Risk Management 2014-2019 developed by PDMA in KP. The relevance of the project was further increased because the project demonstrated a model for institutionalizing disaster risk management in the public education system in KP.

#### Relevance to national and regional policy frameworks

The project is in line with the priorities laid out in the Sendai Framework, a 15-year, voluntary, non-binding agreement adopted by United Nations (UN) Member States on 18 March 2015 at the Third UN World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai City, Miyagi Prefecture, Japan.<sup>5</sup> The project directly addressed one of the seven goals of the Sendai Framework i.e. “substantially reduce disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services, among them health and educational facilities, through developing their resilience by 2030.” The project also indirectly addressed other goals of the Sendai framework related to reducing global disaster mortality, reducing the number of affected people, reducing direct disaster economic loss and increasing the number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies. By promoting school safety through increased awareness and increased capacities in different tiers of the Education Department the project directly contributed to reducing the risk of disruption in educational facilities. The project also directly or indirectly addressed four priority areas of the Sendai Framework: 1) understanding risks, 2) strengthening disaster-risk governance, 3) investing in disaster risk reduction for resilience and 4) enhancing disaster preparedness for effective response and to “Build Back Better” in recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction. The project also reflects the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) Safe School Initiative, which recognizes school children, together with hospital patients, as the most vulnerable people in the times of disaster.<sup>6</sup>

Increasing capacities to respond to multiple hazards is also in line with the National Disaster Management Plan (NDMP) developed in 2013 by NDMA.<sup>7</sup> The planned interventions in the NDMP do not make direct reference to school safety or school based disaster risk reduction, but there is increased recognition on the part of NDMA about the importance of school safety: this is also reflected by the development of a Pakistan School Safety Framework (PSSF) for which HOPE’87 under the current action provided technical and financial support. The NDMA is piloting a school safety project in 68 public and private schools across Pakistan and intends to replicate this through PMDAs.

The KP government’s Road Map for Disaster Management 2014-2019<sup>8</sup> also identifies,

---

<sup>4</sup> Common non-structural measures include building codes, land-use planning laws and their enforcement, research and assessment, information resources and public awareness programmes.

<sup>5</sup> Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030.

[http://www.unisdr.org/files/43291\\_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf](http://www.unisdr.org/files/43291_sendaiframeworkfordrren.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.unisdr.org/we/campaign/wiss>

<sup>7</sup> NDMA Annual Report 2015. <http://www.ndma.gov.pk/publications/AR2015.pdf>. Accessed on January 11, 2013

<sup>8</sup> Road Map for Disaster Management 2014-19. Provincial Disaster Management Authority, Government of KP 2014.



inter alia, mainstreaming DRR into development planning and ‘public awareness, education and training as key priorities. However, like the NDMP 2015-2030 this road map does not show a clear focus on school safety, with the exception of structural measures. The document is critical of many awareness-raising activities and trainings conducted by NGOs in schools because, it is stated, these were not accompanied by structural measures. It also highlights a number of other gaps, such as inappropriate selection of audience, lack of TNAs and the low quality and consistency of the content. While this assessment of training appropriateness and quality may be correct, overall the Road Map betrays an institutional bias for structural measures for school safety. This highlights the relevance of HOPE’87’s approach to work with government. At the same time, it also reveals disconnect between the Education Department and the institutional priorities of PDMA, which is the owner of the road map for disaster management.

#### Relevance to Donor Priorities

The project conformed to ECHO’s priorities in Pakistan, as stated in its Humanitarian Implementation Plan for Pakistan, 2015: i.e. of consolidating the achievements of previous “Action Plans in rural settings for Community-Based and School-Based Disaster Preparedness and promoting institutionalization with a view to a broader resilience approach.” It was also aligned with ECHO’s expectation that partners would “promote a leading role of government services and civil society in the development and implementation of common “models” for DRR, while ensuring that neglected disaster prone areas and excluded population categories are involved in a fair and adequate manner.” In line with ECHO priorities, the project directly built on STDP II implemented by HOPE’87 between April 2013 and to December, 2014. Under STDP II, HOPE’87 developed a model for institutionalizing SBDRM in Education and piloted the model on a smaller scale in two districts of KP, Chitral and Malakand. During the current action HOPE’87 modified the model in light of lessons learnt, and implemented the model across three districts. The Action also addressed the priority of providing a leading role to government services by working through the Education Department. It also addressed the priority of focusing on neglected and disaster prone areas as the three Districts (Chitral, Malakand and Nowshera) are among the most disaster prone areas in KP.

The project also contributed to addressing the European Commission’s (EC) policy priorities for humanitarian assistance in 2015 for South Asia, which expressed the intent to “strengthen the resilience of the most vulnerable communities in disaster-prone areas and build the capacity of institutions involved in DRR, while promoting the replication of DRR models, which have proved to be effective and sustainable.”<sup>9</sup> The project addressed this priority by building the DRR capacities of the Education Department by working with the NDMA and PDMA to promote school safety through awareness and capacity building.

---

[http://www.pdma.gov.pk/sites/default/files/drm\\_road\\_map\\_2014-19.pdf](http://www.pdma.gov.pk/sites/default/files/drm_road_map_2014-19.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> ECHO, Commission Staff Working Document, General Guidelines for Operational Priorities on Humanitarian Aid in 2015. [http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/strategy/strategy\\_2015\\_en.pdf#view=fit](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/strategy/strategy_2015_en.pdf#view=fit)

The project is relevant to HOPE'87's mandate in Pakistan. HOPE'87 has been working in KP since the influx of Afghan refugees in 2002. Since then it has implemented a number of projects in different parts of KP, including areas affected by the 2005 earthquake and areas affected by internal conflict in recent years. School Safety is the main plank around which HOPE'87's Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy for Pakistan is constructed. Integrating DRR knowledge in relevant sections of school curricula and undertaking risk assessment, risk preparedness and implementing programmes to minimize the effects of disaster are key objectives of HOPE'87's Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy in Pakistan.<sup>10</sup> The most important School Safety project HOPE'87 has implemented in recent years is another DIPECHO-funded project, "A Safer Tomorrow - Institutionalizing disaster preparedness in education system (STDP-II), a 21 months long project, implemented under 7<sup>th</sup> DIPECHO Action. The action under review actually builds on the STDP-II.

#### Assessment and prioritization of needs and stakeholders' assessment

This project is an extension of the previous DIPECHO-funded action (7<sup>th</sup> action) implemented by HOPE'87. Therefore, the project design was informed by the needs identified during the 7<sup>th</sup> Action Plan and also shaped by the evolution of an understanding by HOPE'87 during the implementation of DIPECHO-funded on school safety (6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Actions plans). A formal needs assessment, which preceded the project implemented under the DIPECHO-funded 7<sup>th</sup> Action Plan, had highlighted that School Safety remained a neglected area. The assessment noted that although many schools were located in disaster prone areas, the level of schools' preparedness to respond to potential disasters was negligible.

Based on the lessons learnt from STDP II, the current Action addressed some of the gaps. One example was the lack of intensive engagement between the project and the Education Managers at the district level. This gap was addressed by training a cadre of Education Managers from the four districts. The project also benefited from a more comprehensive stakeholder analysis, carried out in 2015, to understand the structure and workings of the Provincial Education Department and to describe policies and programmes. However, HOPE'87's appreciation of needs, priorities and gaps is more clearly reflected in the project proposal than in the stakeholders' analysis report. However, the stakeholder analysis does provides a foundation on which to develop a deeper understanding about the structure and inner workings of the Education Department.

Discussions with various stakeholders during the evaluation highlight the relevance of the intervention. Stakeholders representing the PDMA, Education Department, PITE faculty members who were trained as Provincial Master Trainers, district-level Education Managers, and teachers of government schools who were trained as district level master trainers agreed that the project intervention with its focus on school-based DRM was highly relevant to the natural and man-made hazards in their districts. An Education Manager in Chitral echoed the views of these stakeholders saying that intervention was

---

<sup>10</sup> HOPE'87 Pakistan Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy, August 2012

highly relevant because “with the exception of a tsunami Chitral faces all kinds of natural hazards.”

### **3. EFFICIENCY**

The project’s efficiency was compromised by the failure to sign an Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and to grant No Objection Certificates (NOCs). According to the legal framework for International Non-Government Organizations adopted by the Government of Pakistan in 2013, international Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are required to seek clearance from several government departments at the Federal and Provincial levels to obtain an MOU. They are also required to obtain district-specific NOCs to implement projects in different district i.e. one per district. The process of obtaining MOUs has proven to be an extremely challenging process for many international NGOs, including HOPE’87 and Care International. Only a handful of international NGOs have been able to sign an MOU with the government since 2013. Even though HOPE’87 fulfilled all the requirements, the issue of receiving an MOU remains unresolved. HOPE’87, however, was able to obtain an NOC for Chitral in September 2015. NOCs for other districts were given intermittently: for two months in March 2016, for three months in June 2016 and again for two months in November 2016 and for one month in December, 2016.

In the absence of an MOU and an NOC, implementing project activities was extremely challenging. It greatly affected project activities, so much so that at the time of the Mid-Term Review conducted in February 2016, only five percent of the programme cost was utilized, compared to 85 percent of personnel costs. This indicates the notable underutilization of personnel time. Eventually, some of the activities were completed, many after considerable delay, but others were not.

The completed activities were

- Cascade training at provincial and district levels (trainings for Provincial Master Trainers, District Education Officers, District Master Trainers and teachers who were trained at the cluster level)
- Developed Education sector district & provincial DRM plans for each district (Malakand, Nowshera & Chitral, KPK)
- Developed SDMP & collected 1200 SDMPs from three districts.
- Developed education managers training Manual
- Pre & Post KAP study survey along with Training Needs Assessment for Education Managers
- Consultative workshop with DCTE for review of developed tools
- Parent Teacher Council (PTC) guidebook revision to make it DRR sensitive
- PTC awareness raising material
- PTC awareness raising workshop manual
- Developed MIS data base for all DRM plans
- Data punching of 1200 SDMPs through MIS data base
- Printing of SOPs booklet & dissemination to 28000 schools of KPK
- Literature review & typology for linkages between CBDRM and SBDRM by

- partners
- Design the study (methodology) for testing linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM
  - Test linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM
  - Consolidation of learnings and analysis of linkages tested in the field
  - Regional lessons learned workshop
  - Exit strategy workshop
  - Technical support by engaging international consultant for vetting of developed Pakistan School Safety Framework
  - DRR Steering Committee Meetings Developed
  - Case studies against identified stakeholders

The activities in the work plan, that could not implemented were:

- Orientation of District monitors/supervisors at IMU
- PTC/SMC trainings
- Integration of SDMP in school improvement plans

Expenditure report was not available for analysis

#### **4. EFFECTIVENESS**

The effectiveness of the project is examined against the objectives and results and associated indicators as provided in the Results Framework for the project.

**The specific objective is: “to strengthen the capacity of government institutions, vulnerable communities and schools in KP for addressing disaster risk in a sustainable manner through inclusive CBDRM and SBDRM methodologies”.**

Against the target of training 48 officials of Education Department, the project trained 59 officials, including 22 female and 37 male officials, representing District Education Departments in Chitral, Malakand, Nowshera and Peshawar.

The results of the KAP survey conducted by HOPE’87 for the project and the qualitative data collected for the evaluation show that the project contributed to increasing knowledge and improving practices on SBDRM. The results indicate that the project contributed to reducing a number of misconceptions related to SBDRM: e.g. Education Managers are better able to differentiate between hazards and disasters; there is greater appreciation of the role of human agency and the importance of PTCs as actors for SBDRM. One Education Manager said during an interview for the evaluation “earlier we thought disasters were God ordained, but after attending the training, our awareness has increased and we realize our actions have a big role in creating disasters”. Another Education Manager said that before the training, they did not know that PTCs should also be trained on SBDRM, but now they understand that involving PTCs is important.

For some, the training added to their existing knowledge; for others the trainings provided new knowledge. Two examples highlight this: one of the Education Managers interviewed for the evaluation said “our knowledge was equal to zero, but after the

training we learnt a lot and now we are in a position to take proactive steps to address issues related to SBDRM.” Another Education Manager said he already had a good idea about disaster management, but the training provided him additional details, new concepts and terms regarding SBDRM. Increased knowledge about the roles of different actors involved in SBDRM (e.g. NDMA and PDMA), and the role of different tiers of the Education Department in relation to SBDRM was also mentioned by Education Managers as a take away from the training. Respondents also confirmed receiving information and learning about different risks, vulnerability, building codes, drills for evacuation and different strategies their schools could adopt in case of disasters.

In terms of practices related to SBDRM, the Education Managers played two important roles after attending the training; 1) planning and organizing cluster trainings, and 2) monitoring the cluster trainings. In rare cases, they also followed-up with Principals to see whether the training was replicated at the school level by teachers trained at the cluster level. All male and female managers interviewed for the evaluation, except for the male managers in Malakand, confirmed taking part in planning and organizing cluster trainings. This involved identifying and assigning responsibilities to District Master Trainers in cluster trainings, selecting venues for cluster trainings, and notifying school heads about the training. Occasionally, they followed up with Principals and teachers to ensure high levels of attendance. The three male Education Managers interviewed in Malakand confirmed that the task of planning a cluster training was given to one Education Manager who then handled this responsibility alone. The results of the KAP survey also indicated that the most frequently cited practice related to SBDRM cited by the Education Managers was organizing cluster-level trainings. The other important practice cited by the Managers was monitoring. All the Education Managers took part in monitoring cluster trainings. This was also confirmed by the ten District level Master Trainers who conducted the training and some of the participants of the cluster trainings.

#### Specific Objective Indicator 2

##### Amount of funds allocated for inclusive ED DRM plans through ADP 2015-16 and ADP 2016-17 by the project end

The allocation of funds for replicating the SBDRM model has remained a challenge. HOPE’87 has also noted this as a challenge in its progress reports. During the current action, HOPE’87 provided technical assistance to the Department of Education for developing a Project Cycle-1 (PC1) for replication of the SBDRM model in 25 districts of the province. It is proposed to be added into the Annual Development Plan for 2016-17. The estimated cost of the replication of the model in 25 districts is PKR 56.507 million (€ 507,335). The Department of Education is also considering the option of seeking donor funding for replication of SBDRM model in 25 districts of provinces. The replication would involve using the SBDRM model, with all the tools developed during STDP II and STDP III. The Department will not only use the tools but also benefit from capacities developed by the project, particularly Provincial Master Trainers to train District Level Master Trainers.

However, this expectation appears to be challenged by shifting priorities in the

Department, according to HOPE'87, due to transfer of senior-level staff.<sup>11</sup> It appears from the discussions with a senior representative of Education Department that Departmental priorities for the upcoming budget are tilted more towards provision of missing facilities in schools. An additional challenge is that these missing facilities are not conceived in terms of school safety, though some may, by default, contribute to school safety, for example by construction of earthquake resistant structures.

### Specific Objective Indicator 3

# of districts in KPK where SBDRM activities are replicated by the education department by the end of the project

The Education Department, with the technical assistance of HOPE'87, replicated the SBDRM in four districts, including Chitral, Malakand, Peshawar and Nowshera. Replication of the model entailed refresher training of Provincial Master Trainers, training of District Education Managers, District Master Trainers through PITE provincial level master trainers (see Result 1, indicator 1.2 for details)

### Specific Objective Indicator 4

Elements of convergence between CBDRM and SBDRM are identified, tested and documented by the end of the action

The project successfully conducted a linkages study and identified elements of convergence between the CBDRM and SBDRM models developed by the ECHO partners under the 7<sup>th</sup> Action Plan and further refined under the current Action Plan. The linkages study noted a number of “truisms” that highlight the importance of locating school safety within the CBDRM context and also using schools as a catalyst for strengthening CBDRM. It also notes that despite these “truisms”, the literature on CBDRM appears to treat schools as different zones.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, in practice these linkages are not utilized.

The study offers examples of documents dealing with CBDRM that do not seem to take into account or even make reference to SBDRM. The Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Road Map For Disaster Risk Management 2014-2019, under the theme of “Community Resilience through CBDRM,” does not make reference to linkages with school-based disaster management<sup>13</sup>. The paper points out that even the CBDRM Model developed under the DP/DRR action (HIP 2015) did not make reference to SBDRM.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, the study

---

<sup>11</sup> Mid-term review report jointly developed by HOPE'87 and Care International. See section on challenges.

<sup>12</sup> Selby, David & Kagawa, Fumiyo ( 14 December, 2016).

*Linkages between School-based Disaster Risk Management and Community-based Disaster Management. Sustainability Frontiers.*

<sup>13</sup> Provincial Disaster Management Authority, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. 2014. *Road Map for Disaster Risk Management 2014-2019: Towards a Disaster Resilient Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Peshawar: PFMA.18-24.*

<sup>14</sup> Authors Unspecified. Undated. *Community Based Disaster Risk Management Model: Pakistan, cited in Selby, David & Kagawa, Fumiyo (14th December, 2016).*

*Linkages between School-based Disaster Risk Management and Community-based Disaster Management. Sustainability Frontiers.*

notes that a document developed by the German Society for Technical Cooperation (GIZ), titled “Linkages for Effective Disaster Management in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province”, recognizes children as agents of dissemination of information related to disasters, but does not mention school based disaster management.<sup>15</sup>

Based on review of a number of models, the linkages study also notes that more specific details regarding how school based disaster management is linked to community disaster management are scanty and lack depth. It notes that linking community based disaster management with schools often means including community representatives and parents or, in few cases, representatives of District Disaster Management Committees on School Disaster Management Committee, which indicates that these linkages are not strong.

Having identified gaps and limitations of the models, the study also identified a number of potential linkage points between SBDRM and CBDRM. These include the following:

- Creating structural links between community and school-based disaster risk management, by cross sectional representation of community in school disaster management committee and representation of school disaster management committee in Union Council Disaster Management Committee (UDMC).
- Linking school/community level disaster risk management to district and provincial levels by establishing communication and reporting mechanisms for exchange of information between communities and schools, on the one hand, and district and provincial authorities, on the other.
- Creating two-way communication, reporting and information flow by requiring village disaster management committees and school disaster management committees to share updates with each other through participation in the meetings, information bulletin boards and engaging children and youth for information dissemination.
- Aligning community and school based disaster risk management planning through joint risk assessment and planning, review of each other’s plans, cross-referencing of plans and alignment of implementation.
- Giving the community an active role in school based disaster risk management
- Establishing combined capacity building training for school and community disaster management teams and other stakeholders (including children) with a particular focus on linkages.

---

<sup>15</sup> GIZ. 2010. Linkages for Effective Disaster Management in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province. Islamabad: GIZ. 13, 20. Cited Selby, David & Kagawa, Fumiyo (14 December, 2016). Linkages between School-based Disaster Risk Management and Community-based Disaster Management. Sustainability Frontiers.

- Putting the school at the center of community/village disaster risk management by locating the local disaster management office there and/or housing the local disaster risk reduction resource center there along with the community/village disaster management archive.
- Creating opportunities for youth and children to use their under-acknowledged abilities and participate in community and school based disaster risk management as analyzers, designers/implementers, communicators, mobilizers and constructors of social networks.

The study also proposed six different models for integrating community and school based disaster management. The models propose different strategies for horizontal and vertical integration of community and school based disaster risk management. Of the six models, three are related to horizontal integration at village level between the village disaster management and school based disaster management. They offer strategies for horizontal integration at the village level based depending on following conditions:

1. A functioning village disaster management committee is ready to work with an active Parent Teacher Council that has not taken up the function of disaster risk management
2. There is a functioning village disaster management committee and an active Parent Teacher Council that has taken up of the function of school disaster risk management, but there is minimal or no integration.
3. Where there is an active PTC with developing disaster risk management function, but an established or flourishing VDMC is lacking

The fourth model deals with horizontal integration at a cluster level. This model is proposed for locations where cluster of schools and their communities are ready to work jointly in taking forward disaster risk management through their PTCs.

The fifth and sixth models deal with vertical integration. The fifth model proposes strategies for developing communication, coordination and support between district level and schools and villages for disaster risk management. The sixth model proposes linkages between provincial and district level as they seek to integrate disaster management processes with schools and villages.

The project also piloted the first three models that seek horizontal integration at village level in three UCs of district Nowshera. The study on linkages noted communities' reactions to the implementation of the models: i.e. there was general appreciation of the importance of developing linkages between SDMP and VDMP, but with certain caveats. The study acknowledged that without the support of government and NGOs, these linkages would not be sustainable. Lack of financial resources, limited time available to people to participate in activities related to linkages, and limited representation of young and more active community members in VMDCs were identified as key challenges, which could compromise the ability of VMDCs and PTCs to work together.



The study was quite useful in identifying potential linkages and proposing models for building those linkages, but two missing elements make establishing and sustaining these linkages challenging. Unlike a PTC, which is a permanent structure every school is required to have, there is no village-level committee mandated by law for disaster risk management. At the UC level, locally elected Union Councils are charged to establish and maintain a UDMC, but in practice these structures do not exist. Therefore, for piloting the models these structures were established by Care International and its local implementing partner IDEA, but in areas where such structures do not exist, developing linkages would not be possible.

## **Achievement of Results**

### **Result 1: An improved inclusive SBDRM model with approaches and tools is institutionalized into the government workflow in a supportive environment in KPK province**

Indicator 1.1: An improved and tested SBDRM model with supporting materials (tools and operational guidelines) for KPK available by the end of the action.

HOPE'87 had developed a SBDRM model under STDP II supported by DIPECHO 7<sup>th</sup> Action. Under the current action, HOPE'87 improved tools developed under previous action and also developed new tools. The tools developed under the previous action and further refined under the current action included:

1. Pakistan School Disaster Management Training Manual (2-days)
2. Pakistan School Disaster Management Training Handouts (2-days)
3. Pakistan School Disaster Management Training Manual (5-days)
4. Pakistan School Disaster Management Training Handouts (5-days)
5. Training Manual for District Education Managers (5- days)

The new tools developed under the current action were:

1. Power Point presentations (Pena flex) for 2-days
2. Power Point presentations (Pena flex) for 5-days
3. School Disaster Management Plan (SDMP)
4. District Education Sector Disaster Management Plan (DESDMP)
5. Provincial Education Sector Disaster Management Plan (PESDMP)
6. Parent Teacher Council (PTC) Guidebook (DRR sensitive – Revised)
7. PTC Awareness raising training Workshop Manual & Material
8. Literature Review on developing linkages between SBDRM & CBDRM
9. Typology on developing linkages between SBDRM & CBDRM
10. Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for schools on Natural & Man-made hazards
11. Pre & Post KAP survey form for Education Managers
12. Training Needs Assessment for Education Managers

The tools developed and tested under STDP-2 for master trainers and teachers were reviewed by Review and Standardization of Tools (RST) Working Group, comprising Directorate of Curriculum and Teacher Education (DCTE) and PITE officials, in a tools review workshop held on 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> February 2016. The tools were also reviewed by the Provincial Working Group of PDMA. Feedback was received from PDMA and was incorporated in the revised version.

As the list indicates, the tools included three training manuals. The five-day training manual was meant for training of Provincial Master Trainers (from the PITE faculty) and District Master Trainers. The five day training manual covered topics such as key ideas and concepts related to disaster management, setting up a School Disaster Management Committee (SDMC), understanding and conducting a risk assessment, developing a school disaster management plan, understanding standard operating procedures and mobilizing the school as a disaster management learning organization. The two-day training manual was meant for training teachers at the cluster level conducted by district level master trainers. This was an abridged version of the five-day training. The five-day training for Education Managers, in addition to covering topics such as key concepts, risk assessment, disaster management plans, role of PTCs and evacuation drills, also covered topics like district education sector disaster management planning, provincial education sector disaster management planning and linkages between disaster management at school, district and provincial levels.

The tools developed by HOPE'87 also included templates and guidance notes for developing both Provincial and District Education Sector Disaster Management Plans. However, these tools could have been more appropriately named to reflect the content. They provide detailed template and guidance for developing district level and provincial level education sector plans, but they do not contain plans. These tools have been provided to Provincial and District Education Departments. A two-day workshop on DRM plans was held at Peshawar in December 2016 for officials District Education Departments from the four districts. The participants representing target district filled the templates for District DRM plans during the workshop. During the workshop they also entered data in an online database developed by the project.

The project successfully revised the PTC guidebook to make it DRR sensitive. Throughout the guidebook, modifications have been made to include references to school safety and resilience. The vision and mission for the PTCs also include references to school safety and resilience. The PTC functions have also been revised to include needs assessment, design, implementation and monitoring of school based disaster management activities, with both structural and non-structural measures. Apart from incorporating references to school safety in existing responsibilities of the PTCs, a number of new responsibilities have been added. These include taking part in developing school disaster management plan and monitoring implementation of activities according to an eight-step process, including activities such as risk/hazard assessment, vulnerability and capacity assessment, evacuation drills, regular reviews of plan, determination and display of evacuation routes and emergency exit maps.

Accordingly, changes have also been made to other sections of the PTC guide book that relate to the composition and election of PTC members, rules of business, responsibilities of members, financial powers and procurement functions.

The project also developed a training manual for a half-a-day training and associated materials for PTC members. The training material, developed in Urdu, covers topics such as key concepts related to disaster management, implementation of the eight-step journey and the roles and responsibilities of PTCs related to disaster risk management. Although this material has been developed, it has not been used during the current action. This material can be used in future.

The project engaged reputed international consultants to conduct a high quality literature review on linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM. The consultants drew on extensive literature to describe the rationale for locating disaster management in communities, key features of CBDRM, features of SBDRM and linkages between both. It drew on extensive literature from the field of disaster management to describe role of children as agents of change in disaster risk management and proposed practical steps in deepening linkages between CBDRM and SBDM. The literature review then provided a sound basis for conducting the linkages study.

Tools developed by the project also included a Pre & Post KAP survey form for Education Managers, training Needs Assessment for Education Managers, and training material printed on Penaflex. The training material printed on the Penaflex was appreciated by District Master Trainers and cluster teachers alike. This allowed District Master Trainers to conduct the trainings at cluster level without having to rely on PowerPoint presentation.

Indicator 1.2: By the end of the action, PITE (at the provincial level) and DoE (at the district level) master trainers in KPK are able to replicate SBDRM training through the cascade method.

The project successfully replicated SBDRM trainings in the four target districts through the cascade training approach. Trainings were conducted at three levels: provincial, district and cluster levels.

#### Training of Provincial Master Trainers

At the provincial level the project conducted a refresher training for 23 faculty members representing PITE, including 17 male and six female faculty members. This training is referred to as refresher training because HOPE'87 had trained a cadre of PITE faculty under the previous action. The project successfully incorporated lessons learned from the previous action and used a revised training module that was more practical and appropriate for the context. During the earlier action, it was found that the training conducted by faculty members of the Center of Disaster Preparedness and Management was too technical and not suitable for the school environment. This time, the training was conducted by a senior staff member of HOPE'87. The training content was found to be

more suitable for the school context and relatively easily replicable at the district level.

Provincial Master Trainers interviewed for the evaluation found the training very useful. For those who had attended the training under the previous action, it was a useful refresher. Those who had not attended the previous training found it to be an excellent exposure. Of the three Provincial Master Trainers interviewed two had attended the previous training. They favorably compared this training with the one conducted previously (in 2014). They found it to be more practical and thought it would be replicable at the district level. They appreciated the knowledge, competence and teaching method of the trainer. However, they also pointed that despite the competence and knowledge of the trainer, it would have been better if more than one trainer were engaged in conducting the training. They added that even though a trainer was engaging and knowledgeable, still, stylistically it was a bit monotonous for participants and must have been extremely tiring for the trainer to conduct the training for five days.

#### Training of District Master Trainers

The Provincial Master Trainers in turn trained District level Master Trainers. In all, 81 district level master trainers from four districts were trained. The percentage breakup of master trainers from each district is given in **Table 4-1**. The largest category of teachers trained as masters trainers were Subject Specialist Teachers or SSTs (38.27%), followed by Physical Education Teachers (19.75%). They also included two Principals and two primary school Head Teachers. District Master Trainers from Chitral, Malakand and Nowshera were trained in July 2016, while those from Peshawar were trained in December 2016.

The District Master Trainers found the training to be very beneficial and relevant to their needs for information and planning. Those interviewed for the evaluation in the four districts confirmed that they learnt a great deal about SBDRM by attending the training. They mostly mentioned learning about different types of hazards, both man-made and natural: they learned about hazard mapping, identification of vulnerable places and safe places in schools, preparedness activities such as keeping emergency contacts, the eight-step process for SBDRM, evacuation drills, and emergency exits. A few Master Trainers also mentioned learning how to respond to a terrorist threat. For example, one of the Master Trainer from Nowshera said that they had learnt in the training that in case of a terrorist threat, they should try to buy time by engaging suspected attackers in a discussion, while in the meanwhile security agencies should be informed. Another Master Trainer from Nowshera said that the training helped them to expand their horizons and to think about different issues critically. Some participants also mentioned that having a diverse group representing the different districts was very useful in learning about each other's experience and challenges.

**Table 4-1: Number and Percentage of District Master Trainers by District**

<b>District</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Chitral	17	21
Malakand	17	21
Nowshera	18	22
Peshawar	29	36
Total	81	100

In terms of challenges related to the training, the most often cited issue were hot weather in Peshawar and load shedding during the training. They said it was very challenging to attend the training in extremely hot weather and said absence of a back-up generator added to their difficulties. They did understand that it was not originally planned to be held in July but had to be held then because of delays caused by the non-availability of the MoU. The District Master trainers appreciated the training methodology and said the training used participatory training methods, although some respondents also noted limited opportunities for practical exercises. They also appreciated the efforts of the Provincial Master Trainers in imparting the training. They said they were engaging, but they were not able to address some of the trainees' technical questions. However, this is understandable because the Provincial Master Trainers themselves had only attended a five-day training on disaster management, although for some it was the second training. Another challenge identified by the District Master Trainers was related to the Urdu translation of training material. They found some terms used in the training manual to be more difficult than the English equivalents. As examples, they mentioned two terms *Jadool* and *Goshwara* and said their English equivalents table of contents and table/template are more commonly used and understood than the Urdu term used in the Manual.

#### Cluster Training

District Master Trainers in Chitral, Malakand and Peshawar replicated the trainings at the cluster level. In all, 1,892 teachers from 121 clusters in the three districts were trained (**Table 4-2**).

The smaller number of trained teachers for Chitral partly reflects the geographical challenges because of which some cluster trainings could not be held in remote areas of Chitral, particularly upper Chitral. Chitral is geographically large, the population is small and clusters are spread over a large area. Therefore, it is not feasible for Master Trainers, particularly female trainers, to travel long distances to conduct trainings within minimal resources. It is also challenging for teachers to travel long distances to attend cluster trainings unless their transportation is covered.

**Table 4-1: Number of Clusters Covered by the Training by District and Gender**

Districts	Male	Female	Total and (%)
Chitral	22	9	31 (25)
Malakand	24	18	42 (33.8)
Nowshera	24	24	48 (39)
Total	70	51	121

**Table 4-2 Number of Teachers Trained at Cluster Level in Each District**

Districts	Male	Female	Total and (%)
Chitral	308	142	450 (23.8%)
Malakand	369	249	618 (32.7%)
Nowshera	444	380	824 (43.6%)
Total	1,121	771	1,892

'Cluster teachers' also found the training highly relevant to their needs because, according to a teacher, in recent years the frequency of disasters has increased considerably and vulnerable people like children and women suffer more when a disaster

strikes. They liked the topics covered by the training and also confirmed that the trainers used various methods such as presentations, group work, and group presentations. But like the District Master Trainers, the teachers trained at the cluster level also noted that the trainings did not have practical exercises or demonstrations.

Although the teachers said it would be better if the trainings had also included more hands-on practical exercises, all of the teachers interviewed for the evaluation appreciated the trainings and found them effective. One of the teachers who had attended a cluster training said the training “was very fruitful, and we learnt a lot in the two day session.” Another teacher said, “it was very effective and we can easily provide training to others”. A more interesting example of what he learnt in the training was provided by a teacher in Chitral, who said,

*“in one of the remote valleys of Chitral a flood emergency warning alarm went off when people were still in the mosque for prayer. The Imam of the mosque exhorted people not to leave the mosque, saying that if you get killed in the mosque by the flood, you will die a death of martyr. But as a result of the training I realized that Islam does not stop us from saving our own as well others’ lives”.*

Indicator 1.3 By the end of the project 3 inclusive district education DRM/contingency plans will have been developed by DoE with the support of relevant line departments

The project has developed a good quality template with appropriate guidance notes for developing inclusive district education DRM/contingency plans. The template has been reviewed and approved by RST Working Group. The DRM plans have been developed for the districts by engaging a consultant who provided guidance for developing the DRM plans. But the provincial DRM plans were not prepared. HOPE’87 intends to work with Education Management Information System (EMIS) to achieve this objective. Under the project 1200 schools developed SBDRM plans, but consolidating SBDRM plans and translating them into strategic information system remains a challenge.

Indicator 1.4: By the end of the project, DoE and planning cell in KPK have jointly worked for PC1 fund allocation and utilization for risk reduction activities

The project provided technical assistance to Department of Education to develop a PC1 for replication of the SBDRM model in 25 districts of the province. It is hoped that the government would set aside funds for replication of SBDRM model in the Annual Development Plan for the year 2016-17. However, it appears that later there has been a change in policy priorities within the Department of Education. There are indications that provision of missing facilities will be preferred over replication of model, an indication of preference for brick and mortar projects. However, this not finalized yet.

**Result 2: Enhanced coordination, advocacy and awareness for inclusive and mutually reinforcing CBDRM and SBDRM at all levels**

Indicator 2.1 Formal adoption of the CBDRM and SBDRM by # of key civil society organizations operating at national/ province level in Pakistan by the end of the project

A number of civil society organizations, including three international organizations, four international NGOs, four national NGOs, three private school chains and four networks have endorsed the model and committed to adopt the SBDRM model. International agencies which endorsed the model include UNICEF and UNESCO. The networks include the Pakistan Coalition for Resilience, Pakistan DRR Forum, the Pakistan Humanitarian Forum and the National Humanitarian Forum. Besides, Pakistan School Safety Framework (PSSF), which is informed by experience of HOPE'87 and the SBDRM model, once translated into policy will become binding on all schools, including private schools.

Indicator 2.2: Evidence is collected, documented, disseminated and advocated (case studies, advocacy material/workshops, exchange of lessons learned, linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM at national and regional levels (among South Asia ECHO/DRR Partners))

The project has produced a number of important documents. These include literature review on linkages between CBDRM and SBDRM, study on linkages between CBDRM and SBDRM, an advocacy strategy, joint action plan to implement the common project activities with partners, lessons shared in regional lessons learnt workshop, mid-term review that documents successes, challenges and lessons learnt. These documents were shared with ECHO.

Indicator 2.3 Recommendations (district, province, national level) arising from study/testing of linkages between CBDRM and SBDRM are incorporated into practice

A number of recommendations or, to be specific, six models have been proposed by the study on linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM. Of the six models, three have already been tested, leading to identification of opportunities and challenges for implementation. HOPE'87 has found that in the absence of sustainable VDMCs and UCDMCs it would be challenging to establish meaningful linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM. Apparently, this understanding was the reason why the proposed PC1 for replication of the SBDRM model does not include or foresee implementation of models proposed by the linkages study. The PC1 does not make a direct reference to linkages between CBDRM and SBDRM.

#### **4.1. Challenges**

The most important challenge the project faced was the lack of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and No-Objection Certificate. Even though the legal framework for International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) to operate in Pakistan came into force on 28<sup>th</sup> November 2013, only a handful of INGOs have been able to obtain MOUs. The ECHO partners have regularly updated ECHO about the uncertainty surrounding the process of signing MOUs. As for the issue of NOC, HOPE'87 was able to obtain a project NOC to operate in Chitral for six months. For other districts, NOCs

were granted intermittently, each time for a period of two months, with roughly a month break in between.

Change in departmental priorities of the KP Education Department presented another challenge. Sometimes Department priorities change when senior officials are transferred, requiring renewed advocacy efforts to promote a cause that had been accepted earlier. This is one of the reasons why allocation of funds for replicating SBDRM trainings in the budget for fiscal year 2017-2017 appears to be a challenge. As indicated by an official of Education Department interviewed for the evaluation, in the next fiscal year focus is more likely to be provision of missing physical infrastructure in the schools, indicating a deeply entrenched institutional bias for brick and mortar projects.

In the absence of institutional mechanisms for CBDRM at the village and UC levels, developing meaningful linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM was found to be challenging. In the context of the project, HOPE'87 and Care International were able to develop these linkages because Care International established VDMC and UCDMC. Unlike CBDRM, for which established institutional mechanisms do not exist at village level, the SBDRM model relies on well-established formal institutional structures from the provincial level down to the community level. PTCs, which link communities with the schools are legally sanctioned community institutions that exist on ground, active or dormant.

District Master Trainers as well as teachers who received cluster trainings find it challenging to reconcile what they teach in terms of school safety and objective conditions on the ground. For example, school safety would require less crowded schools and classrooms, but some of schools or certain classrooms within schools are overcrowded. Similarly, some of the schools are located in disaster prone areas. In fact, in Nowshera, some individuals interviewed for the evaluation pointed out an office block for District Education Department that is being built in a flood-prone area, a few metres away from the Kabul river. Master Trainers and teachers confided that they find it difficult to reconcile these contradictions.

One gap related to training methodology identified both by District Master Trainers and participants of cluster level training was lack of practical/demonstration exercises during the training.

Another challenge identified, again by both District Master Trainers and participants of cluster training, was the appropriateness (but not the quality) of translation. They observed that on the whole translation of training manual was good, but there were some translated terms which were more difficult than the English terms they replaced. As a way of example, they mentioned two such terms *Jadool (table of contents)* and *Goshwara (template)*.

One challenge that is particularly relevant to Chitral (also identified in previous evaluation report) is the insufficiency of government-mandated allowances for attending



trainings. This is because of the long distance between schools. Chitral is a geographically large district with a widely-dispersed small population. Travel time from central Chitral to some of the remote areas is as long as 12 hours. Therefore, it is also challenging for teachers to travel long distances to attend cluster trainings unless their transportation costs are covered or in some cases accommodation is arranged and paid for.

Under the current project 1200 schools in the target districts developed SBDRM plans. But challenge remains as to how the mainly descriptive information contained in the SBDRM plans can be translated into a form that can be used for decision-making. Consolidation is particularly challenging because the SBDRM plans contain mostly descriptive information. A more quantitative tool would make it easier to transform SBDRM plans into strategic information to support decision-making.

Limited donor support for school safety or school based disaster risk reduction is another challenge identified by HOPE'87 team.

## **5. IMPACT**

Increased sensitization and awareness of the Education Department at multiple levels is arguably the most important impact of the project. Increased sensitization is almost palpable because the current action built on the gains made under STDP II, and in Chitral, under the STDP I and STDP II.

A notable example of evidence of increased sensitization of Education Department was provided by a representative of Care International's local implementing partner, IDEA, when he was interviewed for the evaluation. He said that during the course of implementing the CBDRM model, they worked with and trained a cross section of government departments in KP, including the Communication and Works, Health, Livestock, Agriculture, and Education Departments. He said they found that of the many government departments, the Education Department was the one aware of disaster risk reduction. He found that the Education Department was more receptive to trainings and ideas and it was easy to communicate with them regarding DRR, adding that terms and concepts related to DRR were somewhat alien for staff of other departments. However, it is important to put this evidence into perspective. This might not be true for all the staff of members of the Education Department, but may be true for those staff members of the Education Department who have been directly or indirectly exposed to SBDRM. Even then, the evidence provided by IDEA is important.

At the provincial level, increased sensitization of the Education Department is also evidenced by the sustained support HOPE'87 received from the Education Department. According to a representative of the provincial Education Department, HOPE'87 is the only agency with whom they have signed a permanent MoU (not be confused with MoU with interior Ministry), while others operate with time-bound NOCs. He said the Department considers HOPE'87 a major stakeholder because of their continuous support for promoting school safety.

The continuity of the DRR Steering Committee established under STDP II is more

evidence of the results of the sensitization of the provincial Education Department. According to an Education Department representative, there is a high level of appreciation of the tools and documents produced by HOPE'87. He offered as evidence the fact that the documents produced by HOPE'87 had been carefully vetted at multiple levels within the Department and had been approved.

The current project has significantly contributed to sensitizing PITE<sup>16</sup> on SBDRM. Having gone through second cycle of training of masters' trainers on SBDRM and then replicating the trainings at district level, PITE faculty members who are trained as Provincial Master Trainers appeared to be well-informed on the philosophy and practice of SBDRM. They have also incorporated DRR topic in the Early Childhood Development (ECD) syllabus, an indication that DRR is being mainstreamed and institutionalized in PITE. The Provincial Master Trainers interviewed for the evaluation confirmed that they also share information related SBDRM with their colleagues and with their trainee teachers in their regular courses, although not in a structured manner.

HOPE'87 has effectively incorporated a lesson learnt from STDP II and is now more intensively engaged with District Education Departments. As a result, the District Education Departments are better informed about the SBDRM model. Education Managers interviewed for the evaluation confirmed that their knowledge about SBDRM had significantly increased and some of their misconceptions about hazards and risks had been corrected. One Education Manager in Malakand told the evaluation team that, during floods, they are assigned to emergency duties on behalf of District Administration. They had been engaged in emergency duties previously, but now had a better understanding of what to do, and how their local efforts contributed to the protection of the communities in emergencies. This has motivated them to work even harder. Another Education Manager spoke of behavior change and said he thought he and his colleagues had become more responsible after the training. They now discuss strategies for making education institutions safer. A District Master Trainer echoed the Education Managers' response, saying that he has realized that the District Education Department has become aware of the need for school safety.

One of the District Master Trainers in Malakand had this to say: *"I have taught for 22 years but I had not thought about what would happen if a disaster strikes. Attending the training made me aware (yea shaoor uजार huwa), so much so that I lecture every class in my school about school safety."* In his opinion this sensitization was the most significant achievement of the training. Another Master Trainer identified a greater sense of professional responsibility as a significant outcome of the trainings – he and others now realize that their duties extend beyond teaching course book to being responsible for the children's safety.

Teachers trained at the cluster level (one per school in the cluster) in all three Districts LSO indicated to the evaluation team that they valued the SBDRM training and now feel

---

<sup>16</sup> PITE is an important arm of the Education Department and works as the lead agency for training teachers and Education Managers.

more knowledgeable about what to do if disaster strikes. A teacher in Chitral said that a tremor would terrify him and he would “run like a mad person, without thinking about where to go or without thinking about other people”, adding that “now I can behave more sensibly and evacuate to a safe place and help other people as well.”

There is some evidence of increased awareness and knowledge among students of those target schools where the District Master Trainers or teachers had shared information with them. However, relatively speaking, the students in Chitral appeared to be more aware about SBDRM: this appears to be the result of sustained engagement between HOPE’87 and schools in Chitral. The students typically recalled messages about finding a safe place if they felt an earthquake; the importance of orderly and systematic evacuation; leaving the building immediately (if possible) or taking shelter under sturdy furniture (in case quick evacuation as not possible), the importance of having doors that open outside and the need to walk rather than run.

Changes in Professional Practice There is some evidence of changes in practices as well, at both professional and personal levels. These reported during interviews appear somewhat more pronounced in Chitral, apparently an indication of sustained engagement by HOPE’87 with the Education Department and schools in Chitral. District Master Trainers from Chitral shared a number of concrete examples of change in practices. For example, one of the Master Trainer said that during a Scouts and Girls Guide gathering, she carried out a practical demonstration of safety during an earthquake. One Master Trainer said his school had developed a school safety plan and charts on disaster management. Another said that after the training she had ensured that all the schools in her cluster have emergency contact numbers, including those of the hospital and police. She makes sure that students know where to run in case of an earthquake. Several Master Trainers told the evaluation team that they use different opportunities to discuss DRR topics in their classes when there is an earthquake or another event. Sometimes the Master Trainers and trained teacher use the students’ Assembly or gatherings like *Bazme Adab* (literary gathering) sessions to discuss concepts of SBDRM.

One of the best examples of impact presented by any school visited by the evaluation team was GGHS Muldeh, Chitral where students of 8<sup>th</sup> grade said they had participated in the development of a school safety plan and a mock drill. Their school also has a hazard map. They said that the most dangerous risk they face is an earthquake. They said, earlier they did not know how to cope with an earthquake situation. After the training they have learnt that they should not panic and should evacuate to a safe place in an orderly manner. They have selected a class leader to help evacuate the class in case of an earthquake. Although some students in Nowshera and Malakand confirmed receiving information and recalled some messages, their experience was not close to that experienced by the 8<sup>th</sup> grade students in Muleh, Chitral.

Another notable example of dedication and learning and commitment to pass on his learning to others is that of a teacher from G.H.S Mughulai in Nowshera, who, instead of going to every class to share information with students, arranged a fifty minute, formal information-sharing session for his fellow teachers. He even arranged light refreshments,

paid for from his own pocket, to maintain a semblance of formality. He said he did this because he is interested in the subject of school safety, which he had developed after reading a training manual developed by UNICEF, given to him by a friend. Attending the training increased his interest further and he decided to 'multiply the benefit' by sharing information with his fellow teachers. He thought the other teachers would share information with their classes, and they had done so. He taught his 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> class students what he had learnt about school safety.

There is sufficient evidence collected during the evaluation visits and interviews with students, trained teachers and their colleagues that some teachers trained at the cluster level have tried to share information with students and teachers. In a few cases, they have gone beyond sharing information and have conducted mock drills, developed school safety plans and displayed emergency contact numbers. In nine of the 12 schools covered by the evaluation, teachers said they had shared what they had learnt with their students. Where possible these claims were verified. The three exceptions were in Nowshera: G.H.S.S, Missiri Banda, Nowshera G.H.S.S. No 1 and G.H.S.S Thana 2. However, students in three girls' schools visited in Nowshera confirmed receiving information from teachers. In Malakand, this claim could not be confirmed with students because school visits could not be arranged. In Chitral students in boys' and girls' schools confirmed receiving disaster preparedness information from their teachers. Female teachers in Malakand, Nowshera and Chitral said that they had shared information with their fellow teachers. Only three male teachers interviewed for the evaluation had not share information with their colleagues because, according to them, they did not find time to do so.

#### Changes in personal practice

Increased awareness and knowledge about DRR has also impacted the personal lives of teachers, Master Trainers, Education Managers and Provincial Master Trainers. A Provincial Master Trainer at PITE and a District Master Trainer in Malakand shared a similar experience. Before they attended the training, it was common practice to boil water in a metal pan and carry it to washroom. After the training they became more sensitive about the dangers and instructed their family members to carry the hot water in a plastic bucket. Another example concerns a female teacher in Chitral, who now keeps an emergency light close by at night in case an emergency arises. One male Education Manager and one female teacher from Chitral explained that they were constructing their houses. Equipped with a new understanding about safety, they are taking all possible precautions to make the construction safer. One of them said that he chose a safe construction site and was using strong iron rods for constructing pillars. An Education Manager from Chitral also said that he has become more conscious about safe construction. He said that prior to the training they would only dig 12 inches deep to lay the foundation, but now they dig deeper foundations and some also use concrete pillars. Another teacher said they also advise other people about safe construction.

#### Increased confidence

Increased confidence, particularly among District Master Trainers, is an important impact of the training. One of the Master Trainers in Nowshera told the evaluation team that

because he had been given the opportunity to conduct multiple trainings at the cluster level, his confidence has considerably improved. Initially he was hesitant to do the trainings because his only experience was teaching students. Conducting a training for teachers, some of whom were as or more qualified as himself was daunting especially when he had to do this in the presence of an Education Manager. But with each training, he said, his confidence improved, with the result that now he can stand up anywhere to deliver a lecture. His experience is reflective of the experience of some other District Master Trainers, who counted increased confidence as an impact of the trainings. A District Master Trainer from Chitral said that after the training he felt more responsible and was confident that he could contribute a lot to disaster management activities. He was sure that if the government were to include disaster management as a syllabus, he could train all the relevant teachers. Increased confidence among Master Trainers was also noted by several District Education Managers. One Education Manager told the evaluation team that “initially [the District Master Trainers] were a bit nervous, but gradually they gained confidence and got better with each training”. Another Education Manager said that District Master Trainers “sound more confident now. If disaster management is included in the syllabus, they can easily deliver lectures on disaster management and school safety”.

#### Broader Impact

There is strong evidence that the development of the Pakistan School Safety Framework has benefited from the experience and expertise of HOPE’87. The representative of NDMA interviewed for the evaluation confirmed that the NDMA had greatly benefited from the hands-on experience of HOPE’87 on school safety projects. She also confirmed that while preparing the PSSF document they referred to and made use of various materials and tools developed by HOPE’87. She also confirmed that the expert comments and feedback provided by HOPE’87 contributed to improving the quality of the PSSF document. NDMA is currently piloting PSSF in the 68 schools around Pakistan. Thus HOPE’87 and STDP III can justifiably claim a role in the success of PSSF.

Endorsement and adoption of model by civil society organization is another immediate impact of the project, though it is yet to be seen to what extent they actually use the model in practice. There is at least one example of an organization using the model. According to a representative of IDEA interviewed for the evaluation, through participation in the project activities in Nowshera with HOPE’87, IDEA has learnt about SBDRM the model and its linkages with CBDRM. He noted that, based on the learning from the project, IDEA is attempting to mainstream SBDRM and CBDRM in a health project in Bannu District. IDEA has benefitted from the tools developed by the project. Building on their experience from this project, they have also proposed a project to a donor that aims to integrate CBDRM and SBDRM.

An example of the impact of the linkages study was shared by the representative of IDEA: in Aman Ghar a VDMC established by the project advocated the construction of a flood protection wall to prevent a local school from flood damage during the rainy season. Usually the school would close because the stream would overflow and flood the way to the school. He explained that the head of the VDMC used his personal linkages

with the Chief Minister of the Province to obtain a grant of PKR 70 million (€ 628,478) for the construction of a protection wall. He concluded that if the VDMC had not been sensitized about SBDRM, they would probably have sought a grant for another project, instead of opting for school safety.

## **6. SUSTAINABILITY**

Sustainability has been the primary concern of the projects implemented by HOPE'87 with the ECHO funding, particularly the current and previous actions (STDP II and STDP III). The projects have aimed to institutionalize a model for school safety, which in other words means to make school safety 'the new normal' in schools within KP. Under the current action, HOPE'87 further refined the SBDRM tools developed under STDP II and developing new ones to implement the model. The current action also involved successful replication of the model, tested on a smaller scale during STDPII, on a larger scale, to assess its potential for even larger replication efforts.

The existence of a model with its associated tools for project implementation is one aspect of sustainability. An equally important aspect is the capacities developed in the different tiers of the Education Department, beginning with the Provincial Education Department at the top, down to the school level. At each level, through sustained engagement and trainings a cadre of trained professionals (both men and women) has been developed. These people are knowledgeable about the model and tools and have the skills and attitudes needed to implement the model. However it would be unrealistic to assume that all of those who are trained would be equally knowledgeable, skillful and committed. Still, after discounting for those less-committed individuals, HOPE'87 through a sustained action has created a cadre of supporters who can take the model forward, so long as a supportive policy environment is provided.

Ownership of the model at different levels of the Provincial Education Department is another assurance of sustainability. The Provincial Education Department considers HOPE'87 to be a trusted partner; it is the only partner with which they have signed a permanent MoU. The Provincial Education Department also recognizes the importance of the model and its various implementation tools developed by HOPE'87 under STDP III project. PITE has taken an important step towards mainstreaming school safety elements by including DRR in their curriculum for Early Childhood Development (ECD) trainings. Unlike the period when STDP II was implemented, the District Education Departments are fully on board and supportive of actions related to school safety. District Master Trainers now have increased technical capacities at the cluster level and the fact that teachers received cluster level training ensures the presence of technical capacity in every school in the district or at least in all the schools that benefited from cluster level training.

However, significant missing piece in the puzzle appears to be the lack of training principals and head teachers and PTC members. Training school principals/head teachers and PTC members could significantly improve ownership of SBDRM model that could indirectly contribute to sustainability of the model. This can potentially be addressed in a future action.

There is significant evidence to suggest that HOPE'87's sustained engagement with the Education Department and schools for institutionalizing SBDRM has produced positive results. However, it must be noted that there are qualitative differences in sensitization on SBDRM between Chitral and other project districts. Even though there is a significant increase in awareness about SBDRM in Malakand and Nowshera, more concrete examples of changes in practice were provided in Chitral. One example is the use of PTC funds, to change the orientation of doors in one the schools in Chitral. Another is of a female District Master Trainer who ensured that all the schools she trained as part of cluster trainings have emergency telephone numbers. Selecting one leader per class to facilitate smooth evacuation is yet another example of institutionalizing safe evacuation. As noted earlier, Education Managers, District Master Trainers and teachers trained at the cluster level in Chitral were able to share more concrete examples of changes in practice in their personal lives. This is not to deprecate the achievements made in other districts, but the qualitative difference shows that a sustained engagement is necessary to bring about positive changes in the longer term.

HOPE'87 has developed a model and the tools necessary for replication. However, a key test for the institutionalization of school safety would be the allocation of funds for the PC1 which proposes replication of the model in 25 districts of KP. It is hoped that funds for replication will be allocated in the budget for 2017-18. The PC1 to be successful will have to overcome a deeply entrenched institutional bias for provision of physical facilities. Interview with a representative of Education Department suggests that despite significant sensitization on SBDRM, on balance, institutional support remains tilted in favour of brick and mortar projects. Having said that focus of Education Department on provision of missing facilities also offers many opportunities. At least in those districts where the District Education Departments and schools have been sensitized, a different way of prioritizing missing facilities that focuses on school safety can be expected. This also presents opportunities for interventions that may be centered around missing facilities such as classroom, toilets, boundary walls, but then gradually spirals out to address other aspects of school safety. This also offers opportunities for advocacy to promote the "safety first angle" in the provision of missing facilities.

HOPE'87's efforts to promote school safety at the national level by engaging with various stakeholders contribute to sustainability of results. HOPE'87's technical support to NDMA was important in developing the PSSF, which is being tested at the national level. Successful implementation of PSSF can re-enforce the institutionalization of SBDRM at the provincial level, as NDMA would push the agenda for school safety through the PDMAs. Even though the project has engaged with PDMA in KP and PDMA took part in monitoring trainings, the policy framework that governs PDMA's work does not reflect a strong focus on school safety, particularly on non-structural measures. A policy push from the centre can influence PDMA's policy framework, can potentially bring the Education Department and PDMA onto the same page with respect to school safety. HOPE'87, together with UNESCO, UNICEF and Plan International has also been instrumental in establishing a national-level School Safety Working Group to promote a school safety agenda. This again will contribute to create an enabling environment at the national and provincial levels for school safety.

## **7. COORDINATION**

The basic premise of the project was to institutionalize SBDRM in KP's Education Department. Therefore, coordination with different tiers of Education Department was crucial. HOPE'87 had already developed strong linkages with the Provincial Education Department and the District Education Departments in Malakand and Chitral during the implementation of STDP II. During the action under review HOPE'87 further strengthened these relationships. HOPE'87 is seen by the Provincial Education Department as one of its most trusted partners. According to an official of the Education Department they consider HOPE'87 as the most trusted agency, and it is the only agency with which they have signed a permanent MoU. According to him HOPE'87 has earned the trust through its sustained efforts over the past years to promote school safety. Additional evidence of the value of strong linkages and coordination with the Provincial Education Department is that when SHED Pakistan, a national NGO, approached the Education Department seeking collaboration, the Education Department issued a NOC, categorically asked SHED Pakistan coordinate their work with HOPE'87.

HOPE'87 also strengthened its previously-established linkages with District Education Departments. During the previous action the Education Department had provided support in organizing the trainings mainly because of directives from the Provincial Education Department. At that time, there was no serious buy-in from District Education Departments, which was reflected in limited participation of the District Education Departments in monitoring activities. They had also expressed concerns about not being included in the planning process. During the current action District Education Managers were also trained and sensitized on SBDRM. As a result, when they returned to their Districts, they actively participated in planning cluster level trainings and systemically monitored clustered trainings.

The project also participated in the national level UNICEF and United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs's (UNOCHA) Education Cluster meetings to discuss and draft ToRs for the Cluster and develop a work plan for National Humanitarian Action.

HOPE'87's coordination with CARE International can be characterized as strong. This was possible because from the very beginning (May 2015) a formal coordination mechanism was put in place in the form of a PWG. The purpose was to ensure a high level of coordination and communication in order to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the projects implemented by ECHO partners. This was particularly important, because some of the activities were jointly planned and implemented, and also because both HOPE'87 and Care International implemented project activities in Nowshera to explore the linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM.

PWG meetings were attended by senior project staff representing HOPE'87, Care International and IDEA, CARE International's local implementing partner in Nowshera. ECHO representatives also attended some of those meetings. PGW meetings were held on an 'as needed' basis. According to project staff representing HOPE'87 and IDEA, the



PWG meetings were successful in ensuring a high level of effective coordination. Meeting minutes also indicate that the participants were able to discuss progress, identify and address issues and plan joint activities. In addition, the MEAL Working Group was formed with the specific agenda to carry out the mid-term project review. The TORs for the mid-term review were jointly developed by the partners and approved by ECHO. Subsequently the mid-term review was conducted by the Meal Working Group.

In addition HOPE'87 worked with the NDMA, PDMA, UNICEF, British Council, Plan International and UNESCO. Collaboration with NDMA centered on PSSF (initially referred to as Pakistan School Based Disaster Risk Management), developed by NDMA with the assistance of UNICEF, the British Council and HOPE'87. HOPE'87 was invited by NDMA to take part in the development of the PSSF as technical partner, according to a senior NDMA representative, "because of its proven experience in school safety". HOPE'87 provided both technical and financial assistance to NDMA for the development of the PSSF. That included "high quality" input to refine the PSSF document. NDMA also used HOPE'87's SBDRM model and associated tools and documents as reference for the preparation of the PSSF. HOPE'87 also provided financial support to hire an expert facilitator for a national level consultation on school safety held in Islamabad on 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> August 2016.<sup>17</sup>

Another notable initiative HOPE'87 has been part of, under the current action, is a school safety forum. HOPE'87 and UNESCO (as co leads), together with UNICEF, MoFE&PT, WFP and Plan International have reactivated the School Safety Forum in 2016. The forum is intended to promote the agenda of school safety in Pakistan. The NDMA and the Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training have been entrusted with the task of leading and sustaining the Forum. This is indicative of HOPE'87's efforts to promote school safety at both the provincial and national levels. It is clear from interactions during the evaluation that HOPE'87 is keenly aware that creating a culture of school safety or institutionalizing school requires multi-pronged action.

HOPE'87 also took an active part in the 13<sup>th</sup> Regional Consultative Committee (RCC) meeting held in Islamabad from 17<sup>th</sup> -19<sup>th</sup> October 2016. The meeting, chaired by NDMA in collaboration with the Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC) was held to share progress made by member countries in implementing the Sendai Framework in its first year and to identify challenges faced. It also aimed to operationalize global frameworks for risk-resilient development in Asia. It was in this context that NDMA, with the assistance of UNICEF, the British Council and HOPE'87, developed the PSSF. The HOPE'87 team attended the meeting and shared their learning and experiences with the participants.

---

<sup>17</sup> The consultation meeting was attended by many key stakeholders, including PDMA's from each province, Communication and Works Departments, Education Department, LEA, and private schools. to list a few

## **8. Lessons Learnt**

One of the most important lessons learnt, highlighted by the project's experience in Chitral, is that sustained engagement is key for bringing about positive change. Compared to other districts, where increased sensitization was visible, in Chitral change was explained in concrete terms and with concrete examples. This is also highlighted by the increased confidence and increased 'ownership' of the training among PITE faculty members who were trained as Provincial Master Trainers during the previous and current actions.

The experience of the District Master Trainers shows that the effectiveness of training is increased if it is combined with opportunities to apply the training in practice, especially when targets are clearly set and performance is monitored.

It has been found through experience that a cascade-training approach leads to some knowledge loss at each stage, with the result that the messages are diluted by the time reach the ultimate intended audience i.e. in this case students.

Institutional motivations for adopting innovations, individual commitment and competence play an important role in determining who receive the messages, and how training messages are received, understood and imparted to others. In a few cases during the evaluation, Principals/Head Teachers and District Education Managers were not aware of the purpose of the training at the time of selecting and recommending teachers for training. Therefore, in some cases instead of selecting the most competent or suitable teachers for the training, they selected teachers who had more free time or were less busy. A clear articulation and understanding of purpose, needs and skills can help to select the best candidates for the trainings.

Motivation of District Master Trainers and teachers trained at cluster level can be enhanced by offering non-monetary incentives, as simple as a bag, jacket or a cap emblazoned with an appropriate title such as Master Trainer. Another incentive can be a Certificate that recognizes their participation in the training. Demand for a Certificate among District Master Trainers was pervasive: it is perceived as a useful tool to benefit from potential job opportunities, pre or post-retirement.

## **9. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The cascade training model could be further strengthened, if in addition to district-level Education Managers, District Master Trainers and school teachers, Principals/Head Teachers were also trained on SBDRM. This would increase ownership of the model at the school level by bringing Principals and Head Teachers on board.

Stronger advocacy efforts are needed to align the policy directions of the PDMA, as reflected in its policy document Road Map for Disaster Management 2014-19<sup>18</sup>, with the

---

<sup>18</sup> Road Map for Disaster Management 2014-19. Provincial Disaster Management Authority, Government of KP 2014. [http://www.pdma.gov.pk/sites/default/files/drm\\_road\\_map\\_2014-19.pdf](http://www.pdma.gov.pk/sites/default/files/drm_road_map_2014-19.pdf)

agenda for school safety. Although the project directly engaged with the PDMA and PDMA representatives also took part in monitoring activities, the policy priorities do not reflect a strong enough focus on school safety. Even when this is mentioned, it is only in terms of physical infrastructural measures.

Discussion with the representatives of Provincial Education indicates a strong bias in favor of replacing missing facilities (classrooms, toilets, and boundary walls) possibly to the detriment of the proposed PC1 for replication of SBDRM. However more of a likely scenario than a foregone conclusion. But it should be taken into account while preparing for future action. One way is to focus on potential opportunities that might arise if the focus remains on providing missing facilities to the exclusion of replicating the SBDRM model. HOPE'87 can design an action that focuses on linkages between missing facilities and school safety. It can build awareness about and advocate for prioritizing missing facilities that have better chance of increasing school safety. As well, strategies for sensitization regarding SBDRM can be developed that can use missing facilities as an entry point and gradually spiral out to cover other areas of school safety such as those included in the SBDRM model.

Although there is a broad agreement to include the DRR curriculum in the syllabus and learning objectives have been identified, this inclusion awaits revision of the syllabus. HOPE'87 should continue to advocate and build support for inclusion of the DRR curriculum and not let the inclusion of the curriculum in the syllabus fall by the wayside.

In order to strengthen the retention of messages in the cascade model, PITE could organize regular refresher trainings, beginning with refreshers for Provincial Master Trainers all the way down to the school level. Another strategy could be organizing quarterly exchange-of-experience sessions for cluster teachers, where the respective District Master Trainer can act as a facilitator. Sessions can be organized in different schools on a rotational basis so that different schools get indirect exposure. Similar sessions can be organized at the district level for District Master Trainers and for Education Managers at the provincial level. Ideally, these would be held quarterly, or at least once in six months. These sessions can provide opportunities to teachers, District Master Trainers and Education Managers to help each other in addressing issues they face in implementing SBDRM. It is quite likely that similar problems will arise. Unresolved issues or questions can go to a higher forum through the District Master Trainers from the same cluster.

Another strategy to strengthen cascade training model could be developing a web-based training module that teachers can use. The training module could include presentations (both in English, Urdu and Pashto) that participants can read, video lectures on topics related to school safety, videos of simulation exercises, best-practice examples in the form of written case studies and video documentaries. A group of competent curriculum development specialists from within the Education Department can be selected to work with external experts on DRR, and IT and media experts to develop online training

---

modules.

A wider network for teachers in trained in school safety should be also developed using social media such as Facebook, WhatsApp, YouTube, Vimeo or Instagram or other appropriate platforms.

Some form of visible recognition should be given to District Master Trainers that distinguishes them as Master Trainers when they go to conduct cluster level trainings. A number of Master Trainers identified the lack of such recognition as one of the reasons for their dissatisfaction. This could be a sleeveless jacket or/and a cap similar to ones worn by humanitarian workers with the title Master Trainer emblazoned on them. Another form of recognition desired by participants of the trainings, particularly the District Level Master Trainers, is a training Certificate that they can use to benefit from potential opportunities in future, before or after retirement.

HOPE'87 is aiming to convince the Independent Monitoring Unit to include school safety related indicators in the independent monitoring system established by the KP government to seek real time feedback on school performance. This is an excellent target. HOPE'87 should pursue this further.

The process of candidate selection for District Master Trainers and participants of cluster trainings should be improved. Candidates should be chosen from a list of applicants. A list of applicants in order of preference with justification should be sought from the relevant Education Managers (for District Master Trainers) and Principals/Head teachers (for cluster level trainings). Similarly, candidates should be asked to provide a legitimate justification and a letter of commitment and a reference from two fellow teachers justifying that she/he is the best candidate for the training.

However, a sense of competition would not come into play easily. To infuse a sense of competition the trainings will have to look attractive. One way to make training attractive is to increase its symbolic value. One way to do this is to offer visible recognition to trained teachers, for example, as indicated above, by providing them a jacket or cap that identifies them as master trainers. At the same time, the practical value of the training can be increased by 1) giving them a Certificate; and more importantly, 2) linking their performance with career progression as a DRR trainer within the Education Department. Teachers who perform well at the school level should be considered for training as District Level Master Trainers. Similarly, District Level Master Trainers who excel could be considered for the position of Provincial Level Master Trainer, instead of limiting this position to the PITE faculty.

Ideally, more than one teacher from one school should be trained. This is important for peer support and can also serve as a form of insurance in case one of the teachers does not perform well. Poor performance could be owing to several factors, including lack of support from management, lack of commitment, lack of competence and/or being over-burdened. Having at least two teachers can infuse a sense of competition as well.

Participants of cascade trainings found some terms used in the training manual to be more difficult than the English equivalents. They said their English equivalents are more commonly used and understood than the Urdu. This suggests that translation should be subjected to more rigorous field-testing. Where appropriate, both English and Urdu terms should be used.

Training methodology should include more practical exercises or demonstration. This was identified as a limitation of methodology by both District Master Trainers and teachers trained at the cluster level.

In areas where schools are spread over a large area and distances to cluster schools are long, appropriate provision should be made in the budget to cover transport costs. It is challenging for teachers as well as Master Trainers to travel long distances to attend or conduct cluster trainings unless their transportation costs are covered. In places like Chitral where distances are long an amount for accommodation should also be provided.

Template of SBDRM plans should be modified to include more closed ended (quantitative) questions, which would allow quantification of information. This would enable District Education Offices to consolidate SBDRM plans relatively easily. Quantitative data can be analyzed to inform critical decision-making. This would also make it possible to integrate SBDRM related data into existing EMIS.

HOPE'87 should engage with the donors to highlight limited support for school based disaster risk reduction initiatives. HOPE'87 can engage with Education sector donors as well as with donors who support DRR initiatives.

# **10. ANNEXES**

## Appendix I: TORs

### Terms of References (ToRs)

#### End of project evaluation

**Title:** “A Safer Tomorrow - Institutionalizing disaster preparedness in education sector (STDP 3)”

**City, province and country:** District Malakand, Chitral & Nowshera, Province Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

**Project number:** ECHO/AS/BUD/2015/91016

#### 1. Background

The Pakistani context combines a multitude of hazards (e.g. earthquake, floods, drought) with often a high level of vulnerability. In recent years Pakistan has been hit by numerous disasters. When disasters strike, it is women, children, elderly and disabled who are the worst affected. There is a clear need to build resilience in the most vulnerable areas, both in communities and in schools. A key element to building resilience is having a systematic, effective and efficient DRM approach adopted by the government that is sustainable. Provincial and district authorities have the mandate and authority to address disaster risk and preparedness, and also have the long-term strategy, commitment and authority needed to build sustainability into DRR/M systems and enhance capacities.

This Action is about ensuring integration of the inclusive School Based Disaster Risk Management (SBDRM) models in government systems at different levels, and strengthening capacity to replicate these models in communities and schools. The models will have to be improved and further adapted to users and context first. The approach used will be one of 'learning by doing', going through a government-led cycle of cascading training from province to school level, school-led and government/NGO-facilitated development of school based DRM plans, which will feed back through different levels of the government planning and budgeting cycle. The project is developed for KPK province in a coordinated approach with a DRR-action by CARE focusing on Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM). These 2 actions have identified common links to be tested between common models, approaches and exchange of resources. Throughout the project lessons learnt will be shared through different joint coordination mechanisms/networks, and the models will be widely disseminated to build a body of knowledge on DRR in Pakistan, and to raise awareness on the common DRM models.

The project is co-funded by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid for Civil Protection (ECHO), Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC), YOU Foundation and HOPE'87. HOPE'87 is implementing the project in District Malakand, Chitral & Nowshera of KPK Province. The project lasts for 21 months (April 2015 to December 2016).

The **Principal objective** of the project is to reduce the vulnerability of rural and urban populations in Pakistan living in areas most affected by natural disasters and conflicts by increasing the preparedness and the response capacities of local communities and authorities to potential and frequent threats.

The **specific objective** is to strengthen the capacity of government institutions, vulnerable communities and schools in KPK for addressing disaster risk in a sustainable manner through inclusive CBDRM and SBDRM methodologies.

#### **Specific Objective Indicators:**

**SOI 1.** # of targeted district and provincial education department officials with 70% increased knowledge

and practice on school and community disaster management by the end of the action.

**SOI 2.** Amount of funds allocated for inclusive ED DRM plans through ADP 2015-16 and ADP 2016-17 by the project end.

**SOI 3.** # of districts in KPK where SBDRM activities are replicated by the education department by the end of the project.

**SOI 4.** Elements of convergence between CBDRM and SBDRM are identified, tested and documented by the end of the action.

The **results** that the project aims to achieve are as follows:

**Result 1:** An improved inclusive SBDRM model with approaches and tools is institutionalized into the government workflow in a supportive environment in KPK province

**Indicators:**

- An improved and tested SBDRM model with supporting materials (tools and operational guidelines) for KPK available by the end of the action.
- By the end of the action, PITE (at provincial level) and DoE (at district level) master trainers in KPK are able to replicate SBDRM training through the cascade system.
- By the end of the project 3 inclusive district education DRM/contingency plans will have been developed by DoE with the support of relevant line departments.
- By the end of the project, DoE and planning cell in KPK have jointly worked for PC1 fund allocation & utilization for risk reduction activities

**Activities:**

- 1.1. Revise and improve the SBDRM model for Pakistan to make it more accessible and aligned with DRR and development planning processes
- 1.2. Review and update as well as develop a set of materials on SBDRM for use and field testing in KPK.
- 1.3. Strengthen and streamline the role of the DRR steering committee for mainstreaming of DRR in the education sector in KPK.
- 1.4. Rolling out and field testing the SBDRM package of materials through mentoring and coaching of education department officials in KPK.
- 1.5. Monitoring of school safety activities by the education department in KPK.

**Result 2:** Enhanced coordination, advocacy and awareness for inclusive and mutually reinforcing CBDRM and SBDRM at all levels.

**Indicators:**

- Formal adoption of the CBDRM and SBDRM by # of key civil society organisations operating at national/ province level in Pakistan by the end of the project.
- Evidence is collected, documented, disseminated and advocated (case studies, advocacy material/workshops, exchange of lessons learned, linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM at national and regional levels (among South Asia ECHO/DRR Partners).
- Recommendations (district, province, national level) arising from study/testing of linkages between CBDRM and SBDRM are incorporated into practice.

**Activities:**

- 2.1. Organise dialogue, advocacy, and consultation with national, provincial and district government and non-governmental stakeholders for raising awareness and capacity with regard to policy and strategy on DRM, using existing humanitarian advocacy forums or networks.
- 2.2. Participation of DRM and education authorities staff (provincial and federal) in the policy dialogue and preparation of recommendations for integration of CBDRM and SBDRM in policies and frameworks.
- 2.3. Test, study and document linkages between SBDRM and CBDRM, and strengthen the links between



the two models.

2.4. Document the learning of the project through publication and diffusion of lessons learnt and support materials.

**Direct beneficiaries:** At least approximately 323,154 individuals (including 28 organizations) will benefit from the action.

**The project locations** are district Chitral, Malakand, Nowshera and Peshawar, KPK in Pakistan.

**The project started** on 1<sup>st</sup> of April, 2015 with an end date of 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016. With an approval of 3 months “No Cost Extension” by the donor, project duration has now been extended till **31<sup>st</sup> December, 2016**.

The implementing partner for this project is HOPE’87 Pakistan.

### 1. Purpose of the Final Evaluation

The study will assess effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency, relevance and scalability of the project. The aim of this evaluation will be to gain lessons learnt that could be used to improve similar actions in the future.

### 2. Objectives of the Evaluation

The final evaluation is to review the achievement of the project’s results and indicators, the short and medium term impact and the efficiency and effectiveness of the implementation process to receive lessons learnt and practical recommendations to improve future actions and to provide ECHO, ADC, YOU Foundation and HOPE’87 with sufficient information to make an informed judgment about the past performance of the project. Moreover, the study is also aimed to document lessons learned from the project interventions, project management structure along with specific, actionable, and practical recommendations for improved programme and strategic actions direction for similar actions in future

The final evaluation will involve to an appropriate degree all interested parties, and will be undertaken by HOPE’87 by hiring an external consultant(s).

### 3. Key Question

The evaluation shall focus specifically on results and (short and medium term) impacts. It shall be a desk and field study with recommendations and lessons learnt for future interventions.

### 4. Evaluation Criteria

*1.2 Key Evaluation Questions would be;*

#### a) RELEVANCE

- How needs were assessed, prioritized and translated into actions plans for different vulnerable groups? How far the project results address the identified problems and needs identified in the stakeholder analysis.
- To what extend does the intervention comply and contributes towards national and regional policy frameworks?
- To what extent was the project adapted to the context- political, disaster preparedness trends, and available DP/DRR capacities at provincial and district levels?
- Was the action coherent with other interventions on DRR/DP DRM sector in the province?
- How far the mainstreaming of disability and gender was part of the project design?

**b) EFFICIENCY**

- How responsive was the project to address the changes in project external environment?
- How efficient was the project to incorporate external and internal learning into SBDRM model and proposed interventions?
- Timeliness of input and activities on financial and human resource management?
- Was the project budget adequate for its purpose particularly phasing out prospects?

**c) EFFECTIVENESS**

- How were the stakeholders (in-country) involved in project design and implementation (their role in developing DP policy)?
- Analyse and elaborate what factors, strategies and approaches needed to be changed as best alternative to create more impact? (Strengths and weaknesses of the project approaches).
- How relevant and effective was the developed common SBDRM Model, tools and advocacy strategy to achieve the project goal and its objectives?
- The effectiveness of cascade training approach with respect to transferring knowledge and skills to provincial/district govt. staff and down at school level (teachers)?To what extent, have the coaching and mentoring aspects at different tiers of common models been effective in building/strengthening the institutional capacity of govt. departments.
- What are the key internal and external factors that have contributed/hindered such achievements? (identify the opportunities and constraints under SWOT of the project)
- Is the link between activities and results strong enough to achieve the specific objective?

- Are there any unplanned results taking place which help achieving or misleading the specific objective?

**d) COORDINATION**

- To what extent are stakeholders involved in strategy development and decision-making?
- To what extent is the intervention designed to rely on local program management (institutional management) or to develop the necessary local institutional capacity?
- How effective were coordination mechanisms among DIPECHO partners for development & implementation of common models and working group?
- How effective was the coordination with external stakeholders (DRR Forum, KPK Education, PITE, DCTE, DEO department, and other govt. line departments etc) to enhance impact for beneficiaries?
- How have knowledge and information on various programmatic components among agencies and other DIPEECHO partner and individual agencies been shared and how efficiently was it done?

**e) IMPACT**

- What were the intended and the unintended impacts of project?
- What is the added value of engaging institutions in building and delivering common model and cascade training approach in creating larger impacts and replication? Were activities carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnectedness into consideration? What is the maturity and viability of the existing levels of SBDRM model? And to what degree had the project and SBDRM model strengthened the institutional capacity of govt. bodies?

**f) SUSTAINABILITY**

- To what extents were the common models institutionalized?
- Evaluating it through departmental lens, how the Education department is taking ownership and prioritizing DP/DRR in their annual planning through allocation of budget and human resources?
- Concerning handover to local authorities and replication, what level of capacities exist at the departmental level and to what extent will the stakeholders continue rolling out SBDRM Model after close of the project.
- Present analysis on to what extent interventions of the project are sustainable for future?
- To what extent did the HOPE'87 discuss with the authorities about the replication process after the end of the current action? What are the main constraints to the replication?

- How staff turnover at Education department like official, Master Trainers, envisaged as challenging factor in sustainability and replication of training approaches? How it was addressed during the project to anticipate their rotation and replacement through Training of Trainers (ToT).
- To what extent will the school be able to support/prioritize DP/DRR activities in their annual school budgets?

#### 5. Evaluation Expert/Consultant:

The lead consultant is expected to:

- Have proof records of at least 5 to 7 years of experiences in the development field with focus on DRR, (ideally with research experience as well) out of which at least 2 years in independent consultancy.
- Knowledge and working experience of KPK Education Department will be considered as an asset and a competitive edge.
- The consultant shall be fluent in English, Urdu and preferably in the local language Khawar/Pashto.
- Be paid an agreed amount for the evaluation including the evaluation report.
- During assignment and visits to STDP-3 project location (district Peshawar, Malakand, Chitral & Nowshera), HOPE'87 offices in Islamabad & Peshawar, stay and travel will be under his/her responsibility and part of the lump sum payment.
- HOPE'87 can assist in arranging the boarding and lodging.
- Takes own liability for security risks related to the service.
- To report to the Assistant Secretary General (Vienna, Austria), Director Operations & Senior Program Manager of HOPE'87 Pakistan.

#### 6. Timetable and Work plan:

The staff of HOPE'87 will assist in coordinating the visit to the field, meetings with beneficiaries, stakeholders and relevant authorities/agencies.

The work plan with methodology will be as follows:

- Project briefing by HOPE'87 at Islamabad /Peshawar office.
- Analysis of project information i.e., grant agreement, project proposal, Common SBDRM Model, Operational Guidelines, developed tools, bi annual reports, ECHO, ADC, YOU Foundation and local partner's guidelines etc.
- Development of detailed checklist/questionnaires for each key evaluation questions
- Meeting with staff and visit to the project location (district Peshawar, Malakand, Chitral and Nowshera) - the consultant will meet with beneficiaries and stakeholders.
- Key Informant Interviews with Ministry of Education including its sub departments, DRR steering committee and sub-working groups, DEO, Target Communities, DIPECHO Partners i.e. CARE International.
- Consultant/firm is expected to meet donor (ECHO) to get their feedback as well.
- Post-evaluation de-briefing to the Director Programs and Operations of HOPE'87, respectively either at HOPE'87 Office in Islamabad.
- Drafting evaluation report against the evaluation objective
- Finalization of report after receiving feedback and comments from HOPE'87 Pakistan and headquarters of HOPE'87 in Austria.
- Presentation and submission of the report.

***The consultant will be paid a lump sum amount inclusive of applicable taxes for his/her evaluation***

service and evaluation report, inclusive his/her travel, boarding and lodging costs.

The evaluation exercise is expected to be held within the calendar period of **1<sup>st</sup> December,, 2016 till 25<sup>th</sup> December, 2016, with the final report to be submitted by the consultant no later than 31<sup>st</sup> January, 2017.**

**Note:** First draft of the report should be available/submitted for review and comments by **15<sup>th</sup> January, 2017** to give sufficient time for review to multiple partners (HOPE'87 & Head Quarter).

## **7. Report:**

- The consultant will submit a precise report in English in printed and electronic version to HOPE'87.
- The consultants will map relevant supporting documentation in a bibliography and include them on a CD/DVD whenever appropriate.
- The report will include an executive summary and will address all the key questions as identified.
- The document format must be adhered to:
  - ! Cover page
  - ! Title
  - ! Date of the final version
  - ! Name of the consultants
  - ! Logos of ECHO, ADC, YOU Foundation and HOPE'87
- Table of contents
- Executive Summary
- Methodology
- Annexes, including bibliography and supporting documents
- The report will include the objectives, framework, collection of information and analysis, reporting and work schedule.
- The report will be structured to provide key findings/conclusions for each evaluation question.
- Recommendations for improvements and future programs will be provided.
- The report will be submitted to HOPE'87 within the timing defined above.

## **8. ETHICAL STANDARDS**

The evaluation team will make clear to all participating stakeholders that they are under no obligation to participate in the evaluation study. All participants will be assured that there will be no negative consequences if they choose not to participate. Study team will obtain informed consent from the participants. In case if study team does not understand participants' first language, they will be taking interpreter/s along. Team will have to receive prior permission for taking and use of visual still/ moving images for specific purposes, i.e., for evaluation report and presentations. The study team will assure the participants' anonymity and confidentiality and will ensure the visual data is protected and used for agreed purpose only. The study team will also take care of standards operating procedures for safety and security according to HOPE'87 policy while working in field as well as in HOPE'87 premises.

## **9. EVALUATION CRITERIA:**

9.1. The profiles of the consultant/firm shall be evaluated based on the aforementioned scope of work & deliverables.

9.2. Award will be made on the past experience, capacity and quality of firm/team along with competitive quote/price among the qualified consultant/firm

#### **10. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS**

ECHO, ADC, HOPE'87 and YOU Foundation will retain all intellectual property rights for any and all material produced, in any media format, for this consultancy assignment.

#### **11. 11. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION**

The interested Consultants/Firms will submit technical and financial proposals through email at the following email ID: [info@hope87.org](mailto:info@hope87.org)

Last date for submission of proposals is Monday, 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2016 by 5.00 pm PST.

**NOTE:** The HOPE'87 anti-fraud policy and the HOPE'87 complaints procedures governing this consultancy can be obtained by emailing at [info@hope87.org](mailto:info@hope87.org) from HOPE'87 Pakistan up to two weeks after launch of this consultancy,.

Any complaints/queries in regard to this consultancy can be sent to [ahmed@hope87.org](mailto:ahmed@hope87.org).

---

## Appendix II: List of People Met

Name		Institutional Affiliation	Designation	Role	District	Date	Method
Ms.Badia Danish	Female	PITE	Subject Specialist	Provincial Master Trainer	Peshawar	14-Dec-16	
Ms. Naheed Akther	Female	PITE	Senior Instructor	Provincial Master Trainer	Peshawar	14-Dec-16	
Zia ul Hasnain	Male	PITE	Senior Instructor	Provincial Master Trainer	Peshawar	14-Dec-16	
Sher Daraz	Male	Provincial Education Department	Deputy Director P&D Education Department	Key Stakeholder	Peshawar	14-Dec-16	
Mr. Wajid Ali	Male	PDMA	Deputy Director DRM	Key Stakeholder	Peshawar	14-Dec-16	
Mohammed Rasool	Male	G.H.S.S Khar	Director Physical Education	Master Trainer	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Yousuf Khan	Male	G.H.S.S. Ghani Gair	Director Physical Education	Master Trainer	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Mohammed Kaleem	Male	G.H.S.S. Dheri Joargah	Director Physical Education	Master Trainer	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Zahid Khan	Male	G.C.M.H.S Batkhela	SPE	Master Trainer	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Attaullah	Male	G.H.S.	SPE	Master Trainer	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Badshah	Male	G.H.S, Hiroshah	SPE	Master	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD

				Trainer			
Ahtisham ul Haq	Male	District Education Department	ADEO	Education Manager	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Zakir Hussain	Male	District Education Department	ADEO	Education Manager	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Raes Khan	Male	District Education Department	ADEO	Education Manager	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Asfandyar	Male	Government Shaheed Shahzad High School	SCT	Fellow Teacher	Malakand	16-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Humayun	Male	Government Shaheed Shahzad High School	SCT	Fellow Teacher	Malakand	16-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Bakht Zada	Male	Government Shaheed Shahzad High School	In Charge Principal	Head teacher	Malakand	15-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Mohammad Waseem	Male	Government High School No, 2 Thana	Principal	Principal	Malakand	15-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Mohammed Zahir	Male	Government High School No, 2 Thana	Teacher	Cluster Level Teacher	Malakand	15-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Atta Ur Rehman	Male	G.H.S No 2, Dheri Allah Dand	PE	Cluster Level Teacher	Malakand	15-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Ms. Safia Zakir	Female	District Education Department	ASDEO	Education Manager	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Ms. Shazia	Female	District Education Department	ASDEO	Education Manager	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD



Ms. Nusarat	Female	District Education Department	ADO	Education Manager	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Robina Ara	Female	G.G.S, Malakand	SST	District Master Trainers	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Romania	Female	G.G.S, Malakand	SST	District Master Trainer	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Ms. Mehreen Riaz	Female	G.G.S, Malakand	SST	District Master Trainer	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Ms. Fazila	Female	GGPS Batkhela no 1	PST	Cluster Level Teacher	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Ms. Kousar Bibi	Female	GGPS Mezara Batkhel	PST	Cluster Level Teacher	Malakand	15-Dec-16	FGD
Razia Gul	Female	GGPS Akbar abad	PST	Cluster Level Teacher	Malakand	16-Dec-16	FGD
Imtiaz Khan	Male	District Education Department	ADEO, Sports and Private Schools	Education Manager	Nowshera	20-Dec-16	FGD
Pazir Zada	Male	District Education Department	ADEO, AMIS	Education Manager	Nowshera	20-Dec-16	FGD
Mohad Aftab	Male	District Education Department	ADEO	Education Manager	Nowshera	20-Dec-16	FGD
Mohd Irfan	Male	District Education Department	ADEO, Establishment and Primary	Education Manager	Nowshera	20-Dec-16	FGD
Ijaz Ahmed	Male	G.M.S. Aman Kot	SST	Master Trainer	Nowshera	20-Dec-16	FGD

Hydayatuallah	Male	G.H.S, Dhagi Banda	SST	Master Trainer	Nowshera	20-Dec-16	FGD
Jawad Ahmed	Male	G.H.s Pir Pai	SST	Master Trainer	Nowshera	20-Dec-16	FGD
Mohad Altaf	Male	G.H.S. Missiri Banda	SST	Master Trainer	Nowshera	20-Dec-16	FGD
Ali Saeed	Male	G.H.S. Missiri Banda	Principal	Principal	Nowshera	21-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Rafique Ahmed	Male	G.H.S. Missiri Banda	Teacher	Trained Teacher	Nowshera	21-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Wasil Khan	Male	G.H.S. Mughulai	In Charge, Principal	In Charge Principal	Nowshera	21-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Zafar Iqbal	Male	G.H.S. Mughulai	S.ST	Trained Teacher	Nowshera	21-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Mr. Hayat khan	Male	District Education Department	ASDEO	Education Manager	Nowshera	21-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Ms. Zakia	Female	GGHS Dag Besood	SST	District Master Trainer	Nowshera	21-Dec-16	FGD
Ms. Nighat Gul	Female	GGHS Zairat Kaka Sahib	SST	District Master Trainer	Nowshera	22-Jan-00	FGD
Ms. Shahida	Female	GGHSS	DPE	District Master Trainer	Nowshera	22-Jan-00	FGD
Ms. Uzma	Female	GGHS Badrashi	PET	District Master Trainer	Nowshera	22-Jan-00	FGD
Ms. Hussantaj	Female	GGPS Railway Station	Head Teacher	Cluster Level Teacher	Nowshera	22-Jan-00	FGD
Ms. GulawSugra	Female	GGMS KhatakoBulding	SST	Cluster Level Teacher	Nowshera	22-Jan-00	FGD

Ms. Farzana	Female	GGPS KhatkoBuldng	SST	Cluster Level Teacher	Nowshera	22-Jan-00	FGD
Ms. Hasrat Nasim	Female	GGPSBadrashi	SST	Cluster Level Teacher	Nowshera	22-Jan-00	FGD
Shakila Anjum	Female	District Education Deparment	AEDO, Establishment Primary	Education Manager	Chitral	19-Dec-16	FGD
Ghazala	Female	District Education Deparment	ADEO primary	Edcuation Manager	Chitral	19-Dec-16	FGD
Zubida Khanum	Female	District Education Deparment	ADEO, Primary	Education Manager	Chitral	19-Dec-16	FGD
Shahid	Male	District Education Deparment	SDEO	Education Manager	Chitral	19-Dec-16	FGD
Qazi Sharif Ahmad	Male	District Education Deparment	ADEO	Edcuation Manager	Chitral	19-Dec-16	FGD
Abdul Jalil	Male	District Education Deparment	SDEO	Education Manager	Chitral	19-Dec-16	FGD
Shahzad Nadim	Male	District Education Deparment	ADEO Es	Edcuation Manager	Chitral	19-Dec-16	FGD
Syedul Abrar	Male	GHS Moroi Chitral	Head Master	Head Teacher	Chitra	19-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Rizwana Falak Noor	Female	GGHS DrosH	SST	District master Trainer	Chitral	20-Dec-16	FGD
Ambrina	Female	GGHS Shahnigar	Head Teacher	District Master Trainer	Chitral	20-Dec-16	FGD

Maria Rubi	Female	GGHS Broz	SST	District Master Trainer	Chitral	20-Dec-16	FGD
Anila Hassan	Female	Government Centennial Model School Denin	SST	District Master Trainer	Chitral	20-Dec-16	FGD
Sharif Urehman	Male	GHS Garamchashma	SST	District Master Trainer	Chitral	20-Dec-16	FGD
Sami Urenman	Male	GHS Moroï	SST	District Master Trainer	Chitral	20-Dec-16	FGD
Jahanzeb	Male	GMS Ginjiret	SST	District Master Trainer	Chitral	20-Dec-16	FGD
Rafi Ullah	Male	GPS Chitral town	PST	Cluster Level Teacehrs	Chitral	21-Dec-16	FGD
Iqbal Mustafa	Male	GPS Uchusht	PTS	Cluster Level Teacehr	Chitral	21-Dec-16	FGD
Bibi Nasima	Female	GGHS Singur	SST	Cluster Level Teachers	Chitral	21-Dec-16	FGD
Bibi Rubina	Female	GGHS Muldeh	SST	Cluster Level Teachers	Chitral	21-Dec-16	FGD
Ghazala	Female	GGHS Singur	SST	Cluster Level Teachers	Chitral	21-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Tania Ali	Female	NDMA	Gedner Advisor	Gender Advisor	Islamabad	22-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Ejaz Ahmed Khan	Male	Plan International	School Safety Speicalist	School Safety Speicalist	Pehsawawr	2-Jan-17	Individual Interview
Sadiq Ahme	Male	IDEA	Advoacy Officer	Advoacy Officer	Peshawar	3-Jan-17	Group Interview

Najibullah	Male	Project Cooridinator	Head Programme Development	Head Programme Development	Peshawar	3-Jan-17	Group Interview
Ahmed Abbas	Male	HOPE'87	Director Operations	Director Operations	Islamabad	2-Dec-16	Group Interview
Saba Jaffery	Male	HOPE'88	Project Cooridionator	Project Cooridinator	Islamabad	3-Dec-16	Group Interview
Syed Israr Ahmed	Male	HOPE'89	Programme Manager	Programme Manager	Islamabad	14-Dec-16	Group Interview
Dawood Iftikhar	Male	HOPE'90	Manager MEAL	Manager MEAL	Islamabad	14-Dec-16	Individual Interview
Shoib Haider	Male	HOPE'88	Country Direcotr	Country Director	Islamabad	3-Jan-16	Individual Interview

## **Annex III: Tools**

### **Interview guide for interview with Project Staff ECHO Project in Peshawar**

- What was the program philosophy and whether it is reflected the values of HOPE87?
- What values were promoted by the project and whether these values were clearly articulated?
- How was project designed? How was the project contextualized?
- Which lessons from the past were incorporated?
- In the past HOPE'87 worked with the partners, why not this time?
- What are the key achievements of the project?
- What challenges did you face in implementing this program?
- How were challenges met? What challenges could not be overcome and why? What did these challenges mean for the effectiveness of the program?
- What performance management and monitoring mechanisms were in place to monitor the progress of the project? How was the project monitored? What indicators were used to monitor progress and achievements?
- How is Pakistan School Safety Framework (PSSF) different for SBDR model you had developed under 7<sup>th</sup> Action?
- What could have been done differently? What could have been improved?
- If HOPE87 were to do this project again, what would they do differently?
- In your opinion what are the impacts of the project?
- How can these impacts be sustained?
- In your opinion how could this work be sustained in future?
- What's next?

## **Questions for District Level Master Trainers**

Training of Education managers was held in two phase: in the first phase a three day training was held in Peshawar for District Managers from Chitral, Malakand and Nawshera. In the second phase, a two day follow-up training was held.

### **Training of Education Managers**

Ask the following questions for first and second phase of the training

- When did you attend the training?
- What was the training about?
- How relevant was this training to your needs?
- Why was this training important?
- Why was this training important for Education managers?
- What topics were covered in the training?
- What topics did you like best and why?
- What topics you did not like and why?
- Which topics were missing? What other topics should have been included?
- What methods were used by the trainers?
- How effective was the training?
- What did you learn from the training?
- What do you know now that you did not know before?
- What challenges did you face in the training?
- What could have been improved?

### **After the training?**

- What expectation did HOPE'87 if you? What did they expect you to do after the training?
- What did you do after the training?
- What role did you play in organizing training at cluster level?
- How were training at cluster level organized?
- Who else participated in organizing cluster level training?
- How many training events were organized?
- Did you monitor the cluster trainings?
- How many training events did you monitor?
- How did you monitor the training?
- Did you develop any monitoring reports? (Do you have a copy of a monitoring report you developed. Can you share it)
- What is your assessment of cluster trainings?
- How effective were trainings held at cluster level?
- What material did master trainers use to conduct the training?
- How useful was material?
- Were master trainers to cover all the topics?
- What methods did master trainers use to conduct the training?
- What challenges did master trainers face face in conducting the training?
- What could have been done differently?

- What support did you provide to masters trainers to make cluster trainings successful?
- Did you monitor if masters trainers have brought about any changes in school?

**Impact of the Training**

- What impact did the training have on you?
- What changes, if any, did cause in your professional and personal lives?
- What change did you see, if any, in master trainers?
- What change did you see, if any, teachers who were trained at cluster level?
- What change did you see schools?
- What change did you see in education department?
- How sustainable this change?



## **Questions for District Level Master Trainers**

Training of Education managers was held in two phase: in the first phase a three day training was held in Peshawar for District Managers from Chitral, Malakand and Nawshera. In the second phase, a two day follow-up training was held.

### **Training of Education Managers**

Ask the following questions for first and second phase of the training

- When did you attend the training?
- What was the training about?
- How relevant was this training to your needs?
- Why was this training important?
- Why was this training important for Education managers?
- What topics were covered in the training?
- What topics did you like best and why?
- What topics you did not like and why?
- Which topics were missing? What other topics should have been included?
- What methods were used by the trainers?
- How effective was the training?
- What did you learn from the training?
- What do you know now that you did not know before?
- What challenges did you face in the training?
- What could have been improved?

### **After the training?**

- What expectation did HOPE'87 if you? What did they expect you to do after the training?
- What did you do after the training?
- What role did you play in organizing training at cluster level?
- How were training at cluster level organized?
- Who else participated in organizing cluster level training?
- How many training events were organized?
- Did you monitor the cluster trainings?
- How many training events did you monitor?
- How did you monitor the training?
- Did you develop any monitoring reports? (Do you have a copy of a monitoring report you developed. Can you share it)
- What is your assessment of cluster trainings?
- How effective were trainings held at cluster level?
- What material did master trainers use to conduct the training?
- How useful was material?
- Were master trainers to cover all the topics?
- What methods did master trainers use to conduct the training?
- What challenges did master trainers face face in conducting the training?
- What could have been done differently?

- What support did you provide to masters trainers to make cluster trainings successful?
- Did you monitor if masters trainers have brought about any changes in school?

**Impact of the Training**

- What impact did the training have on you?
- What changes, if any, did cause in your professional and personal lives?
- What change did you see, if any, in master trainers?
- What change did you see, if any, teachers who were trained at cluster level?
- What change did you see schools?
- What change did you see in education department?
- How sustainable this change?

## **Questions for Teachers Receiving Cluster Level Training**

### **Cluster Level Training**

- When did you attend the training?
- What was the training about?
- How relevant was this training for needs of your school or your own needs?
- What topics were covered in the training?
- What topics did you like best and why?
- What topics you did not like and why?
- What other topics should have been included?
- What material was used to conduct the training?
- What methods were used by the trainers? How did they train you?
- What did you learn from the training?
- How useful was the material given to you during the training? ( they were given a training manual)
- What do you know now that you did not know before?
- How effective was the training?
- What challenges did you face in the training?
- What could have been improved?
- Did someone from district education office monitor the training?

### **Application of the Training**

- What expectation did HOPE'87 team have of you? What did they want you to do after the training?
- How did you apply what you learnt in the training?
- If you were not able to apply what you learnt in the training, what are the reasons?
- Did you share your learning with principal of the school? How?
- Did you share information with your colleagues? What information did you share?
- Did you share information with your students, how (in assembly or in classes)?
- If you did not share this information, why?
- Did you influence any changes in your school based on what you learnt in the training? If yes, what changes did you influence?

### **Impact of the Training**

- What impact did the training have on you?
- What changes, if any, did training cause in your professional and personal lives?
- What change did you see in schools?
- How sustainable is this change?



## **Annex VI: Lists of Documents Consulted**

- Comparative Analysis of Comprehensive School Safety Framework and Pakistan School Safety Framework
- Disaster Risk Management Training for Education Sector Managers. A Power Point Presentation.
- Education Managers Visit Details
- Education Sector Stakeholder Analysis Report by HOPE'87
- Exit Strategy Workshop Report, 25<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup> November 2016
- Joint Review of SDMP and VDMP village Aza Khel Payan, 28, September, 2016.
- Kagawa, F. and Selby, D., Linkages between School-based Disaster Risk Management and Community-based Disaster Management: A Review of the Literature, 11 October 2015.
- Kagawa, F., Selby, D., Knowledge, Attitude and Practice Survey and Training Needs Assessment of Education Officer and Manager, 12 January 2016.
- Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Disaster Risk Management Training Manual for Education Sector Managers.
- Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province: District Education Sector Disaster Management Planning Template, DRAFT Task -2 sustainability Frontiers, 17 April 2016.
- Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province: District Education Sector Disaster Management Planning Template: Completion Guidance, Task-2 sustainability Frontiers, 7 April 2016.
- Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province: Provincial Education Sector Disaster Management: Completion Guidance, Task-4, 7 April 2016
- Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province: Provincial Education Sector Disaster Management Planning Template, DRAFT Task -2 sustainability Frontiers, 17 April 2016.
- Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province: School Disaster Management Planning Template: Completion Guidance, Task-2 sustainability Frontier 7 April 2016.
- Khyber Pakhtunkhwa School Disaster Management Training Manual (Sub-District Training Handouts) prepared by Hope 87, 14 March 2016.
- Letter from Planning Officer notifying meeting to discuss Working Paper, April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016
- Linkages between School-based Disaster Risk Management and Community-based Disaster Management: Typology, Sustainability Frontiers, 12 October 2015

Meeting Minutes

- 1st Project Working Group Meeting..Tuesday – 23rd June, 2015 at 10:00 AM
- 2nd Project Working Group Meeting, 26th August, 2015
- 3rd Project Working Group Meeting. Tuesday – 6th October
- 4th Project Working Group Meeting. Tuesday – 10th November, 2015
- 5th Project Working Group Meeting. Tuesday – 1st December 2015
- 6th Project Working Group Meeting. Thursday – 12th January 2016
- 7th Project Working Group Meeting. Tuesday – 9th February, 2016
- 8th Project Working Group Meeting. Tuesday – 8th March, 2016
- 11th Project Working Group Meeting. Wednesday – 1st June, 2016
- Minutes of meeting with the Secretary Elementary and Secondary Education, 3rd May, 2016
- Minutes of Meeting with Secretary Elementary and Secondary Education (E&SE). 24 February 2017
- Steering committee Minutes, November 26, 2016

### **Monthly Progress Reports**

- Monthly Report for April, 2016
  - Monthly Report for May, 2016
  - Monthly Report for June, 2016
  - Monthly Report for July, 2016
  - Monthly Report for August, 2016
  - Monthly Report for September, 2016
  - Monthly Report for October, 2016
  - Monthly Report for November, 2016
  - Monthly Report for December, 2016
- 
- National Consultative Meeting Report, Pakistan School Based Disaster Risk Management (PSBRM) Framework, 17th and 18th August 2016.
  - PAKISTAN SCHOOL Safety FRAMEWORK (PSSF) 3 (Rvsd).
  - Parent Teacher Council (PTC) Guide, Reprinted by Citizen Engagement for social delivery AusAID Pakistan Collaborative Approach
  - Project Mid-term Review Report SBDRM & CBDRM Projects by HOPE'87
  - School Based Disaster Risk Management (SBDRM) Model, Pakistan
  - School Disaster Management, STEP 1 Awareness-Raising in the School Community, Task -4 Parents teacher Awareness Raising Workshop Sustainability Frontier 7 April 2016.
  - School Disaster Management, STEP 1 raising awareness in the school community.
  - School Disaster Management, STEP 2 raising awareness in the school community.
  - Shehzad, K, Field Visit Report Village Muhib Banda, U.C Muhib Banda, 1 August, 2016.
  - Shehzad, K, Dairy For Linkages Study VDMC Members, Elected Representatives, PTC Members village Muhib Banda, 26 August 2016.
  - Shehzad, K, Dairy For Linkages Study village Muhib Banda, 4 August 2016.
  - Shehzad, K, Mobilize PTC Members for formation of SDMC village Muhib Banda, 18 August 2016.
  - Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) Natural & Man-made Hazards.
  - Training on CBDRM for Community Members village Amankot, 14 September, 2016

- Training on SBDRM for PTC/SDMC Members village Aza Khel Payan, 23 August, 2016
- Parent Teacher Council Awareness Raising Workshop Task-4, 7 April 2016
- Pakistan DRR in the Education Sector Advocacy Strategy, 24 April 2014.
- Orientation of SDMC Members, 3 August 2016.
- School Disaster Management Plan, 9 August 2016
- Revised Work Plan
- Regional lessons learned workshop, 2015-2016, 15-17 May 2016.
- Training on SBDRM for PTC/SDMC Members, 12 August 2016.