

CENTRAL ISLANDS PEA 2016 CAPACITY EVALUATION REPORT

MARCH 2017

**COMPILED AND PRESENTED BY GLADYS SIALE
MANAGERESS/EAPE
MEHRD**

PURPOSE: The purpose of the evaluation was to gather baseline data about the capacity of EOs at the Central Islands' PEA.

METHODOLOGY: There are four broad areas of capacity that were evaluated: leadership, adaptive, management and operational. There are twenty-six indicators across these four areas with a varying number of descriptive statements for each indicator. There are four levels of evaluation of inadequate, emerging, established and well-established.

The evaluators read out the indicators and descriptive statements to the PEA officers. The PEA officers discussed each one, came to a consensus judgement about their current levels of ability and work currently carried out at the PEA, and explained their reasoning. Evaluators asked them to provide evidence and examples.

EVALUATORS were the Manageress for EA Performance and Evaluation and the Education Sector Adviser (ESA).

1. LEADERSHIP CAPACITY

VISION, SHARED BELIEFS AND VALUES

Emerging

**There is some understanding*

of the vision of the PEA aligned to a common set of beliefs and values.

** These are shared by some but not all.*

** They are not used to set priorities and work for improvement.*

** They are only partially aligned with the PEA's goals.*

The EOs are aware that the NEAP informs their vision but they do not automatically connect the vision of the ESF and NEAP with their vision for the work of the PEA.

There was very little forthcoming from any of the EOs on the vision of the PEA and there is no written vision statement for the PEA. It is not something that is part of their thinking when they consider the work of the PEA. They said they rely on other documents to state what the vision of a PEA should be. So a short-term or long-term vision for Central Islands' Province is not embedded in their thinking or work.

They were more comfortable with the notion of shared beliefs and values although they did not articulate any of these. These are unstated but automatically inform their attitudes and behaviour.

MISSION

Emerging

** There is some understanding*

of what the PEA is, and why it does what it does, which is reflected in the values and shared beliefs.

** However, this may not be clear to all.*

** A shared mission informs the work of a few.*

A lack of a clear vision impacts EA officers' understanding of their collective mission and purpose. They know that the ESF, NEAP and PEAP inform their AWP but they do not discuss these together and connect them to their work activities.

The CEO and PEO do not have a strong, harmonious working relationship with each other which is partly why the PEA lacks a strong collective mission. Each EO expressed their mission in a compartmentalised way e.g. the PEO Inspection spoke of her activities in specific detail but neither she, nor the CEO or PEO connected her inspection activities with other aspects of EA work.

Other EOs did not outline their mission and purpose or any activities they had undertaken. Each one's activities are disconnected from the overall goals and targets of the PEA.

There are no regular, formal meetings to discuss, make decisions and act on decisions to improve their own organisation and schools.

GOALS LINKED TO THE NEAP AND PEAP

Emerging

- * They may be vague and generalised.*
- * They may lack a realistic time frame for completion.*
- * They may lack credible measurable attainment*
- * They only occasionally set priorities for the day-to-day work of the EAs.*

Established

- * There are concrete goals from the current NEAP and PEAP.*

The lack of a PEA vision and mission meant goals were poorly defined. The EA officers said goals came from the NEAP but they did not explain what these were. Despite their AWP based on the NEAP, the CEO and PEO could not explain the PEA's 2016 goals.

However, the PEO for Inspection could explain a few of her goals. She plans and organises her activities and has time-frames, activities and goals which are set by the demands of the inspection process. The CEO and PEO said they set their own goals but neither explained what these had been for 2016. Having clearly set out goals and targets does not appear to be a priority for this PEA.

The AWP might or might not be followed or it may be partially followed. The 2016 AWP with goals and targets was not provided at the meeting.

ANALYTICAL AND STRATEGIC THINKING AND PLANNING

Emerging

- * PEA leadership can handle some complexity in the workplace.*
- * Has some ability to analyse issues.*
- * Can generate a few strategies.*
- * Strategies are not clearly linked to mission, vision, and goals.*
- * They are minimally explained and/or lack coherence*
- * They often do not become day-to-day activities.*
- * The AWP is based on some NEAP outcomes.*
- * Part of the AWP is directed at improving schools.*
- * And part of it is directed at EA management strengthening.*

There was variance in results for each EO for this indicator. The PEO for Inspection could provide some evidence of capacity to analyse data from schools and prioritise areas of need and the strategies to address needs. The PEO had the most factual knowledge about schools in the province (and the most experience) but did not appear to take the next step of analysing what he knew. The CEO showed the least capacity to analyse and strategically plan. She did not appear to know how to do this and to understand that it was an essential part of her role.

However, as a group they could deal with low-level difficulties in the workplace – distance, time, problems of travel – and generate a few strategies to deal with these challenges. However they more often spoke of the difficulties and not the strategic decisions they had taken to solve them. They did not present as very capable in dealing with complex school issues such as evaluating the capacity of the School Principal/Head Teacher and teachers, a needs' analysis and providing appropriate training. They did not explain or show a realistic plan of action for improving schools and strengthening the EA (the key goal of the PEAP). They were not in the habit of developing strategic plans once they had established goals and targets. They did not link vision, mission, goals, targets and outcomes.

This was an emerging capacity at best. The CEO focussed almost exclusively on the EA office administrative issues of travel, time, weather, distance and lack of money.

CHANGE MANAGEMENT

Emerging

- *The PEA leadership shows some understanding of how to take action to improve the PEA organisation.*

Established

- *The PEA leadership has sufficient experience in leadership for change.*
- ** There is evidence of specific improvement in a number of schools.*

The PEO and the Principal Education Officer Inspectorate were most animated in this section of their response. They were certain that they had had enough impact on schools to improve them, albeit only 10 schools (*given that there are seventy-five schools in the province and they had both worked for a number of years in the PEA*).

Nevertheless, [1] they maintained that they had worked strongly with the communities in those 10 schools. [2] They had made what they considered to be significant improvement in 1 particularly difficult school and noticeable improvement in the other 9. [3] All 10 schools were close to closure or in danger of closing and they reversed this by direct support for infrastructure. [4] They also provided effective teachers in these schools to keep them open.

Change management practice was demonstrated most by the Principal Education Officer Inspectorate.

ORGANISATIONAL SKILLS

Emerging

- * PEA leadership has some commitment and understanding of effective organizational work practices.*
- * Organizing lacks a detailed plan of action for long-term change.*
- * There are only a few or insufficient targets for the PEA workplace*

Established

- * There is broad understanding of how to tackle school issues and problems so a school will improve.*

Following on from the change management in the 10 schools, the PEO Inspectorate and the PEO stated that they had shown “broad understanding of organisational change” in schools. The PEA was in the “emerging” stage in the other descriptors.

To be established they would have to have demonstrated organisational skills in their PEA, which were lacking and long-term improvement in more schools over a number of years.

The PEA need more time to establish effective strategies for change in schools.

FINANCIAL COMPETENCE

Inadequate

** The PEA leadership has a limited sense of financial responsibility and decision-making.*

** He/she is weak on disclosure and accountability for retirement of imprests*

Emerging

** He/she partly analyses the financial implications of decisions.*

** He /she somewhat discloses, explains and accounts for*

- EA budgets;

- the exact use of EA grants;

- can explain all sources of EA funds

** He/she draws conclusions about finances but takes little action on PEA and school financial irregularities.*

The EOs stated that this is where they needed a full-time accountant located at their office. They all said they did not have the financial understanding to complete this part of their responsibilities and they did not receive sufficient support from the MEHRD-based accountant.

They said their level of “accounting” for funds was, for example, they knew they had spent, twice yearly, SBD 50,000 on meeting with other EAs. The CEO said not all imprests had been “retired” and gave no explanation.

THE ABILITY TO MOTIVATE AND ENABLE OTHERS

Inadequate

- * The leader has little knowledge or understanding of how to inspire others.*
- * He/she has little impact on them in a positive way.*
- * He/she has little rapport and trust with others.*
- * There are no or few regular, formal meetings.*

The EOs agreed that this was inadequate in their PEA.

However, the PEO Inspectorate said they had motivated a few schools and the community (see 1.5).

2. ADAPTIVE CAPACITY

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Inadequate

**There is no record of monitoring results; no information to LPMU;*

Emerging

** The performance of EA and schools is partially measured and progress partially tracked.*

** There is some data on programme activities and outputs.*

** There is some measurement of outcomes.*

**There is little or ad hoc monitoring of schools, using the Literacy Monitoring Instrument to measure teacher and school activity in literacy.*

**There is little recorded monitored results; no information given to LPMU*

The EOs participated in the two-day literacy training for schools and EAs. They said they monitor a few schools. This monitoring decision seems to be left to the individual sense of responsibility of an EO rather than a planned, organised activity.

Evidence that they undertook this activity was not provided and no-one had recorded any part of this monitoring activity.

The EOs had not reported any monitoring it to the LPMU as is expected of EAs. Generally monitoring and measuring performance is not a strong focus or an integral part of their work with schools.

DATA, PROGRAMME PLANNING AND ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE

Inadequate

** Effective information systems are not in place.*

Emerging

** The use of performance data is understood well enough to occasionally be used to improve the PEA organisation and schools.*

** There is a basic ability to gather data:*

- sometimes SIEMIS data forms are gathered from schools or from some but not all schools.

** There is a little ability to analyse and use data to support programme proposals.*

** Data information is sometimes reported to government:*

- sometimes SIEMIS data forms are sent to AMD/MEHRD on time (by 31st March)

** Data is seldom used to evaluate the organisation and schools and for decision-making.*

There was little or no discussion of this indicator. The EOs understood how important data is but it does not figure much in any of their activities except perhaps for small amounts of data the PEO Inspectorate collects. All said “emerging” mostly described their ability and the current data gathered by the PEA. Data collection was weak.

They do not use SIEMIS data to decide programmes. Knowing which data to collect, to analyse and then know how to use it to improve schools, is not understood. They do not align data with their activities and outcomes. This indicator may likely be more in the “inadequate” range than “emerging”.

Data collection, analysis and use would be a significant training need of this PEA.

PROGRAMME RELEVANCE, INTEGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Emerging

- * The majority of core programmes are defined and linked to the current NEAP, AWP, mission and goals.*
- * However, there is no clear strategy to develop and implement programmes.*
- * There is a limited assessment of gaps in existing programmes and little action taken.*
- * There is some ability to create new programmes.*

The CEO did not explain who wrote the Annual Work Plan (AWP) or when this had been done for 2016 and how she knew it had been followed by all the EOs. Individual EOs constructed their own work activities and these may or may not be discussed with the other EOs.

There was a lack of understanding of the need for collaboration and input by all EA officers for clarity around their activities for the year, as well as the inter-relatedness of all EOs' activities. This indicator was between “inadequate” and “emerging”.

JOB DESCRIPTIONS, KEY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Inadequate

** There is little or no fulfilment by EAs of their key*

- timely retirement of imprests*

Emerging

** There is partial understanding by EAs in fulfilling roles and meeting job descriptions.*

** There is some fulfilment of key responsibilities by EAs including*

- accountability for EA grants.*
- some data is collected and sent to central office.*

Established

** There is mostly a fulfilment of*

- Literacy Programme implementation*

The EOs had little to say about their job descriptions and roles and responsibilities. They appear to give this very little thought. They agreed with each other that it was mostly in the “emerging” stage especially in fulfilling specific, expected responsibilities, such as accounting for their EA grant and sending specific data to central office which is expected of every EA. They did not state why imprests were not retired in a timely way. Mostly they are in the “emerging” stage for this indicator but with some important weaknesses: they did not show that they ever analyse their roles and responsibilities or review these and did not state how they knew they fulfilled their roles and responsibilities. They do support the implementation of the literacy programme in schools but do not systematically monitor it.

ASSESSMENT OF SCHOOL NEEDS

Inadequate

** Planning for school improvement is not supported by systematically collected information about school needs.*

** There is limited and/or irregular and/or brief contact between the PEA and schools.*

Emerging

** Collected information about the school informs some planning, although collection is haphazard.*

** There is some regular contact between the EA and some schools – at least 30% of the total work time of all EA Officers is spent in schools (at least 6 days per month) excluding conferences and workshops.*

This indicator is between “inadequate” and “emerging”. Some information is collected from schools but it is not used strategically to analyse school needs and plan a systematic programme of support for improvement. However, in their answer to Indicator 1.5, the EOs made a strong case that in fact they have supported schools – firstly with infrastructure then supplying the right sort of teachers - so some planning and assessment must have taken place in these 10 schools. The EA officers estimated that only 10% to 20% of their time was spent with schools even though this is their core job. The CEO spent the least amount of time in schools citing weather, distance, poor access to boat transportation (if the inspector has taken the boat, it cannot be used by others – *and the CEO does not accompany her on the boat and complete her own work with the school at the same time as the EO Inspector*), poor access to schools and lack of money as reasons for not going to schools. It was not clearly understood that the majority of their work time needs to be in schools if they are to improve them. The PEO Inspectorate was the most systematic in school visits with a clear purpose, an expected range of activities and work outcomes.

ENGAGEMENT WITH THE SCHOOL BOARD AND THE COMMUNITY

Emerging 📌

- * The importance of School Boards is understood by the PEA and there is some attempt to engage with them.*
- * Involvement with the community is considered important for school improvement.*
- * There is some contact and engagement between the PEA and the community regarding schools.*
- * The PEA has a few productive meetings with a few School Boards and the community about school needs.*

The EOs felt that this was a strength for them, although still between “emerging” and “established” but definitely somewhat better than the “emerging” stage.

They felt they communicated well with school communities and school boards. They also have a regular radio programme that they said they used to good effect to communicate news and activities about schools to the general community.

The PEO stated that 80% to 90% of schools had a functioning School Board but not all members of school boards understood their role and functions. The PEA had made sustained attempts to establish strong relationships with school communities and school boards.

3. MANAGEMENT CAPACITY

LEADERSHIP BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE FOR THEIR ROLES

Inadequate

** There has been limited further learning and development by EA officers.*

** Commitment to their work is somewhat lacking. 📞*

Emerging

** The EA officers have some background and prior experience in leadership and management.*

** They have some experience of developing others in their role e.g. school principals as leaders.*

** There is satisfactory*

📞 commitment to their work.

The EOs usually attend MEHRD workshops but have very little other learning and development. They did attend a short workshop conducted by the Institute of Public Administration and Management (IPAM) for capacity-building.

All have a teaching background with two having school leadership experience. There has been little further learning and development since initial qualifications and training. They have not had training in supporting capacity development of school leaders and teachers.

SHARED PRACTICES AND DECISION MAKING PROCESSES

Emerging

** There is a common set of good practice among some staff but these are not shared consistently and only partially align to the organisation's purpose.*

** Appropriate decision-making processes have been established and are known.*

** However decisions often break down, become informal and have limited impact.*

This is “emerging” at best. There are no regular, formal, decision-making meetings which may indicate they are somewhat “inadequate” in this indicator.

However, decisions are usually transparent. Some satisfactory decisions are made but not followed through.

GOAL-SETTING AND MEETING TARGETS

Emerging

** Goal setting in the AWP mirrors the current NEAP and is part of the work of the PEA.*

** Targets are based on short-term goals in daily work but strategies are weak.*

** Targets may lack milestones.*

** Targets are known and used by some staff.*

** Targets are linked to goals.*

All EOs stated this was an “emerging” capacity. Each had their own targets and goals and basic strategies (strategies that have worked previously) loosely based on the AWP and therefore the NEAP.

The EOs said they couldn’t meet all targets because of a lack of time and money and access to schools (*however most schools are on the 3 islands near to each other and the PEA office*). They felt that their targets were realistic but not always met.

NEAP goal-setting was established in the AWP but targets may not actually be met by the EOs. The development of strategies to meet targets was very weak and was a significant training need for this PEA.

FINANCIAL PLANNING SYSTEMS AND BUDGETING

Inadequate

** There is a limited financial system in place and minimal long-term financial planning for managing targeted goals and activities.*

** There are few realistic budget projections.*

** Financial plans and budgets are not updated when needed, to reflect priorities.*

** There is a minimal overall budget and poor individual programme budgets, and little understanding of these.*

This is “inadequate”. The EOs said they do not ever discuss together their overall budget, their own programme budget and the annual goals and priorities of the PEA. They do not align their own budgets for their programmes into the larger budget and expenditures. They never adjust their budgets because they never have budget and expenditure meetings.

The PEA appears to operate with almost no understanding of overall budget and financial decisions and the direct impact these have on their work.

The EOs also stated that a lack of data (and their lack of data gathering) makes budget projections difficult. They said that their MEHRD-based accountant, Henry Kezi, does not visit as a budget adviser and to audit expenditure (according to the EOs) and only ever visit as the imprest-holder.

FINANCIAL OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT

Inadequate

* There is little or no documentation of finances that is recorded and retained:

- there is little or no evidence to AMD that the Maintenance Grant is used for maintaining and repairing school buildings and equipment.

Emerging

* *There is some financial accountability. A few financial contributions are made public, with contributions deposited and activities and costs documented.*

* *The majority of financial arrangements are reported to MEHRD/AMD.*

* *A few financial reports are submitted including a few of the following:*

(1) the bi-annual financial report and budget

(2) the work programmes and manpower establishments;

(3) Retirement reports for all schools.

* *There is at least some financial checks and balances in place.*

The EOs felt they did an adequate job on financial operations management given that no-one has expertise in this area and their nominated accountant almost never advises them.

According to the EOs, the accountant does not support them in developing a budget at the beginning of the year or preparing budget expenditures for MEHRD. The CEO was not clear on the full financial entitlement of the PEA.

OPERATIONAL PLANNING AND PROCESSES

Inadequate

** Operations are random with little medium- to long-term planning including for:*

- the annual school stocktake

** There are few processes such as reviews, and information dissemination for active functioning of the organization.*

** The use of processes is variable or unplanned*

- Curriculum materials are not sent to schools for a long time and for the start of the school year.

- there is not an enforced date for completion of a schools' stocktake so forms can be sent to MEHRD for book reprints;

- curriculum materials' distribution is not signed off by the EA on delivery to schools.

** There is little monitoring and evaluation of processes, such as*

- monitoring each schools' curriculum materials' needs and the order forms (schools make requests direct to MEHRD).

** Discussion at formal meetings does not lead to effective action. (There are no formal meetings).*

Operational planning and processes were very weak. The EOs said they cooperated with the contractors for curriculum materials distribution but were unclear as to their role and responsibilities. *(A number of people at MEHRD believe the EA should go to schools with contractors to ensure appropriate materials reach the right schools).*

They did not discuss whether they had a realistic, operational plan. They made limited comments on how effective they were at real-world activities as in the last 2 dot points which would require consistent communication and regular, continuing school visits.

PEA STAFF PERFORMANCE

Emerging

- * Most PEA staff are somewhat working to their potential.*
- * Mostly they are reliable and somewhat capable and committed to the organisation.*
- * A few have developed a little ability to solve problems as they arise.*
- * The majority are a little interested in developing in their work and in the success of the PEA's mission.*
- * A current EA officer could not take on the role of EA leadership.*

Established

- * Most show some independence from the CEO and could work without a leader in the short-term.*

Given the declined working relationships of Eos, the PEO's comment that they are "established" in this indicator is difficult to agree with. Answers in other indicators would show that in their performance they have not always developed strategies and actions for their own organisations' success, but have had some success with a number of schools in improvement.

Given the problems in this PEA, this indicator is no more than "emerging". The CEO did not discuss how staff appraisal of EOs occurred and how each person's performance was measured.

It would appear that they have never been appraised on performance and this would be a training need, especially given that part of their role is to appraise School Principals/Head Teachers.

RECRUITING, RETAINING AND TRAINING OF SCHOOL STAFF

Emerging

**There is a developing capacity to recruit and retain staff for schools.*

** Some training, coaching, and feedback is provided to school leaders and teachers,*

** Training occurs infrequently.*

** School performance is evaluated to a small extent but there is limited understanding of how to do this.*

The EOs stated they had done an acceptable job in supporting schools' with their School Development Plan (*although they previously stated they only visited between 10% and 20% of schools so the breadth of their impact would be limited*). The CEO stated they had supported School Boards well and worked with them on school staff's attitude to work, and on the chain of command between schools and the School Board including any disconnect between the school and the School Board.

The PEO Inspectorate said she helped school principals in teacher appraisals, using the MEHRD instrument for teacher appraisal (part of Inspectorate). She appeared to have the strongest understanding of how to appraise teachers. However, there was not a systematic approach by the PEA on analysing what they find out about teaching quality and constructing a programme to address teaching needs in a school. Appraisal and training of school leaders was a weakness with all the EOs. There was no discussion of how or when they do staff training in schools. (*Training of PEA staff to train and support school leaders and teachers is a significant need for them to effectively fulfil their roles and responsibilities towards improving schools*).

The PEO stated that only 10 of 568 teachers had been appraised and confirmed by the verification committee. All others were in "acting" teacher roles. The EOs said this was a bureaucratic problem – a problem of the processes for appraisal and confirmation of teachers. Two areas of complaint about MEHRD/central management were: the Inspectorate division does not send back school inspection reports to the PEA, and the TSD teacher appraisal system has a negative impact on teachers.

4. OPERATIONAL CAPACITY

STAFFING OF SCHOOLS

Inadequate

** On-going teacher absenteeism is not dealt with by the PEA with schools.*

Emerging

** Schools are adequately staffed but there is some inappropriate staffing.*

** There is some attempt to address poor staff performance but this is not always successful.*

** Staff turnover is a persistent problem.*

** Poor school staff punctuality partially being addressed.*

The PEO Inspectorate does some random checking, during school inspection, of teacher absence and poor punctuality. The EOs know the problem but have not developed effective strategies to deal with the issue.

There was no problem-solving by them in this discussion. They did not explain their plan and strategy to reduce this problem, as well as the other key staffing issues in schools.

SCHOOL BOARD INVOLVEMENT

Emerging

- * The PEA is not well-engaged with them for successful school improvement.*
- * School Board activities with schools are not always encouraged and supported by the PEA.*

Established

- * The PEA understands and supports the School Board's role and responsibilities for school improvement.*

The EOs understand the high importance of working with school boards and have a rapport with them but not a strong working relationship and effective collaborative strategies on the most important issue of how to improve their school.

COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

Established

- * A planned, broad communication strategy is in place within the PEA.*
- * Key messages are communicated to most schools and School Boards.*
- * Communication with stakeholders is generally consistent and coordinated and results in positive responses.*

The PEA has a weekly radio programme that is a most effective means of communicating with the community, and with parents, schools and School Boards. This is a key method of communication especially given how scattered communities are.

DATABASES AND MANAGEMENT REPORTING SYSTEMS

Inadequate

- * Systems for tracking the work of the PEA are not in place.*
- * There is unplanned and no formal tracking of financial information, use of budgets, programmes and outcomes.*
- * Databases are not used by PEA staff.*

There is no data system at all throughout the PEA. The PEO Inspectorate did not attend (“she missed”) the inspection data system training provided by MEHRD. They did not mention any manual filing system for data that they had developed.

There is an urgent need for training in this area.

SUMMARY of PERFORMANCE

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS and INDICATORS	INADEQUATE	INADEQUATE to EMERGING	EMERGING	EMERGING to ESTABLISHED	ESTABLISHED	ESTABLISHED to WELL-ESTABLISHED	WELL-ESTABLISHED
LEADERSHIP CAPACITY							
1.1 Vision, Shared Beliefs and Values			EMERGING				
1.2 Mission			EMERGING				
1.3 Goals linked to current NEAP and PEAP			EMERGING				
1.4 Analytical and Strategic Thinking and Planning			EMERGING				
1.5 Change Management					ESTABLISHED		
1.6 Organisational Skills			EMERGING				
1.7 Financial Competence			EMERGING				
1.8 The Ability to Motivate and Enable others	INADEQUATE						

Overall leadership capacity is in the emerging stage at best. The PEO Inspectorate showed strong capacity to lead in her inspection role. The PEO had a plentiful and useful knowledge of the schools and the province but did not extend his capacity in ways to enhance, support or lead others in their roles. Unfortunately, the CEO – the key leader – displayed few characteristics of an effective leader. She is unable or unwilling to ensure there is collaboration and strong cooperation between the EOs. And in this respect she does not lead by example. There are no formal meetings, which are important for sharing information, and planning and organising activities with a collaborative and supportive system. Decisions are made in an ad hoc way and largely by each individual EOs in their own role. The CEO speaks most often of the constraints in the PEA even though the other EOs have made in-roads in the improved functioning of schools. CEO leadership is a particular failure in enabling and motivating others. However, she is dealing with an apparently intractable PEO.

The PEA's own vision and mission statements are not clear or not established. Goals are linked to the AWP but this is an annual/start-of-the-year exercise (or done at the end of the previous year) that will have an essential impact on their everyday activities.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS and INDICATORS	INADEQUATE	INADEQUATE to EMERGING	EMERGING	EMERGING to ESTABLISHED	ESTABLISHED	ESTABLISHED to WELL-ESTABLISHED	WELL-ESTABLISHED
ADAPATIVE CAPACITY							
2.1 Performance Measurement			EMERGING				
2.2 Data, Programme Planning and Organizational change			EMERGING				
2.3 Programme Relevance, Integration and Development			EMERGING				
2.4 Job Descriptions, Key roles and Responsibilities			EMERGING				
2.5 Assessment of School Needs		INADEQUATE to EMERGING					
2.6 Engagement with the School Board and the community				EMERGING to ESTABLISHED			

Overall, adaptive capacity is “emerging”. Strengths of the PEA are their relationships with the community and developing relationships with school boards. One of the most significant recent adaptations for EAs has been the introduction of the Literacy programme in schools across the Solomon Islands for years 1 to 3, which was progressively introduced from 2014. This PEA supports its implementation but does not monitor the programme in schools and has not attempted to evaluate its impact on teaching and learning in years 1 to 3 and the school principal. The EA officers understand the importance of adaptive capacity but it does not appear to impact their thinking in regards to their work both for their organisation and for schools. There is not a strong understanding of adapting programmes to directly meet school needs.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS and INDICATORS	INADEQUATE	INADEQUATE to EMERGING	EMERGING	EMERGING to ESTABLISHED	ESTABLISHED	ESTABLISHED to WELL-ESTABLISHED	WELL-ESTABLISHED
MANAGEMENT CAPACITY							
3.1 Background and Experience		INADEQUATE to EMERGING					
3.2 Shared Practices and Decision-Making Processes			EMERGING				
3.3 Goal-Setting and Meeting Targets			EMERGING				
3.4 Financial Planning Systems and Budgeting	INADEQUATE						
3.5 Financial Operations' Management			EMERGING				
3.6 Operational Planning and Processes	INADEQUATE						
3.7 PEA Staff performance			EMERGING				
3.8 Recruiting, Retaining and Training of school staff			EMERGING				

THE CENTRAL ISLANDS' PEA IS "EMERGING" IN MANAGEMENT CAPACITY, UNDERSTANDING AND PRACTICE, WITH TWO "INADEQUATE" AREAS OF CAPACITY. CURRENTLY THE CEO AND PEO ARE NOT DEMONSTRATING LEADERSHIP AND GOOD MANAGEMENT BY THEIR EXAMPLE. THE PEA WAS WEAKEST IN FINANCIAL PLANNING SYSTEMS AND BUDGETING WHICH THEY BLAMED ON LACK OF APPROPRIATE ACCOUNTANCY SUPPORT, AND WEAKNESS IN THE SETTING UP AND MANAGING OF OPERATIONAL PLANNING AND PROCESSES, PRIMARILY DUE TO A LACK OF UNDERSTANDING OF THE HIGH IMPORTANCE OF THIS AND HOW TO GO ABOUT DOING IT.

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS and INDICATORS	INADEQUATE	INADEQUATE to EMERGING	EMERGING	EMERGING to ESTABLISHED	ESTABLISHED	ESTABLISHED to WELL-ESTABLISHED	WELL-ESTABLISHED
OPERATIONAL CAPACITY							
4.1 Staffing of schools			EMERGING				
4.2 School Board Involvement			EMERGING				
4.3 Communication Strategy					ESTABLISHED		
4.4 Databases and Management Reporting Systems	INADEQUATE						

As with leadership capacity, adaptive capacity and management capacity, operational capacity of the PEA is at best “emerging” on both understanding and setting up appropriate operations within their organisation. The EOs are very weak on operational matters to address strategic planning, action and activities, as well as to measure the impact of their activities, to refine programmes and to develop new ones. Communication via a radio programme was a highly positive element of their operations.

THE WAY FORWARD!!!