



July 20, 2017

DIVISION MEMORANDUM

No. 453 s. 2017

**REGIONAL MONITORING EVALUATION AND ADJUSTMENT (RMEA) DATA
GATHERING FOR THE 4TH QUARTER SY 2016-2017**

**TO : District Supervisors/OIC's
District M&E Coordinators
District IT Coordinators**

1. The districts are hereby informed to supply the needed data on the enclosed slides for the 4th Quarter SY 2016-2017, as provided by DepEd Regional Office VII.
2. Should you need softcopies of the enclosed slides, kindly send an email to norman.blanco@deped.gov.ph or call/SMS Mr. Norman Blanco at 0932-5144455.
3. All PowerPoint slides must be submitted through email on or before July 22, 2017 (Saturday) for the Division Office to consolidate the data.
4. Immediate and wide dissemination of this Memorandum is desired.


RHEA MAR A. ANGTUD, Ed.D., CESO VI
Schools Division Superintendent

Telephone Numbers:

Schools Division Superintendent:	(032) 255-6405
Asst. Schools Division Superintendent:	(032) 414-7457
Accounting Section:	(032) 254-2632
Disbursing Section:	(032) 255-4401
Admin/Legal:	(032) 253-7847

Website : www.depedcebuprovince.com

E-mail Add : depedcebuprovince@yahoo.com

A. EXTENT OF SMEA IMPLEMENTATION

DISTRICT	NO. OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS COVERED BY SMEA								
	ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS			JUNIOR HS			SENIOR HS		
	ACTUAL NUMBER	JOINING SMEA	%	ACTUAL NUMBER	JOINING SMEA	%	ACTUAL NUMBER	JOINING SMEA	%
e.g. Alcantara	8	7	87.5	1	1	100	1	1	100
DIVISION									

B.1 EXTENT OF SMEA IMPLEMENTATION

DISTRICT	NO. OF LEARNERS COVERED								
	Kindergarten			GRADES 1-3			GRADES 4-6		
	ENROLMENT (EOSY)	COVERED BY SMEA	%	ENROLMENT (EOSY)	COVERED BY SMEA	%	ENROLMENT (EOSY)	COVERED BY SMEA	%
e.g. Alcantara									

B.2 EXTENT OF SMEA IMPLEMENTATION

DISTRICT	NO. OF LEARNERS COVERED					
	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL			SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL		
	ENROLMENT (EOSY)	COVERED BY SMEA	%	ENROLMENT (EOSY)	COVERED BY SMEA	%
e.g. Alcantara						

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on ACCESS

1.1 Learners at Risk of Dropping Out (LARDOs)/Drop Outs

KEY STAGE	SDO Enrolment		NUMBER OF LARDOs/Drop Outs				Trend (Increasing, Decreasing, Fluctuating)
	BOSY	EOSY	Sem 1		Sem 2		
			Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
K-Grade 3							
Grades 4-6							
Grades 7-10							
Grades 11-12							
K-Grade12							

Only the data in the Fourth Quarter is referred to as Dropouts.

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on ACCESS
1.2 Learners with Poor Nutrition (LPNs)

BOSY Enrolment	
EOSY Enrolment	

KEY STAGE	NUMBER OF LPNs THAT ARE									
	WASTED				Trend (Increasing, Decreasing, Fluctuating)	SEVERELY WASTED				Trend (Increasing, Decreasing, Fluctuating)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
K-Grade 3										
Grades 4-6										
Grades 7-10										
Grades 11-12										
K-Grade12										

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.1 Learners with Quarterly Failures (LQFs)

SUBJECT	NUMBER OF LQFs																		
	Grades 1 - 3					Trend	Grades 4-6					Trend	Grades 7-10					Trend	
	BOSY ENR:		EOSY ENR:				BOSY ENR:		EOSY ENR:				BOSY ENR:		EOSY ENR:				
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	F	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	F	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	F				
MTB																			
English																			
Filipino																			
Science																			
Math																			
AP																			
MAPEH																			
EPP/ TLE																			
EsP																			

The data in the Final Rating reflect the numbers of LQFs determined by the Recomputed Final Grade after the summer classes program.

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.2 Learners with Reading Gaps (LRGs)
 —Non-Reader(NRs), Slow Readers (SRs), and Frustration Readers (FRs)

LRGs by Subject	NUMBER OF NRs, FRs, and SRs																	
	Grades 1 - 3					Trend	Grades 4-6					Trend	Grades 7-10					Trend
	BOSY ENR: EOSY ENR:						BOSY ENR: EOSY ENR:						BOSY ENR: EOSY ENR:					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	FINAL		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	FINAL		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	FINAL	
NRs in MTB																		
FRs in MTB																		
NRs in Filipino																		
FRs in Filipino																		
SRs in Filipino																		
NRs in English																		
FRs in English																		
SRs in English																		

The data in the Final Rating reflect the numbers of LRGs after the summer Remedial Reading Program.

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.3 Learners with Numeracy Gaps (LNGs)
 —Non-Numerates(NNs), Slow Numerates (SNs) and Frustration Numerates (FNs)

LNGs	NUMBER OF NNs, SNs, and FNs																	
	Grades 1 - 3					Trend	Grades 4-6					Trend	Grades 7-10					Trend
	BOSY ENR: EOSY ENR:						BOSY ENR: EOSY ENR:						BOSY ENR: EOSY ENR:					
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	FINAL		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	FINAL		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	FINAL	
Non-Numerates																		
Slow Numerates																		
Frustration Numerates																		

The data in the Final Rating reflect the numbers of LNGs after the summer Remedial Numeracy Program.

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.4 Teaching of Learning Competencies (LCs) in the School Year

LEGEND					
C1	Taught 100% of LCs		C3	Taught 50%-74% of LCs	
C2	Taught 75%-99% of LCs		C4	Taught below 50% of LCs	
N	Total No. of Teachers		C	Category of Teachers	

SUBJECT	Grades 1 - 3					Grades 4-6					Grades 7-10				
	N	C1	C2	C3	C4	N	C1	C2	C3	C4	N	C1	C2	C3	C4
MTB															
English															
Filipino															
Science															
Math															
AP															
MAPEH															
EPP/ TLE															
EsP															

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.4.1 Teaching of Learning Competencies (LCs) in Grades 1-3

LEGEND					
C1	Taught 100% of LCs		C3	Taught 50%-74% of LCs	
C2	Taught 75%-99% of LCs		C4	Taught below 50% of LCs	
N	Total No. of Teachers				

SUBJECT	NUMBER OF GRADES 1-3 TEACHERS WHO																			
	C1: Taught 100% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered					C2: Taught 75-99% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered					C3: Taught 50-74% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered					C4: Taught below 50% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered				
	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
MTB																				
English																				
Filipino																				
Science																				
Math																				
AP																				
MAPEH																				
EPP/ TLE																				
EsP																				

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.4.2 Teaching of Learning Competencies (LCs) in Grades 4-6

LEGEND			
C1	Taught 100% of LCs	C3	Taught 50%-74% of LCs
C2	Taught 75%-99% of LCs	C4	Taught below 50% of LCs
N	Total No. of Teachers		

SUBJECT	NUMBER OF GRADES 4-6 TEACHERS WHO																			
	C1: Taught 100% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered					C2: Taught 75-99% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered					C3: Taught 50-74% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered					C4: Taught below 50% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered				
	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
English																				
Filipino																				
Science																				
Math																				
AP																				
MAPEH																				
EPP/ TLE																				
EsP																				

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.4.3 Teaching of Learning Competencies (LCs) in Grades 7-10

LEGEND			
C1	Taught 100% of LCs	C3	Taught 50%-74% of LCs
C2	Taught 75%-99% of LCs	C4	Taught below 50% of LCs
N	Total No. of Teachers		

SUBJECT	NUMBER OF GRADES 7-10 TEACHERS WHO																			
	C1: Taught 100% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered					C2: Taught 75-99% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered					C3: Taught 50-74% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered					C4: Taught below 50% of LCs in the Quarter/s Already Covered				
	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	N	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
English																				
Filipino																				
Science																				
Math																				
AP																				
MAPEH																				
EPP/ TLE																				
EsP																				

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.5 Learners' Mastery of Learning Competencies (LCs) in the School Year

LEGEND

C1	Learners with NO MASTERY	FG of 60-74	C3	Learners NEARING MASTERY	FG of 80-89
C2	Learners that LACK MASTERY	FG of 70-79	C4	Learners ATTAINING MASTERY	FG of 90-99
C	Category of Learners		N	Total Number of Learners	

SUBJECT	Grades 1 - 3					Grades 4-6					Grades 7-10				
	N	C1	C2	C3	C4	N	C1	C2	C3	C4	N	C1	C2	C3	C4
MTB															
English															
Filipino															
Science															
Math															
AP															
MAPEH															
EPP/ TLE															
EsP															

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.5.1 Learners' Mastery of Learning Competencies (LCs) in Grades 1-3

LEGEND

C1	Learners with NO MASTERY	GRADE of 60-74	C3	Learners NEARING MASTERY	GRADE of 80-89
C2	Learners that LACK MASTERY	GRADE of 70-79	C4	Learners ATTAINING MASTERY	GRADE of 90-99
C	Category of Learners		N	Total Number of Learners	

SUBJECT	ENROLMENT		NUMBER OF GRADES 1-3 LEARNERS WHO															
			C1: Have NO MASTERY OF LCs				C2: LACK MASTERY OF LCs				C3: ARE NEARING MASTERY OF LCs				C4: ATTAINED MASTERY OF LCs			
	BOSY	This Quarter	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
English																		
Filipino																		
Science																		
Math																		
AP																		
MAPEH																		
EPP/ TLE																		
EsP																		

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.5.2 Learners' Mastery of Learning Competencies (LCs) in Grades 4-6

LEGEND					
C1	Learners with NO MASTERY	GRADE of 60-74	C3	Learners NEARING MASTERY	GRADE of 80-89
C2	Learners that LACK MASTERY	GRADE of 70-79	C4	Learners ATTAINING MASTERY	GRADE of 90-99
C	Category of Learners		N	Total Number of Learners	

SUBJECT	ENROLMENT		NUMBER OF GRADES 4-6 LEARNERS WHO															
			C1: Have NO MASTERY OF LCs				C2: LACK MASTERY OF LCs				C3: ARE NEARING MASTERY OF LCs				C4: ATTAINED MASTERY OF LCs			
	BOSY	This Quarter	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
English																		
Filipino																		
Science																		
Math																		
AP																		
MAPEH																		
EPP/ TLE																		
EsP																		

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

Status Report Progress Performance Indicators on Quality & Relevance
2.5.2 Learners' Mastery of Learning Competencies (LCs) in Grades 7-10

LEGEND					
C1	Learners with NO MASTERY	GRADE of 60-74	C3	Learners NEARING MASTERY	GRADE of 80-89
C2	Learners that LACK MASTERY	GRADE of 70-79	C4	Learners ATTAINING MASTERY	GRADE of 90-99
C	Category of Learners		N	Total Number of Learners	

SUBJECT	ENROLMENT		NUMBER OF GRADES 7-10 LEARNERS WHO															
			C1: Have NO MASTERY OF LCs				C2: LACK MASTERY OF LCs				C3: ARE NEARING MASTERY OF LCs				C4: ATTAINED MASTERY OF LCs			
	BOSY	This Quarter	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
English																		
Filipino																		
Science																		
Math																		
AP																		
MAPEH																		
EPP/ TLE																		
EsP																		

Division of Cebu Province

- DMEA-Organizational Effectiveness Q2 of CY 2017
- DMEA-Delivery of Basic Education Services Q4 and End of SY 2016-2017

M&E Report on CIGPs

IDENTIFIED CIGPS	SDO INTERVENTIONS	TA NEEDED FROM RO
A. Delivery of Basic Education Services (Access)		
B. Delivery of Basic Education Services (Quality and Relevance)		
C. Delivery of Basic Education Services (Governance)		
D. Organizational Effectiveness (WFP Implementation)		
E. Organization Resource Support (Human, Financial)		

Qualitative M&E Data: On LARDOs/Dropouts

DISTRICT OF _____

LARDOs			Dropouts	Trend
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
				Increasing/ decreasing/ fluctuating
Having done serious QA-TA-ME services to schools, what are the common reasons why there are LARDOs?				
1.				
2.				
3.				

Qualitative M&E Data: On LARDOs/Dropouts

DISTRICT OF _____

Please list down the interventions the different schools in your SDO have been implementing in order to save LARDOs.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Qualitative M&E Data: On LARDOs/Dropouts

DISTRICT OF _____

Which among the interventions in your list has/have been effective in saving LARDOs? What makes this/these effective? You may share the most significant stories of LARDO/s being saved. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

Intervention	Reasons for Effectiveness/ Significant Stories of LARDO/s being saved

A video presentation (3-5 minutes) would be welcome.

Qualitative M&E Data: On LARDOs/Dropouts

DISTRICT OF _____

Which among the interventions in your list have the potentials of becoming effective in saving LARDOs? What makes this/these intervention/s less effective? What adjustments in **structure, process, and/or tools** have to be made to improve its implementation? Cite specific activities conducted in SY 2017-2018. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

Intervention	Weaknesses	Adjustments to be made

Qualitative M&E Data: On LARDOs/Dropouts

DISTRICT OF _____

Factoring in the most logical reasons why there are still LARDOs, choose one **LARDO intervention** which your SDO finds promising or effective, and prepare comprehensive standards and guidelines on how to implement it. Explain the structure (responsible persons), the process (systematic steps and procedures), and the tools (instruments) needed. You may use extra slides if necessary.

Name of Intervention: _____

STEPS	PROCESS	STRUCTURE	TOOLS
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

Qualitative M&E Data: On LARDOs/Dropouts

DISTRICT OF _____

What localized policy/ies would you like to propose to the Region to consider to be able to successfully address the issues on LARDOs/ Dropouts?

1.

2.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Quarterly Failures (LQFs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Number of Learners with Quarterly Failures (LQFs)				No. of Failures	Trend
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	FG	

Having done serious QA-TA-ME services to schools, what are the common reasons why there are LQFs?

1.

2.

3.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Quarterly Failures (LQFs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Please list down the interventions the different schools in your SDO have been implementing in order to save LQFs.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Quarterly Failures (LQFs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Which among the interventions in your list has/have been effective in saving LQFs? What makes this/these effective? You may share the most significant stories of LQF/s being saved. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

Intervention	Reasons for Effectiveness/ Significant Stories of LQF/s being saved

A video presentation (3-5 minutes) would be welcome.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Quarterly Failures (LQFs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Which among the interventions in your list have the potentials of becoming effective in saving LQFs? What makes this/these intervention/s less effective? What adjustments in **structure, process, and/or tools** have to be made to improve its implementation? Cite specific activities conducted in SY 2017-2018 , incl. summer. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

Intervention	Weaknesses	Adjustments to be made

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Quarterly Failures (LQFs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Factoring in the most logical reasons some learners have quarterly failures, choose one LQF **intervention** which your SDO finds promising or effective, and prepare comprehensive standards and guidelines on how to implement it. Explain the structure (responsible persons), the process (systematic steps and procedures), and the tools (instruments) needed. You may use extra slides if necessary.

Name of Intervention:

STEPS	PROCESS	STRUCTURE	TOOLS
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Quarterly Failures (LQFs)

DISTRICT OF _____

What localized policy/ies would you like to propose to the Region to be able to successfully address the issues on LQFs?

1.

2.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Reading Gaps (LRGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Number of Learners with Reading Gaps (LRGs)					Trend
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Summer	

Having done serious QA-TA-ME services to schools, what are the common reasons why there are LRGs?

1.

2.

3.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Reading Gaps (LRGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Please list down the interventions the different schools in your SDO have been implementing in order to save LRGs.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

1.	
2.	
3.	

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Reading Gaps (LRGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Which among the interventions in your list has/have been effective in saving LRGs? What makes this/these effective? You may share the most significant stories of LRG/s being saved. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

Intervention	Reasons for Effectiveness/ Significant Stories of LRG/s being saved

A video presentation (3-5 minutes) would be welcome.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Reading Gaps (LRGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Which among the interventions in your list have the potentials of becoming effective in saving LRGs? What makes this/these intervention/s less effective? What adjustments in **structure, process, and/or tools** have to be made to improve its implementation? Cite specific activities conducted in SY 2017-2018, incl. summer. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

Intervention	Weaknesses	Adjustments to be made

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Reading Gaps (LRGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Factoring in the most logical reasons some learners have reading gaps, choose one **LRG intervention** which your SDO finds promising or effective, and prepare comprehensive standards and guidelines on how to implement it. Explain the structure (responsible persons), the process (systematic steps and procedures), and the tools (instruments) needed. You may use extra slides if necessary.

Name of Intervention:

STEPS	PROCESS	STRUCTURE	TOOLS
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

*Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Reading Gaps (LRGs)***DISTRICT OF _____**

What localized policy/ies would you like to propose to the Region to be able to successfully address the issues on LRGs?

1.

2.

*Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Numeracy Gaps (LNGs)***DISTRICT OF _____**

Number of Learners with Numeracy Gaps (LNGs)					Trend
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Summer	

Having done serious QA-TA-ME services to schools, what are the common reasons why there are LNGs?

1.

2.

3.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Numeracy Gaps (LNGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Please list down the interventions the different schools in your SDO have been implementing in order to save LNGs.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Numeracy Gaps (LNGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Which among the interventions in your list has/have been effective in saving LNGs? What makes this/these effective? You may share the most significant stories of LNG/s being saved. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

A video presentation (3-5 minutes) would be welcome.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Numeracy Gaps (LNGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Which among the interventions in your list have the potentials of becoming effective in saving LNGs? What makes this/these intervention/s less effective? What adjustments in **structure, process, and/or tools** have to be made to improve its implementation? Cite specific activities conducted in SY 2017-2018 , incl. summer. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Numeracy Gaps (LNGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Factoring in the most logical reasons some learners have numeracy gaps, choose one **LNG intervention** which your SDO finds promising or effective, and prepare comprehensive standards and guidelines on how to implement it. Explain the structure (responsible persons), the process (systematic steps and procedures), and the tools (instruments) needed. You may use extra slides if necessary.

Name of Intervention:

STEPS	PROCESS	STRUCTURE	TOOLS
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Numeracy Gaps (LNGs)

DISTRICT OF _____

What localized policy/ies would you like to propose to the Region to be able to successfully address the issues on LNGs?

- 1.
- 2.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Poor Nutrition (LPNs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Number of Learners with Poor Nutrition (LPNs)												Trend
Q1			Q2			Q3			Q4			
W	SW	LPN	W	SW	LPN	W	SW	LPN	W	SW	LPN	

Having done serious QA-TA-ME services to schools, what are the common reasons of LPNs?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

*Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Poor Nutrition (LPNs)***DISTRICT OF _____**

Please list down the interventions the different schools in your SDO have been implementing in order to save LPNs.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

*Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Poor Nutrition (LPNs)***DISTRICT OF _____**

Which among the interventions in your list has/have been effective in saving LPNs? What makes this/these effective? You may share the most significant stories of LPN/s being saved. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

Intervention	Reasons for Effectiveness/ Significant Stories of LPN/s being saved

A video presentation (3-5 minutes) would be welcome.

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Poor Nutrition (LPNs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Which among the interventions in your list have the potentials of becoming effective in saving LPNs? What makes this/these intervention/s less effective? What adjustments in **structure, process, and/or tools** have to be made to improve its implementation? Cite specific activities conducted in SY 2017-2018 , incl. summer. (Please use additional slides if necessary)

Intervention	Weaknesses	Adjustments to be made

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Poor Nutrition (LPNs)

DISTRICT OF _____

Factoring in the most logical reasons why some learners have poor nutrition, choose one **LPN intervention** which your SDO finds promising or effective, and prepare comprehensive standards and guidelines on how to implement it. Explain the structure (responsible persons), the process (systematic steps and procedures), and the tools (instruments) needed. You may use extra slides if necessary.

Name of Intervention:

STEPS	PROCESS	STRUCTURE	TOOLS
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

Qualitative M&E Data: On Learners with Poor Nutrition (LPNs)

DISTRICT OF _____

What localized policy/ies would you like to propose to the Region to be able to successfully address the issues on LPNs?

1.

2.