

KENYA

**Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST)
and
Development Partners in Education**

FAST TRACK INITIATIVE ENDORSEMENT CEREMONY

7 JULY 2005

**ASSESSMENT OF THE PRIMARY EDUCATION
COMPONENTS OF KENYA EDUCATION SECTOR
SUPPORT PROGRAMME (KESSP) 2005-2010**

SUMMARY:

The primary education plans within the KESSP are of a high quality by comparison with earlier efforts in the African region to develop basic education plans within a sector-wide approach. The Ministry and its partners need to be congratulated for their strenuous efforts during this inevitably lengthy process. It needs to be stressed that no plan can ever be perfect. Yet the overall road map to achieve UPE is clear; it has been painstakingly constructed; and it enjoys substantial political support.

Furthermore most primary education IPs are now sufficiently well developed and ready for implementation. Some of these already have a successful track record based on earlier investments and are likely to move forward quickly. Others will need to proceed more slowly and steadily as new and experimental approaches are tested out. There remain a few components where further preparatory work and design is needed before a detailed programme can be implemented.

However, there are no grounds for complacency on the part of the Ministry and its development partners. Once the plans have been finalized and agreed; implementation, perhaps the hardest part, needs to get underway.

STRENGTHS:

- The plans have been developed through a highly consultative process led by the Ministry in which all key stakeholders have been engaged. This process has been strongly supported by the local donor community.
- The broad strategies and policies for achieving quality UPE are supported by both Cabinet and Parliamentarians. This is reflected in the Government's substantial financial commitment to primary education which exceeds the EFA benchmarks.
- There has been extensive dialogue between the Ministry and the MOF to ensure that the plans are realistic in relation to the Government's medium-term resource envelope for the sector. The financing gap has been deliberately set at a modest level, in view of past concerns about the predictability of external funding.
- There now exists a critical mass of Ministry officials who own the KESSP and are committed to its implementation. These managers have a clear sense of what they are trying to achieve, how it will be done, and how their effort link up with other Programs.
- A comprehensive set of strategies have been developed to improve access to primary education for children out of school, including vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.

- A coherent set of school-based interventions have been developed to promote quality improvement, including the development of both head teachers and classroom teachers, and the continued provision of instructional materials.
- A policy decision has been taken to keep the number of primary and secondary teachers constant over the medium-term in order to maintain the necessary fiscal space for investments in the primary education components.
- “Mainstreamed” management structures and accountability relationships have been developed for the KESSP, and a responsible manager appointed for each IP.
- Established implementation and financing mechanisms are already in place as a result of earlier systems development support for free primary education.
- Results-based management will be the foundation of the overall capacity building plan for the KESSP. Complementary to the proposed accountability relationships, this process will enable management to pay continuous attention to the programme results required to achieve UPE.

CONCERNS: (comments inserted end May on completion of KESSP Appraisal)

The concerns highlighted here will begin to be addressed during the first year of KESSP implementation by GOK/donors and should form part of the agenda for the planned joint review meetings

- Little attention has been given to achieving efficiency gains across the various Investment Programmes. This is a key concern in view of the need to increase coverage and improve quality simultaneously when Government financial commitments have reached a limit. [Addressed during appraisal]
- No alternative financing scenarios were developed for the KESSP, which would have enabled Government to present the total programme, as well as the priorities within it. The single option that was prepared was based on the premise of a desired financing gap, rather than starting from a desired programme and estimating the volume of external resources required to fund it. [Addressed during appraisal]
- The primary education components of the KESSP are not explicitly linked to a common set of high level indicators that reflect the access, equity and quality objectives of the overall programme. The specification of these indicators would strengthen the coherence of the KESSP. [Addressed during appraisal]

- The Government's preparedness for implementation cannot be fully known until key programmes are rolled-out. Many of the programmes are new and experimental in nature, and the structures and implementation approaches, especially at the district level, have yet to be fully tested. [Remains a valid concern]
- There appears to be no communications strategy, plan or related budget for KESSP. [Remains a valid concern – Aide Memoire refers to need for a communications strategy]
- The capacity building interventions within the KESSP do not incorporate either a holistic decentralization design or a comprehensive approach to teacher management. [Remains a valid concern – Aide Memoire refers to need for a capacity building plan to be developed urgently]
- Too much reliance is placed on training as a solution to capacity weaknesses. A holistic approach to capacity building is required which targets key entities within the sector. The focus should be on the systemic problems that affect the achievement of the primary sub-sector strategies. [Remains a valid concern – Aide Memoire refers to need for a capacity building plan to be developed urgently]

CONCLUSIONS:

- Estimated volume of external resources required to reach UPE

The estimated volume of external resources required is US\$22.7 million in 2005/06, US\$83.5 million in 2006/07 and US\$142.7 million in 2007/08 for a total of US\$248.9 million over the first three years.

- Monitoring and Evaluation

The framework for the monitoring and evaluation process is being developed as part of the KESSP and includes a comprehensive set of high level sector indicators together with joint annual sector reviews.

- Knowledge and /or data gaps

As part of the monitoring and evaluation process for KESSP, it is critical that the quality of data collected, analysed and distributed should improve in conjunction with the plans for the development and strengthening of the EMIS.

- Capacity development

A comprehensive capacity development strategy and plan for Headquarters, provincial and district level is being prepared together with guidelines for the development of school level plans.

Statement

“Having read the assessment of the primary education components of the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP) 2005 -2010, we, the undersigned, donors and development agencies in Kenya, endorse the KESSP and the primary education components within it”

list of agencies and signatories to be inserted here

FAST TRACK INITIATIVE

APPRAISAL OF PRIMARY EDUCATION COMPONENTS OF KESSP

The FTI Appraisal and Endorsement Process

1. The appraisal of the Primary education component of the KESSP is based on the guidelines and indicative framework developed for the EFA Fast Track Initiative (FTI). The FTI is a global partnership of countries and education sector donors established in 2002 to enable developing countries to achieve the MDG goal for Universal Primary Education adopted through increased aid. This partnership aims to ensure that no country which has prepared a credible and sustainable plan for achieving UPE should fail to meet the target because of insufficient financial resources.
2. The process for carrying out the appraisal and endorsement has recently changed in two main respects. Firstly, countries applying are no longer required to assess their basic education system and submit a detailed proposal to the FTI Secretariat in Washington. Secondly, the endorsement of the plan is undertaken by all the local donors represented in the country and not the FTI Secretariat. The FTI Secretariat simply circulates the endorsement to FTI donor partner headquarters. Having financial resources to invest in the primary education sub-sector is not a prerequisite for endorsement. All local donors working in the education sector are encouraged to sign up in order to provide assurances for prospective donors lacking country knowledge that the plan is sound. Endorsement does not signal that the plan is perfect and the local donor community is encouraged to record any concerns they have on its content. Documenting the concerns will allow them to be addressed during implementation of the KESSP proceeds and through the regular joint review process agreed between government and donors.
3. The FTI appraisal and endorsement is important for the GOK because it has the potential to secure additional donor resources to meet the financing gap for achieving UPE. And because the GOK has adopted a sector-wide approach, incremental resources would finance the wider KESSP. Additional funds may be leveraged through existing or new bilateral and multilateral donors. A further possibility is the central Catalytic Fund for the FTI which aims to provide bridging grant financing to countries classed as 'donor orphans'. From the donor perspective, endorsement by local donors is an important step towards enhanced donor harmonization, since it represents a commitment to work together in support of implementation of KESSP towards achieving UPE and EFA.

Approach to the FTI Appraisal

4. The FTI appraisal is an integral part of the KESSP appraisal which places emphasis on its primary education components. The first stage in the FTI appraisal was conducted by an independent consultant on behalf of the local donors immediately before the official joint government and donor appraisal of the KESSP held from 16 to 27 May 2005. A presentation of the main findings of the assessment was made on the first day of the appraisal mission with a view to highlighting some of the key concerns to be addressed during the appraisal. The appraisal therefore builds on the findings of the independent assessment by examining some of the issues raised in more depth, as well as addressing other issues (e.g. financial management) that could not be tackled within the time limitations. The FTI appraisal, therefore, represents a contribution to the final outcome of the joint appraisal mission. The conclusions reached during the joint appraisal on the primary education components of the KESSP constitute the full FTI appraisal and endorsement.

5. The FTI Secretariat has prepared new guidelines for the appraisal of government UPE plans and these are intended to be applied flexibly. The scope of the appraisal covered six areas:

- (a) the consultation process for developing the plan;*
- (b) the quality of the strategy;*
- (c) the affordability of UPE plans in the context of KESSP, the wider sector plan;*
- (d) targets and the monitoring process;*
- (e) implementation readiness; and*
- (f) institutional capacity.*

In addition, the appraisal examined the present status of the education sector in relation to the indicative framework benchmarks (Annex 1).

6. A largely qualitative approach to the appraisal was adopted, which relied heavily on semi-structured interviews with ministry officials and discussions with the donor community. The interviews enabled the consultant to examine 12 of the 13 primary education components of the KESSP (including Early Childhood Care Development and Education (ECDE) and Quality Assurance and Standards (QAS)). The interviews also gathered information on the capacity building investment Programs, which have been defined to include the management structures for the KESSP, the Education Management Information System (EMIS), and critically, Teacher Management. Two meetings were organized with the local donors, the first to explain the FTI and the scope of the assessment and the second to listen to the views and concerns of the donors on the primary education components of the KESSP. Key documents were reviewed which included: (a) the KESSP; (b) Sessional Paper No.1 of 2005; (c) the Report of the National Conference on Education and Training, 2003; (d) the 2005 Public Expenditure Review for Education; (e) the TSC Staffing Norms Study; and (f) the MoEST "proposal" in support of the FTI appraisal and endorsement, prepared prior to the new guidelines being issued.

Main Findings of the Appraisal

7. It is evident that the Government's plans for UPE are credible, have been well thought through and they have benefited from an extensive dialogue with all the main stakeholders. However, there are significant concerns that will need to be addressed in a number of the criteria examined as these plans evolve. The GOK is also making progress towards the quantified benchmarks for EFA as discussed in the next section. (The figures are set out in Annex 1)

EFA Indicative Framework

8. Primary enrolments in public and private schools increased from 5.9 million in 2002 to 7.1 million in 2003 with the introduction of free primary education. By 2005, enrolments had reached 7.5 million. The net enrolment ratio (NER) stood at 82.5% in 2003, which indicates around 1.5 million children of school age are not in the formal school system. An estimated 1 million of these children live in ASAL areas and urban slums. If Kenya is to achieve a NER of 100% by 2015, the primary education strategy will need to improve the present primary school completion rate from 64 percent to 100 percent in 2010. (See Annex 1) On a positive note, there is evidence that free primary education is improving retention. Dropout rates are currently reported at 2.8% per annum.

9. The GOK has either met or is close to meeting the key benchmarks related to resource mobilization and allocation to the education sector (Annex 1) and, provided the economy continues to grow, these will help to propel Kenya towards UPE. The education sector accounts for 33.1 percent of the Government's total recurrent budget (20 percent benchmark) and primary education was allocated 57.4 percent of the recurrent budget for education¹ (benchmark is 64 percent) in 2003. However, government expenditure on teachers' salaries is very high² at over 5.4 times per capita GDP. This is reflected in the wage bill, which absorbs 84.5% of recurrent spending (in 2003), leaving 15% for non-wage expenditures. Teachers' salary at 80 percent of recurrent budget are above the EFA benchmark of 66 percent but are expected to come down over the next five years as the total number of teachers are expected to remain constant. The last two years, moreover, have witnessed a significant increase in non-wage expenditures in primary schools in the form of capitation grants for instructional materials and other purposes. Student-teacher ratio is close to the EFA benchmarks of 40:1, it appear that it may increase to 42:1 over the period of implementation of KESSP.

¹ It would go up to 62 percent by the end of KESSP with donor contributions to the primary sector.

² Total teachers remuneration has been negotiated until 2007-08 and is fixed. The compensation package would be renegotiated in 2007-08 and average teacher salary can be brought more in line with international norms at that time.

The Consultation Process

10. The extent and quality of the engagement with key stakeholders is the strongest feature of the KESSP. The process has been actively led by the Ministry and strongly supported by the local donor community. The dialogue has been continuing for more than two years and there is clear evidence of an open and trusting relationship emerging between the Ministry and donors that will be invaluable as the plans for primary education unfold and KESSP implementation gets underway.

11. Meetings between the Ministry and key stakeholders, including civil society, were initiated in the first half of 2003 in order to address the implementation challenges presented by free primary education. In November 2003, the Ministry organized a National Conference to debate the challenges facing the sector and brought together Parliamentarians, officials from other ministries, academics, NGOs, civil society organizations, teachers, parents, the teachers' union, student representatives and donor agencies. The views expressed at the conference fed into the development of Sessional Paper No. 1, which was approved by the Cabinet in November 2004 and then by Parliament in January 2005.

12. In parallel with the preparation of the Sessional Paper, the Ministry started to work on a sector-wide approach which evolved into KESSP. This way of working required a considerable amount of lateral communication between the groups working on the Sessional Paper and the groups working on the KESSP. Working on the policy and strategy, and the programme simultaneously has enabled the MOEST to complete the planning process relatively quickly. The donors were consulted on all stages of the KESSP development and provided technical consultants to work closely with Ministry of Education officials. The KESSP was presented to the Joint Pre-Appraisal Mission in January 2005 and has been subsequently refined.

13. The key strengths of the consultation process are as follows:

- the process has been led by the Ministry and as a result the KESSP is owned by the Ministry;
- the views and opinions of key stakeholders were invited at the start of the process;
- essential political support has been secured through the development of the Sessional Paper;
- donors have worked together towards a common objective and in support of the Ministry;
- both the Honourable Minister and the Permanent Secretary have been personally involved in the development of the KESSP;
- there has been dialogue between MoEST and MOF to ensure that the KESSP fits within the MTEF.

Taken together, these strengths constitute a solid foundation for successful implementation.

14. However, one issue arising from consultations with stakeholders, is that district managers in the Ministry do not appear to have been actively involved in the design of the KESSP, which has largely taken place in Nairobi. These managers will need to be more closely involved in the development of the detailed work plans for which they bear implementation responsibility, in order for the programme to benefit from their knowledge of conditions on the ground.

Quality of Primary Education Plans

15. The MOEST has conducted two stages of planning for primary education: (a) the strategic level which sets out the broad policies and strategies for achieving the GOK's objectives to improve access, equity and quality; and (b) the operational level which describes the Investment Programs that are designed to deliver these policies and strategies. The strategies are broadly contained in the Sessional Paper and the operational plan is set out in the 5-year KESSP document. To obtain a complete understanding of the GOK's plans for primary education it is necessary to refer to both documents.

16. At the strategic level, a comprehensive set of strategies have been identified for improving access to primary education for vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. These include around 1 million children in ASAL areas and urban slums, as well as a large number of AIDS orphans many of whom are excluded from the school system. School feeding has been identified as a key measure to attract and retain poor and malnourished children to school and separate sanitation facilities will be provided to improve the retention of girls. In addition, a coherent set of school-based interventions for improving quality have been developed, which include the professional development of classroom teachers and head teachers, and the continued provision of instructional materials.

17. Efficiency measures feature less prominently. However, the Ministry has decided to recruit teachers only to replace natural attrition and to take steps to improve the utilization of teachers. A redistribution exercise is currently ongoing through the district authorities to transfer teachers to schools which experience shortages. Contact hours will be increased and multi-grade teaching will be piloted and adopted to manage small class sizes in areas of low population density. These proposals represent steps in the right direction though the details workplans and precise implementation arrangements remain to be worked out.

18. These overarching strategies have been converted into concrete primary Investment Programs in the KESSP, which sets out sub-programme activities and estimated costs. Interviews with Ministry staff demonstrated a clear understanding of the approach and rationale for their respective Programs. By virtue of their participation in the ongoing planning process, there is now a critical mass of Ministry staff who own the KESSP and are committed to its implementation. These managers have a clear vision of what they are trying to achieve, how it will be done, and how their efforts link up with other Programs.

20. There are a number of concerns that will need to be tackled as the primary education plans unfold. The first and most critical issue is that little attention is given to achieving efficiency gains across the Investment Programs. Expanding the coverage to “hard to reach” target groups whilst simultaneously improving quality will inevitably impart an upward pressure on costs. These additional costs will have to be financed mainly through efficiency savings since it is clear from the MTEF that the GOK has now reached a limit in terms of resource allocations to the education sector. The KESSP Appraisal mission has identified a number of measures that would be essential to attain efficiency in the different programs and these are reflected in the aide-memore.

22. Another concern is the thrust of the pre-service primary teacher education programme where major policy issues need to be addressed before significant investments can be considered. These include the competencies of teacher trainers, the number of Teacher Training Colleges and output of new teachers. This is a critical issue for the long-term since most primary teachers are already in the school system and can therefore be developed through in-service training.

Affordability

23. For UPE to be attained, the estimated costs of the primary education components should be affordable in relation to the total expenditure for the overall sector program. The Ministry has prepared cost estimates for the KESSP which are aligned with the MTEF ceilings for the Ministry. The amount of donor financing needed to reach 100 percent primary completion rate has been estimated within the KESSP by adjusting the cost proposals to reconcile the total cost of the FTI and other spending on education with the resources that might be available. Costing and budgeting for the provision of good quality primary education is crucial for the achievement of the FTI goals.

The costs associated with reaching the FTI goal of 100% primary completion and of total spending on education, are shown in three scenarios:

- “*Current Resource*” Scenario, which shows what would be spent if MOEST had only the resources likely to be provided by the Treasury together with donor funds already committed or promised;
- “*Middle Scenario*”, showing projected expenditures that would go a significant way towards meeting the objectives of the KESSP and FTI; and
- “*High Scenario*”, showing expenditures that would allow Kenya to achieve the KESSP and FTI objectives, and that would be undertaken should additional resources be available.

The Ministry is currently targeting the “Middle Scenario” that would allow it meet a significant number of KESSP objectives with the total resource gap of US\$801 million (Table 1). But if additional funds are available, it would be able to attain all the objectives of KESSP and the FTI goals, for a total amount of US\$1028 million over five year (Table 1). Of the total amount required, DFID has already

committed US\$100 over the next five year while the World Bank has committed US\$50 over the same period. Additional commitments are expected from other donors in the near future.

The summary cost tables of the three scenarios are attached. The KESSP cost projections are indications of how the MOEST intends to spend its resources. The cost process remains flexible, and the program will be reviewed annually.

The largest components of the updated KESSP, Middle Scenario are:

- Instructional material and school operating cost grants (primary, public and NFE), KSh 35,618 million;
- Universities, including student loans but excluding operational grants to universities, KSh 12,797 million;
- Secondary education, KSh 12,861 million;
- Primary School Feeding, KSh 9,088 million;
- Primary construction, KSh 6,462 million;
- HIV/AIDS, KSh 4,251 million;
- TIVET, KSh 3,370 million;
- Non-Formal education, KSh 1,948 million.

Basic education represents 62% of total KESSP investment program; core poverty programs (including secondary bursaries) account for 70%. Basic education represents 52% of total spending on education, including teacher salaries. Taking account of information provided by donors, the three scenarios show financing gaps as follows:

Table 1: Resource requirement for KESSP and FTI

Financing Gap Calculation, KSh million, assuming present and expected	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	Total, 2005/06-09/10
Current Resource Scenario Total Costs	94613.0	101892.8	107864.6	107765.9	109616.9	
Funding Available	87733.1	91640.1	97727.9	99347.7	102526.7	
Current Resource Scenario Financing Gap	6879.9	10252.7	10136.7	8418.2	7090.2	18777.7
Middle Case Scenario Total Costs	96425.4	105197.7	112503.7	113363.2	115616.6	
Funding Available	87733.1	91640.1	97727.9	99347.7	102526.7	
Middle Case Scenario Financing Gap	8692.3	13557.6	14775.8	14015.5	13089.9	40131.0
High Case Scenario Total Costs	97041.1	107292.5	117812.6	118540.0	120588.3	
Funding Available	87733.1	91640.1	97727.9	99347.7	102526.7	
High Case Scenario Financing Gap	9308.0	15652.4	20084.7	19192.3	18061.6	58299.0
Financing Gap US\$ million, assuming present and expected commitments.	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	Total, 2005/06-09/10
Current Resource Scenario Gap	86.0	128.2	126.7	105.2	88.6	534.7
Middle Case Scenario Gap	108.7	169.5	184.7	175.2	163.6	801.6
High Case Scenario Gap	116.4	195.7	251.1	239.9	225.8	1028.7

24. There are critical issues to be addressed to enable a reduction in the public costs of the secondary, TIVET and university sub-sectors and in order to maintain expenditure levels required at the primary level. However, the Ministry has made a clear commitment to finance fully the primary education components of the KESSP, therefore budgets of other sub-sectors have been deliberately constrained. In addition, the total number of primary and secondary teachers has been capped at 235,000 to restrict the growth of the teachers' wage bill and free up resources for primary investment Programs.

Targets and Monitoring Process

26. The Ministry has paid significant attention to the development of logframes for individual IPs. On the whole it is possible to identify the outputs for each of these Programs, although in some instances these are obscured by too much detail. The revision of the KESSP document has led in some cases to a mismatch between the logframe and the narrative, which will need to be rectified.

27. Baseline data for monitoring purposes is currently available through the School Census and plans are well advanced to introduce a computer-based EMIS that will collect and process relevant data at the District level. It is anticipated that the new system would integrate data systems of the Ministry and the TSC, so that comprehensive data is available on teachers, as well as enrolments and pupil flows. However, information available to programme managers through the EMIS will need to be supplemented by periodic reports from implementing agencies on the ground, as well as through field visits. Programme managers and their management units will be responsible for monitoring and reviewing progress for their respective components. These points are explicitly recognized in the Monitoring and Evaluation component in the KESSP.

28. The outputs in the component logframes are explicitly linked to a common set of high level indicators which reflect the access, equity and quality objectives of the overall programme. These indicators have been constructed by going back to the policies and strategies in the Sessional Paper and KESSP.

29. The monitoring process raises issues of concern. The write-up in the KESSP is sound, but requires further development before effective monitoring can be introduced. The KESSP Steering Committee and individual programme managers will need first to specify the reports they require in order to review progress and take corrective action. This will form the basis for identifying the sources of data and constructing a plan for its collection, analysis and processing. In addition, for the purposes of the bi-annual joint reviews, the monitoring process should capture progress on themes that relate to improvements in the overall programme. These actions might usefully include the medium- and long-term concerns highlighted during this appraisal.

Implementation Readiness

30. A key question is whether the KESSP programme and the primary education components are ready for implementation. Whilst there are some primary education components that require further data collection and analysis, for others there are well established implementation and financing mechanisms in place. In this respect, the establishment of school bank accounts and empowerment of School Management Committees for the instructional materials component of FPESP, are suitable as implementation mechanisms for other primary education IPs, where capitation grants are envisaged.

31. There are a number of key steps the Ministry has taken to prepare itself for the challenges of implementation, in particular: (a) establishing “mainstreamed” management structures and accountability relationships for the KESSP; (b) appointing a responsible manager and developing annual work plans for each IP; (c) organizing regional workshops to prepare district personnel for their implementation responsibilities.

32. Concerns have been expressed by development partners about whether the Ministry is prepared for the scale and complexity of the implementation challenge. This is a legitimate concern. Many of the Programs are new and experimental in nature, and the proposed structures and approaches, especially at the district level, have yet to be fully tested. Further, the Ministry will need to rely on the active support of other ministries and local authorities, which will have other priorities. It is essential, therefore, that key interventions are rolled-out gradually in order to gain experience and make the necessary adjustments before going to scale. However, the most important step that the Ministry can take to prepare for implementation is to communicate widely and effectively with the implementers at the district level and below. It would be important for the Ministry, therefore, to prepare an appropriate communications strategy and plan.

Institutional Capacity

33. As well as choosing the appropriate technical strategies, the Ministry and other key actors will need to develop the capacity to implement them. It is encouraging therefore that the Ministry has already embarked on a short-term capacity building programme to develop the managerial skills of key personnel. A focal point has been established within the Policy and Planning Directorate to coordinate the short- and medium-term programme, which is essential in view of the fact that capacity building activities are planned in many of the IPs. The main emphasis is being placed on training, which crucially extends to DEBs and DEOs, although not to the exclusion of other interventions. Attention is also being placed on establishing effective management structures for the KESSP and strengthening organization-wide systems such as EMIS and ICT. A major strength of the capacity building plan is the introduction of Results-Based Management, adoption of which will be essential if the aims and objectives of the KESSP are to be achieved.

34. The Ministry recognizes clearly that the development of relevant capacity will be a continuous process throughout the implementation of the KESSP and is aware of a number of gaps that will need to be addressed. The most critical concern is the development of a holistic design for the decentralization of services to the district level and below. Under FPESP, responsibilities have been devolved to the school level, effectively by-passing the district level. The challenge now is to see how best the districts and zones can support and add value to the developments envisaged at the school level. This will require an examination of the full range of education functions to determine where activities should be carried out and where decisions should be taken. This is likely to result in new mandates and responsibilities for key bodies, including for instance, SMCs.

35. A second concern relates to teachers, who must be the main target for capacity building and professional development. Presently, the KESSP gives considerable attention to teacher development and norms for determining the number of teachers required. However, a more comprehensive approach to teacher management is needed if teachers are to be fully effective in the classroom. This will involve the development of relevant policies and processes for recruitment, promotion, transfers and absence management as Kenya moves towards a more decentralized system. It is evident from the survey of teachers carried out as part of the TSC Staffing Norms Study that there are fundamental issues that need to be addressed.

36. Finally, in terms of individual capacity, there is a risk that too much reliance is being placed in training as a solution. Training may impart relevant skills, but it may not result in the desired changes in behaviour if the incentives at the organizational level do not encourage people to use their skills. For this reason, there is a strong case for the Ministry to embrace a holistic approach to capacity building in key entities, e.g. Ministry headquarters, District Education Offices, School Management Committees. This will require a review of management structures, staffing requirements and workloads, relevant organizational processes, as well as skill needs. The focus should be strategic, that is looking at systemic problems which are likely to affect the achievement of the overall sector strategies.

Conclusion and Recommendations

37. The primary education plans within the KESSP are of a high quality by comparison with earlier efforts in the African region to develop basic education plans within a sector-wide approach. The Ministry and its partners need to be congratulated for their strenuous efforts during this inevitably lengthy process. It needs to be stressed that no plan can ever be perfect. Yet the overall road map to achieve UPE is clear; it has been painstakingly constructed; and it enjoys substantial political support. Furthermore most primary education IPs are now sufficiently well developed and ready for implementation. Some of these already have a successful track record based on earlier investments and are likely to move forward quickly. Others will need to proceed more slowly and steadily as

new and experimental approaches are tested out. There remain a few components where further preparatory work and design is needed before a detailed programme can be implemented.

38. But there are no grounds for complacency on the part of the Ministry and its development partners. There may be a temptation to relax once the plans have been finalized and agreed; but it needs to be remembered that implementation, not the plan, is the hard part.

Strengths

- The plans have been developed through a highly consultative process led by the Ministry in which all key stakeholders have been engaged. This process has been strongly supported by the local donor community.
- The broad strategies and policies for achieving quality UPE are supported by both Cabinet and Parliamentarians. This is reflected in the Government's substantial financial commitment to primary education which exceeds the EFA benchmarks.
- There has been extensive dialogue between the Ministry and the MOF to ensure that the plans are realistic in relation to the Government's medium-term resource envelope for the sector. The financing gap has been deliberately set at a modest level, in view of past concerns about the predictability of external funding.
- There now exists a critical mass of Ministry officials who own the KESSP and are committed to its implementation. These managers have a clear sense of what they are trying to achieve, how it will be done, and how their effort link up with other Programs.
- A comprehensive set of strategies have been developed to improve access to primary education for children out of school, including vulnerable and disadvantaged groups.
- A coherent set of school-based interventions have been developed to promote quality improvement, including the development of both head teachers and classroom teachers, and the continued provision of instructional materials.
- A policy decision has been taken to keep the number of primary and secondary teachers constant over the medium-term in order to maintain the necessary fiscal space for investments in the primary education components.
- "Mainstreamed" management structures and accountability relationships have been developed for the KESSP, and a responsible manager appointed for each IP.
- Established implementation and financing mechanisms are already in place as a result of earlier systems development support for free primary education.
- Results-based management will be the foundation of the overall capacity building plan for the KESSP. Complementary to the proposed accountability relationships, this process will enable management to pay continuous attention to the programme results required to achieve UPE.

Concerns (comments in bold inserted end May on completion of KESSP Appraisal)

The concerns highlighted here will begin to be addressed during the first year of KESSP implementation by GOK/donors and should form part of the agenda for the planned joint review meetings

- Little attention has been given to achieving efficiency gains across the various Investment Programmes. This is a key concern in view of the need to increase coverage and improve quality simultaneously when Government financial commitments have reached a limit. **[Addressed during appraisal]**
- No alternative financing scenarios were developed for the KESSP, which would have enabled Government to present the total programme, as well as the priorities within it. The single option that was prepared was based on the premise of a desired financing gap, rather than starting from a desired programme and estimating the volume of external resources required to fund it. **[Addressed during appraisal]**
- The primary education components of the KESSP are not explicitly linked to a common set of high level indicators that reflect the access, equity and quality objectives of the overall programme. The specification of these indicators would strengthen the coherence of the KESSP. **[Addressed during appraisal]**
- The Government's preparedness for implementation cannot be fully known until key programmes are rolled-out. Many of the programmes are new and experimental in nature, and the structures and implementation approaches, especially at the district level, have yet to be fully tested. **[Remains a valid concern]**
- There appears to be no communications strategy, plan or associated budget within the KESSP. **[Remains a valid concern – Aide Memoire refers to need for a communications strategy]**
- The capacity building interventions within the KESSP do not incorporate either a holistic decentralization design or a comprehensive approach to teacher management. **[Remains a valid concern – Aide Memoire refers to need for a capacity building plan to be developed urgently]**
- Too much reliance is placed on training as a solution to capacity weaknesses. A holistic approach to capacity building is required which targets key entities within the sector. The focus should be on the systemic problems that affect the achievement of the primary sub-sector strategies. **[Remains a valid concern – Aide Memoire refers to need for a capacity building plan to be developed urgently]**

Recommendations

In accordance with FTI guidelines

- Estimated volume of external resources required to reach UPE

The estimated volume of external resources required is US\$22.7 million in 2005/06, US\$83.5 million in 2006/07 and US\$142.7 million in 2007/08 for a total of US\$248.9 million over the first three years.

- Monitoring and Evaluation

The framework for the monitoring and evaluation process is being developed as part of the KESSP and includes a comprehensive set of high level sector indicators together with joint annual sector reviews.

- Knowledge and /or data gaps

As part of the monitoring and evaluation process for KESSP, it is critical that the quality of data collected, analysed and distributed should improve in conjunction with the plans for the development and strengthening of EMIS.

- Capacity development

A comprehensive capacity development strategy and plan for Headquarters, provincial and district level is being prepared together with guidelines for the development of school level plans.

Annex 1

Table 1: EFA Indicative Framework

Indicator	FTI Benchmark	Baseline (2003)	Target (2015)
Resource mobilization			
Public domestically generated revenue as % of GDP	14-18	18.7	20
Public recurrent spending on education as % of total recurrent spending, excluding grants	20	33.1	33.1
Primary education share of recurrent budget (%)	64	57.4	57.4
Student flows			
Gross intake into first grade as % of 6 year old children	100	122	100
Primary completion rate in grade 8 (gross)	100	58.3	100
% repeaters among primary schoolpupils	10	11.7	10
Service delivery			
Pupil-teacher ratio in public primary schools	40	39	40
Average annual salary of primary school teachers as a multiple of per capita GDP	3.5	5.4	5.4
Recurrent spending on non-teacher salary as % of total recurrent spending on primary education	33	20	20
Annual instructional hours in public primary schools	850-1000	955	955
% of pupils enrolled in private primary schools	10	4	10

Sources:

Medium-term expenditure framework
 Appropriation Accounts
 Statistical booklet
 KESSP (School Infrastructure Plan)
 TSC Staffing Norms Study