Appraisal of the Zambia NIF III 2011-2015 under the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP)

Contents

Pages

Table of Contents

Overall Assessment 4

Recommendation 11

Detailed Appraisal 13

Introduction 13

Strategic focus/relevance 13

Internal coherence 15

Quality 16

Sustainability 17

Risk Analysis 18

Financing: Allocative percentages 18

The Evidence Base. Quality of documents consulted. 19

Educational Indicators from available Documents 19

Summary of Appraisal 22

Acronyms

AWPB	Annual Work Plans and Budgets
CPs	Cooperating Partners
ELM	Education Leadership and Management Training
EMIS	Education Management Information System
FMAP	Financial Management Action Plan
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GPE	Global Partnership for Education
GRZ	Government of the Republic of Zambia
JAR	Joint Annual Review
LCMS	Living Conditions Monitoring Survey
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MESVTEE	Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTEF	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
NER	Net Enrolment Ratio
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisation
NIF	National Implementation Framework
PAF	Performance Assessment Framework
PTR	Pupil Teacher Ratio
SNDP	Sixth National Development Plan
TEVET	Technical Education and Vocational Training

Overall Assessment

The overall assessment is that the NIF III[1] is a credible plan that addresses the Republic of Zambia's development needs and provides the platform for major positive education sector development. It aims to guide the articulation of broader objectives of the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) in the fields of education, science, vocational training and early education.

The NIF III aims to:

1. Re-introduce free education for all from grade 1 to grade 12 and to make it compulsory;
2. Upgrade all primary schools providing grades 1 to 4 or those providing grades 5 to 7 to full primary schools offering grade 1 to grade 7;
3. Upgrade community schools to fully fledged primary and secondary schools;
4. Review the language of instruction policy so as to promote the teaching of local languages at primary level;
5. Phase out the basic and high school education system and re-introduce the conventional primary (Years 1 to 7) and secondary education (Years 8 to 12) system;
6. Provide and facilitate Early Childhood Education centres and teachers;
7. Open two paths for grade eight pupils based on their grade seven performance to follow up to grade twelve. One will be for learners who will follow an academic path and the other for learners who will follow a technical path.
8. Re-orient the curriculum for primary and secondary schools to put emphasis on life skills subjects to enable learners meet with the demands of self-employment and the labour market;
9. Upgrade teachers' qualifications to meet the minimum required standards through in-service training;
10. Promote inclusive education by integrating children with mild to moderate learning disabilities in the mainstream schools and offer special education to those who cannot be integrated;
11. Give priority to the teaching of science subjects in educational institutions at all levels;
12. Promote collaboration between industry and research institutions;
13. Establish a national research centre to coordinate educational research activities.

The NIF III document includes a systematic analysis of the sector and each subsector: the current situation; policy changes planned; proposed strategies to be adopted; planned activities; and the targeted movements in the major indicators. It is underpinned by a comprehensive cost model projecting student flows for grades 1-12, deriving sector-wide enrolment and three cost projections. An associated Annual

[1] Throughout this report the title NIF III and the Framework are used interchangeably

Work Plan and Budget, once developed, is expected to provide a clear prioritisation and timing of all activities together with detailed funding allocations. The framework produced can be used as an effective resource utilisation tracking instrument.

The NIF III is strongly rooted in the Zambian context and is based on an analysis of the current trends. It includes an analysis of fiscal, social and technical capacity vulnerabilities of the country. The Framework provides an informative situational analysis of the education sector and the broader social context which, according to the latest comprehensive Living Conditions Monitoring Survey (LCMS) in 2010, states that 60.5 per cent (from 60.5% in 2006) of Zambia's population are living below the poverty datum line, with rural poverty levels at 77.9 percent. Extreme poverty stands at 42% of the total population, whilst income distribution remains highly unequal, resulting in worsening human deprivation as demonstrated by the decline in the country's Human Development Index (HDI). The appraisal suggests that the Framework could be strengthened with the inclusion of a finer grained set of strategies targeting poverty and rural issues.

The NIF III is strong on the need to address issues of equity, especially gender, although the strategies proposed will require determined and innovative efforts at changing the national mindset, especially with regards the education of girls.

The Framework's complexity is appropriate, as is the overall emphasis on improving access, quality, management and M&E of the public education sector as a whole.

As seen in table 1.1 below, lessons from the earlier NIF II have been identified and actions proposed. These have been reviewed by the CPs to see what has been incorporated into the NIF III. It was found that a significant number have been addressed. The outstanding issues will be discussed as part of the sector dialogue. It was agreed that these outstanding issues will be reviewed in the annual JAR meeting and discussed how they can be addressed as part of the NIF III.

These issues especially relate to the share of the total budget taken up with Management and Administration, the tension between access and the expansion of enrolment and quality, and the argument that higher education has been under-resourced.
Further, the Framework covers all sub-sectors, the learner is defined as the central beneficiary of the Education system, and strategies are proposed for achieving the vision, including the human, technical and financial capacities required.

Table 1.1 The extent to which NIF II lessons have been taking forward into NIF III plan		
Key Area	**Key Lesson from NIF II**	**Addressed in NIF III?**
Policy Actions	a) Education leadership and management training to be made compulsory for head teachers and deputy head teachers; in addition possibilities should be explored for subsidies for participants.	Yes. ELM training is being conducted and is included in the NIF III plan and budget. This is also a key indicator being monitored in the education strategic PAF (#B9)
	b) Improve teacher deployment and retention, especially in rural areas, through the review of incentives and developing provincial interventions that are specific to the area.	Yes. This is included in the NIF III documentation and is a key issue of discussion in the sector dialogue.
	c) Improve resource allocations for non-salary expenditure in rural areas.	Yes. Non-wage expenditure is a key issue as part of the sector dialogue and within the NIF III. It is looked at in two indicators in the strategic PAF (C13 and E29).
	d) Improve teaching and learning outcomes in literacy, numeracy, science and mathematics at primary and secondary levels.	Yes. This has been highlighted in NIF III as it was largely absent in NIF II. It is a key part of the sector dialogue and there are 4 specific indicators in the strategic PAF that relate to this important issue (A1, B7, C18, D27)
	e) Improve gender parity, particularly completion, transition and pass rates for girls as they move through the system.	Yes. There is now also gender disaggregated information in the NIF III for all of these issues at all levels. Again, there are 4 specific indicators in the strategic PAF (A1, B4, B5, B6) so they will be an integral part of the sector dialogue.
	f) Establish incentives and quality assurance mechanisms to support university education.	Yes. The NIF III has included tertiary education and with the ministries being combined, and a joint budgeting process, there is much closer collaboration at the tertiary level to the rest of the Ministry. This is at an early stage but a Government priority. What is most notable is that the tertiary education has been costed and included in the projections; making the NIF III a full sector plan.
Technical Areas	a) Increase emphasis on actual teaching and learning in the classroom; place more focus on learner performance as opposed to inputs.	Yes. This is a new element in the NIF III and much more attention is being paid to quality measures than in NIF II. That includes proxy indicators on quality such as teacher and pupil attendance and pupil/teacher contact time; both of which are included in the strategic PAF (B7, D26). NIFIII prioritizes development of national literacy improvement framework and programme (PAF A1 & 2, D27)
	b) Improve the areas of focus used to assess sector performance, including prioritising key indicators through the development of a strategic sector PAF.	Yes. This has been completed. While there are 33 indicators and this is a relatively large number of indicators to track, it is an improvement on the 200+ that are included within the NIF III. These indicators will be reviewed annually in the JAR and each year will be assessed for scope and stretch and to determine if they are still the priority areas upon which to assess sector

		performance. This is the first time for the sector to have its own strategic PAF and it is a useful way to focus not only on process or technical areas alone, but to also bring in the elements of institutional systems strengthening and budgeting and financing of the sector.
	c) Ensure financial management is improved by full implementation of the FMAP and recommendations from annual audits.	Yes. FMAP is included in the NIF III. Certainly this is a much stronger focus for NIF III for all the partners. There is much greater participation in Financial management discussions already as part of the PAF development and the NIF III is clear that better planning and budgeting and use of fund is important for improving efficiency in the sector. (NIF III PAF D23)
	d) Strengthen the JAR process by systematising and institutionalising follow-up on the JAR findings and recommendations.	Yes. The JAR process is well spelled out in the NIF III. It was also clear that the NIF III will be have a strong focus on institutional strengthening and capacity building to improve systems across all levels.
	e) Enhance in-service training to upgrade teaching methodologies and skills	Yes. There is a significant component of in-service training planned for the period of NIF III. This has a stronger focus on quality. PAF C18
	f) Improve coordination of the support to community schools and improve implementation of the community schools operational guidelines.	Yes. There is an intention for community schools to be upgraded and a strong political commitment to make that happen. This will entail providing better policy framework and supervision/registration, as well as provision of trained teachers and operational grants to some community schools. This is also a specific indicator in the strategic PAF (C15)
	g) Improve implementation of the decentralised textbook procurement system.	No. There is no specific reference in the NIF III , nor in the sector dialogue for the improvement of the textbook procurement system explicitly. However, the procurement process is under greater scrutiny and with a procurement audit currently underway the recommendations from that will allow it to be addressed during the NIF III period. (PAF E30
	h) Improve monitoring of standards and implementation of the continuous assessment system	Yes. It is mentioned in the NIF III but does not have sufficient detail and is an area where more information is required.
	i) Establish mechanisms to guarantee timely minimum budgetary and release levels for school grants.	Yes. There is an existing structure and the depravity index of all districts that sets out the parameters. What is needed is improved allocation of resources. This is not solely a MESVTEE issue and involves the MOF. The NIF III has addressed this issue and it is included as an indicator in the strategic PAF (C13)

	j) Ensure more effective utilisation of the cost projections model in the planning and budgeting processes of the Ministry.	Yes. NIF III used the costing projection models extensively in the development of the costs and the three scenarios in the financing chapter of the NIF III.
	k) Institute more effective teacher supervision and school management.	Yes. NIF III has set out way to improve school supervision by improving leadership and management training, however much more will be required over the period to improve that capacity and with the base case scenario this is being done on a modest scale, but could be supported by partners to expand further, such as the STEP UP project of USAID which is focusing on institutional strengthening.
	l) Document and implement successful interventions from relevant programmes/projects, such as: ▪ learner improvement strategic plans ▪ target setting ▪ lesson planning ▪ monitoring teacher-pupil contact time.	Yes. There has been discussion on lesson learning from NIF II and from other partners. These issues of quality improvement are a key element of the NIF III analysis and planning. These are also indicators that will be monitored in the sector dialogue through the strategic PAF (B7, C14, C18)
	m) Improve data on: ▪ learning outcomes at early grade and as learners progress through the system ▪ teacher absenteeism ▪ unit costs for key inputs (for instance cost per pupil by level, latrine and classroom construction, teacher training).	Yes. There is a clear understanding within the NIF III that data needs to be accessible to all planners and used for budgeting purposes, as set out in the projection model. The focus is much more on learning outcomes and quality than in NIF II. The issues of teacher absenteeism and measuring learning at early grades is one that has already had significant discussion since the NIF II evaluation was completed. There is not yet enough focus in the NIF III on unit costs and that should be addressed in the JAR. These indicators are being measured through regular monitoring as well as through the strategic PAF (A1, D26, D27)

A series of measures designed to enhance quality, equity and effectiveness are included in the Framework. These primarily concern:

- the simplification of education governance through the creation of a single Ministry of Education;
- the reconfiguration (and simplification) of the education structure (primary, secondary and tertiary) and the introduction of two streams (academic and vocational) at the secondary level;
- proposals to strengthen provincial, district, community and school level management, and human resource capacity in line with the policy of decentralisation;
- the training and recruitment of additional teachers to reduce the pupil teacher ratio;
- infrastructure development especially to take account of the introduction of lower and secondary education as a single phase of education;
- the development of ICT in Education;
- the increased provision of textbooks, teaching and learning materials, and measures to improve the quality of teaching (teachers, infrastructure and textbooks);
- actions designed to reduce teacher pupil ratios;
- measures to address equity and gender issues, awareness of HIV and Aids and other health issues, and Special Education Needs;
- proposals to expand the tertiary sector and technical and vocational education.

It is noted that few of these focus directly on the classroom and the quality of teaching and learning. From Zambia's experience with Community Schools it is known that key to ensuring an improvement in quality is to empower communities so that the system becomes accountable to them. When relatively so little Primary School financing is being allocated to development, with the majority going to infrastructure, there is cause for concern. On the other hand, Government's decision to upgrade Community Schools with their record of better performance is wise, provided that communities generally perceive they have ownership of them in spite of their being designated public schools.

In addition, the appraisal recommends that a stronger set of policy and strategic options informed by international trends is needed to ensure that the proposed expansion of the Higher Education and Technical and Vocational Education sub-sectors, and the provision of ICT, do not continue to suffer from the present under-funding in the future.

Given the contextual challenges and institutional weaknesses described in the NIF III documentation, the strong emphasis on capacity building is appropriate, although it

is not entirely clear from where personnel are going to be recruited to be trained or to provide the capacity building required, which raises longer-term sustainability concerns.

Critical to the effective implementation of the NIF III programmes will be how devolution and decentralisation evolve in practice and, in particular, as a way of enhancing budgeting, resource allocations, utilisation and tracking. As decentralisation evolves, it is anticipated that greater clarity will emerge on the coordination structures necessary, and the respective roles and responsibilities of the central and decentralised entities will emerge. In particular it will be necessary to institutionalise the intended distinction between the Ministry's focus on policy, financing, sector strategy and quality assurance, and the implementation roles and responsibilities of provincial, district, community and school level entities. Capacity building will be critical to the success of this realignment.

At present the budget goes almost entirely on recurrent expenditure, with the NIF III aiming to reduce this to around 81% thereby leaving the balance, which will include CP contributions, for development. Given the salary challenges facing the sector, this target is unlikely to be reached although it is pleasing to note the intention to do so. The resource envelope for the NIF III amounts to an estimated US$ 6.4 billion. This includes an estimated US$ 261 million support from CPs (NIF III, table 16.5). A projected financing gap of US$ 238 million over the five year plan, or approximately US$ 4.8 million per year, is estimated.

In spite of uncertainties in the macroeconomic environment, the Government of Zambia has recently committed itself to maintaining current increases in the percentage share of the budget to education. At present this stands at 17.5%. The Global Partnership in Education (GPE) norm for allocations to Primary Education is 20%. Of the Recurrent Budget, the Framework estimates 55% being allocated to primary education, 29% to Secondary Education and 5% to Tertiary and Higher Education. Teacher salaries (which are low) are projected to rise by 10% annually over the course of the Framework (Tables 16.2 and 16.3 detail the percentage shares).

The projected NIF III financing gap of approximately US$238 million over five years (based on present and continuing levels of resourcing from government and donors) is a challenge but the MESVTEE is optimistic about narrowing it through further increases in budgetary allocation and donor support. It knows that the sustainability of the NIF III will be driven by the degree of ownership shown by the political leadership across the country and that this will be reflected in the level of fiscal support provided to education in the national, district and local budgets. Buy-in to the NIF III will be enhanced if the Ministry manages to achieve some quick visible wins such as formally enabling communities, commencing construction and the provision of learning materials and textbooks within the next six months.

There are no evident allocations on non-priority activities within the sector and it is pleasing to note that a reduction in spending on administration and management is being targeted.Strong political support for the NIF III at both the policy and strategic level is noted.

Recommendation

The NIF III should be accepted as a credible plan as it forms a platform for the further development of the education sector in the Republic of Zambia.

However, in accepting this recommendation, the Co-operation Partners (CPs) encourage the Government of Zambia to take account of the following caveats:

1. Whilst the ambition of the Framework is admired, the timeframe is tight. It is suggested that the time it takes to embed change in any context should not be forgotten. The use of the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) rolling programme approach is commended and can be used to demonstrate how the MESVTEE can better prioritise its activities and obtain a tighter control on Unit Costs.
2. In absolute terms the Financing Gap is bridgeable over the five years of the framework, and the three financing options presented and the adoption of the Baseline Option provide a good starting point. However, it is suggested that more explicit strategies also be considered for narrowing it.
3. It is anticipated that the internal strategic coherence of the Framework and the logical sequencing of sections and activities will be enhanced with the strategic PAF, and the completion of the AWPB that encompassing all the sub-sectors. It will be important to more tightly align these in a timed and fully costed Implementation Plan, both aligned with the MTEF. The on-going need to strengthen the EMIS and capacity in the use of information should be a priority, especially its introduction in all ten provinces, across all districts, zones and in all local education offices, with equipment, facilities and capacity building. Doing so will enable planners at all levels, including school managers, to obtain a better understanding and use of information, and control of Unit Costs.
4. Better data is critical and the EMIS unit should be strengthened to carry out the routine data and disseminate it in a timely manner, but also to add in new data on learning outcomes that is gathered from other sources, such as the ECZ. Without sufficient and high quality data it is difficult to plan, budget and advocate for improvements.

6. Devolution and decentralisation are implied in the NIF III as a way of enhancing budgeting, resource allocations, utilisation and tracking. Action needs to follow and in particular there needs to be a prompt examination of coordination structures across all levels to align and harmonise and, in

particular, to capitalise on the gains of Community Schools where empowered communities have and can further hold the education system to account.

Detailed Appraisal

Introduction

(i) The appraisal has found that the NIF III has much to commend it and is likely at least partially to achieve its medium to long term development objectives. It is assumed that the NIF III is a living document and will be subject to on-going revision and editing as the plan evolves. Suggestions and ideas raised in this appraisal should be considered in this context.

(ii) The statement is qualified because of the challenges listed in the situational analysis and because, in spite of improvements in the GDP over the last three years and the relatively high percentage of the budget allocated to education, uncertainties remain in the international commodities markets which could negatively affect Zambia's economy.

(iii) The level of technical detail in the NIF III, especially with regards the work done on financing it, gives the reader a sufficient level of confidence that the proposed activities will lead to the achievement of the Framework's worthy development objectives. However, these activities need to strengthen what happens in the classroom if they are to have any impact.

Strategic focus/relevance

(i) The strategic direction of the Framework is clear and is aimed at improving access, efficiency and quality. This is evidenced in:

- The decision to merge the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Science, Technology and Vocational Training into one, the Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education, to achieve improved harmonisation of the sector and education delivery. There is a risk that the budgetary and unit cost gains made by primary education in the past may be threatened with the merger with Higher Education which is acknowledged to require higher unit costs.
- Making Primary and Secondary Education fee free and compulsory, and restructuring the schooling sub-sector to have primary education cover grades 1-7 and secondary education grades 8-12. This will also enable the merging of community schools into the formal sector. There is a risk that communities generally will lessen their engagement in the sector and perhaps stop providing resources to primary schools in the mis-belief that education is totally free. It was noted in the appraisal of the draft NIF III in 2010 that some students from Community Schools achieved better results overall than their Public School counterparts. One reason given for this was that communities held education providers to account, The MESVTEE must endeavour to

ensure that it capitalises on the strengths of these former community schools and, in particular, encourages continued community engagement in them .

- The emphasis on improved teacher development, teacher management and improved quality through infrastructure development. However, the amount of funding for this is unclear and needs to be clarified.
- The clear strategy for Monitoring and Evaluation.

(ii) The Framework's development objectives are relevant and consistent with the MESVTEE's educational priorities and strategy and, in particular, its commitment to increase access to, and improve the quality of, education, conditions of teaching and learning, school management and accountability; and the strengthening of central, district and local levels of management and accountability. The NIF III addresses these areas through a mixture of improving the teacher – pupil ratio, capacity building programmes, infrastructure development and the provision of teaching and learning resources. These are considered to be appropriate. However, the financial allocations do not appear to be adequately dimensioned, especially with regards the need to improve the quality of teaching and learning in classrooms, in contrast to the emphasis on infrastructural development. Nonetheless, in terms of the country's conditions, the appraisal acknowledges that there is a tricky balance to be achieved with the sector's infrastructural demands.

(iii) It is anticipated that the extent to which the proposed strategic outcomes will meet the actual present unmet needs will become clearer when the documentation on the education sector strategic PAF and the AWPB are finalised.. At his stage the appraisal can confirm that the planning and development processes behind the NIF III are sound and are strongly supported by CPs. This is evidenced by the CP endorsement of the NIF III, and the signing of both the MAF and the JFA.

(iv) Not all aspects of the documentation reviewed reflect an equally sufficient level of understanding of the complexities involved in, and incentives required to deliver, the outcomes intended and, in the longer term, for successful and sustainable long-term education sector reform and development. Three examples support this contention:

First, given the prioritisation of literacy and numeracy, it would be helpful knowing the level of resource to be applied to ensuring that all primary school pupils are literate and numerate by the end of seven years of schooling. It is also considered necessary to clarify the formative skills, competencies and values that are to be developed by the education system, rather than to rely on summative measurement of content and information currently required by national assessment processes. This includes the need to develop assessments on learning outcomes at early grades. It is imperative to the achievement of the quality agenda to have better data on whether or not a child can read, write and do maths. This requires regular annual

data collection on learning outcomes to be carried out and widely disseminated to all stakeholders, including parents.

Second, it is one thing articulating the development of a middle income country in which all citizens will have embraced entrepreneurship, be able to engage in lifelong learning, learn new things quickly, be capable of more complex problem-solving, willing and able to take more decisions, understand more about what they are working on, require less supervision, assume more responsibility and, as vital tools towards these ends, have better reading, quantitative, reasoning and expository skills. It is another translating these values and competencies into a curriculum which develops them and into teaching and learning that facilitates them. Revisions to the curriculum at primary to incorporate early grade literacy and numeracy are welcome. The curriculum revision at secondary is more complex as its delivery challenges are different depending on whether it is a rural or urban context. The two tier system proposed for technical stream and an academic stream is one that could be effective but requires analysis and careful planning before it is implemented.

Third, the investment in teachers, initial teacher training and teaching and learning at school level must be seen to lead directly to a rise in performance levels; not just knowledge about education by teachers, but to an ability to teach effectively. What this means in practice should be established and agreed and effective strategies implemented to achieve it. There needs to be a better understanding of the teacher and pupil absenteeism, and how to ensure that when a teacher is in class, learning is taking place.

In editing the NIF III, the Implementation Plan and the AWB, what these skills, competencies and values are should be identified and included, as should how they are to be developed and measured, to ensure that the investment being made is effectively targeted. This is an issue that should be highlighted in the sector dialogue during the Joint Annual Review process.

Internal coherence

(i) There is an internal coherence (the logical sequencing of sections and activities) to the NIF III based on current sub-sectoral structures and existing areas of work. Whilst mention is made to ‘systemic restructuring’ in the Framework’s chapter on the Institutional and Human Resource Framework (chapter 14), at this stage it is only implied that this will occur on the basis of a rationalisation of the ministry’s structures and functions. Without restructuring, it will be difficult to operationalise the Framework as effectively as it is intended. No doubt this will become clearer as and when a timed and fully costed Implementation Plan aligned with the MTEF is developed and the Annual Work Plans and Budgets are drawn. Failure to do so will not achieve the administrative efficiencies anticipated in the Framework.

(ii) Listing actions without prioritising them may appear to embody an implicit assumption that they will lead to the desired goal and, indeed, imply a strategic direction, but there is no certainty that they will. For example, it is necessary to ask whether building schools in rural areas automatically results in more children accessing education, especially those who are most disadvantaged and hardest to reach, either in a geographic or socio-economic sense.

Quality

(i) Much mention is made in the NIF III about quality and the need to improve it but nowhere is it stated precisely what constitutes quality. Proxy indicators such as pupil-teacher ratios, class-pupil ratios, pupil textbook ratios, pupil-teacher contact time, teacher absenteeism, literacy and numeracy rates are listed. It is pleasing to note that the NIF III explicitly acknowledges the importance of early grade literacy and reading books (not just textbooks) and early grade numeracy, and that unless literacy is addressed, textbooks will have little impact.

(ii) The NIF III further acknowledges that language teaching is not the same as initial literacy development. It is a pity, therefore, that the Framework does not indicate the extent to which the NIF III is building on Zambia's impressive experience in literacy and numeracy training and its work on textbook provision, where it has made significant progress on ensuring that the language level of textbooks is appropriate to the literacy levels of the various grades. A general omission in the activities listed under the primary and secondary sub-sectors concerns the need for teacher training in how textbooks are used or should be used.

(iii) Zambian Education has long recognised the impact of good school management on learning achievement. Whilst the NIF III refers to increasing the number of inspectors, it does not mention how this work will be financed. The November, 2010 appraisal found that the inspectorial service suffered from a lack of resources. The important role of the role of community and parents should not be overlooked. Since inspectors cannot visit schools frequently (and the costs of doing so are high), school communities are probably best placed to ensure that teachers are present and that teaching and learning are taking place every day. Further, whilst the Framework refers obliquely to increasing teacher contact hours, which in turn could also improve levels of efficiency, it neglects to acknowledge that equally important is the amount of time both pupils and teachers spend in class, assuming of course that time spent in classrooms is worthwhile and that minimum quality standards of teaching and learning are being met.

(iv) It should be pointed out that strengthening classroom and national assessment practices, another area identified for action in the Framework, is not simply about national examinations. It is crucial that teachers are trained in

diagnosis, testing and remedial work. Such class/school level assessment can supplement formal examining, especially in the primary school when checking on literacy and numeracy rates in different grades before formal assessment occurs can allow remedial action to be taken. Evidence from across the Indian sub-continent, for example, has shown that examination failure is as much about a failure by pupils to read (including reading and understanding the examination paper) as it is about failing to acquire the requisite knowledge.

(v) Reform of the primary and secondary curriculum is planned. No mention is made of the guiding principles except that students leaving schools should be employable and trainable. The decision to bifurcate the secondary curriculum into academic and technical programmes reflects the aspirations outlined in 2030 *Educating Our Future, Vision 2030* and the objectives of the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP). Revising any curriculum can be problematic and result in an undue emphasis being place on content at the risk of ignoring the core competencies and generic skills that should be developed.

Sustainability

There is evidence of strong political commitment to the Education Sector. The NIF III acknowledges that the Framework's sustainability will be driven by the degree of ownership shown by the political leadership across the country. Information provided to the appraisal indicates that education is a strong priority of the new government and is reflected in in the level of fiscal support provided to the sector.

Assuming that the macroeconomic projections prove correct and that the Government continues to maintain its declared strong support for the NIF III, there is a strong case to be made for increasing the sector's share in the national budget beyond present levels to bridge the US$ 46million annual financing gap. It constitutes a reasonably manageable risk, provided political conditions remain sufficiently stable to encourage the donor community to continue to support the country.

An on-going challenge will be how to use development partner support to institutionalize capacity development. Activity areas identified all have the potential to lead to sustained change.

Another important ongoing challenge remains how to train teachers properly in remote areas, as well as attracting them to working and staying in more remote locations. This is critical to the expansion of access and quality of primary education in harder to reach rural areas. It is not clear from the documentation reviewed how the MESVTEE intends to achieve this and what particular non-financial incentives will be put in place to assure that this challenge is properly addressed, as the

financial incentive has not meant teachers remain in rural posts. This is an area to be explored further.

Risk Analysis

An omission from the NIF III is a Risk Analysis. This should be addressed when the Framework is edited and risks associated with financing, financial management, systemic and capacity issues are identified and mitigating actions listed. As risks can arise from across government, it is recommended that discussion be held with at least the Ministry of Finance and the Director of the Civil Service. Where core skills training of public servants in financial and asset management and procurement, human resource management and computer skills are considered inadequate, it would be wise to identify these systemic risk areas. Further, no environmental risk assessment is included in the NIF III. The risk analysis should be undertaken before the JAR and then discussed in the JAR 2013. The environmental risk assessment should be undertaken, particularly because of the strong focus on infrastructure expansion at secondary and tertiary level.

Financing: Allocative percentages

The following two tables detail the allocative percentage shares of the budget in terms of the total required resources and the recurrent expenditure.

Table 16.2: Summary of Total Required Resources by Sub-Sector, 2011-2015
(K billion)

Sub-Sector	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total	% share	US$m
Early Childhood Education	4	5	6	4	6	**25**	0.1%	5
Primary School Education	2,227	2,749	3,087	3,457	3,866	**15,387**	**46.4%**	**3,077**
Secondary School Education	1,774	2,160	2,468	2,657	3,030	**12,089**	**36.4%**	**2,418**
Tertiary Education: Teacher Training	33	36	39	42	46	**196**	0.6%	39
Tertiary Education: University	290	313	330	356	385	**1,674**	**5.0%**	**335**
Management and Administration	486	523	562	604	650	**2,824**	8.5%	565
Science and Vocational Training	141	184	201	217	233	**976**	2.9%	195
Total Required Resources	**4,956**	**5,970**	**6,692**	**7,338**	**8,215**	**33,172**		**6,634**

Table 16.3: Required Recurrent Expenditure Resources
(K billion)

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total	% Share	US$m
Early Childhood Education	2	3	3	2	3	**12**	0.0%	2
Primary School Education	2,224	2,617	2,954	3,327	3,736	**14,857**	**55.2%**	**2,971**
Secondary School Education	1,084	1,320	1,494	1,682	2,055	**7,635**	**28.4%**	**1,527**
Tertiary Education: Teacher Training	18	20	21	23	25	**107**	0.4%	21
Tertiary Education: University	249	269	283	305	330	**1,436**	**5.3%**	**287**

Management and Administration	486	523	562	604	650	**2,824**	10.5%	565
Science and Vocational Training	4.9	5.1	5.5	6	6.4	**27.9**	0.1%	6
Total Recurrent Resources	**4,069**	**4,756**	**5,321**	**5,950**	**6,805**	**26,900**		**5,380**

It will be noted that when the amount for recurrent expenditure is subtracted from the total estimated resource it is possible to arrive at an estimate of development funding. For Primary Education, that amounts to US$106000.00 or less than US 30 cents per student; for Secondary Education, US$891000.00 or around US$1.50 per student; whilst for Universities it is US$48000.00, or around US$1.00 per student.

At present 90.2% of financing for the sector comes from GRZ sources with 9.8% from the donor partners.

The Evidence Base. Quality of documents consulted.

Two documents consulted were:

(i) November (2010) Final Report: Appraisal of the Ministry of Education National Implementation Framework III (NIF) 2011-2015, under the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP), Republic of Zambia.

(ii) August (2011) Education Sector National Implementation Framework III, 2011 – 2015, Republic of Zambia

These and the background documents to the November (2010) appraisal provided a rich insight into the context and the challenges facing the Republic of Zambia. It is evident that as part of the development of the NIF III, the MESVTEE consulted widely, including at the district, zonal and local level. This gave officials a clear appreciation of conditions on the ground and an understanding of challenges being faced.

Educational Indicators from available Documents

The following tables capture indicators listed in the NIF III. They have not been verified.

Table 1

Domain/Indicator	**Latest value**	**Comment**
Population (Total size)	14,309,466 Female (?) (source: Index Mundi, 2012)	Estimated birthrate 3.04%
% of population below the poverty line (Total/females)	64%	Rural population represents around 60% of the total population, of which 81% is below the poverty line.
School Population		

Primary	Total 3045000 Male 49.9% Female 50.1%	
Gender Parity Index	0.97%	
Orphans	541986 in Primary Education	This constitutes nearly 18% of the Primary School population
Double Shift	+50% of primary school population	
Completion Rate Grade 7	91%	
Transition Rate	Grade 7 to 8 49%	Grade 8 is start of secondary school.
Repetition Rate	Grade 6 Male 6.3% Female 6.17% Average 6.41%	
Dropout Rate	End of Primary school Male 2.21% Female 5.38%	
Survival Rate to Grade 7	Male 70.25% Female 60.39%	
NER grade 7	Male 95.9 Female 90.92 Average 93.7	
Cohort : Out of School	435430	Source: UNICEF
PTR	57:1 (grades 1–4) 52.1 (grades 5-7)	20 districts with over 100:1
Classroom/Pupil ratio	38.8:1	
Teachers	80% unqualified in 20 districts Teacher attrition: average 3000 (2010)	
Textbook/Pupils ratio	English 1–3 Mathematics 1-4	
Secondary	Total students 622068	
NER	*Grades 8- 9* Male 30.19 Female 28.93 Total 30.6 *Grades 9-10* Male 55.5 Female 56.6 Total 56 *Grades 10-12* Male 30.5 Female 23.7 Total 27	

Orphans	107412 in Lower Secondary 61811 in Upper Secondary	Total represents around 27% of secondary school population.
Classroom/Pupil ratio	43:1	

Table 2

Framework Budget	**Budgeted amount US$**	**Comment**
Total budget envelope	**6396million**	**% of Total Budget envelope (100%)**
Aggregate recurrent budget	5380million	84%
Primary education	2,971million	46.4%
Secondary	1,527million	36.4%
Higher	287million	5.0%
Aggregate budget for capital investment	1016million	15.9%
Total public expenditure on education as a share of total public expenditure.	19.7%	
Aggregate Recurrent Budget	**5380million**	
% of recurrent budget spent on teacher salaries (%)	? %	
Primary education's share of total recurrent budget (%).	55%	See Figure 16.3 NIF III
Secondary education's share of total recurrent budget (%)	29%	
Higher education's share of total recurrent budget (%)	5%	
Teacher education's share of total recurrent budget (%)	?	
Management and Administration (%)	11%	
Plan Financing Gap over 5 years		
Scenario 1 High Case	2052million	
Scenario 2 Medium Case	826million	
Scenario 3 Low Case	238million	Case adopted

Summary of Appraisal

Summary of Appraisal			**Very satisfactory**	**Satisfactory**	**Room for improvement**	**Comments**
Education Plan Development Process	Education Plan Preparation Process			√		i) Plan based on extensive consultation involving local, district, provincial and national level stakeholders. ii) Plan has undergone a series of iterations, including an internal appraisal conducted by a team of international consultants in November, 2010. iii) A great deal of work has gone into modelling the financing options.
	Stakeholders engagement		√			Plan has strong political and stakeholder support as well as support from donor community and civil society.
Education Plan	Education Sector analysis		√			i) This is the third National Plan, each of which has been based on an increasingly detailed sector analysis as the quality of the EMIS has improved. ii) The Plan addresses the aspirations contained in the *Educating Our Future, Vision 2030* and the objectives of the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) in the fields of education, science, vocational training and early education.
	Plan design	Policy priorities		√		i) Free primary and secondary education; ii) Expansion of Tertiary and Higher Education. iii) Development of TEVET and Skill training, especially in the area of Literacy training. iv) Access, quality, relevance, equity, efficiency, skill development.
		Programme design and prioritisation of strategies			√	Whilst performance indicators have been established, the AWPB and Strategic Performance Assessment Framework are still in the process of refinement, athough it will be completed by end Dec 2012.
		Plan financing		√		Three financing options have been modelled. The base plan which projects a

						financing gap of US$ 238 million over 5 years has been adopted. A strong set of actions are proposed to address this (Table 1.1)
		Monitoring and Evaluation		√		i) A common monitoring framework (Education sector PAF) is in the process of being agreed upon between the Ministry and all major stakeholders, including the country's Cooperating Partners. ii) Sub-sector reporting and monitoring requirements are being developed. iii) Annual progress reviews are being instituted. iv) Improvement of relevant data collection and the utilization of impact monitoring results in policy-making and resource allocation. v) M&E and mainstreamed into the Annual Work Plans and Budgets vi) Systems being developed to improve evidence based decision making at district level, vii) MTEF process has been adopted along with the introduction of *Annual Work Plans and Budgets* vii) Capacity of District Education Offices and respective management system will be strengthened viii) Semi-annual reports that will include details of progress, financial expenditure profiles and actions to be taken forward ix) A Joint Annual Review to be undertaken to assess previous year's performance. Will form the basis for the planning and budgeting process of the following year, including additional funding possible upon achievement of the 6 agreed disbursement linked milestones. x) A Mid-Term review of NIF III to be carried out.
		Development and financing of action plan	√			The base plan projecting a financing gap of US$ 238 million over 5 years has been adopted. Recurrent expenditure projects to constitute 82% of budget with nearly 90% of development budget allocated to infrastructure.
Appraisal of implementation readiness	System capacity			√		NIF III states there are widespread capacity needs. However, the NIF III builds on NIF II. This is a key constraint to effective delivery of the objectives of the NIF III and is a core area of focus as part of the DFID/GPE business case.
	Governance and Account-ability			√		Difficult to assess on basis of documentation. An Institutional and political analysis/ drivers of change study was conducted as part of the DFID/GPE programme documentation development.
	Risks to implementation and mitigation				√	No risk analysis undertaken in the NIF III. This has subsequently been discussed and risk has been assessed as part of the DFID/GPE business case. This will be a key discussion issue as part of the JAR.