## Annex 1 – Standardized Grant Reporting Template

# Global Partnership for Education
# Education Sector Program Implementation Grant (ESPIG)
# – Annual Implementation Status Reporting Template –

**Background and Instructions**

The objective of this template, which is to be completed by the Grant Agent (GA), is to allow GPE to report on progress in the implementation of the "Program" to which the ESPIG contributes.

The "Program" is defined either as:

1) A pooled program, to which the ESPIG contributes; or
2) A stand-alone project financed by the ESPIG.

This information will allow the GPE Secretariat to assess and analyze whether the Program is on track to achieve its objectives or whether remediation is needed. On the aggregate level, it will help the Secretariat assess and analyze progress towards its strategic goals and objectives.

This template is for completion by GAs. The GA can use its own internal process to report on progress in particular sections as long as all information outlined in the template is captured in the GA's own template.

Please provide detailed information to adequately reflect progress made and results achieved in the reporting period. Prior to completion, GAs are strongly encouraged to share the draft with the Developing Country Partner (DCP)'s Local Education Group (LEG). Once completed, the implementation status report should be sent to the applicable Country Lead at the GPE Secretariat (cc to gpe_grant_submission@globalpartnership.org) with copy to the Coordinating Agency, which will circulate the report to the DCP's LEG.

Please send the report by: July 20 of each year

---

**Reporting period - from** July 01, 2015 to June 30, 2016**:**

---

## 1. General characteristics

### 1-1. Program information

Program Name[1]: DFID and GPE funded Zambian Education Sector Budget Support Programme

Developing Country Partner: Zambia

Grant Agent: DFID

Program Amount[2]: $85.58m

### 1-2. Program financing resources

This Program is financed by GPE (ESPIG) as well as other financing resources: X Yes □ No

If Yes, indicate all financing resources and their amount[3] [4]:

| | |
|---|---|
| GPE (ESPIG) | Amount (USD): 35.2m |
| Name of financing resource 2: DFID Zambia | Amount (USD): 50.38m |

### 1-3. Duration

Start date of Program: 22 April, 2013

End date of Program: 31 March, 2018

Start date of ESPIG: 25 may, 2013

Original end date of ESPIG: 15 November 2016

Revised end date of ESPIG: 31 March 2018

[1] Refer to "Program Name" under Section 1: Overview of ESPIG Application. If there is no name, then insert "not applicable."

[2] This means the total amount of the Program, not just the ESPIG amount, in case of pooled funding.

[3] Specify approved allocation.

[4] The total amount of all financing resources should match the program amount under 1-1 Program information.

## 2. Program implementation

### 2-1. Program implementation overview

*Briefly describe and analyze:*

*(a) Overall Program objective(s) is* **more and better quality education and skills training for boys and girls from pre-primary to tertiary education.**
The outcomes will be to:

- Increase from 60 to 72.5% the number of boys and girls transitioning from primary to junior secondary and from 45% to 53% from junior to senior secondary school
- Reduced number of districts that have a Pupil Teacher Ratio(PTR) of more than 60:1 in lower primary (grades 1-4) from 37 to 5 districts
- Increase % gr. 9 pass rate from 35% to 47% for boys and 46% for girls
- 100% of GRZ education sector PAF disbursement-linked milestones are met each year

*(b) Assess the likelihood that the overall objective(s) will be achieved at the end of program implementation - please refer to page 22 for details on rating*

| **Progress toward achievement of overall objective(s)** | |
|---|---|
| **Rating from Previous Reporting Period[5]** | **Rating for Current Reporting Period** |
| □ Highly Satisfactory (HS)<br>X Satisfactory (S)<br>□ Moderately Satisfactory (MS)<br>□ Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)<br>□ Unsatisfactory (U)<br>□ Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | □ Highly Satisfactory (HS)<br>X Satisfactory (S)<br>□ Moderately Satisfactory (MS)<br>□ Moderately Unsatisfactory □ (MU)<br>□ Unsatisfactory (U)<br>□ Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) |

*(c) Cumulative progress towards overall objective(s)*

The Education Sector Budget Support (SBS) programme received a satisfactory score during the Annual Review (AR) process completed in mid-August 2016. Most outputs are meeting expectations. While most outcomes are also on track to be met by the revised end date, the challenge is to translate this into progress, which will require high-level policy influencing in support of the programme. Strong progress has been maintained across all 4 Outputs: (i) Financial Management, (ii) Leadership and Management (iii) Evidence-based Planning and Budgeting and (iv) Teacher Capacity. There are 13 Output Indicators of which: 3 scored A+, 8 scored A, and 2 scored B. Areas of strong performance include: reduction in audit irregularities (1.1), delivery of school grants (1.4) and delivery of technical assistance to Ministry (2.3).

[5] This does not apply to a new Program.

Since the beginning of the programme, institutional changes include:

- Grant funds going directly to primary schools in 5 provinces from May 2016.
- Increased budget allocation from 11% in 2011 to 23% in 2015 for secondary education.
- The Office of the Auditor General's (OAG's) Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) education sector reports, including management responses, shared as part of the sector dialogue with all partners (2013 and 2014 audits both unqualified with less than 1% materiality).
- OAG start work on Education sector audits within first 2 months of year.
- Internal audit produced and shared with Cooperating Partners (CPs) to increase efficiency of delivery in 2014 and 2015.
- Outputs Based Budget (OBB) for 2 year running has maintained an 11% of total budget allocations for operational grants and activities (up from 6% or less prior to 2014).
- Indicators focused on quality and learning included in the overall education sector indicators within the OBB and reported against in sector dialogue and to Cabinet.
- New procedures in place at District level for handing over constructed latrines to schools – resulting in usage up to 3-8 months faster than previously.
- Better Value for Money (VfM) achieved and reduced potential fraud – '999 code' used to have indefinite payment of rural hardship allowance removed and replaced with a 12 month code which means that teachers will only receive the allowance owed to them while still working in remote areas.
- Catch-up pilot study developed and led by MoGE to improve literacy and numeracy for upper primary grades based on international evidence base with formal scale up planned from January 2018.
- National Assessment Surveys (NASs) conducted in grades 2, 5 and 9 in 2014 and embedded into Ministry of General Education (MoGE) systems. Dedicated budget for conducting learning achievement testing now at grades 2, 5 and 9.
- Reduction in examinations malpractice with none reported at grades 7 and 12 in 2015.
- Learning outcomes data used in budgeting and planning and now included in EMIS database and shared on MoGE website for full transparency of results.

Areas of concern include full implementation of the Financial Management Action Plan (FMAP) (1.2) Non delivery of EMIS training (3.2) and the wider insufficiency of resources and training placed for curriculum implementation. There is continued progress on some outcome indicators relating to access, e.g. the transition rate from Junior to Senior Secondary and relating to quality, e.g. the percentage of districts with a pupil: teacher ratio below 1:60. However, learning outcomes remain low.

Other key challenges include completion the new Education Act and the full receipt of allocated budget in challenging economic circumstances. SBS remains a good investment, extending access to quality education, and building capacity in MoGE. There is strong collaboration with MoGE and the Policy Implementation Technical Committee (PITC) which provides for effective and collaborative management.

Equity and gender are integrated into all sector dialogue discussions and most indicators are gender disaggregated. In 2015 there was progress on supporting community schools, which service the poorest communities, often in rural areas. The community school guidelines were finalised, as was a lower cost model for construction of latrines that incorporate menstrual hygiene management; particularly affecting girls' access in upper primary and into secondary education. Still there remain challenges of access to children with special needs, and increasing numbers of out of school children to be tackled.

Community schools are not getting their proportionate share of the school grants. This will be important to focus on, as the grants are directly provided to primary schools to ensure community schools are also included.

*(d) Among risk factors identified in the ESPIG Application, describe any factors[6] jeopardizing the overall implementation of the Program. If there are newly identified risk(s), please specify them*

*(e) Describe any mitigation measures for the risk factors described in (d)*

SBS programme risk was assessed in June, August, December 2015 and February 2016. At each assessment, risks were carefully analysed, triggers identified and mitigating action defined. The number of identified risks was adjusted down from nine in 2014 to five as directed by the DFID Zambia office. In the last AR (August 2015) the overall risk level of SBS was assessed as Medium as the rating of risks was adjusted to be against the achievement of outcomes and not just the outputs of the programme.

- The risk review in December 2015 showed that the risk to resource allocation was reduced. Funds that were to be removed from the sector (up to a 42% reduction) were recovered, after effective lobbying and Cooperating Partner support, resulting in an overall reduction of 2% but with a real value increase. The risk on misuse of funds reduced after review of GRZ audits and an unqualified audit result. All other risks remained unchanged over the period.
- The risks review in February 2016 agreed that risks 4 and 5 no longer reflected the current environment and should be removed
  - Risk 4 related to delays in disbursement of DFID or GPE funds. The anticipated triggers for this risk were delays in GPE Board approval of funds in 2013 and delays in signing the financial procedures agreement between DFID and GPE – both of which are now complete.
  - Risk 5 related to a possible Lack of sufficient external funding to the education sector affecting sector dialogue. This risk has not materialized and sufficient funds have now been committed to the end of the programme.

The risks set out in the table below reflect those changes.

| Risk | Description and Triggers | Mitigation Actions |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Government fails to prioritise the projected levels of financial resources for the education sector resulting in the inability to fully implement the quality focused elements of National implementation Framework III (NIF III) | • Inadequate budget available for primary education<br>• Insufficient coordination between the two Permanent Secretaries (PSs) in budgeting and planning<br>• Insufficient non-wage resources made available down to school level (operational grants allocated and released in full and in a timely manner)<br>• Both DFID's funding through SBS and GPE financing does not provide sufficient incentives to influence changes in allocations to achieve better quality learning outcomes at primary and secondary level<br>• Budget allocations focus on infrastructure at secondary and | • Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA) has been developed for implementation of the NIF III<br>• CPs and GRZ in Sept 2012 signed a Mutual Accountability Framework, committing to supporting the sector and the NIF III implementation.<br>• A sustained policy dialogue underway which includes monitoring resource allocations (both wages and non-wage expenditure) and Public Finance Management (PFM)<br>• Sector dialogue is inclusive of both PSs in technical meetings and technical vocational (TEVET)/higher education is part of reviews, reporting and discussions |

[6] Such factors include any changes in political context and/or institutional arrangements.

| Risk | Description and Triggers | Mitigation Actions |
|---|---|---|
| | tertiary levels | • CPs continue to undertake annual field visits as part of the Joint Annual Review (JAR) to verify performance at district level<br>• Technical Assistance (TA) provides capacity building in key areas and is implemented when required (demand driven and timely)<br>• Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) has specific indicators of which are budget related.<br>• PAF has 4 indicators monitoring budgeting and financing of the sector, including a Disbursement Linked Milestone (DLM) for % of budget allocated for both primary and secondary levels. |
| 2. Risk of corruption and general misuse of funds | • Health checks do not continue in 2016.<br>• FMAP implementation is not carried out<br>• Poor management response to OAG annual audits<br>• Audit process is not of sufficient quality and depth<br>• Bank reconciliations on the GRZ accounts continue to not be performed on time<br>• Procurement unit is adequately staffed with qualified manpower. | • CP support to the continuing health checks and FMAP implementation<br>• CP support to conducting Public Expenditure Review/ Public Expenditure Tracking System (PER/PETS) in the sector<br>• Procurement audit is finalised and mitigation measures identified and implemented<br>• CP to conduct Fiduciary Risk Assessment (FRA) and monitor regularly in audit meetings<br>• Openness and transparency around annual audits for the sector continue with the OAG and chief accountant<br>• PAF includes indicator on improved audit implementation<br>• Forensic audit to be undertaken after results of PETS/ Qualitative Service Delivery Survey (QSDS) and PER identify bottlenecks in the system |
| 3. Poor quality and usage of national statistics to monitor progress | • Education statistical bulletin not released annually on a timely basis<br>• No progress on Education Management Information System (EMIS) reform<br>• Learning outcome data not available annually | • CP support effective M&E framework for Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) & NIF III<br>• support to national statistics office<br>• support on institutional capacity in EMIS<br>• TA to EMIS department<br>• Support roll out of National Assessment Survey (NAS) plans |
| 4. (New) Ability of district and school level to manage and account for the funds disbursed directly to primary schools. | • Disbursements now made to primary school bank accounts in 5 provinces since March 2016<br>• Insufficient capacity of head teachers to administer funds<br>• No training provided to Head teachers and administrators for use of funds, bank reconciliations, etc.<br>• Community schools may not be registered, making it harder for funds to be delivered to community schools equitably<br>• Potential lack of funding to monitor funds | • Ensure all schools received full amount of primary school grants directly by reviewing Annual Workplan and Budget (AWPB) to have sufficient funds<br>• Zambia Education Sector Support Technical Assistance (ZESSTA) provides materials on simple budgeting and accounting to be distributed to all primary schools<br>• Conduct verification visits and audit to ensure funds are reaching schools in full and well utilised and accounted for. |

| Risk | Description and Triggers | Mitigation Actions |
|---|---|---|
| | | • Review AWPB to ensure sufficient funds for monitoring PFM are included. |
| 5. (New) Reduction of support from DFID Zambia affects delivery of education outcomes for both DFID and GPE programme | • 20% Regional Adviser cover is insufficient to replace the full time Education Adviser based in Zambia to deliver the outcomes of the programme to March 18<br>• GPE funding is not effectively disbursed because of lack of sufficient support in-country<br>• Technical oversight could become insufficient as other donors fail to fill the gap left by our lower engagement in the education sector | • Effective handover from current Education Adviser to the Zimbabwe Education Adviser<br>• Good coordination with partners, especially UNICEF on the transitioning out of leading the sector<br>• Good information flow with GPE secretariat and accurate and timely reporting back to GPE on performance and assessment processes |

**Summary of Likelihood and Impact**

| | | Impact | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Insignificant** | **Minor** | **Moderate** | **Major** | **Severe** |
| **Likelihood** | **Almost Certain** | | | | | |
| | **Likely** | | 5. reduction of support from DFID Zambia affects delivery of education outcomes for both DFID and GPE programme | 4 Ability of district and school level to manage and account for the funds that are disbursed directly to primary schools. | | |
| | **Possible** | | | 2. Risk of corruption and misuse of funds<br><br>3. Poor quality and usage of national statistics to monitor progress | 1. GRZ fails to prioritise the projected levels of financial resources for the education sector resulting in the inability to fully implement the quality focused elements of NIF III | |
| | **Unlikely** | | | | | |
| | **Rare** | | | | | |

*Complete the table below:*

*Refer to outcome indicators in the Program results framework in the ESPIG Application, Section 3: Program description, and report on progress made during the reporting period*

The SBS Outcome Statement is: *"More and better quality education and skills training for boys and girls from pre-primary to tertiary education.* SBS has five outcome indicators, three of which are on track against 2015 logframe milestones. 2017 targets for the other two remain attainable. Unless otherwise stated, data in this AR comes from Education Management Information System (EMIS), reported in the Annual Performance Report (APR) 2015[i], and Educational Statistical Bulletin[ii] (ESB) 2015.

| | Source | Baseline | | Current reporting period | | | Next reporting period | | End target | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Data | | | Indicator target for the next reporting period[7] - Initial target set in the Program Document | Indicator target for the next reporting period - Revised target if applicable | Indicator target at the end of Program - Initial target set in the Program Document | Indicator target at the end of Program - Revised target if applicable |
| | | Data | Month/ Year | Target | Actual | Month/Year for actual data | | | | |
| Outcome Indicator 1 : *Number of districts with Pupil: Teacher Ratio (PTR) of more than 60:1 in lower primary (grade 1-4* | ESB | 37 districts out of 72 in | 2011 | 20 | 15 | January – December 2015 | 15 | NA | 8/103 | NA |
| Outcome Indicator 2: *The Percentage of boys and girls completing grade 9 (lower-secondary)* | ESB | T: 62 (M:68 / F:56) (2011)= 68/103 | 2011 | 68% (m:72%/f: 64%). | 57.3% (m:59.6%/ f:55.2%) | January – December 2015 | 69.5% (M: 73% / F: 66%) | NA | TBD | NA |
| Outcome Indicator 3a: *The Percentage of girls and boys transitioning from Primary to Junior secondary school* | ESB | M=55.5 % F= 56.6% T= 56.0% | 2011 | 71% (m:70%/ f:72.5%). | 64.5% (m:63.7%/ f:65.5 | January – December 2015 | 71.5% (M: 71%, F: 72%) | NA | 72.5% (M:72.5%, F:73%) | NA |
| Outcome indicator 3b: *Percentage of girls and boys transitioning from Junior to Senior secondary school* | ESB | T: 45.5 (M:46 / F:45) | 2011 | 45% | 46.2% (m:47.4%/ f:44.8%) | January – December 2015 | 48% (M: 49%, F 47%) | NA | 53% (M: 53%, F: 53%) | NA |
| Outcome Indicator 4: GRZ education sector | JAR review | 0 | 2013 | 75% | Tba (87%) | April 2015 to March 2016 | 75% | NA | 100% | NA |

[7] This usually refers to the target set in the Program document. However, if the Program went through "non-minor revisions" as defined in the GPE Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants, including any changes in the results framework, the new target should be reported.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) percentage of Disbursement Linked Milestones (DLMs) met | process and PITC (LEG equivalent) | | | | | | | | | |
| Outcome Indicator (formerly 3): Net Enrolment Rate' (grades 10-11. | ESB | M=26.1% F= 19.9% T: 23% | 2011 | M=32% F=28% T=30% | M= 35.3% F=28.6% T= 32% | January – December 2015 | M: 34% F: 30% T: 32% | N/A | M: 34% F: 30% T: 32% | N/A |

Outcome Indicator 4 is discussed in more detail with the calculations set out below.

| DLM | Indicator | Target | Performance | Met? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Outcome 3b: % of girls and boys transitioning from Junior to Senior secondary school | 45% (m:46%/f:44%) | 46.2% (m:47.4%/f:44.8%) | Yes |
| 2 | Output 1.4: Average amount of school grant per child | 34ZMW primary, 100ZMW secondary | 50ZMW primary, 153ZMW secondary | Yes |
| 3 | % of Primary and secondary schools that have implemented School-based continuous professional Development (SBCPD) through lesson study (Primary: all subjects, Secondary: Science and maths) | Primary schools 90% in 3 provinces Secondary schools 65% in 10 provinces | Primary schools; 87% in 3 provinces Secondary schools 68% in 10 provinces | 50% Not at Primary but at Secondary |
| 4 | Output 1.2: % of activities in the Financial Management Action Plan (FMAP) fully implemented | FMAP implemented and 80% completed | FMAP implemented and 74% completed | No |
| 5 | Output 3.3 National Assessment Surveys conducted and results included in Education Statistical Bulletin (ESB) by May of each year (DLM 5) | Conducted and 2014 results shared and 2013 results included in ESB | NAS grade 5 Conducted and results disseminated in 2015 | Yes |
| 6 | Output 1.3: % of education budget allocated to primary and secondary education (DLM 6) | Primary 50%, Secondary 20% | 69% primary, 23% secondary | Yes |

## 2-2. Progress in Program implementation: overall progress and progress by components

### *Overall progress in program implementation*

*Assess the overall progress in Program implementation by taking into consideration the progress of the individual Program components, project management, financial management, procurement, monitoring and evaluation, actual disbursement vis-à-vis planned disbursement, as well as financial reporting requirements including submission of the audit report -- refer to page 23 for details of rating.*

| **Overall progress in Program implementation** |
|---|

| Rating from Previous Reporting Period[8] | Rating for Current Reporting Period |
|---|---|
| □ Highly Satisfactory (HS)<br>X Satisfactory (S)<br>□ Moderately Satisfactory (MS)<br>□ Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)<br>□ Unsatisfactory (U)<br>□ Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | □ Highly Satisfactory (HS)<br>X Satisfactory (S)<br>□ Moderately Satisfactory (MS)<br>□ Moderately Unsatisfactory □ (MU)<br>□ Unsatisfactory (U)<br>□ Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) |

The rating has been remained the same as in the last 12 months.

*For each component, briefly describe and analyze:*

*a) Objective(s) of the component*

| Indicator(s) | Milestones 2015 | Progress |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1 Number of audit irregularities (including reductions in outstanding imprest) | 20 in 2013 OAG report | **Met.** 15 in 2014 OAG report (A+) |
| 1.2 Percentage of activities in the Financial Management Action Plan (FMAP) fully implemented **(DLM 4)** | FMAP implemented and 80% complete | **Not Met.** FMAP Implemented and 74% complete (B) |
| 1.3 Percentage of education budget allocated to primary and secondary education **(DLM 6)** | Primary 50%, Secondary 20% | **Met.** 56% primary, 23% secondary (A) |
| 1.4 Average amount of school grant per child **(DLM 2)** | ZMW 34 primary, ZMW 100 secondary | **Met.** ZMW 50.4 primary, ZMW 153 secondary (A+) |

Note: Data presented for progress is derived from the MoGE Annual Progress Review and covers performance during the calendar year 2015. This was the most recent information available at time of writing.

**Component /output 1: More resources and stronger systems for financial management and improved value for money in the Ministry of Education**

*a) Progress made during the reporting period vis-à-vis planned results for the component*

Overall Progress on Output 1 meets expectation (A). Milestones for 3 out of 4 Milestones were met.

- 1.1. The number of audit irregularities for Financial Year (FY) 2014 was 15, which is better than the milestone of 20 and represents considerable progress since the 2010 baseline of 60. This is clearly a welcome development though the rigour of auditing procedures must be maintained

[8] This does not apply for a new Program

- 1.2. The FMAP covers financial management system strengthening including: management of staff establishments, implementation of the Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS), Output Based Budgeting (OBB), procurement systems, internal audit and school grants. In an independent assessment of the FMAP conducted by Deloitte, as part of the Annual Statement of Progress of the Education Fiduciary Risk Assessment (ASP of FRA), 74% of activities in FMAP were assessed as completed in 2015 compared to a target of 80%.
- 1.3. In 2015, investment at both primary and secondary levels exceeded milestones, reflecting continued government commitment to fund the sector. Out of a total budget of ZMW 9.4 billion (£616 million), ZMW 5.3 billion (56.5%) was allocated to Primary and ZMW 2.1 billion (22.4%) to secondary. The total budget increased by 9.5% over 2014. A total of MKW 8.2 billion (86.5%) was actually released. The proportion released was high for personal emoluments (95%) and grants and payments (96%) but low for capital expenditure (44%). Incomplete releases, particularly for capital expenditure, are a feature of Zambia's cash rationing system across government departments. Education does not fare any worse than other sectors.
- 1.4. At both primary and secondary levels, all government and registered community schools benefitted from a total grant disbursement of ZMW 4.7 billion. Average expenditure per child was ZMW 50.4 in Primary and ZMW 153 at secondary which compares favourably with the 2015 milestones (ZMW 34 per child at primary and ZMW 100 per child at secondary). However, this masks inequalities between schools. The PETS found that the grant formula was not being applied consistently across districts and some schools received notably less than others. Starting from 2016, the system of grant payment to schools is being changed so that money is deposited directly into individual school accounts (being piloted in five provinces). This development was welcomed as effectively ensuring that all schools receive their full entitlement.

Overall, there is progress in resourcing and financial management. Activities are building the capacity of government to sustainably finance the education sector beyond the end of SBS in 2018. In 2015, all donor funding represented just 2.3% of total budget, but has been focused on operational expenditure which supported strategic activities aimed at system strengthening and quality improvement. MoGE are commended for continued collaboration and transparency

This programme has many elements that relate to improving public financial management; The Ministry has carried out two internal audits and shared reports with Cooperating Partners (CPs) and civil society; The 2014 audit of MoGE was unqualified and had materiality of less than 1%. The Financial Management Action Plan (FMAP) implementation is continuing, though slightly behind schedule. The activities were revised as part of the Annual Statement of Progress (ASP) for the education Fiduciary Risk Assessment (FRA) to acknowledge the completion of activities and the addition of new activities that will continue to improve PFM. Those include: (i) implementing recommendations from ZESSTA's payroll review, (ii) strengthening process for lower levels to report on use of funds to MOGE HQ, (iii) improving the MOGE website to publish both budget / execution reports as well as education statistics.

2015 was significant for the introduction and piloting of the Output Based Budget (OBB). Implementation was frustrated by incomplete release of budgeted funds. However the process was widely seen as a success. The 2016 Output Based Annual Workplan and Budgetiii (OBAWPB) has been developed through a process of zero-based budgeting and challenge meetings, ensuring that all activities are aligned with strategic targets and have an explicit aim of improved learning outcomes.

*b) Any deviation from the implementation/action plan during the reporting period as well as any factors jeopardizing the implementation of activities*

There were actions and recommendations made at the last annual review as follows:

Summary of responses to issues raised and actions taken in previous annual review and the progress towards those actions to be undertaken in the last 12 months that would improve implementation were as follows:

- Recommendation 1. "Use the findings and recommendations of the Public Expenditure Review (PER) and Public Expenditure Tracking System (PETS) / Quality Service Delivery Survey (QSDS) to review bottlenecks of funding and improve budget efficiency by end September 15" *Response:* **DONE.** Recommendations were agreed and included in final reports in December 2015 and have been discussed in the Financial Technical Committee (FTC), the Policy Implementation Technical Committee (PITC), and the JAR. An in-depth formal dissemination meeting was held on 5th April. PETS and PER Recommendations were included in discussions with Cabinet Office on Human Resource Management issues as part of restructuring of the Ministry. They also have been acted upon. Funds in 5 provinces are going directly to primary schools with bank accounts.
- Recommendation 2. "Add specific VfM indicator to output one when revising the DFID/GPE logframe by October 15" *Response:* **DONE.** The economists and education adviser discussed this in October and February and agreed that it was not necessary to include in the logframe but to substantially report on VfM indicators as part of the AR process.
  Recommendation 3. "Add an indicator for output one on the percentage of education budget disbursed for primary and secondary education by October 15". *Response:* **DONE**.

*c) Mitigation measures implemented, if any*

The following recommendations are set for the coming 12 months:

- *Recommendation 1.* Government should prioritise full release of funding for the implementation of the 2016 education budget, in order to maximise implementation of the new curriculum and minimise bottlenecks and barriers to access. *Who:* MoF, MoGE, *When:* Ongoing throughout 2016.
- *Recommendation 2.* Government should expedite finalisation of the new Education Policy and Act in order to provide a clear foundation for future planning and remove barriers to the gazetting of new schools. *Who: MoGE,* GRZ, *When:* By December 2016.
- *Recommendation 3:* Government should ensure the education chapter of the Seventh National Development Plan and its accompanying National Implementation Framework (NIF IV) is finalised and ready for implementation on 1st January 2017. *Who:* GRZ, MoGE *When:* by December 2016
- *Recommendation 4.* The splitting of Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education(MESVTEE) into MoGE and MoHE creates a challenge in maintaining the comparability of data for Indicator 1.3. In future years the total budget figure used to calculate the percentage should continue to include **both** MoGE and MoHE budgets to calculate the percentage of total education expenditure for primary and secondary sectors. *Who:* DFID using information provided by GRZ. *When:* By June 2017.
- *Recommendation 5.* Although the revised FMAP has been endorsed by the FTC and the PITC and is being implemented, it is important to get the formal approval of the changes from the PS. This should be completed by end July. In addition, the FMAP needs to be regularly reviewed during the FTC meetings and be discussed during the budget process to ensure there is sufficient funding available to implement the activities set out for 2016. *Who:* MoGE *When:* by July and October respectively.
- *Recommendation 6.* It was noted during 2016 JAR fieldwork that examination centres are not available in many remote schools, which compromises access, especially for girls. The key requirement for a school to become an examination centre is the presence of a strong room and lockable solid door. It is recommended that MoGE prioritise expenditure on the upgrade of school structures for this purpose in the 2017 budget. *Who:* MoGE, *When:* By September 2016 for inclusion in budget 2017.

- *Recommendation 7.* The new process for 2016 of disbursing grants directly to primary schools should be accompanied by a rigorous internal audit verification process at school level. It is recommended that audit visits be conducted in each province, in at least 5% of schools receiving grants. *Who:* MoGE, *When:* December 2016.
- *Recommendation 8.* While the improved supply of textbooks reported at the JAR is welcome, there was widespread concern raised concerning the quality of textbooks procured by MoGE to support implementation of the revised curriculum. This warrants a full review of textbook procurement procedures, including selection of books. The Aide Memoire for 2016 will include a specific recommendation that should be followed up as part of the sector dialogue *Who:* Independent review (possible through ZESSTA) *When:* by December 2016.

**Component/Output 2: Improved leadership and management systems and capacity at all levels**

*a) Objective(s) of the component*

| Indicator(s) | Milestones 2015 | Progress |
|---|---|---|
| 2.1. Number of school managers and administrators (heads/ deputy heads) at primary and secondary level completing Education Leadership and Management training (ELM) | Primary: 600<br>Secondary: 700<br>Total: 1,300 | **Met.** Primary 991, Secondary 321 for a total of 1,312 (A) |
| 2.2a. Average Percentage of teachers present during unannounced visit | 83% all<br>89% urban | **Met.** APR reports 83% based on PETS QSDS survey (A) |
| 2.2b. Improved data on teachers' attendance | No further milestone set for 2015 | Progress not reported. |
| 2.3. Technical Assistance effectively supports MoGE to achieve outputs in logframe | a. Curriculum costing completed<br>b. Catch-up pilot materials developed | a. **Exceeded.** ZESSTA has assisted in developing costed options for curriculum implementation and used in budgeting process. (A+)<br>b. **Exceeded.** pilot materials developed for literacy and numeracy (A+) |

*a) Progress made during the reporting period vis-à-vis planned results for the component*

Overall Progress on Output 2 met expectation (A). Milestones for 2015 were only set for 2.5 of the 3 indicators. Of these, two were met.

- 2.1. The total number of school managers and administrators completing ELM training at both primary and secondary level met the target. However, when it is disaggregated into sub sectors, the primary level was 991, which substantially exceeded the 2015 milestone of 600 but fewer teachers (321) were trained at secondary level did not. The reason is that priority was given to training at primary level where it was felt the skills were the weakest.

- 2.1. The 2016 JAR identified school leadership and management as a key issue for improving quality and learning outcomes. ZESSTA has supported the convening of a task group to investigate more cost effective and appropriate alternatives to the existing ELM programme. Proposals for task-based and certificated short courses have been developed with a focus on performance management and financial management that will potentially impact all indicators under Output 2. The shift from the existing ELM training has been agreed by the Ministry and the focus is on lower level access for significantly more head teachers/administrators each year through an Institutional Leadership and Management Development (ILMD) approach. ZESSTA is assisting the Ministry to roll this out and budget has been allocated in 2016.
- 2.2.a The average teacher attendance reported in the APR is 83% which meets expectations. The source of data was the PETS/Service Delivery Survey of December 2014. Systems still need to be developed for routine tracking and reporting on this indicator by MoGE which should be disaggregated by urban and rural, as it is not currently available. ZESSTA has supported MoGE Human Resources (HR) department to develop an action plan to deal with weaknesses in performance management which should support the reduction in teacher absences.
- 2.2.b No 2015 Milestone was set for improved data on teacher attendance and there remains little progress in this area. This was in part because the EMIS support to the Ministry was slow in starting as the ZESSTA team did not find acceptable consultants to conduct the support until early 2016. Now this is on track and the team supporting EMIS are working to improve the data collected in the annual school census. It is expected that better data will be available for the next AR.
- 2.3. 2015 was the first full year of operation of the Zambia Education Sector Support Technical Assistance (ZESSTA) facility. In 2015 ZESSTA has consistently met the expectations set including the two milestones: (a) costed options for curriculum implementation and (b) development of pilot materials for catch up programme. The MoGE are highly complementary of the quality of ZESSTA outputs and the responsiveness of their services. ZESSTA is effectively building capacity of a wide range of directorates by ensuring that all outputs are developed in close collaboration with relevant officials. ZESSTA's moto is 'always with, never for'. Other key outputs produced with ZESSTA support include: (i) a review of lessons from NIF III implementation, (ii) the National Education and Skills Policy, (iii) recommendations for addressing HR challenges including payroll, deployment, retention and teacher management. (iv) PFM strengthening. (v) a roadmap for access to and use of quality data. (vi) the Catch-up initiative for remediation of pupils, (vii) a Teachers' Curriculum Implementation Guide (TCIG), (viii) defining cost-effective alternatives to ELM programme for leadership and management, (ix) development of National Learning Assessment Framework
- The improvement of leadership and management at all levels of the education system remains high on the agenda. With essential inputs such as trained teachers and textbooks increasingly in place, the challenge remains in performance management, and in delivering improved learning outcomes.

*b) Any deviation from the implementation/action plan during the reporting period as well as any factors jeopardizing the implementation of activities*

Summary of responses to issues raised and actions taken in previous annual review and the progress towards those actions to be undertaken in the last 12 months that would improve implementation were as follows:

- *Recommendation 1: "*Once the QSDS survey data is cleaned and finalised, use it to set new targets in the logframe for increasing the number of days of teacher's attendance by October 15" *Response:* **DONE.**
- *Recommendation 2: "*Discuss with World Bank to include urban and rural breakdowns on teachers' attendance data in the PETS/QSDS report by September 15" *Response*. **NOT DONE.** The WB was unwilling to provide detailed data on the teacher attendance beyond the sample surveys conducted

and no urban rural breakdown has been possible because of the poor quality of the data. This recommendation is still a priority to focus on in the next year. World Bank to be requested to provide an explanation and the issue willbe carried forward by ZESSTA and MoGE (see also recommendation 10)

- *Recommendation 3:* "Consider with the MESVTEE the possibility of an efficiency index, rather than just reporting on teacher attendance e.g. an estimation of learning hours access in a year. If disaggregated by district this would provide a useful measure of equity of access". *Response*: **NOT DONE**. This has not proved practicable, due to practical constraints on the collection of valid and comparable data. Emphasis has been placed on wider support through ZESSTA to strengthening HR and teacher management and to first address the payroll mismatch issues and to focus on teacher attendance through the district level monitoring for which funding has been provided in the APWB for 2016. This recommendation should continue into the next year..
- *Recommendation 4:* Revise target for indicator 2.3 "Strengthened capacity in MESTVEE for financial management" to track actual changes in financial management capacity by October 15". *Response:* **DONE.** This was considered as part of the review of the logframe and is now being supported with ZESSTA support and increased priority has been given to this workstream in 2016.

*c) Mitigation measures implemented, if any*

The following recommendations are set for the coming 12 months:

- *Recommendation 9*. ZESSTA and MoGE to finalise costed options for an enhanced and accredited ELM programme for consideration by MoGE. Courses should include topics related to: leadership, school development planning, performance management, and financial management. *Who* ZESSTA and MoGE. *When:* By November 2016.
- *Recommendation 10.* ZESSTA and MoGE to develop a documented strategy for improved data on teacher attendance. *Who* ZESSTA and MoGE. *When:* By December 2016.
- *Recommendation 11.* Indicator 2.2a to be revised to read 'Average percentage of teachers present during annual sample based survey' – hence allowing for the use of sampling methods other than unannounced visits. *Who* DFID. *When:* With immediate effect.
- *Recommendation 12.* ZESSTA to finance the annual sample based survey in 2017 and budgeted within MoGE budget for 2018.

**Component /output 3: Improved access and availability of data for evidence based planning and budgeting**

*a) Objective(s) of the component:*

| Indicator(s) | Milestones 2015 | Progress |
|---|---|---|
| 3.1 Education Statistical Bulletin (ESB) published annually | ESB 2015 finalised and disseminated by May 2016 | **Met.** ESB 2015 Tables finalised and disseminated with partners in May 2016 but final printed version with printers and not yet shared. (A) |
| 3.2 TA supports improvements of EMIS at national and district levels | 100% of planned training conducted on EMIS at district level | **Not Met.** Training has not been conducted as TA was not in place and Ministry hadn't yet set targets (B) |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3.3 National Assessment Surveys (NASs) conducted and results included in ESB by May of each year. (DLM 5) | Conducted and 2014 results shared and 2013 results included in ESB | **Met.** NAS in grade 5 conducted in November 2014 and results disseminated in April 2015.<br>Results of the NAS included on the MoGE website and linked to the ESB 2014 and included in ESB 2015.(A) |
| 3.4 Literacy and Numeracy survey for early grade (1 or 2) conducted and results included in ESB in the following year | Data from 2014 used in planning and budgeting, as seen in the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) 2016 | **Met.** NAS at Grade 2 also conducted in Dec 2014 and disseminated in April 2015. Funding for conducting NAS at Grade 2 and 5 included in the budget process and within the 2016 AWPB. (A) |

*b) Progress made during the reporting period vis-à-vis planned results for the component*

Overall Progress on Output 3 met expectation (A). Three of four indicators were met.

- 3.1. ESB 2015 data was provided electronically to stakeholders in the JAR in May/June. However, this was limited to the statistical tables and the final narrative was being finalised during the JAR and is expected to be shared in hard copy by the end of June. The key indicators needed to assess performance and to be used for planning purposes was shared, leaving this indicator narrowly achieved. EMIS 2015 data was used in the MoGE Annual Performance Report (APR) used at the 2016 JAR. Further, EMIS 2015 data is informing development of NIF IV.
- 3.2. Planned training on EMIS at district level has not been conducted. However, the delays in ZESSTA support to the EMIS personnel in the MoGE have now been resolved. ZESSTA has supported quality assurance and printing of ESB 2014 and 2015. ZESSTA and has also conducted a range of activities aimed at improving EMIS systems including: (i) revision of data collection tools to better track learner performance and teacher attendance, (ii) investigating options for improved integration of existing EMIS databases, (iii) developing a vision and roadmap for capacity strengthening for more effective and efficient utilisation of EMIS to inform policy, decision making and management, (iv) quality assurance of annual school census questionnaires. Funding for the EMIS activities has now been included in the 2016 AWPB. Ministry is working on strategy for education data and detailed activities have been added to ZESSTA workstream for 2016.
- 3.3 Grade 5 NAS has been conducted and results disseminated. The APR reports a decline in performance since the previous survey in 2012 where the scores were around 2% points higher than in 2014. Scores in 2014 were as follows: Numeracy 35.5%, Reading in English 32.1%, Life Skills 34.6%, and Reading in Zambian Languages 35.2%. NAS assessments are valuable in providing a measure of progress in learning outcomes for the system as whole. The reasons for the decline have started to be investigated by MoGE. One possible explanation is that the 2014 assessment was done during the first year of implementation of the new curriculum and may reflect negative consequences of implementing with insufficient supporting materials and professional development.
- 3.4 Grade 2 NAS was also conducted in 2014 and results disseminated in 2015[iv]. Grade 2 pupils were struggling to read – with average Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) ranging from 1.8 to 8.4 words per minute and comprehension was very weak. Performance correlated with the degree of parental support and availability of reading materials. These findings may inform priorities for intervention. In mathematics children demonstrated a reasonable number sense. Only 11.4% scored zero on simple addition. The new curriculum addresses the findings of the Grade 2 NAS in its emphasis on the '5 key early reading skills' and on instruction in the familiar language. It is imperative that the next assessment takes place on schedule in 2016. This will be the opportunity to see the changes to the results as the curriculum has now been implemented for these lower grades. An improving trend at this foundational level would give cause for optimism in achieving subsequent improvements higher in the system. The field visits conducted in May 2016 already provided some qualitative evidence that literacy and numeracy at lower grades; from grade 1, has started to improve.

- Overall, there is solid progress in the availability and use of both EMIS and assessment data, which will provide a firm foundation for evidence based planning and tracking of learning outcomes. The challenge remains to maximise the use of this data for improved learning outcomes.

*c) Any deviation from the implementation/action plan during the reporting period as well as any factors jeopardizing the implementation of activities*

Summary of responses to issues raised and actions taken in previous annual review and the progress towards those actions to be undertaken in the last 12 months that would improve implementation were as follows:

- *Recommendation 1.* "Once TA for EMIS activities is defined and it is clear who is handling what area, the recommendations from the 2014 JAR should be reviewed by the Ministry and taken on board, as applicable". *Progress:* **DONE.** There has been substantial progress in the development of EMIS systems, with support from ZESSTA, consistent with recommendations of both 2014 and 2015 JAR .
- *Recommendation 2.* "Continued support to the assessment reforms in Zambia by providing technical advisory support and support to the global Learning Metric Task Force where Zambia is a learning champion". *Progress:* **DONE.** There has been good progress on assessment reform with NAS embedded in local systems. NAS for Grades 2 and 5 are planned for the last quarter of 2016 funded through the OBB. Plans to implement PISA 4 Development are also on-track.
- *Recommendation 3.* "Support the MESVTEE to ensure learning outcomes data from Examinations Council of Zambia (ECZ), Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TEVET) /Colleges/Universities to be added to EMIS database so it is available for improved budgeting and planning at provincial and district levels. This should also become easily accessible on the MESVTEE website by March 16. *Progress:* **Partially DONE.** ZESSTA supported the revision of EMIS data collection tools to incorporate learner achievement, and has provided technical support to MoGE to publish learning outcomes data from NAS on its website. The consolidation of EMIS data has yet to be completed, but this is now on track and part of the ZESSTA workstream. However, the higher education statistics will not be included as available funding cannot support activities in the MoHE. This should remain important in 2016 but as it has been embedded in ZESSTA activities does not need to remain a recommendation for this AR.
- *Recommendation 4. "*PTR reductions at district level match findings of the PETS/QSDS but are contradictory at provincial and national levels to the Ministry's datasets. *Progress:* **Partially DONE.** ZESSTA assistance in integrating EMIS is ongoing and aims to eliminate discrepancies in data held at different levels of the system. This will continue in 2016 and should remain a recommendation to review PTR data for improved accuracy, especially as this is a DLM for the programme.

*d) Mitigation measures implemented, if any*

The following recommendations are set for the coming 12 months:

- *Recommendation 13.* Complete planned training of EMIS at district level during 2016. *Who:* MoGE with ZESSTA support. *When:* by end 2016.
- *Recommendation 14.* Complete NAS surveys in Grades 2 and 5 with prompt dissemination of results to inform planning, budgeting and teacher professional development. *Who:* MoGE and ECZ. *When:* reports available by March 2017.
- *Recommendation 15.* Review PTR data for improve accuracy, especially at district level and disaggregate by urban/rural *Who:* MoGE with ZESSTA support. *When:* by March 2017.

**Component /output 4: Enhanced professional standards, qualifications and capacity of teachers**

*a) Objective(s) of the component*

| Indicator(s) | Milestones 2015 | Progress |
|---|---|---|
| 4.1. Percentage of Primary and secondary schools that have implemented School Based Continuous Professional Development (SBCPD) through lesson study (Primary: all subjects, Secondary: Science and maths) **(DLM 3)** | Primary schools<br>90% in three provinces.<br>Secondary schools<br>65% in ten provinces. | **Not Met.** Primary schools; 87% in 3 provinces (A)**Met.**<br>Secondary schools<br>68% in 10 provinces (all districts) (A) |
| 4.2 Number of secondary teachers qualified by level | Primary T:96%, Senior T:27 % | **Met.** Target Numbers Met<br>Advanced Diploma: 260<br>Cert in special education: 423<br>Dip in Education: 22,748<br>Bachelor's Degree: 2445<br>Master's Degree: 137<br>Other Bachelor's Degree: 250<br>Primary Teachers Certificate: 37,030<br>Special Education Degree: 143<br>Special Education Diploma: 931 (A) |

*b) Progress made during the reporting period vis-à-vis planned results for the component*

Overall Progress on Output 4 met expectations with milestones for both indicators met. However the indicators do not measure specifically the capacity of teachers to deliver. We know that increased leadership and management training as well as inservice training on the implementation of the new curriculum, included in the AWPB 2016, will build capacity of teachers.

- 4.1. The percentage of schools implementing SBCPD at primary level was 87% in 3 provinces, which narrowly missed the target of 90% and should be considered as met, as it is on track to be achieved and expanded to other provinces in 2016. The percentage implementing SBCPD at secondary level was 68% in 3 provinces, which narrowly exceeded the target of 65%. This is a priority area for CPs and it is supported by JICA, USAID at lower grades. ZESSTA have been reviewing the quality of SBCPD provided and assisting in the design of the leadership and management support planned in 2016.During the JAR, there was broad consensus from stakeholders that teacher capacity is a major barrier to curriculum implementation, and especially for the vocationalisation of the curriculum in secondary school. ZESSTA have supported the development of costed options for both in-service and preservice training required for curriculum implementation. ZESSTA has also supported MoGE with the drafting of the Teachers' Curriculum Implementation Guide (TCIG) and the National Learning Assessment Framework to support SBCPD.

- 4.2. The targets were changed as it was felt more important to see how the changes where taking place in terms of teachers trained and to provide fuller detail across the different levels. The target is to improve against the previous year's qualifications. For 2015 there is a positive trend in the supply of teachers, with improvements in PTR at both Primary (55.3 in 2014 and 48.9 in 2015) and Secondary levels. (25.1 in 2014 and 23.9 in 2015 for grades 8 and 9). The total number of teachers in the system has increased from 77,961 in 2011 to 98,035 in 2015. However, this masks the discrepancies between districts and between urban and under-resourced rural areas The Annual Progress Report of the MoGE notes that shortages remain in qualified teachers in secondary level in many areas, especially in Information and Communication Technology (ICT). 200 places to train ICT teachers had to be readvertised because of a lack of applicants. ZESSTA has begun supporting Teacher Education and Specialised Services (TESS) in planning for the provision of (i) in-service and (ii) pre-service training related to the Revised Curriculum, and (iii) upgrading teachers from certificate to Diploma level.
- Overall emphasis on this output indicator must be maintained. Both in-service and pre-service education remains critical to the successful implementation of the new curriculum.

*c) Any deviation from the implementation/action plan during the reporting period as well as any factors jeopardizing the implementation of activities*

Summary of responses to issues raised and actions taken in previous annual review and the progress towards those actions to be undertaken in the last 12 months that would improve implementation were as follows:

- *Recommendation 1. "*Teacher education needs to focus on improving teaching in the classroom, management of the school and management at district and provincial level. This needs to be part of the overall sector dialogue on an on-going basis". *Response:* **DONE.** JAR 2016 reported the intention to review of the teacher education curriculum for consistency with the new curriculum. In addition, SBCPD is being rolled out nationally with a focus on classroom implementation of new curriculum. Training materials have been developed and training for the catch up pilot and in-service training are being implemented during the August break.
- *Recommendation 2. "*Monitoring the OBB and the OBWPB to ensure adequate funding of teacher training (in-service and pre-service) is included for 2016 budget by end September 15. *Response:* **DONE.** Expenditure on teacher training has been prioritised in budget execution with 87% of budget released for 2015. Indicator 4.2 shows that the outputs of the system are meeting expectations. The inservice training budget was increased by CP funds from DFID/GPE as well as through GRZ. This is being supported by ZESSTA through the development of the Teachers' Curriculum Implementation Guide (TCIG) which is being provided to all schools with DFID/GPE support.
- *Recommendation 3. "*Support dialogue on the use of improved data on teacher's knowledge provided by the NAS, which should be shared with the relevant directorates and improve coordination between directorates of Teacher Education, Standards and Curriculum, and the Examinations Council of Zambia" *Response*: **Partially DONE.** Data on teacher's knowledge is provided through an assessment conducted by the ECZ for teachers of grades 7, 9 and 12. This data is widely disseminated. The ECZ have found that Teacher's subject knowledge is above that of students, but low at secondary level; highlighting the need to improve teacher's subject knowledge as a critical area. This should still be a priority to utilise the research to determine priorities in the in-service training programme offered in August and December.

*d) Mitigation measures implemented, if any*

The following recommendations are set for the coming 12 months:

- *Recommendation 16.* MoGE to continue to prioritise roll out of SBCPD ensuring that all teachers in implementing grades are met within the next year. *Who:* MoGE. *When:* By end May 2017.
- *Recommendation 17*. Seek feedback from teachers participating in SBCPD to systematically evaluate its quality and relevance to teachers' needs. *Who:* MoGE. *When:* By end May 2017.
- Recommendation 18. MoGE should consider implementing further measures to support the deployment and retention of teachers in rural areas. This should include prioritising the deployment of newly recruited teachers to new districts and enforcing the four year period during which new teachers may not be allowed to transfer after initial posting. *Who:* MoGE. *When:* By end May 2017.
- *Recommendation 19.* Any in-service training should include updating on subject knowledge for teachers, where the ECZ results have shown are the greatest weaknesses. *Who:* MoGE/ TESS *When:* by May 2017.
- *Recommendation 20.* The presentation of Output 4.2 in the logframe must be reviewed and the wording aligned with the presentation of data in the APR. *Who:* DFID in consultation with the Planning Department. *When:* By September 2016.

### 2-3. Program Results

*Complete the table below:*

*Refer to <u>output</u> indicators in the Program results framework from the ESPIG Application, Section 3: Program description, and report on progress made during the reporting period*

| Component/output 1: **More resources and stronger systems for financial management and improved value for money in the Ministry of Education** | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Source** | **Baseline** | | **Current reporting period** | | | **Next reporting period[9]** | | **End target** | |
| | | | | **Data** | | | **Indicator target for the next reporting period[10] - Initial target set in the Program Document** | **Indicator target for the next reporting period - Revised target if applicable** | **Indicator target at the end of Program - Initial target set in the Program Document** | **Indicator target at the end of Program - Revised target if applicable** |
| | | **Data** | **Month / Year** | **Target** | **Actual** | **Month/year for actual data** | | | | |
| Output Indicator 1.1 *(insert)* # of audit irregularities (including | AOG Annual Report | 60 | 2010 | 20 | 15 | 2015 | NA | 15 | 10 | 15 |

[9]Note that the original Program Document has an end date of 2015, which was subsequently extended to March 2017. There were therefore no targets for 2016 set in the original grant application.

[10] This usually refers to the target which was set in the Program document. However, if the Program went through "non-minor revisions" as defined in the Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants, including any changes in the results framework, the new target should be reported.

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| reductions in outstanding imprest) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Output Indicator 1.2 % of activities in the FMAP fully implemented (DLM 4) | Semi Annual Health Checks | FMAP Revised | 2013 | FMAP Implemented and 80% completed | FMAP Implemented and 78% | 2015 | FMAP Implemented and 80% completed | FMAP Implemented and 90% completed | FMAP Implemented and 80% completed | FMAP Implemented and 90% completed |
| Output Indicator 1.3 % of education budget allocated to primary and secondary education | MOGEannual Progress Report | 52.6%: Primary 12.6% Secondary | 2011 | 50% Primary<br><br>20% Secondary | 56% Primary<br><br>23% Secondary | 2015 | NA | 50% Primary<br><br>20% Secondary | 50% Primary<br><br>11% Secondary | 50% Primary<br><br>20% Secondary |
| Output Indicator 1.4 Average amount of school grant per child (DLM 2) | MOGEannual Progress Report | 17.25 Primary 148.10 Secondary | 2012 | 34 Primary 100 Secondary | 50.4 Primary 153 Secondary | 2015 | NA | 38 Primary 135 Secondary | NA | 38 Primary 135 Secondary |

| **Component/Output 2: Improved leadership and management systems and capacity at all levels** | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Source** | Baseline | | **Current reporting period** | | | **Next reporting period** | | **End target** | |
| | | | | **Data** | | | **Indicator target for the next reporting period - Initial target set in the Program Document** | **Indicator target for the next reporting period - Revised target if applicable** | **Indicator target at the end of Program - Initial target set in the Program Document** | **Indicator target at the end of Program - Revised target if applicable** |
| | | **Data** | **Month/Year** | **Target** | **Actual** | **Month/Year for actual data** | | | | |
| Output Indicator 2.1 # of school managers and administrators (heads/deputy heads) at primary and secondary level completing education leadership and management training (ELM) | MOGE annual Progress Report | Primary <100 Secondary <100 | 2011 | 600 Primary<br><br>700 Secondary | 991 Primary<br><br>321 Secondary | 2015 | NA | 700 Primary<br><br>800 Secondary | 30% (original indicator phrased as %) | 800 Primary<br><br>900 Secondary |
| Output Indicator | EMIS | 82% | 2013 | 83% | 83% | 2015 | NA | 87% | NA | 97% |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.2a. Average % of teachers present during unannounced visit (rural/urban) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Output Indicator 2.2b. improved data on teachers' attendance (rural/urban) | EMIS | No Data Availabl e | 2011 | No target set | NA | NA | NA | No target set | SDS survey #2 conducted and report received | SDS survey #2 conducted and report received |
| Output Indicator 2.3. TA effectively supports MoGE to achieve outputs in logframe | HoGE Annual Progres Report | No TA currentl y provide d | 2012 | Curriculum costing completed, Catch-up pilot material developed | Curriculum costing completed, Catch-up pilot material developed | 2015 | NA | To be added | To be added | To be added |

| Component/output 3: **Improved access and availability of data for evidence based planning and budgeting** | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Source** | **Baseline** | | **Current reporting period** | | | **Next reporting period** | | **End target** | |
| | | | | **Data** | | | **Indicator target for the next reporting period - Initial target set in the Program Document** | **Indicator target for the next reporting period - Revised target if applicable** | **Indicator target at the end of Program - Initial target set in the Program Document** | **Indicator target at the end of Program - Revised target if applicable** |
| | | **Data** | **Month/Year** | **Target** | **Actual** | **Month/year for actual data** | | | | |
| Output Indicator 3.1 Education Statistical Bulletin (ESB) published annually | EMIS | 2010 ESB finalised & dissemi nated | 2012 | ESB2014 finalised and disseminated by May 2015 | Most ESB 2015 Tables finalised no dissemination by May 2016 | 2016 | NA | ESB 2015 finalised and disseminated by May 2016 | ESB 2014 finalised and disseminated by May 2015 | ESB 2015 finalised and disseminated by May 2016 |
| Output Indicator 3.2 TA supports improvements of EMIS at national and district levels | EMIS | No TA currentl y provide d | 2012 | 100% of planned training conducted on EMIS at district level | Training not conducted | May 2016 | NA | 100% of planned training conducted on EMIS at district level | 100% of planned training conducted on EMIS at district level | 100% of planned training conducted on EMIS at district level |
| Output Indicator 3.3 National | ECZ | 2008 conduct | 2011 | Conducted and 2014 | NAS in grade 5 conducted | 2015 | NA | Not conducted. Data used in | Conducted and 2014 results | Not conducted. Data used in |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assessment Surveys conducted and results included in ESB by May of each year (DLM 5) | | ed. Results provided in report from ECZ | | results shared and 2013 results included in ESB | in 2014 and results disseminated in 2015 | | | planning and budgeting and seen in AWPB 2016 | shared and 2013 results included in ESB. | planning and budgeting and seen in AWPB 2016 |
| Output Indicator 3.4 Literacy and Numeracy survey (for early grade (1 or 2) conducted and results included in ESB in the following year | ECZ | No data yet availabl e | 2012 | Not conducted. Data from 2014 used in planning and budgeting, as seen in the AWPB 2015 | Grade 2 NAS 2015 report disseminated | 2015 | NA | EGRA/EGMA (or equivalent conducted and results shared. | Not conducted. Data from 2014 used in planning and budgeting, as seen in the AWPB 2015 | EGRA/EGMA (or equivalent conducted and results shared. |

| Component/output 4: Enhanced professional standards, qualifications and capacity of teachers | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Source** | **Baseline** | | **Current reporting period** | | | **Next reporting period** | | **End target** | |
| | | | | **Data** | | | **Indicator target for the next reporting period - Initial target set in the Program Document** | **Indicator target for the next reporting period - Revised target if applicable** | **Indicator target at the end of Program - Initial target set in the Program Document** | **Indicator target at the end of Program - Revised target if applicable** |
| | | **Data** | **Month/Year** | **Target** | **Actual** | **Month/Year for actual data** | | | | |
| Output Indicator 4.1 % of Primary and secondary schools that have implemented SBCPD through lesson study (Primary: all subjects, Secondary: Science and maths) (DLM 3) | EMIS | No data yet availabl e | 2012 | Primary schools 90% in three provinces, Secondary schools 65% in ten provinces | Primary schools; 87% in 3 provinces, Secondary schools 68% in 10 provinces (all districts) (Met) | 2015 | NA | Primary schools 40% in 10 provinces Secondary schools 70% in ten provinces | Literacy T: 40 (M:40, F:41) M&S % 65 (M:65/F:65) | Primary schools 40% in 10 provinces Secondary schools 70% in ten provinces |
| % of secondary | EMIS | Junior | 2012 | Primary T:96 | APR and ESB | 2015 | NA | Primary T:95 | Junior T:76.5 | Primary T:95 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| teachers qualified by level | | T:62.2 (M:59.1 /F:65.2) Senior T:17.9 (M:19/F :16) | | Senior T:27 | 2015 do not report statistics as % qualified – rather in terms of absolute numbers trained. (Target Numbers Met) | | | Senior T:30.5 | (M:75?F:78) Senior T: 27.5 (M:30/F:25) | Senior T:30.5 |

***Note: Insert components and sub-components <u>only</u> when possible.***

**2-4. Program Disbursement**

*Note: "Disbursement" refers to funds transferred by the Grant Agent (or by other financing resources) to the government or other implementing partners, or funds directly expensed by the Grant Agent (or by other financing resources).*

| | Current reporting period | | Cumulative | | Next reporting period | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Planned Disbursement (US$) | Actual Disbursement (US$) | Planned disbursement (US$) | Actual Disbursement (US$) | Reporting period | Future planned disbursement (US$) |
| GPE (ESPIG) | 9,600,000 | 8,000,000 | 19,263,000 | **17,663,000** | June 16 to June 17 | 10,769,000 |
| Financing resource 1 *DFID Zambia* | 10,360,000 | 8,600,000 | 39,548,000 | 41,291,000 | June 16 to June 17 | 3,632,000 |
| Total | 19,960,000 | 16,600,000 | 58,811,000 | 58,954,000 | June 16 to June 17 | 14,401,000 |

**2-5. Technical, policy, or knowledge products (if any)**

If technical, policy, or knowledge products were financed by the Program, and produced during the reporting period, please list them and advise where they can be found.

Two reports were produced in 2015/16. They were fully funded by the DFID/GPE programme, using only DFID funds but are seen as a joint product. They are available on the World Bank website as they were produced by the World Bank. The titles are:

Public Expenditure Review for the Primary and Secondary Education Sector in Zambia

Public Expenditure Tracking Survey/ Quantitative Service Delivery Survey for the Primary and Secondary Education Sector in Zambia

**2-6. Lessons learned and/or best practices and/or innovations (optional)**

- Field visits undertaken in four provinces in May as part of the JAR, focused on implementation of the new curriculum. They confirmed that learning levels evidenced by final examination scores in grades 7, 9 and 12 remain stubbornly low. However there was also some encouraging evidence of progress in lower grade literacy and numeracy. A spot check test conducted with 1,070 children in grades 1-3 found a significant improvement compared to two years ago[v]. Teachers spoke supportively of revised approaches to teaching early years including new methodologies for literacy

teaching and use of local language as the medium of instruction. Progress in the critical early years will provide a firm foundation for subsequent improvements higher up the system. We must look to the forthcoming Grade 2 National Assessment Survey (due by early 2017) for further evidence.

- JAR Fieldwork also revealed widespread support for the new curriculum. However much work remains to ensure its full implementation. This includes: (i) continued attention to the training and orientation of teachers through School Based Continuous Professional Development (SBCPD), (ii) ensuring the availability of necessary documentation, including syllabuses at schools, (iii) emphasis on the supply of quality textbooks, (iv) ensuring that schools have necessary capacity to manage teacher development and teacher performance. If these activities are not prioritised then there may be a drop in learning outcomes in the short term as teachers struggle to implement without the required tools.
- During 2016 the Education Act and Policy have remained in draft form. This has been a slow process that was stalled at parliamentary level for review and sent back for further revisions. Wide stakeholder consultations have been held but it hasn't been finalised to be returned to Cabinet for consideration. This absence of clear policy on school classification prevents legal gazetting of new schools, complicates allocation of funds, and hampers attempts to address mismatches in the payroll. This issue should be addressed as a matter of urgency by the incoming government, after the elections.
- While government is making adequate provision for education in the budget, a challenge still remains on allocation and release of funds (see Output 1.3 for detailed figures). Impact on learning outcomes can only be expected if funds agreed with Ministry of Finance are released on time. The non-release of funds for infrastructure is a particular concern. This is frustrating completion of outstanding works on ECE centres, secondary schools, strong rooms in primary schools and science laboratories in secondary schools. Lack of proper infrastructure is compromising access to education, particularly in remote rural areas, by limiting the number of school places available, especially at secondary level.
- ZESSTA has emerged during 2015-16 as a highly valued and responsive facility to support policy development and implementation in MoGE. ZESSTA's approach, summarised in the moto - 'always with, never for' - is helping to sustainably build capacity within the Ministry in manner likely to benefit the Ministry for years to come. ZESSTA will be crucial to DFIDs strategy to mitigate any negative effects of DFID's anticipated exit from the education sector in March 2018. Documentation of the ZESSTA model could be of wider international interest and should be disseminated through the DFID education cadre to inform education programming in similar contexts.

## 3. GPE Corporate Results Framework

### 3-1. Global numbers[11]

***Number of textbooks purchased and distributed[12] (as a result of the Program)***

Textbooks have been purchased in 2015. These are done as part of the overall Government workplans, as well as funded in part by donors in the pooled fund (Irish Aid and JICA) as well as USAID. However, there is no specific figure that is fully attributed to the programme alone but it is part of an overall contribution. The total textbooks purchased figures is included below but is not directly attributable to the programme.

[11] If the Program is a pooled program, to which the ESPIG contributes, a pro-rated calculation will be used by the Secretariat to estimate GPE's contribution. The Grant Agent is not responsible for making these calculations.

[12] Please submit the data on the number of textbooks both purchased and distributed. Textbooks purchased but not yet distributed will not be included here. For more information, please see the definition of "textbooks purchased and distributed" on the next page.

| Subsector | Source | July 2014-June 2015[13] | | | | Current reporting period | | | | Next reporting period | | End target | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Data | | | | Data | | | | Indicator target for the next reporting period[14]<br><br>- Initial target set in the Program Document | Indicator target for the next reporting period<br><br>- Revised target if applicable | Indicator target at the end of Program<br><br>- Initial target set in the Program Document | Indicator target at the end of Program<br><br>- Revised target if applicable |
| | | Target | Actual | % (actual/ target) | Month /Year for actual data[15] | Target | Actual | % (actual/ target) | Month/Year for actual data | | | | |
| Primary (ISCED16 1) | MoGE | n/a | n/a | | | 22,000 | 30,000 | | 2015/16 | Tbd | | tbd | |
| Lower Secondary (ISCED 2) | MoGE | n/a | N/a | | | 90,000 | 90,800 | | 2015/16 | Tbd | | Tbd | |
| Other (if any, specify as per ISCED) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | | 112,000 | 120,000 | | | | | | |

**Textbooks purchased and distributed**

This indicator tracks the number of school textbooks that were purchased and distributed through the Program during the reporting period.

Textbooks are books designed for instructing pupils in specific subject areas. The requested data should include textbooks that have been distributed to schools and have either been distributed to pupils on loan or kept in schools for use in the classroom. The data on textbooks should exclude books in school libraries as well as novels and books for use by teachers (such as curriculum guides, syllabi and teacher guides). The data of textbooks can include textbooks in stock but not currently in use by pupils and should include all languages of instruction.

***Number of teachers trained (as a result of the Program)*** *(disaggregate by sex)*

[13] Data for the July 2014 - June 2015 reporting period is needed to establish this indicator's baseline for purposes of the GPE results framework 2016-2020, which was adopted by GPE Board in December 2015. The template will be updated for the next reporting period.

[14] This usually refers to the target set in the Program document. However, if the Program went through "non-minor revisions" as defined in the Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants, including any changes in the results framework, then the new target should be reported.

[15] Please submit the collected data in the month closest to June 2015. The data should cover a period of one year.

[16] International Standard Classification of Education - http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/isced-2011-en.pdf#search='ISCED+2011'

Not Applicable. Teachers are trained as part of the programme, with in-service, pre-service, leadership and management and upgrading from certificates to degrees. This is done as part of the overall Government training plans, and also includes support from the DFID/GPE technical assistance component of the programme. However, there is no specific figure that is fully attributed to the programme alone but it is part of an overall contribution.

| Subsector | Source | July 2014-June 2015[17] | | | | Current reporting period | | | | Next reporting period | | End target | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Data | | | | Data | | | | Indicator target for the next reporting period[18] - Initial target set in the Program Document | Indicator target for the next reporting period - Revised target if applicable | Indicator target at the end of Program - Initial target set in the Program Document | Indicator target at the end of Program - Revised target if applicable |
| | | Target | Actual | % (actual/ target) | Month/Year for actual data[19] | Target | Actual | % (actual/ target) | Month/Year for actual data | | | | |
| ECD (ISCED 0) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Primary (ISCED1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Secondary (ISCED 2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Teachers trained**

This indicator tracks the number of teachers who received and completed formal training, according to national standards, through the Program during the reporting period.

The requested data refers to formal teacher training (pre- or in-service) designed to equip teachers with the knowledge, attitude, behavior, and skills required for teaching at the relevant level and perform their tasks effectively. Teachers are comprised of professional teaching/instructional personnel who

[17] Data for the July 2014 - June 2015 reporting period is needed to establish this indicator's baseline for purposes of the GPE results framework 2016-2020, which was adopted by GPE Board in December 2015. The template will be updated for the next reporting period.

[18] This usually refers to the target which was set in the Program document. However, if the Program went through "non-minor revisions" as defined in the Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants, including any changes in the results framework, the new target should be reported.

[19] Please submit the collected data in the month closest to June 2015. The data should cover a period of one year.

are directly involved in teaching students. They include classroom teachers; special education teachers; and other teachers who work with students as a class in a classroom, in small groups in a resource room, or in one-to-one teaching inside or outside a regular classroom. Teaching/ instructional staff excludes non-professional personnel who support teachers in providing instruction to students, such as teachers' aides and other paraprofessional personnel.

***Number of classrooms built or rehabilitated (as a result of the Program)***

Not applicable. Classrooms have been built as part of the Government programme and its overall workplans. However, there is no specific figure that is fully attributed to the programme alone but it is part of an overall contribution.

| Subsector | Source | July 2014-June 2015[20] | | | | Current reporting period | | | | Next reporting period | | End target | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Data | | | | Data | | | | Indicator target for the next reporting period[21]<br><br>- Initial target set in the Program Document | Indicator target for the next reporting period<br><br>- Revised target if applicable | Indicator target at the end of Program<br><br>- Initial target set in the Program Document | Indicator target at the end of Program<br><br>- Revised target if applicable |
| | | Target | Actual | % (actual/ target) | Month/Year for actual data[22] | Target | Actual | % (actual/ target) | Month/Year for actual data | | | | |
| ECD (ISCED 0) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Primary (ISCED1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lower Secondary (ISCED 2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overall | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

[20] Data for the July 2014 - June 2015 reporting period is needed to establish this indicator's baseline for purposes of the GPE results framework 2016-2020, which was adopted by GPE Board in December 2015. The template will be updated for the next reporting period.

[21] This usually refers to the target which was set in the Program document. However, if the Program went through "non-minor revisions" as defined in the Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants, including any changes in the results framework, the new target should be reported.

[22] Please submit the collected data in the month closest to June 2015. The data should cover a period of one year.

**Classrooms built and/or rehabilitated**

This indicator tracks the number of classrooms that were built and/or rehabilitated through the Program during this reporting period.

Data on classrooms should be reported upon completion of the building or rehabilitation during the reporting period. Classrooms comprise rooms in which teaching or learning activities can take place. They are semi-permanent or permanent physical structures and may be located in a school.

**3-2. ESPIG support to the development or improvement of an Education Management Information System (EMIS)**

*Note: 3-2. applies only to the ESPIG*[23]

| Baseline (July 2014-June 2015) | Current reporting period | Next reporting period |
|---|---|---|
| a. Did the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of an EMIS during the reporting period?<br><br>X Yes □ No<br><br>b. Did the ESPIG support the development or improvement of an EMIS during the reporting period?<br><br>X No | a. Did the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of an EMIS during the reporting period?<br><br>X Yes □ No<br><br>b. Did the ESPIG support the development or improvement of an EMIS during the reporting period?<br><br>X Yes<br>X ECD X Primary X Lower Secondary<br>□ No | Does the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of an EMIS during the next reporting period?<br><br>X Yes<br>X ECD X Primary X Lower Secondary<br>□ No |

**Education Management Information System**

A system for the collection, integration, processing, maintenance and dissemination of data and information to support decision-making, policy-analysis and formulation, planning, monitoring and management at all levels of an education system. It is a system of people, technology, models, methods,

[23] If the Program is a pooled program, please complete ONLY when the EMIS is financially supported by the ESPIG.

processes, procedures, rules and regulations that function together to provide education leaders, decision-makers and managers at all levels with a comprehensive and integrated set of relevant, reliable, unambiguous and timely data and information to support them in fulfilling their responsibilities.[24]

**3-3. ESPIG support to the development or improvement of a learning assessment system**

*Note: 3-3 applies only to the ESPIG[25]*

| Baseline (July 2014-June 2015) | Current reporting period | Next reporting period |
|---|---|---|
| (a) Did the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of a learning assessment system during the reporting period?<br>X Yes □ No<br>(b) Did the ESPIG support the development or improvement of a learning assessment system during the reporting period?<br>X Yes<br>□ ECD X Primary X Lower Secondary<br>□ No | (a) Did the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of a learning assessment system during the reporting period?<br>X Yes □ No<br>(b) Did the ESPIG support the development or improvement of a learning assessment system during the reporting period?<br>X Yes<br>□ ECD X Primary X Lower Secondary<br>□ No<br><br>(c) If Yes to (b), was the learning assessment system implemented during the reporting period?<br><br>X Yes □ No<br><br>(d) If Yes to (c), is the updated data on learning available this reporting period?<br><br>X Yes □ No<br>(e) If Yes to (d), please attach to Annex 3 the updated data on learning. | Does the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of a learning assessment system during the next reporting period?<br>X Yes<br>X ECD X Primary X Lower Secondary<br>□ No |

[24] http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001547/154743e.pdf

[25] If the Program is a pooled program, please complete ONLY when the learning assessment system is financially supported by ESPIG.

**Learning assessment system**

*Please refer to the definitions for "assessment," "assessment system," and "learning assessment system" that follow:*

*Assessment* is "the process of gathering and evaluating information on what students know, understand, and can do in order to make an informed decision about next steps in the educational process," whereas an *assessment system* is "a group of policies, structures, practices, and tools for generating and using information on student learning and achievement."[26] It is the use of this information that is key for improving learning, and for that to be possible, learning data must be accompanied by contextual data so that factors that impact learning can be identified and action taken. When we talk about a *national learning assessment system*, then, what we are talking about is a functional apparatus, usually housed within a Ministry of Education, which gathers information on learning – together with contextual data – nationwide and feeds this information back to the policy, management, and classroom levels to improve learning. As Pedro Ravela and his colleagues point out: "Assessment in and of itself does not produce improvement. There must be stable links between the domains of assessment and those of curriculum development, teacher training, research, policy design, communications and outreach, among others."[27] In this way, a strong national learning assessment system closes the feedback loop to the rest of the education system to achieve meaningful improvement in learning.

**3-4. GPE Corporate Results Framework – ESPIG Variable Part Indicators**

**Not Applicable**

*Note: 3-4 applies only to ESPIGs approved after 2014*

*Extract relevant information from the ESPIG Application, specifically Section 3: Program Financial Overview, Program Cost and Disbursement by Intervention/Component, Section 4: Variable Part Information, Means of Verification, Schedule for Disbursement - and report on progress made during the reporting period*

*The Variable Part indicators should meet incentive-based requirements that indicate transformative strategies to improve equity, efficiency and learning outcomes in basic education. Disbursement is in general conditional to the achievement of the targets. The GA in consultation with the LEG needs to verify that (some of the) indicators have been reached, how verification has been conducted, and that the Variable Part is being (partially) disbursed.*

[26] Clarke, M. (2012) "What Matters Most for Student Assessment Systems: A Framework Paper." *SABER-Student Assessment Working Paper 1*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
[27] Ravela, P. et al. (2008). "The Educational Assessment that Latin America Needs". *Working Paper Series No. 40*. Washington, DC: PREAL, p. 17.

| Type of indicator | Indicator title | Source | Baseline | | *(insert the year and the month of target attainment verification)* | | | | *(insert the year and the month of target attainment verification)* | | | | *(insert the year and the month of target attainment verification)* | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Data | Month/ Year | Indicators | | Disbursement (US $m) | | Indicators | | Disbursement (US $m) | | Indicators | | Disbursement (US $m) | |
| | | | | | Target | Actual | Target | Actual | Target | Actual | Target | Actual | Target | Actual | Target | Actual |
| Indicator(s) on Learning Outcomes | *(insert actual title of indicator*) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicator(s) on Equity | *(insert actual title of indicator)* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicator(s) on Efficiency | *(insert actual title of indicator*) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Annex 1**: included above

**Annex 2**:

Note: Figures relate to DFID financial Year April 1- March 31st.

| **Education Sector Budget Support** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Expenditure tracking document** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **DFID funds** | **2013/14** | | | **2014/15** | | | **2015/16** | | | **2016/17** | | | **2017/18** | | | **Totals** | | |
| | Planned | Actual | Balance | Planned | Actual | Balance | Planned | Actual | Balance | Planned | Actual | Balance | Planned | Actual | Balance | **Planned** | **Actual** | Balance |
| SBS – core support | £14,100,000 | £14,100,000 | £0 | £8,000,000 | £8,000,000 | £0 | £5,000,000 | £5,000,000 | £0 | £0 | | £0 | £0 | | £0 | **£27,100,000** | **£27,100,000** | £0 |
| SBS – performance tranche | £1,000,000 | £1,000,000 | £0 | £1,330,000 | £1,330,000 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £1,330,000 | | £1,330,000 | £2,340,000 | | £2,340,000 | **£6,000,000** | **£2,330,000** | £3,670,000 |
| SBS – TA component - ZESSTA | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £1,073,256 | £1,073,256 | £0 | £1,000,000 | | £1,000,000 | £397,525 | | £397,525 | **£2,470,781** | **£1,073,256** | £1,397,525 |
| World Bank | £0 | £0 | £0 | £238,000 | £238,000 | £0 | £300,000 | £300,000 | £0 | £0 | | £0 | £0 | | £0 | **£538,000** | **£538,000** | £0 |
| Evaluation+Other | £6,982 | £6,982 | £0 | £84,237 | £84,237 | -£0 | £78,695 | £78,695 | £0 | £169,054 | | £169,054 | £0 | | £0 | **£338,968** | **£169,914** | £169,054 |
| SBS – other (M&E, FLD,admin) | £400,000 | £0 | £400,000 | £250,000 | | £250,000 | £250,000 | £66,304 | £183,696 | £250,000 | | £250,000 | £250,000 | | £250,000 | **£1,400,000** | **£66,304** | £1,333,696 |
| **DFID SBS Sub-Total** | **£15,506,982** | **£15,106,982** | **£400,000** | **£9,902,237** | **£9,652,237** | **£250,000** | **£6,701,951** | **£6,518,255** | **£183,696** | **£2,749,054** | **£0** | **£2,749,054** | **£2,987,525** | **£0** | £2,987,525 | **£37,847,749** | **£31,277,474** | £6,570,275 |
| **GPE funds** | **2013/14** | | | **2014/15** | | | **2015/16** | | | **2016/17** | | | **2017/18** | | | **Totals** | | |
| | Planned | Actual | Balance | Planned | Actual | Balance | Planned | Actual | Balance | Planned | Actual | Balance | Planned | Actual | Balance | Planned | Actual | Balance |
| SBS – core support | £0 | £0 | £0 | £5,300,000 | | £5,300,000 | £5,300,000 | | £5,300,000 | £5,300,000 | | £5,300,000 | £700,000 | | £700,000 | **£16,600,000** | **£0** | £16,600,000 |
| | $0 | $0 | $0 | $8,500,000 | $8,600,000 | -$100,000 | $8,000,000 | $8,000,000 | $0 | $8,000,000 | | $8,000,000 | $1,100,000 | | $1,100,000 | **$25,600,000** | **$16,600,000.00** | $9,000,000 |
| SBS – performance tranche | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | | £0 | £2,000,000 | | £2,000,000 | £1,000,000 | | £1,000,000 | £0 | | £0 | **£3,000,000** | **£0** | £3,000,000 |
| | $0 | $0 | $0 | $1,600,000 | $1,063,965 | $536,035 | $1,600,000 | | $1,600,000 | $1,600,000 | | $1,600,000 | $0 | | $0 | **$4,800,000** | **$1,063,965.00** | $3,736,035 |
| SBS – TA component | £0 | £0 | £0 | £600,000 | | £600,000 | £600,000 | | £600,000 | £600,000 | | £600,000 | £600,000 | | £600,000 | **£2,400,000** | **£0** | £2,400,000 |
| | $0 | $0 | $0 | $960,000 | | $960,000 | $960,000 | | $960,000 | $960,000 | | $960,000 | $960,000 | | $960,000 | **$3,840,000** | **$0.00** | $3,840,000 |
| SBS – Project Supervision/ evaluation | £60,000 | £0 | £60,000 | £130,000 | | £130,000 | £130,000 | | £130,000 | £130,000 | | £130,000 | £130,000 | | £130,000 | **£580,000** | **£0** | £580,000 |
| | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 | $209,000 | | $209,000 | $209,000 | | $209,000 | $209,000 | | $209,000 | $209,000 | | $209,000 | **$936,000** | **$0.00** | $936,000 |
| **GPE SBS Total (GBP)** | **£60,000** | **£0** | £60,000 | **£6,030,000** | | £6,030,000 | **£8,030,000** | | £8,030,000 | **£7,030,000** | | £7,030,000 | **£1,430,000** | | £1,430,000 | **£22,580,000** | **$0.00** | $22,580,000 |
| **GPE SBS Total (USD)** | **$100,000** | **$0** | $100,000 | **$11,269,000** | **$9,663,965** | $1,605,035 | **$10,769,000** | **$8,000,000** | $2,769,000 | **$10,769,000** | **$0** | $10,769,000 | **$2,269,000** | **$0** | $2,269,000 | **$35,176,000** | **$17,663,965** | $17,512,035 |
| **Education SBS programme Total (DFID + GPE Funds) - GBP** | **£15,566,982** | | **£15,566,982** | **£15,932,237** | | **£15,932,237** | **£14,731,951** | | **£14,731,951** | **£9,779,054** | | **£9,779,054** | **£4,417,525** | | **£4,417,525** | | | |

**Annex 3**: From 3-3 (e), if applicable, please attach updated data on learning.

The full set of documents related to learning at grades 2 and 5 for 2012 and 2014 and grade 9 for 2013 are available on the Ministry of General Education's website (http://www.moe.gov.zm/#). The data is widely disseminated with partners and is now accessible to all through the website. It is widely discussed in the Joint annual review and results are shared openly with all stakeholders, including civil society, donors and other interested stakeholders.

**Rating System**[28]

**Progress toward achievement of overall objective(s):** This rating is forward-looking, in that it ***assesses the likelihood*** that the overall objective(s) of the Program will be achieved. The main criteria on which to base this assessment include: project implementation performance, likelihood of major risks, observed intermediate results (outputs), relevance and efficiency.

- For Programs in the early stages of implementation, for which outputs are not yet observable, this rating is based on (i) overall program implementation progress rating (for details, see below) and achievement of scheduled outputs and (ii) judgments regarding the likelihood that major risks—factors outside the control of the Program—can jeopardize the achievement of the Program's outputs and/or outcomes.

- For Programs well advanced in implementation, the rating also includes the extent to which expected outputs are being achieved, as well as implementation performance and risks.

The rating should also consider the extent to which the project's objectives remain relevant to the country's development priorities, GPE's strategic objectives as well as the GA's strategy/Country strategy/Partnership Framework/sector strategies, and corporate goals.

| **Rating Definition** | |
|---|---|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | There are likely to be **no** shortcomings in the Program's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance. |
| Satisfactory (S) | There are likely to be **minor** shortcomings in the Program's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | There are likely to be **moderate** shortcomings in the Program's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | There are likely to be **significant** shortcomings in the Program's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance |

[28] This rating system is based on the World Bank's PDO Rating as well as IP Rating. For details, please refer to The World Bank (2014), Preparing the ISR for Investment Project Financing under http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PROJECTS/Resources/40940-1365611011935/Guidance_Note_Project_Prepration.pdf#search='preparing+the+ISR+for+Investment+Project+Financing+OSPF+World+Bank'

| | |
|---|---|
| Unsatisfactory (U) | There are likely to be **major** shortcomings in the Program's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | There are likely to be **severe** shortcomings in the Program's achievement of its objectives, in its efficiency, or in its relevance. |

**Overall Program implementation progress:** Rate the overall implementation of the Program based on:

1. The progress of the individual Program components
2. The implementation arrangements -- Program management, financial management, procurement, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E)
3. Rate of actual disbursements compared with planned disbursements.
4. Financial reporting requirements including submission of audits.

The rating should reflect the current status of the Program (compared to **Progress toward achievement of overall objective(s)** rating which is forward looking). The rating needs to strike a balance between recent progress and overall progress. A common mistake to avoid is that recent progress carries too much weight. Thus as long as progress is made in the past reporting period, the rating is upgraded, even though the overall progress is still lagging significantly. Upgrading should be based on concrete evidence of improvement instead of expectations and promises.
If unsatisfactory performance of one or more of the above four factors is jeopardizing the timely or efficient achievement of any of the Program's major outputs, then the rating should be MU, U, or HU.

| **Rating Definition** | |
|---|---|
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The Program is expected to achieve or exceed all of the major outputs efficiently without significant shortcomings. |
| Satisfactory (S) | The Program is expected to achieve almost all of its major outputs efficiently with only minor shortcomings. |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The Program is expected to achieve most of its major outputs efficiently with moderate shortcomings. |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | The Program has moderate shortcomings that limit or jeopardize the achievement of one or more outputs but a resolution is likely. |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | The Program has significant shortcomings that limit or jeopardize the achievement of one or more outputs and a resolution is uncertain. |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The Program has major shortcomings that limit or jeopardize the achievement of one or more outputs and a resolution is unlikely. |

[i] MoGE, *2015 Annual Progress Report on the Implementation of the Sixth National Development Plan (R-SNDP)*

[ii] MoGE, (2016), *Educational Statistical Bulletin 2015.*

[iii] MoGE, (2016), *Output-Based Annual Workplan and Budget.*

[iv] Examinations Council of Zambia, USAID & DFID, 2015, *National Assessment Survey of Learning achievement at Grade 2.*

[v] MoGE, (2016), *Consolidated Report of the Joint Annual Review (JAR) Field Visits May 8-16, 2016: Review of the implementation of the revised curriculum*