Application Form *for* Multiplier Education Sector Program Implementation Grant – Multiplier ESPIG

April 2018

OVERVIEW	
Country:	Zimbabwe
Grant agent(s):	UNICEF
Coordinating agency(ies):	DFID
Date of submission of the endorsed ESP/TEP:	8/1/2016
Period of the ESP/TEP:	2016-2020
Date of submission of the full application package:	8/31/2016
Program name (optional):	Click here to enter text.
Multiplier ESPIG amount requested ($US):	USD $10m
Multiplier ESPIG - Fixed Part[1] (US$):	USD $7m
Multiplier ESPIG - Variable Part[2] (US$):	USD $3m
Co-funding mobilized (US$):	USD $52m
Agency fees (Multiplier) – additional to allocation:	USD $ 800,000
Regular ESPIG amount requested:	USD $8.9m
Regular ESPIG - Fixed Part[3]	0
Regular ESPIG - Variable Part[4]:	USD $8.9m
Agency fees (Regular ESPIG) - additional to the country allocation:	USD $712,000
Estimated starting date:	1/9/2018
Estimated closing date:	12/1/2020
Expected submission date of completion report:	1/1/2021

Grant modality - (please enter 'X')		
		Sector Pooled
	X	Project Pooled/ Co-financed
		Project/ Stand-alone

[1] Including other grant agent costs such as supervision, country offices, etc. (See "supplemental program cost" section of this application).
[2] Including other grant agent costs such as supervision, country offices, etc. (See "supplemental program cost" section of this application). Please note that any grant agent costs which is allocated to the variable part can only be disbursed if indicators are reached.
[3] Including other grant agent costs such as supervision, country offices, etc. (See "supplemental program cost" section of this application).
[4] Including other grant agent costs such as supervision, country offices, etc. (See "supplemental program cost" section of this application). Please note that any grant agent costs which is allocated to the variable part can only be disbursed if indicators are reached.

NOTE TO THE USER

Notification to the Secretariat

Prior to any ESPIG application development process, the coordinating agency should always notify the Secretariat of the country's intent to apply. The Secretariat will engage with the government and coordinating agency to agree on a timeline for the preparation and submission of the application, based on the country's own education sector planning and GPE submission dates.

Application Guidelines

Applicants should read the Multiplier ESPIG Guidelines and/ or the regular *ESPIG Guidelines* (where relevant), which explain the application development process, including timeline, necessary steps and intermediary submissions for the quality assurance process of the application. In case additional information is needed, the applicant can contact the country lead at the Secretariat.

Application package

The full application package is considered an integral part of the Board's approval. Any changes to any of these documents from submission to the GPE should follow the *ESPIG Policy*. This includes any changes to program documents during the internal approval process of the grant agent.

Data Sources

The financial, education sector, and any country information data included in the application should be accompanied by the relevant sources in the corresponding sections of the form.

CONTENTS

I. Key players 5

I.1 Partner Ministry
I.2 Coordinating agency
I.3 Grant agent

II. Multiplier ESPIG 6

II.1 Sources and types of co-financing
II.2 Showing that funding is new and additional
II.3 Debt sustainability

III. Fulfilment of the requirements - Fixed Part 8

III.1 A credible, endorsed ESP/TEP
III.2 Evidence of commitment to finance the endorsed ESP/TEP
III.3 Availability of critical data

IV. Country information 11

V. Program 11

V.1 Program description – summary
V.2 Expected outcomes
V.3 Results framework
V.4 Financial overview
V.5 Supplemental program cost
V.6 Monitoring and evaluation
V.7 Risks and implementation readiness
V.8 Past and current performance
V.9 Aid effectiveness

VI. Variable Part 23

VI.1 Summary of Variable Part indicators and targets
VI.2 Dimensions: equity – efficiency – learning outcomes
VI.3 Means of verification

VII. Inclusive Approach 26

VII.1 Consultation
VII.2 Sign-off

Annex I: Definitions of terms 29

LIST OF TABLES

The application contains the following tables to help provide the necessary information, in addition to the narrative sections.

TABLE 1:	Evidence of external resource mobilization	
TABLE 2:	Level of education covered by the program	
TABLE 3:	Outcome indicators	
TABLE 4:	Output indicators	
TABLE 5:	Program costs and expected disbursement by year	
TABLE 6:	Program costs and expected disbursement by component	
TABLE 7:	Other grant agent costs and grant agent fees	
TABLE 8:	Evolvement of grant financing modalities	
TABLE 9:	Variable Part indicators	
TABLE 10:	Means of Verification	

II. MULTIPLIER ESPIG

II.1 Sources and types of co-financing

The GPE Multiplier Fund mobilizes external funding alongside a contribution from GPE. Please list the funding mobilized from each partner, the name of the partner, and the instrument (for example grant, loan, etc.). This funding should be committed at this time.

#	Partner	Amount	Instrument (grant, loan, etc.)
1	Germany - KfW	Euro15m (USD $18.3m)	Grant
2	DFID	£24m (USD $33.7m)	Grant
3	Click here to enter text.	Amount in US$	Click here to enter text.
4	Click here to enter text.	Amount in US$	Click here to enter text.
5	Click here to enter text.	Amount in US$	Click here to enter text.
	Total in US$:	USD $52m	Click here to enter text.

II.2 Showing that funding is new and additional

To access the GPE Multiplier Fund, the finance mobilized (listed in question 3, above) should be genuinely new and additional.

This means that funding such as additional grants to the education sector, or financing such as new concessional lending has been committed, and that these additional resources would not have been committed if funding from the GPE Multiplier Fund were not available.

Please explain briefly why the additional funding would not have been mobilized without the incentive of the GPE Multiplier Fund.

#	Partner	**Justification for additionality** (please list any supporting documents that you would like to include, and list them in the "Additional Information" section in II.6 below).
1	Germany - KfW	The German Government (Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, BMZ) has been supporting the education sector in Zimbabwe through the Education Development Fund (EDF).

		The last two grants were made available in December 2016 and December 2017 respectively through KfW. The latest grant was at the total committed amount of Euro 15m valid until end of 2019 of which Euro 10m was already released to UNICEF to support Zimbabwe's ESSP. KfW is aware that additional funding through the Multiplier fund would increase the amount of funding that could be used to support districts in poorer provinces to improve the quality of education. If the above additional funding of Euro 15m can leverage additional funding from the GPE multiplier fund, then it is providing good value for money and will complement the EDF programme support; which will lead to a stronger focus on equity and improved learning and make improvements to financial management in the sector
2	DFID Zimbabwe	DFID globally contributes significantly to the GPE. DFID's support to date in DFID Zimbabwe has been through the EDF fund and to CAMFED to support girls' education in the most disadvantaged districts. DFID has been the Coordinating Agency for GPE and became aware early on of the option for the multiplier fund to raise additional resources for education. The ESSP was endorsed in June 2016 and there is a significant funding gap, particularly in terms of non-wage expenditure in the sector. DFID is aware this funding gap could be partially filled with the additionality of the multiplier fund and so DFID is incentivized by the Multiplier. DFID's commitment to the education sector in Zimbabwe was under review, as part of a DFID wide revision of business plans after the new UK Government came into power in June 2017. These funds could have gone to other sectors that DFID Zimbabwe supports, but it was felt that DFID's commitment to the education sector would bring leverage for additional funds through the multiplier fund; doubling the current variable tranche funding, and increasing support to an otherwise underfunded sector. DFID Zimbabwe plans to continue to invest in the education sector through the EDF by up to £24m ($33.7m) over the next three years. As of March 2018, DFID Zimbabwe extended the EDF programme for one additional year and is providing £8m in funding up to March 2019. In addition, a new business

		case of continued support to the education sector is being developed for the additional £16m DFID has committed to the education sector, subject to Ministerial approval of the UK Government.
3	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
4	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
5	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
	Total in $US:	USD $52 mil

II.3 Debt sustainability (if applicable)

If one or more of the instruments listed in question 3, above, creates a financial liability for the government (for example, a loan), please comment on the implications for debt sustainability.

#	Partner	Implications for debt sustainability
1	Germany - KfW	None
2	DFID	None
3	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
4	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
5	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.

II.6 Additional Information (if applicable)

Justification for additionality (please list any supporting documents that you would like to include).

#	Partner	Additional Information to Justify additionality
1	Germany - KfW	Letter of commitment:

2	DFID Zimbabwe	Letter of commitment:
3	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
4	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.
5	Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.

III. FULFILLMENT OF FUNDING REQUIREMENTS – FIXED PART

III.1 Requirement 1: An endorsed quality ESP/TEP[6]

Please explain why the endorsed ESP/TEP can be considered a quality plan by summarizing the main conclusions and recommendations of the Appraisal Report and how these were addressed in the Appraisal Memo, including any adjustments made to the ESP/TEP and/or any medium-long term follow-up actions decided upon, as a result of the independent assessment, as well as any other outstanding issues related to the ESP/TEP.

The draft Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP 2016-2020) for Zimbabwe was forwarded to the GPE Secretariat in 2016, following 2 formative assessments commissioned by and received from DFID as the GPE Coordinating Agency in Zimbabwe and as a member of the Education Coordination Group (LEG). Additional inputs were received following the QAR1 and the QAR2 GPE process.

While the ESSP includes the aspiration for a large capital investment in classroom and school construction, achieving the goals depend on the outcome of discussions with a range of partners, and will consider a number of modalities. The remainder of the programme has taken a very cautious approach in anticipating the resources which may be available and the GPE programme reflects this.

In the cover note and in the response to the two DfID quality assessments MoPSE has responded to all of the recommendations and has made a number of changes to the ESSP documentation on the basis of the recommendations.
There were two principal areas of concern:
a) The comprehensiveness and completeness of the Operational Plans (OP's), and linked to this
b) The total costs for the programs, which will change depending on the agreed activities and so affect the overall financing frame and the potential funding gaps.

MoPSE took the decision to work on the Operational Plans in a way that builds the understanding of the Departments who will be responsible for the activities and the budgets; this is a time consuming and iterative process. Considerable further work was achieved in July 2016 with adjustments to the financing tables in the ESSP. Further adjustments based on initial implementation were made at the Annual Review in November 2016, and further monitoring of targets made during the 2017 sector review. The Plans now include all expected resources. MoPSE considers the ESSP and the accompanying Operational Plans as a work in progress and a living document which will adjust to changes in the enabling environment. By ensuring that an Education Sector Performance Review is held annually in November, MoPSE commits to the ESSP as the principal education planning document for MoPSE 2016-2020, and the ESSP has been the basis upon which the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education has operated since then and upon which other funding have been contributing to.

III.2 Requirement 2: Commitment to finance the endorsed ESP/TEP

Please use the table below to provide information on external resource mobilization. For evidence of domestic resource mobilization, complete the Excel template in ***this link***[7] only if there are changes to the education financing data submitted in the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) process. Indicate if you are using fiscal or calendar year, and if the former please state when (the month) the fiscal year begins and ends. Also include, where applicable, the sources of all data.

TABLE 1 |

Evidence of external resource mobilization

Actual value for three years			Target values for the period of the Program					
Data for the past three years (indicate years as relevant)			Data for the relevant duration of the program (indicate years as relevant)					
2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	year 3	year 4	year 5	Total
Education sector plan								
Education sector plan cost (local currency) – Source: ESSP 2016-2020 pp.72-73 "Table 10: No change scenario and impact of MoPSE funding and expenditure 2016-2020"								
USD $810,431,000	USD $876,109,530	USD $949,095,655	USD $1,030,443,473	USD $1,121,347,751				USD $4,787,427,409
External funding – excluding GPE funds (local currency)								

[6] Evidence of a credible ESP will primarily be drawn from the ESP documents submitted prior to the application itself. This section should therefore be limited to a brief summary of key issues highlighted in the appraisal process.

[7] This Excel template is the same as the domestic financing spreadsheet initially submitted during the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) process. It is also available on the GPE website at: http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/funding-model-requirement-matrix-domestic-financing-annex. Should you have any question about this section of the application form, please send an email to the GPE Secretariat at gpe_grant_submission@globalpartnership.org.

USD $31,869,077	USD $28,320,000	USD $21,582,000	USD $17,353,000	USD $17,353,000				USD $116,477,077
Funding gap as recorded in the ESP (local currency)								
(USD $31,869,077)	USD $35,935,530	USD $113,943,655	USD $148,694,877	USD $180,663,092				USD $447,368,077
GPE support (local currency)								
A total amount of USD $20,584,958 was committed in December 2016 as GPE II Education Sector Program Implementation for the Government of Zimbabwe. GPE funds will be critical additions to fill the serious financial gap in the ESSP.								

III.3. Requirement 3: Availability of critical data, or a strategy to use and produce data

This requirement concerning the availability of data or alternatively a strategy to produce and use data is divided into three sub-components as indicated below.

III.3.1 A recent education sector analysis

- Provide information and dates on the most recent education sector analysis, including a list of which analytic elements are included (e.g. demographic analysis, analysis of existing policies, costs and financing, system performance and system capacity).
- Indicate how vulnerability and equity, particularly the situation of education for marginalized groups, including girls and children with disabilities, have been addressed.[8]

In order to evaluate progress and to provide an evidence based foundation for identifying the priorities for the preparation of the Education Sector Strategic Plan 2016 – 2020, MoPSE with the support of its education partners carried out a comprehensive Education Sector Analysis (ESA Zimbabwe July 2015). This document details the progress made in education and the challenges across the following domains:

a) Enrolment and Internal Efficiency (pp27 – 48),

[8] Reference can be made to the assessment made in the GPE Funding Model Requirements Readiness Matrix (Quality Assurance Review Phase I Matrix), with this paragraph limited to an update on progress vis-à-vis identified gaps; alternatively, if the analysis exists in another document, this section can simply reference that document, which should then be attached.

b) Education Costs and Financing (pp51 – 70),
c) Teachers (pp72 – 93),
d) Quality and Learning Outcomes (pp94 – 104),
e) Schools and Systems Governance Issues (pp106 -112),
f) Environment (pp 116 – 127), Equity in Schooling (pp128 138),
g) Early Childhood Development (pp139 – 148) and
h) Non-formal Education and Literacy Training (pp 149 – 152).

Equity in schooling, focusing on distribution of resources, special needs and access to the Schools Psychological Services are well researched and the ESA noted that these were all areas requiring attention. There are 784,271 learners (25.41% of enrolled learners) in primary school and 314,189 learners (32.07% of enrolled learners) in secondary school that are classified as orphaned or vulnerable children (OVCs). The most affected children in terms of learning outcomes come from the remotest and poorest schools with only 10% of children with disabilities in school. Therefore considerable strengthening of school support services remains to be achieved. The recommendations have informed the priorities in the ESSP at the policy and activity levels and have resulted in these being core areas for GPE funding.

GPI varies across the country and across the levels of education and the ESA notes further research is needed which is a priority for the Planning Research and Statistics Department, funded under the GPE programme. The government is in receipt of DfID funding from the Campaign for Female Education and the Girls Education Challenge and is reaching more than 120,000 direct beneficiaries.
MoPSE intends to conduct another ESA in preparation for the new ESSP for 2021 and beyond.

III.3.2 Basic financial and education data

- Provide date of last submission of data to UIS and highlight any areas where data was not provided;
- Highlight any gaps in national data (such as data quality issues, disaggregation by gender, availability of data on marginalized groups, financial data, etc.); and

- Provide summary of strategies to address these, including how the implementation of a data strategies will be financed and whether they are part of the endorsed ESP.[9]

i) The last submission of data to UIS was in 2016.
2017 data is now available and will be forwarded to UIS

ii) There are still some gaps in the data being collected e.g. facilities for special needs and Children with Disabilities (CWD) disaggregated by age and location. In addition, some of the finance data from private colleges is needed. There are still challenges with timeliness of data provision, data entry takes a long time and the production of the annual document can be delayed. The capacity to analyze and use the data requires strengthening.

iii) Each year the ED46 (EMIS form for data collection) is reviewed by all the departments, including partners, and made comprehensive; MoPSE plans to improve the institutionalization of data collection processes at MoPSE head office and to make sure that relevant data is available for the districts and provinces – this will require more person power and will depend on the requests to the Public Service Commission. The need for professional development in the use of data is a core element of the Capacity Development in ESSP.

MoPSE intends to build its research capacity through the establishment of Centre for Education Research, Innovation and Development (CERID) – the Center will act as a spur to increase the relevance and timeliness of data collection, a focus for evidence based use of data and for developing the analytical capacity at the subnational levels.

III.3.3 A system or mechanisms to monitor learning outcomes

- Indicate whether there is a system for measuring learning outcomes and if so, describe briefly;

[9] If these strategies are included in the endorsed ESP, this paragraph should be limited to a list of the strategies and their financing source and a reference to the relevant section in the ESP.

- Highlight any gaps and provide summary of strategies to address these, including how the implementation of the strategies will be financed.[10]

Zimbabwe has a long tradition of formal assessment with testing at the end of Grade 7, 'O' Levels after Form 4 and 'A' Levels after Form 6. The examinations were initially managed by the Cambridge Examinations Board, who worked with the Zimbabwe Examinations Council to develop a purely Zimbabwean examination system. ZimSEC is an independent body and is funded through examination fee payments. With the establishment of the new curriculum and a rethinking of how children should be assessed ZimSEC has been working with MoPSE and in particular the Curriculum Development and Technical Services (CDTS) Department to develop a mixed approach to monitoring learning outcomes which includes both formal examinations but also a significant element of continuous assessment. This will be phased in with the new curriculum and teachers will be trained and supported to implement this. The examination system and results will provide an opportunity for research into where there are successes and what the causes of these are. CERID will initiate research to use this data effectively and to feed research results back into the policy/ strategy debate.

MoPSE, aware of the need to both monitor the success of children in the early grades and to pick up on children with specific challenges have focused on doing this through assessment of early reading. Therefore, ZimSEC, in collaboration with MoPSE, Australian Council for Education Research (ACER) and UNICEF, have been carrying out Zimbabwe Early Learning Assessments (ZELA) of grade 3 students. In addition, capacity within ZimSEC has been built, supported by ACER, to carry out these early learning assessments, which will now form a regular part of the assessment procedures.

IV. COUNTRY INFORMATION

NOTE: 1. Federal State applicants should duplicate this section as needed for States applying.
2. Please include the sources of population and GDP data in footnotes.

Total population:	13 943 242

[10] If the system or strategy to develop one are included in the endorsed ESP, this section should be limited to a brief statement and a reference to the relevant section in the ESP.

GDP Per Capita (USD):	USD 1,076 p.a.
School year runs from (month to month):	January to December
Budget cycle runs from (month to month):	January to December

V. PROGRAM

V.1 Program description - summary

In 1,500 words or less (maximum 3 pages), please:

- Provide a narrative of the Program in summary form, describing overall program objectives and related expected outcomes, and the components and sub-components with financing amounts (further details are to be provided in table form under IV.2 and IV.3).
- Indicate as relevant GPE's anticipated share by components and sub-components if this is a co-financed project.

The overall program objective is to increase the number of children successfully completing basic education.

The program sub-objectives are:
Increasing access to a quality learning environment for the most disadvantaged children
Increase the number of children transitioning from Grade 7 to Form 1
Improve the pass rate in mathematics in the most disadvantaged schools
Increase the number of girls completing basic education focusing on Forms 1 - 4
Strengthening the policy and accountability frameworks
Building leadership and managerial capacity

The following is a summary of the program areas.

A. The GPE Multiplier Fund Fixed Tranche

The fixed tranche element of the MF will be allocated through a one-off top up to the SIG for the 1,000 poorest P3 'satellite' schools. Selection will use the criteria already agreed and approved by the EDF Program Steering Committee. The intention is for these schools to have access to funds to complete classrooms and equip the learning environment so that the new curriculum can be delivered effectively. The program will ensure that all construction takes account of children with disability. Better learning and equipped accommodation (and in many cases accommodation for the first time) will encourage more children to enter and to stay in school so improving learning outcomes and efficiency.
Schools will budget this fund for 2019 and will receive support and guidelines on the use of the funds and the criteria for usage will include: construction, purchase of essential equipment and teaching and learning materials for the new curriculum.

More than 200,000 children can benefit as will teachers and communities

B. The GPE Variable tranche and Multiplier Fund Performance Tranche

1. Program 1 – Equity and Access

Component 1.1 – Parental Awareness Training
Experience has shown the strong influence and contribution that parents have on the education of their children but also in addressing a broad range of social issues which affect the children in school and out of school. This component focuses on strengthening support of parents and communities, who understand and can influence social issues affecting the children which currently prevent them from accessing or staying in schools.

Component 1.2 – Teaching and Learning materials for most disadvantaged children
The new curriculum is being introduced in a phased manner. Text books and learning material have been provided to the poorest schools. This program component will supplement the existing resources and procure material identified for poor schools for the new learning areas and for basic education grade 5, 6 and 7, following the same selection criteria used and procurement as used by the Ministry for the current GPE 2 procurement.

Component 1.3 - Additional payment to SIG for 500 additional most disadvantaged schools
SIG has proved an effective modality for building the capacity of schools to manage their own resources and to improve the

learning environment, improving access and eventually learning outcomes. Additional fuds will allow 500 schools and some 75,000 children to benefit. The strengthened policy and strategic capacity of MoPSE to support children with physical and learning difficulties, as well as the importance of support to ECD, will be reflected in the positive list of agreed activity for the use of SIG funding.

2. Program 2 – Improved learning outcomes

Component 2.1 Establish cluster based support networks for mathematics teachers
In order to address the problem of low pass rates in mathematics in rural school's cluster subject associations/ panels will be established or strengthened to improve teaching of mathematics at classroom level so enhancing teacher performance through a variety of in-service strategies and the provision of additional professional support. The national subject association will update existing material and manuals to cater for the current needs under the new curriculum and this material which will be used for the cascade training and in the clusters.

Component 2.2 Mathematics teaching and learning resources to identified disadvantaged schools
Math teaching requires not only the text books but additional learning resources which are generally unavailable in the poorest schools. Materials that will be developed or distributed will include additional teaching guides or textbooks, including tips, strategies and ideas for particularly difficult topics or concepts; standardised mock examination papers that focus on Grades 5, 6 and 7; mathematic kits, inclusive of all material needed for learners to understand math.

3. Program 3 – Efficiency and Improved Retention

Component 3.1 – Strengthen implementation of career, guidance and counselling
From wide consultations, which the Ministry undertook in 2017, it became clear that many issues affecting dropouts at the lower secondary are life skills social issues to be addressed under program 1. A large number of students and parents mentioned that there was little information on the possible opportunities accruing form education and that teachers and schools lacked the knowledge to advise students and parents. Guidance can help encourage children to stay in school, inform parents of the value of education and so improve learning outcomes as children have the ambition to achieve post school goals.

Component 3.2 – Community based cross-sectoral platforms to address child protection issues and strengthening of child protection committees

From the 2017 district consultations it emerged that it is important to reach out to identify social issues affecting children in communities, such as children with disability, OVCs, out of school children, child headed households etc. Platforms are needed where cross sectoral solutions can be developed, where community selected members who are already part of Child Protection Committees and other sectors (i.e. health, social welfare) discuss, address and identify the issues affecting children, identify the forms of assistance needed and the resources available, which would improve the access and retention to education.

Component 3.3 – Teachers capacity building on special needs and learning disability
Data shows that there are many children with disabilities who do not access or drop out because of lack of appropriate support in the mainstream schools, and not everyone has the opportunity to send their children to a special school. Teachers in schools and resource centres need to have inclusive skills and methodology to cater for children with special needs. This program builds on the current efforts which developing material to tackle this need.

4. Program 4 – Institutional Strengthening

Component 4.1 – Capacity and Leadership Development
The district consultations have realised the importance of having an effective community / school/ District platform. This will be supported by programs described above. An important element of making this work is having leaders who understand what it is to lead and that there are skills that can be learned to be more effective. The program will provide training and support to local leader to give them skills to be strong and effective counterparts.

Component 4.2 - Capacity building all structures of MoPSE
District staff have made great steps in being able to prepare their operational plans and have started to have an effective reporting capacity. Sills are nevertheless still nascent in effective monitoring and in the interpretation and use of evidence based information. The program will work with the District staff to build these capacities.

5. Program 5 Program Management and Monitoring

The Grant Agent provides on-time and relevant support to MoPSE Departments in the implementation of the programs. Additionally, the GA provides monitoring support for all the programs and regular reporting with the ECG Secretariat to the meetings and the financial and narrative reporting to the GPE.
Consultancy support is sometimes needed by MoPSE for not programmed areas and will be decided during the Annual Review.

The ESSP should have a mid-term review and then preparations need to commence for the next ESSP.
Please define the event or project activity that will mark the start of the program and which will take place by the expected start date:
As 70% of MF is programme based, first activities in 2019 are based on USD $7m for SIG top-up and as results and targets of the remaining indicators are achieved, activities and programmes described in the PD and Implementation Plan will be carried out within the timeframe indicated.

Complementary information for overview purposes:

Please specify whether the Program covers the following:

• Development and use of Education Monitoring and Information System – EMIS (Please refer to definition in Annex I: **Definitions**)	Yes
• Development and use of learning assessment system? (See refer to definition in Annex I: **Definitions**)	Yes

Please complete the table below, specifying the levels of education and age (from age to age) covered by the program:

➔ *Extend an/or adapt the table to the number of levels covered by the program, by copying/pasting or erasing rows as relevant.*

TABLE 2 |

Levels of education covered by the program

Levels	Age
ECD	3-5
Primary	6 - 12
Lower Secondary	13 - 16

Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.

➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*

V.2 Expected outcomes

Please complete the table below, extracting relevant information from the detailed Program document. The Program will be monitored and progress will be reported against these **outcome indicators and targets** in the ESPIG annual implementation status reporting template to be submitted each year of the grant to the Secretariat.

➔ *Indicate the years starting with the baseline year. Extend and adapt the table to the number of components, subcomponents and outputs that fits the Program, by copying/pasting or erasing rows as relevant.*

TABLE 3 |

Outcome indicators (as extracted from the program document)

Baseline	Targets				
2017	2018	2019	Year 3	year 4	year 5
Equity Indicator 1:	Transition rate from Grade 7 to Form 1 for 17 lowest Districts (average)				
Source of data:	EMIS				
65.4%	% increase in 10 lowest districts	% increase in 17 lowest districts			
Equity Indicator 2:	Education Act revision including promotion of alternative methods to disciplines other than corporal punishment				
Source of data:	Minutes of ECG				

Education Act revision drafted	Submitted to cabinet	Approved by Cabinet			
Equity Indicator 3:	School Improvement Grant released in Quarter 1				
Source of data:	Proof of disbursement				
		SIG released in Q1			
Efficiency Indicator 1:	Female Survival Rate Form 1-4				
Source of data:	EMIS				
77.39%	79%	81%			
Efficiency Indicator 2:	School Financing Policy submitted to Cabinet				
Source of data:	Click here to enter text.				
	Submitted to Cabinet				
Efficiency Indicator 3:	EMIS data available by Quarter 3				
Source of data:	EMIS				
		Available			
Learning Outcomes Indicator 1:	Number of primary school teachers (G1-G7) that have participated in the in-service training programme using a new training package for mathematics				

Source of data:	Programme documents and reports				
	50% x 2 teachers per school	50% x 2 teachers per school			
Learning Outcomes Indicator 2:	ZELA findings and recommendations adopted and implemented				
Source of data:	ZELA reports				
	Pre-2018 ZELA findings and recommendations reviewed and at least 3 being implemented and ZELA 2018 completed and shared on the MOPSE website	ZELA 2019 completed and shared on the MOPSE website and at least 3 new recommendations being implemented			
Learning Outcomes Indicator 3:	Every school received CD package				
Source of data:	DSI reports				
	Every school received CD package				
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*					

V.3 Results framework[11]

Please complete the table below, extracting relevant information from the detailed program document. There is NO need to reproduce the full results framework here, as long as the program document provides a full results framework with a results chain. The Program will be monitored and progress will be reported against these **output indicators and targets** in the ESPIG annual implementation status reporting template to be submitted each year of the grant to the Secretariat.

If the program plans to purchase and distribute textbooks, train teachers, or build or rehabilitate classrooms, please use the following indicators (GPE Strategic Plan 2016-2020)[12]:

- Number of textbooks purchased and distributed
- Number of teachers trained
- Number of classrooms built or rehabilitated

NOTE: These indicators are NOT compulsory indicators. They are therefore applicable only when the program plans to implement these activities. In case of sector-pooled funds, please indicate numbers planned at sector level.

➔ *Indicate the years starting with the baseline year. Extend and adapt the table to the number of components, subcomponents and outputs that fits the Program, by copying/pasting or erasing rows as relevant.*

TABLE 4

Output indicators (extracted from the program document)

Baseline	Targets				
2018	2019	2020	year 3	year 4	year 5

[11] For sector-wide financing (through budget support or pooled funds), a reference could be made to the ESP results framework.

[12] For definition of indicators, see attached **Annex1**.

Component 1:	**Equity and Access**				
Objective(s):	Increasing access to a quality learning environment for the most disadvantaged children Increase the number of children transitioning from Grade 7 to Form 1				
Sub-component 1.1:	Parental awareness training				
Output indicator:	Number of clusters holding community consultations on social issues affected retention and access				
Source of data:	Programme documents/reports				
0	1,219 clusters				
Output indicator:	Number of relevant materials for advocacy (media, flyers) and for training produced				
Source of data:	Programme documents/reports				
0	9,000 copies				
Output indicator:	Number of clusters received training of key stakeholders and parents on social issues affecting retention and access, how to address them and monitoring at school and cluster level				
Source of data:	Programme documents/reports				
0	1,219 clusters				
Sub-component 1.2:	Teaching and learning materials for most disadvantaged children				
Output indicator:	Number of schools received learning and teaching materials identified across learning areas				
Source of data:	Programme documents/reports				
0	5,000 schools				

Sub-component 1.3:	School infrastructure				
Output indicator:	Number of additional disadvantaged schools received SIG				
Source of data:	SIG report				
0	500 schools	500 schools			
Component 2:	**Improved Learning Outcomes**				
Objective(s):	Improve the pass rate in mathematics in the most disadvantaged schools				
Sub-component 2.1:	Establishing cluster based support networks for mathematics teachers				
Output indicator:	Number of subject panels on mathematics at cluster levels created or strengthened				
Source of data:	Programme documents/reports				
0	1,219 clusters				
Output indicator:	Number of primary level teachers (grade 4,5,6,7) received in-service training in mathematics at cluster level				
Source of data:	Programme documents/reports				
0	35,000 teachers				
Sub-component 2.2:	Mathematics teaching and learning resources to identified disadvantaged schools				
Output indicator:	Number of learners received learning and teaching materials for primary mathematics				
Source of data:	Programme documents/reports				

	140,000 learners				
Component 3:	**Efficiency and Improved Retention**				
Objective(s):	Increase the number of girls completing basic education focusing on Forms 1 - 4				
Sub-component 3.1:	Strengthen implementation of career, guidance and counselling				
Output indicator:	Guidance and Counselling teaching and learning materials developed, endorsed by the Ministry and printed				
Source of data:	Programme documents/reports				
	Developed, approved and printed				
Output indicator:	Number of Guidance and Counselling teachers and other education personnel received training				
Source of data:	Programme documents/reports				
0	26,700 (8,900 G&C focals + 8,900 heads + 8,900 DSC reps)				
Sub-component 3.2:	Community based cross-sectoral platforms to address child protection issues and strengthening of child protection committees				
Output indicator:	Current existing structures at district and community level identified and mapped				
Source of data:	Mapping reports				
0	Identification and mapping completed				
Output indicator:	Number of districts reactivated and strengthened of the existing structures (the CPC, village registers, the BEAM committees) in collaboration of the cross sectoral and stakeholders				

Source of data:	District reports				
0	72 districts				
Output indicator:	Number of schools formed Child Protection Committees in schools				
Source of data:	Programme documents and reports				
0	8,900 schools				
Sub-component 3.3:	Teachers capacity building on special needs and learning disability				
Output indicator:	Number of teachers received in identification and teaching methodologies for children with special needs and learning disability in mainstream schools				
Source of data:	Programme documents and reports				
0	26,700 teachers (3 teachers per school, 8,900 schools)	26,700 teachers (3 teachers per school, 8,900 schools)			
Sub-component 3.4:	Teaching and learning materials and assistive devices for children with special needs				
Output indicator:	Number of teaching and learning materials and assistive devices procured for children with special needs				
Source of data:	Programme documents and reports				
0	18,000 children				
Component 4:	**Institutional Strengthening**				
Objective(s):	Strengthening the policy and accountability frameworks Building leadership and managerial capacity				

Sub-component 4.1:	Capacity and leadership Development				
Output indicator:	Number of districts carried out RBM discussions through community engagement				
Source of data:	Programme documents and reports				
0	72 districts	72 districts			
Output indicator:	District-based evidence and best practices gathered and shared				
Source of data:	EDU-News				
0	Evidence and findings included in EDU-News				
Sub-component 4.2:	Capacity building of districts on implementation and monitoring (all structures of MoPSE)				
Output indicator:	Number of districts carried out monitoring and evaluation of district personnel??				
Source of data:	Programme documents and reports				
0	72 districts	72 districts			
Output indicator:	Number of districts carried out training on curriculum implementation, learner support services, data analysis, planning and management				
Source of data:	Programme documents and reports				
0	72 districts				
Component 5:	**Program Management and Monitoring**				
Objective(s):	Strengthening program management and monitoring capacity				

Sub-component 5.1:	GA costs and consultancies				
Output indicator:	Click here to enter text.				
Source of data:	Click here to enter text.				
Sub-component 5.2:	ESSP monitoring and evaluation				
Output indicator:	ESPR meeting carried out and report finalized				
Source of data:	ESPR report				
	ESPR report finalized	ESPR report finalized			

➔ *For more rows, please copy and adapt a set of the above rows and paste them here.*

V.4 Financial overview

Please complete the table below, indicating program cost and disbursement by year as applicable, based on information extracted from the program document. If it is a co-financed project, indicate estimates for the expected disbursements of GPE funds by year.

TABLE 5

Program costs and expected disbursements by year – in USD

Indicate years:	2019	2020	year 3	year 4	year 5	Total

Total program costs per implementation year[13]	13,197,714	5,622,286				
Total program costs per calendar year	13,197,714	5,622,286				

Please complete the table below, listing the proposed interventions/components, and indicating the expected disbursement by year and total cost for each component, as well as their respective percentage of the total grant.

If it is a co-financed project, indicate estimates for the expected disbursements of GPE funds by year.

➔ *Extend and adapt the table to the number of components that fits the Program, by copying/pasting or erasing rows as relevant.*

TABLE 6 |

Program costs and expected disbursement by component[14] – in USD

Components	2019	2020	year 3	year 4	year 5	Total costs	%
Component 1	2,817,714	1,772,286				4,590,000	24.4
Component 2	800,000	800,000				1,600,000	8.5
Component 3	1,960,000	1,810,000				3,770,000	20
Component 4	410,000	410,000				820,000	4.3

[13] Implementation year runs by 12-month cycle beginning with signing of grant agreement. For example, if the signing is expected to start in July 2016 then the implementation year is July 2016 to June 2017, and July 2016 should be entered as Year 1. The program costs per calendar year for 2016 should reflect the estimated costs for the July – December 2016 period.

[14] If not using budget support as grant modality.

Component 5	210,000	830,000				1,040,000	5.5
Multiplier ESPIG – Fixed Part (additional SIG amounts and GA technical support costs)	7,000,000					7,000,000	37.1

➔ *For more rows, please copy the above rows and paste them here.*

V.5 Supplemental program cost

TABLE 7 |

Other grant agent costs and general agency fees – in USD[15]

Indicate years:	2019	2020	year 3	year 4	year 5	Total
General agency fees (in addition to MCA):	USD $1,061,486	USD $450,514				
Other grant agent costs, including for supervision, country office, etc. (part of MCA)	USD $41,373	USD $442,846				

IV.5.1 Use of Other grant agent costs, including for supervision, country office, etc.

In 300 words, please indicate how Other grant agent costs, including for supervision, country office, etc. will be utilized.

[15] See *ESPIG Guidelines* for explanation of respectively other grant agent costs and general agency fees.

The GA expert inputs are in the specific areas that the program wants to develop and also wants to strengthen MoPSE capacity (ECD, Special Needs, Curriculum development, quality improvements). The overall management support will have a focus on developing and strengthening the financial management within the ministry in line with the MoFED FMIS and will be supported in this by the social policy specialist who has considerable experience in PFM. Please refer to the PD for specific breakdown of the cost.

V.6 Monitoring and evaluation

In 300 words, please:

- Explain how the Program will be monitored and evaluated.
- Include how the monitoring and evaluation of the Program is aligned with the national reporting systems and to the monitoring and evaluation of the Education Sector Plan through the Joint Sector Reviews or other processes.

The Education Coordination Group (ECG), chaired by the Minister and membered by relevant MoPSE departments, other ministries and institutions, UN agencies, international organizations, representatives of CSOs (ECOZI) and donors, takes the lead in monitoring and adjusting progress on the ESSP 2016 – 2020, especially through the Education Sector Performance Review (ESPR) process and meetings. The ECG has monitor and consult on the programme implementation, progress and results supported by GPE II and will continue the same for the Variable Tranche and Multiplier Fund of GPE. The ECG meets for regular (ordinary) and scheduled meetings such as Annual Review/national sector review and extraordinary meetings are also organized for specific topics requiring special attention of the ECG members.

In addition to the Ministry's regular structures (school heads, DSIs, PEDs) to be used to monitor progress in relevant activity implementation with the set milestones and timelines to deliver the results, MoPSE will ensure that progress in all the areas supported by GPE is measured through various means of verification:
- EMIS: data will show the progress or regress and will enable analysis of trends to be done, both at national, as well as sub-national level. Data will be available in the third quarter of each year
- ZIMSEC to generate national examination data, such as ZELA? and mathematics exam results
- Survey research under the auspices of CERID which will particularly focus on the issues of survival rate for girls at secondary in 2019
- Independent verification through contracting external expertise to carry out quantitative as well as qualitative verification prior to each Annual Review.
- CAMFED and ECOZI present in the country will independently verify implementation as well as progress and report directly to the ECG in-year and at the Annual Review

- Ministry of Education through regular quarterly monitoring visits and the production of reports which will be shared with ECG members.
- Program and activity level reports.

The Grant Agent, UNICEF, provides on-time and relevant support to MoPSE Departments in the implementation of the programs as well as monitoring support for all the programs and regular reporting with the ECG Secretariat to the meetings and the financial and narrative reporting to the GPE. UNICEF applies the HACT system to monitor utilization of disbursed funds and end user feedback system to monitor procurement and distribution of goods. Regular joint monitoring will continue.

For the auditing mechanism, see the PD for detail. The MoPSE has the established internal auditing system through which programme-related transactions and activities will be classified in a Chart of Accounts for expenditures and sources of funds. Clusters and districts will be required to produce annual audited accounts, either by being directly audited by the provincial internal audit office or by providing independently audited accounts to the same office in line with the HACT established thresholds. GPE will also finance a share of the external financial monitoring contract being put in place by UNICEF for the School Improvement Grants (SIG) Programme. Provision has been made in the cost estimates for this external monitoring to serve as a back-up to the internal audits referred to above.

V.7 Risks, implementation readiness, and sustainability

In 300 words, please:

- Outline the principal risks and assumptions associated with the Program and what is planned to mitigate these risks.
- Demonstrate readiness for implementing the Program.
- Explain what is being done to ensure sustainability of the Program.

For a comprehensive risk analysis see the Programme Document. The principal risks stem from the fragile national, regional and economic environment, exacerbated by the recent drought and the global downturn. The economic challenges may have an impact on both the national government ability to meet recurrent costs and on parents' ability to raise funds for fees and levies for funding all non-salary expenditure. Elections by nature a resource demanding exercise and may put pressure on the fiscus as they take precedence over other national programs. However, MoPSE and the Grant Agent will monitor the situation and seek to take action to mitigate impact.

The programme has been designed to have a minimum impact on possible recurrent costs but to maximize the potential for the

nation to allow all children to realize their potential. There is a focus on introducing the new curriculum and building the professional skills of teachers to meet new demands as well as to respond to equity concerns through non-formal education and inclusive education. Longer term replacement costs for learning materials should be met on the assumption the economy improves over the medium term.

Implementation benefits from, the systems established during the current GPE programme and in particular the revitalisation of the school cluster system and the strengthening of the districts and provinces in developing their own strategic plans and identifying local focus and local solutions to local problems, Nationally, the curriculum development department (CDTS) and the independent examinations council are institutional strengths. Research capacity will be developed in MoPSE through CERID (see ESSP/GPE Component 4) but will also draw on the well established and respected university sector.

V.8 Past and current performance

In 250 words or less, please:

- Describe the implementation status of any past or current GPE grants.
- Explain how the proposed Program builds on lessons learned through the implementation of previous grants.

For countries that are not past or current GPE grant recipients, answer "Not applicable" in the box below.

Progress has been made since the first tranche of the GPE2 grant was received in January 2017. Progress in each component area is summarized below and documents discussed are available on request.

Component 1 (Policy)

Policies and legislative reform: The Thematic Working Group (TWG) on Policies and Legislation, operating within a framework provided by Education Coordination Group (ECG), drafted an action plan, costed and with timeframes, focusing on five areas: inclusive education, school financing, education amendment bill, school development committees and early learning.
Education Amendment Bill: Review of the Education Act was completed. Proposals in the draft Education Amendment Bill were subjected to an extensive national consultation process and a report on these consultations has been compiled. A set of Memorandum of Principles (MOPs) was prepared and endorsed. Currently the draft bill is being worked on by the Attorney General's office followed by submission to Cabinet for approval.

Inclusive education: The TWG group for inclusive policy was formed. Discussions were held, and progress reported at the ESPR 2017 held in January 2018. The engagement of a consultant for the first phase is under way, and the process is led by the department of LWS and supported by the technical advice of the legal department.
School financing: A concept note on the need for a school financing policy and related Terms of Reference (TORs) for the development of the policy have been approved by Ministry, a consultant has been engaged and work is under way for the development of a school financing policy.
Early learning Policy: a review of the existing regulatory framework and circulars on early learning has been undertaken with engagement of players across all MoPSE departments, gaps were identified and a comprehensive document is available now to be reviewed and in order to plan the next steps. The department of Infant Education in charge of ECD education is collaborating with the legal department to continue the work.

Component 2 (Curriculum)

Action plan 2018 for implementation of curriculum is finalized with costs and timelines for the roll out of the next phase.
Teachers' guides have been printed and distributed. Teachers' training program on syllabus interpretation for the grades phasing in 2018 has been carried out and for the grades phasing in in 2019 plans are under preparation.
Procurement of textbooks: procurement for the agree numbers of textbooks has been finalized; finalizing the procurement modalities has taken some time but now the procedures are in place it is anticipated that there will be no further delays. The second phase of procurement is now under way, and distribution of the procured textbooks will be carried out in the first quarter of 2018, including material for ECD.
Absorption of Early Reading Initiative (ERI) and PLAP principles into the pre-service programs: Discussions between MoPSE and Ministry of Higher and Tertiary Education on integration of these programs as well as the new curriculum in pre-service are under way, and a committee to spearhead the process has been put in place with membership from the two ministries and some stakeholders to plan the next steps. The discussions held so far have been positive and constructive, and a more unified understanding of the sustainability of the program is emerging. A concept paper on ERI, PLAP and teacher pre-service integration has been drafted by MoPSE and forwarded to the Permanent Secretary MoHTESTD for his consideration.
Early Reading initiative (ERI): a concept note on ERI and community engagement in early learning has been drafted and approved by the Ministry. Support for the procurement of early learning material, ECD and outdoor play equipment by more than 4,000 schools was done, including community engagement discussions on the importance of ECD and the role of play in early learning.

Component 3 (Equity)

The NFE policy is in place and the NFE action plan, costed for training, mode of delivery and resources is now available. The review of the NFE syllabus for Form 1 – Form 6, including the validation process was finalized and is now under design and for printing.
Special needs: ERI and PLAP annex finalized and distributed to all districts. Screening tools for CWDs is in the final stages of Ministry approval process. A TWG to review and develop the inclusive education policy has been formed.
Complementary funding: In order to have a comprehensive picture of the situation by district and area, MoPSE collected data from districts on the current status of community funding in school and construction projects underway, cluster technical hubs being planned, needs, etc. Provincial planners are involved in this process as well, and met, together with ministry head office and other stakeholders and drafted the guidelines for complementary funding, inclusive of edibility criteria and modalities of funding. These guidelines now are awaiting approval.

Component 4 (Institutional Strengthening)

The concept note for the holistic organizational development for MoPSE has been endorsed by ECG. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for a consultancy to undertake this has been finalized and approved and a consultancy team has been engaged to support the ministry.
The Centre for Educational Research Innovation and Development (CERID) mapping has taken place and a draft concept paper on its establishment and functions drafted. A ToR for the CERID manager is now available and is being used to recruit for the post. The Ministry has engaged consultants to support the establishment of CERID, with the first phase completed and a report available on the next steps. A CERID team of 6 people has been put in place, and a plan for 2018 has been drafted and awaiting approval. It is anticipated that the first tasks of CERID will be to look at the operational research that is necessary for monitoring and developing the performance elements of the new program.

Component 5 (Monitoring, ESSP)

Districts have submitted the DOPs reviews of 2017 to MoPSE.
The POPs have been finalized and are available.
The ESPR of 2017 was held successfully with participation across sectors, and with greater participation from the Ministry of Higher and Tertiary Education as well as the Ministry of Finance.
Continual monitoring of the updated curriculum implementation and the other GPE2 program components continues to ensure

continuity of interventions from GPE 2.

Progress on Alignment, PFM and Policy Dialogue

MoPSE has been consulting with Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED) on reflecting donor funds in the "Blue Book" (the document that summarizes government's budget receipts and allocations to Ministries and Departments in Zimbabwe and when published available on the MoFED website).

In addition, the Director Finance MoPSE is now working with the Projects Office, MoFED, to configure the grants module of SAP to be used by MoPSE HQ, Province and District Offices (as is the case for the Ministry of Health). MoPSE is using GPE funds to train accountants and administrative officers who will be using this new grant module.

V.9 Aid effectiveness

Please complete the table below to illustrate how the proposed grant financing modality is evolving in comparison to the previous grant (where applicable) vis-à-vis alignment with national systems.
Note: Please provide brief justifications/explanations in your response.

TABLE 8 |

Evolvement of grant financing modality

	Previous GPE grant	Current application
In relation to the ESP/TEP		
Is the GPE-funded Program aligned with the Education Sector Plan?	Yes	Yes
Are the projected expenditures of the Program included in the multi-year forecast of the Minister of Finance (Medium Term Expenditure Framework)?	No	Yes, payment of programmes are done using the PFM system.
In relation to the national budget and parliament		
Is the project included in the national budget?	No	Yes, in the budget statement.
Does the national annual budget show specific appropriations for the different planned expenditures (economic and/or functional classification)?	No	Yes
In relation to treasury		
Is the majority of the financing disbursed into: (a) the main revenue account of government, (b) a specific account at treasury or (c) a specific account at a commercial bank?	Into a dedicated commercial bank account	Specific account at treasury

Is the expenditure process (documents and signatures on commitment, payment orders, etc.) for the national budget used for the program expenditures? Are there any specific derogations or safeguards on the national execution procedures for the program expenditures (other documents and/or signatures)?	MoPSE district officers certify that expenditure has been used for the correct purposes and audit expenditure	The GPE 2 programme will develop disbursement and accounting systems and procedures which align more closely with GoZ systems. Districts will be required to request expenditure approval through MoPSE structures and then to the Grant Agent UNICEF using and building the capacity of government PFM systems.
In relation to procurement		
Are government procurement rules used? If so are there any derogations/safeguards on the use of these rules introduced?	No, procurement is in line with HACT principals	No, procurement is in line with HACT principals
In relation to accounting		
Is the financial accounting directly on government's accounting systems used for the national budget? If not, are the accounting results afterwards integrated in government's accounting systems?	No, expenditure has been through dedicated UNICEF accounts in the districts but with certification of expenditure by district officials	The GPE 2 programme will develop disbursement and accounting systems and procedures which align more closely with GoZ systems. Districts will be required to request expenditure approval through MoPSE structures and then to the Grant Agent UNICEF using and building the capacity of government PFM systems.
In relation to audit		
Will the financial accounts be audited by the government's external auditor?	No, auditing is by external auditors commissioned by UNICEF but with audit reports being sent to MoPSE	Yes, MoPSE Department of Finance will keep a record of all expenditure which will be both internally audited and audited by the GoZ external auditor.

In relation to reporting		
Will the information on project execution be included in the Education Sector Plan Annual Implementation Report prepared by the Ministry of Education?	The report was included in the Education Sector Review which was held in November 2016 and 2017 and its report.	Yes, information will be included in reports on the execution of Operational Plans on an annual basis during the sector review.
Will separate / additional reports be required for the Program?	Yes, annual donor report to the GPE	Yes, annual donor report to the GPE

IV.5.1 Evolution of aligned assistance

In 375 words or less, please:

- Describe how the proposed grant financing modality is evolving in comparison with the previous grant (if applicable) based on the table above.
- Explain what mechanisms are in place to mitigate fiduciary risks and why they seem appropriate.
- Detail how the proposed Program lays the foundation for more aligned assistance in the future.

In GPE I Zimbabwe was allocated at the amount of USD $23.6m which were successfully utilized to produce the results in the Education Sector. Subsequently additional allocation of GPE II's fixed amount of USD $20.58m was approved to build on the earlier successes. The country is now eligible for the remaining variable tranche of USD $8.9m as well as USD $10m from the Multiplier Fund. Of these amounts, USD $7m are programme based and the remaining are results based. Zimbabwe has proven to be having the capacity to achieve the targets which will release additional funds. Excellent collaboration between MoPSE and UNICEF as well as UNICEF having been the GA since several years have been critical to show low level of risks and efficient implementation. The programme proposed is in line with the ESSP and builds on the previous grants as well as other sources of funding, such as EDF.

VI. VARIABLE PART INFORMATION

VI.1 Summary of Variable Part indicators and targets

Please complete the table below, by providing and defining the selected indicators and providing recent data for the indicators, where applicable, to reflect past trends, and the specific targets for the Program.

➔ *Extend the table as necessary to fit the Program and number of indicators in each dimension, by copying/pasting rows as relevant.*

TABLE 9 |

Variable Part Indicators

	Past trends data		Baseline	Program targets	
Indicate years for data entries:	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
1. Equity					
Indicator:	Transition rate Grade 7 to Form 1 for 17 lowest Districts				
Definition of indicator:	The number of learners admitted to the first grade of a higher level of education in a given year, expressed as a percentage of the number of learners enrolled in the final grade of the lower level of education in the previous year.				
Data/targets:	69.6%	69.1%	65.4%	% increase in all 10 lowest districts	% increase in all 17 lowest districts
Indicator:	Education Act revision with promotion of alternative methods of disciplinary to corporal punishment				

Definition of indicator:	On the 16th of March 2013 a National Constitution of Zimbabwe was adopted and number of sections of the Education Act need to be aligns it to this effect. The final approved Act is important for the overall policy stance of MoPSE, as making policy operational requires the Act approval for the Minister to issue the necessary statutory instruments (for example for school finance, inclusive education, school feeding, health etc.).				
Data/targets:			Revised	Submitted to Cabinet	Approved By Cabinet
Indicator:	School Improvement Grant released in Quarter 1				
Definition of indicator:	School Improvement Grant (SIG) is under the Education Development Fund (EDF) that has been released since 2014 to most disadvantaged schools identified by equity-based indicators, with school income being the most critical factor. The Ministry is now aiming to make sure that SIG is released directly to schools on time for the start of the school year, by the end of March; since the funds were being released in the last quarter of the year.				
Data/targets:		SIG released in September 2016	SIG released in Nov 2017		SIG released to schools in Q1 (by 31st March 2019)
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*					
2. Efficiency					
Indicator:	Female Survival Rate Form 1-4				
Definition of indicator:	Percentage of a cohort of learners who enrolled in the first grade of a level of education in a given school- year who eventually reach the final year (or target year). Its purpose is to assess the "holding power" and internal efficiency of education system. The survival rate to final year indicates the proportion of a learner cohort that completes each year and survives to final year. Conversely, it indicates the magnitude of dropout before final year.				

Data/targets:	75.69%	79.7%	77.39%	79%	81%
Indicator:	School Financing Policy submitted to Cabinet				
Definition of indicator:	It is the intention of MoPSE to develop, with the support of its stakeholders, school financing policy that will simplify and clarify the uses of all the funds at the school level and ensure that there is transparent accountability for the use of the funds.				
Data/targets:				SFP Submitted to Cabinet	
Indicator:	EMIS data available by Quarter 3				
Definition of indicator:	EMIS data is available and used for planning and budgeting purposes by the end of September of the current year.				
Data/targets:					Available
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*					
3. Learning outcomes					
Indicator:	Number of Primary teachers (G1-G7) that have participated in the in-service training program using a new training package for math (cumulative)				
Definition of indicator:	Teachers receive in-service training programme of xx days and Teaching and learning materials to improve their quality of teaching in mathematics				
Data/targets:				50% x 2 teachers per school	50% x 2 teachers per school
Indicator:	Zimbabwe Early Learning Assessment findings and recommendations adopted and implemented				
Definition of indicator:	Zimbabwe Early Learning Assessment (ZELA) is sample based survey that is conducted every year in order to establish the extent to which learners have mastered the competencies that are expected of them at the end of grade 2. The competencies are assessed using a carefully designed test that uses a set of carefully selected test items from a bank. The items are directly linked to a set of standards against the Infant School				

	curriculum (ECD A to Grade 2). The sample of learners is required to take a test in English, Maths, and a local language (Shona or Ndebele).				
Data/targets:	ZELA 2015 completed and shared (date) but recommendations not taken up	ZELA 2016 completed and shared (Date) but recommendations not taken up	ZELA 2017 completed and Shared (April 2018)	Pre-2018 ZELA findings and recommendations reviewed and at least 3 being implemented and ZELA 2018 completed and shared on the MOPSE website	ZELA 2019 completed and shared on the MOPSE website and at least 3 new recommendations being implemented
Indicator:	Every school received a package of documentation related to the curriculum framework, syllabi and continuous assessment tasks				
Definition of indicator:	Zimbabwe developed and adopted its curriculum framework in 2015. Development of syllabuses started soon after, with 104 syllabi for different subjects for all levels different subjects for all levels completed by the end of 2015. In 2016 the inception phase of the curriculum was implemented, and largely involved the development of materials and training of teachers (especially in syllabus interpretation and continuous assessment).				
Data/targets:				Every school received CD package	
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above rows and paste them here.*					

VI.2 Strategies and actions in equity, efficiency, learning outcomes

For each specific dimension, please:

- Describe the selected strategies/actions in the Education Sector Plan to address the issue of each specific dimension.
- Explain how the proposed strategies/actions are included in a results' chain and can be considered transformational.
- Demonstrate that the proposed implementation strategies are robust and evidence-based.
- Demonstrate that the selected indicators have a stretch effect as opposed to a mere continuation of current trends.

1. Equity

Equity Output Indicator: Improved transition Rate from Grade 7 to Form 1 of districts (17) with a 2017 transition rate below 70%

Problem:
Opportunity costs particularly in rural areas, poorly resourced rural schools, lack of parental and student understanding of the value of education.

Inputs:
Changes to the Education Act providing for a ban on corporal punishment and a stronger framework for ministerial action.
School funding policy and implementation
Program 1 component 1.3 Expansion of the SIG program to more schools providing for i) improved infrastructure ii) better learning resources iii) parental/ community engagement in the decision-making processes
Program 1 component 1.1 parental awareness training
Program 1 component 1.2 – Teaching and Learning materials for most disadvantaged children
All the other programs will contribute inputs that should contribute to better transition.

Outputs:
A wide range of legitimate school level interventions that target the parents and community on the value of learning, provide for improved learning environment and resourcing and a sustainable financial basis for further improvement

Outcomes:
Children continue in well-equipped and resourced schools, competent teachers able to deliver the curriculum and parents

supportive of continuing education

Transformation:
Parental and community attitudinal change – this will take a considerable time to effect but it is essential if there is to be an impact on society

Stretch:
It is not only the parents and students who need to understand the value of education it is also the District level staff and this has to be developed as a part of the inputs, bringing together the different input elements and making them coherent and so achieving the synergy will require managerial skills that also need to be developed and nurtured (under the CD program of the current GPE and under other programs).

2. Efficiency

Improved female Survival Rate Form 1 – Form 4

Supported by financial stability at schools, termination of corporal punishment, EMIS data available to verify progress in a timely manner.

Problem:
The female survival rate trend shows little consistent improvement. Participatory consultation at the district and school levels has identified a variety of causes which are more or less important in different districts and schools. A one size fits all response is not what is required but rather an examination and response on the lines of 'local solutions to local problems'.

Inputs:
a) Counselling and careers guidance for all children on the benefits of continuing learning
b) The advocacy with parents and communities on importance of education as well as child protection issues and establishing committees
c) Leadership development so that district, school and community leaders can advocate for girls to continue learning

Outcomes
Parents and communities, children and staff can have a good knowledge of the causes for girls failing to continue and can respond to this with the specific solutions needed. Understanding in communities that there are challenges for girls that are not educations alone but are cross sectorial and cross cultural and that working across the community level interventions is important (health, education, social protection, welfare etc.)

Transformation:
The transformational nature of the interventions will be to engage the whole community in analysing and then responding to the problems identified. This is 2 stage, firstly the understanding of the importance and value of education and then secondly identifying the problems and responses. It will take time but will be genuinely transformational.

Stretch:
MoPSE head office and the provincial and district offices have to learn a new modus operando that will build the engagement with the community on specific issues and then responding to the agreed solutions. It will require MoPSE inputs after the program has finished to embed this approach in the overall way of working.

3. Learning outcomes

Primary school teachers of mathematics successfully participate in the in-service mathematics training program to develop skills and knowledge so they can deliver the content of the New Curriculum: 2019: 2 teachers per school in half 36 districts: 6123 teachers, 2020: 2 teachers per school in the remaining 36 districts: 6123 teachers

Supported by:
Zimbabwe Early Learning Assessment (ZELA) findings up to 2017, reported, adopted and top 3 recommendations implemented (2019)
Every school received a package of documentation related to the curriculum framework, syllabi and continuous assessment tasks

Problem:
The Government focus on STEM requires a solid mathematics basis for all learners, inadequate success in mathematics by children throughout the system will make this difficult to acheve. There is a major disparity between the urban and the rural P3 schools. The causes for low performance are myriad but home poverty is contributing (lack of food, distance to school, lack of parental support) as is poor environment and teachers managing with few resources. P3 schools also have the largest numbers of

untrained teachers so additional support is essential.

Inputs:
a) School financing policy to provide for more equitable and secure funding
b) Using the ZELA analysis to identify and implement specific interventions
c) Providing all schools with a handbook/ package of materials to help understanding of the new curriculum and continuous assessment (for advocacy with the staff, students and with parents and the community).
d) Developing and/ or strengthening the cluster based support network for mathematics teachers
e) Mathematics resources for the poorest schools Additional teaching guides or textbooks, including tips for particularly difficult topics or concepts.
standardised mock examination papers that focus on Grades 5, 6 and 7.
Mathematic kits, inclusive of certain simple material needed for learners to apply math

Outputs:
Poorer schools are better equipped with more knowledgeable teachers and with access to relevant learning materials and support systems.

Outcomes:
Children from the poorest schools show improvement in mathematics mastery. A reference target will be to see the pass rates in P3 schools improving at Grade 7

Transformation:
The new curriculum provides an opportunity to have a focussed and intensive training on knowledge and skills needed to deliver the curriculum and the opportunity to provide the necessary learning materials. This backed by an effective support mechanism through the clusters can serve to transform the maths learning.

Stretch:
While MoPSE has a good knowledge of how to reach many teachers through cascade training, the development of a training package for use requires considerable effort as will the coordination and support to build the cluster level management.

VI.3 Means of verification

Please complete the table below by providing an overview of means of verification for each of the three dimensions, the timing and methodology (including inclusiveness) of the process for determining whether the target is reached as well as the process to determine (partial) disbursements based on the results. The means of verification should include:

1) Responsible party
2) Source document
3) Indicative timing of validation by local education group.

➔ *Extend and adapt the table if more rows are needed to fit the Program, by copying/pasting rows as relevant.*

TABLE 10 |

Target attainment verification for disbursement

Means of verification	Month and year of target attainment verification	Month and year of disbursement of variable part
1. Equity		
Indicator:	Transition rate Grade 7 to Form 1 for 17 lowest Districts (avg.)	
Internal verification: Verification report from GA Draft ESPR report to be available and circulated 2 weeks prior to the sector review Approval of ESPR report by the ECG External verification: Independent verification by third party to be done annually in the form of school sample survey	November /December 2018 and 2019	January 2019 and 2020
Indicator:	Education Act revision including rejection of corporal punishment	
Internal verification: 1. Minister informs ECG of submission and this is reported in the 2018 ESPR	By December 2018 and 2019	January 2019 for 1st disbursement and January 2020 for second disbursements. However, if the verification is completed

2. Minister informs ECG of cabinet approval and reported in the 2019 ESPR		before this date, then the funds can be disbursed earlier - within 3 months of verification
Indicator:	School Improvement Grant released in Quarter 1	
List of all schools receiving SIG to be produced and shared with GPE and stakeholders in the ECG annually by 31st March 2019 Internal verification: GA reports April 2019 External verification: 1- Report produced using the existing mechanism of EDF with a specific action to confirm the timing of disbursement. 2- CSO survey report April 2019	April 2019	June/July 2019
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above set of rows and paste them here.*		
2. Efficiency		
Indicator:	Female Survival Rate Form 1-4	
Internal verification: Verification by GA and PRS immediately following data entry. Draft ESPR report to be available and circulated by 31st October annually. The data in the draft ESPR must be complete and accurate; the presentation formats and analytical work may be amended following the JSR with partners. External verification: Independent verification by third party to be done annually in the form of school sample survey	December 2018 and 2019	January 2019 for 1st disbursement and January 2020 for second disbursements

Indicator:	School Financing Policy submitted to Cabinet	
Internal verification: 1. Minister informs ECG of submission and this is reported in the 2018 ESPR 2. Minister informs ECG of cabinet approval and reported in the 2019 ESPR	November / December 2018	January 2019
Indicator:	EMIS data available by Quarter 3	
Internal verification: Verification by ECG where analysis and dissemination will be a standing agenda item to the ECG. Draft ESPR report reflects the EMIS	September 2019	As soon as verified
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above set of rows and paste them here.*		
3. Learning outcomes		
Indicator:	Number of Primary teachers (G1-G7) that have participated in the in-service training program using a new training package for math	
Internal verification: ECG minutes External verification: Independent verification by third party will be done annually in the form of school sample survey	December 2018 and 2019	February 2019 February 2020
Indicator:	ZELA findings and recommendations adopted and implemented	
ZELA assessment at grade 2 to be conducted in 2018 with full report available by 31st March 2019. Review of ZELA reports from previous years up to 2018 to be analysis and recommendations reviewed to determine the top 3 recommendations to be taken forward by	March 2019 and 2020	April 2019 for 1st disbursement and April 2020 for second disbursements

October 2018.		
Indicator:	Every school has received the Curriculum package	
Internal verification: DSI reports consolidated by PRS and presented to ECG External verification Independent verification by third party to be done annually in the form of school sample survey	November/ December 2018	January 2019
➔ *For more rows, copy a set of the above set of rows and paste them here.*		

VII. INCLUSIVE APPROACH

VII.1 Consultation

In 300 words, please:

- Discuss the scope and depth of collaboration in the development of the application within the local education group, the government and its development partners including civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, and the private sector.
- Describe if and how the development of the application has strengthened local education group collaboration.

The Education Coordinating Group (ECG) is the country's Local Education Group. The government takes the lead in this forum with the Minister of Primary and Secondary Education as the Chair, the Permanent Secretary as the Deputy Chair, and the Department of Policy, Research and Statistics as the Secretariat. From the partners, for GPE programs, DFID is the Coordinating Agency while UNICEF is the Grant Agent. Other key members of the ECG are World Bank, UNESCO, CAMFED and the Education Coalition of Zimbabwe (ECOZI) which represents civil society organizations.

The engagement of the ECG in the current application has been extensive, as the process has involved several iterations. There have been 2 stages: the first was when the country was only applying for the Variable Tranche there was comprehensive ECG engagement, a

small working group, which included MOPSE Planning directorate, DFID, UNICEF and ECOZI, had been established which reported to the ECG. The second stage started with the decision to apply for the additional grant of $10m under the Multiplier Fund in November 2017 and to make it a joint application for both the Variable Tranche and the Multiplier Fund. In the ECG meeting held shortly after the Education Sector Performance Review in January 2018 the ECG again affirmed the continued application and to meeting the full submission May 2018 deadline.

This process, though long, has meant that the members of the ECG have increasingly engaged in the policy level issues. The establishment of ad hoc working groups to address specific issues has become a part of the roles of donors, CSOs and Governments and regular contributions are being made which has strengthened the dialogue and collaboration. These include this application, reviewing progress against the ESSP, review of curriculum implementation, school level financing policy, and the revisions to the Education Act.

VII.2 Sign-off

Signature of applicant ministry representative	
The below signatory endorses this application on behalf of the government. (Please scan this page after signature and include it as an attached file to the submission.)	
Name of signatory:	**Prof. Paul Mavima**
Job title/ ministry:	**Honorable Minister of Primary and Secondary Education**
Date:	4/30/2018
Signature:	

Signature of the grant agent representative (Country Director of agency)	
The below signatory endorses this application on behalf of the grant agent agency or organization. (Please scan this page after signature and include it as an attached file to the submission.)	
Name of signatory:	**Mohammed Ag Ayoya**
Job title/ agency:	**Representative, UNICEF Zimbabwe**
Date:	4/30/2018

Annex I:

DEFINITIONS	
The definitions below explain how certain terms used in the template should be understood within the context of the ESPIG:	
Relating to funding modalities	
Sector Pooled	This refers to a scenario of diverse group of grant or credit modalities with varying instruments and mechanisms. The specificity for sector pooled funds is that multiple contributing partners deliver funds in a coordinated fashion to support implementation of the national education plan, or specific parts thereof. Under this modality, country systems are normally used for procurement, financial management, M&E and reporting.
Project pooled / Co-financed	This refers to a scenario where the funding mechanism is made up of different source agency funds to support a common project.
Project/ Stand-alone	This refers to a scenario where the funding mechanism is unilateral, or in other words, not pooled with any other sources of financing.
Relating to key indicators	
Number of 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	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 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	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.
Relating to system areas	
Education Monitoring and Information System EMIS	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, 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.[16]

[16] Definition of EMIS from the Global Monitoring Report (UNECO, 2008), page 101.

Learning assessment system	**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."[17] 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."[18] 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.

[17] *Clarke, M. (2012) "What Matters Most for Student Assessment Systems: A Framework Paper."* SABER-Student Assessment Working Paper 1. *Washington, DC: WB.*

[18] Ravela, P. et al. (2008). "The Educational Assessment that Latin America Needs". *Working Paper Series No. 40*. Washington, DC: PREAL, p. 17.