

# Application Form for Multiplier Education Sector Program Implementation Grant – Multiplier ESPIG<sup>1</sup>

OVERVIEW	
Country:	Ghana
Grant agent(s):	The World Bank
Coordinating agency(ies):	Chair: UNICEF/Co-chair: USAID
Date of submission of the endorsed ESP/TEP:	1/14/2019
Period of the ESP/TEP:	2018-2030
Date of submission of the full application package:	10/31/2019
Program name (optional):	Ghana Accountability for Learning Outcomes Project (GALOP)
Multiplier ESPIG amount requested:	\$15,000,000
Multiplier ESPIG - Fixed Part <sup>2</sup> :	\$9,820,000
Multiplier ESPIG - Variable Part <sup>3</sup> :	\$5,180,000
Co-funding mobilized:	\$150,000,000
Agency fees (Multiplier) – additional to allocation:	\$262,500
Regular ESPIG amount requested:	\$9,400,000
Regular ESPIG - Fixed Part <sup>4</sup> :	\$6,580,000
Regular ESPIG - Variable Part <sup>5</sup> :	\$2,820,000
Agency fees (Regular ESPIG) - additional to the country allocation:	\$164,500
Estimated starting date:	2/14/2020
Estimated closing date (last day of the month, e.g. May <u>30</u> , 2025):	12/31/2024
Expected submission date of completion report:	6/30/2025
<b>Grant currency</b> - please enter 'X' in the box to indicate the currency of the grant amount and fees	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> US Dollar
	<input type="checkbox"/> Euro <sup>6</sup>
<b>Grant modality</b> - (please enter 'X') <sup>7</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/> Sector Pooled
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Pooled/ Co-financed
	<input type="checkbox"/> Project/ Stand-alone

<sup>1</sup> This application form was revised in January 2019.

<sup>2</sup> Including other grant agent costs such as supervision, country offices, etc. (See "supplemental program cost" section of this application).

<sup>3</sup> Including other grant agent costs such as supervision, country offices, etc. Please note that any grant agent costs which is allocated to the variable part can only be disbursed if indicators are reached.

<sup>4</sup> Including other grant agent costs. Grant agent costs allocated to the variable part can only be disbursed if indicators are reached.

<sup>5</sup> Including other grant agent costs. Grant agent costs allocated to the variable part can only be disbursed if indicators are reached.

<sup>6</sup> Only applicable to grants approved after January 1, 2019, including grant applications submitted in November 2018.

<sup>7</sup> See Annex 1 for definitions.

## **NOTE TO THE USER**

### **Disclosure of ESPIG Documents:**

→ Following the final GPC/Board approval of this application, the final document will be published on GPE website. This is in line with GPE's transparency policy, requiring that all approved ESPIG applications and other related documents including program documents, and Joint Sector Review reports or aide memoirs will be published on GPE website under the country pages of the developing country partner unless objected by the individual country. Please note that sensitive personal information, including phone numbers and email addresses, will be redacted/erased from documents prior to publishing on our website.

### **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 quarterly 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. Please also review the document "Guidance to the Grants and Performance Committee for Evaluating the Expression of Interest," available at: <https://www.globalpartnership.org/funding/gpe-multiplier>. In case additional information is needed, the applicant can contact the country lead at the Secretariat.

### **Application Package:**

→ The full ESPIG application package is considered an integral part of the /GPC or 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

---

<b>I. Multiplier ESPIG</b>	<b>4</b>
I.1 Sources and types of co-financing	
<b>II. Fulfilment of the requirements - Fixed Part</b>	<b>4</b>
II.1 A credible, endorsed ESP/TEP	
II.2 Evidence of commitment to finance the endorsed ESP/TEP	
II.3 Availability of critical data	
<b>III. Country information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>IV. Program</b>	<b>7</b>
IV.1 Program description	
IV.2 Expected outputs	
IV.3 Financial overview	
IV.4 Aid effectiveness	
<b>V. Variable Part</b>	<b>11</b>
V.1 Variable part strategies in equity, efficiency, learning outcomes	
V.2 Variable part indicators, targets and means of verification	
V.3 Disbursement mechanism	
<b>VI. Inclusive Approach</b>	<b>14</b>
VI.1 Development Partners	
VI.2 Sign-off	
<b>Annex I: Definitions of terms</b>	<b>15</b>

## I. MULTIPLIER ESPIG

### II.1 Sources and types of co-financing

The GPE Multiplier 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.).

The Amount of funding should equal or exceed the value of co-financing included in the Expression of Interest. If it does not, please provide an explanation.

The Application may not be approved if the total value of all co-financing is lower than the US\$ 3 to US\$ 1 ratio required to access the Maximum Country Allocation from the Multiplier.

#	Partner	Amount (US\$)	Instrument (grant, loan, etc.)
1	International Development Association	150,000,000	IDA credit
2			
3			
4			
5			
	<b>Total in US\$:</b>	<b>150,000,000</b>	

## II. FULFILLMENT OF FUNDING REQUIREMENTS – FIXED PART

### II.1 Requirement 1: An endorsed quality ESP/TEP<sup>8</sup>

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 Ghana ESP (2018-2030) is aligned with the SDGs, the African Union Agenda 2063, and the national vision as outlined by the National Development Planning Commission, and the government manifesto. It lays out the vision, mission, institutional functions and guiding principles that underpin the orientation of the ESP; and is evidence-based and informed by the ESA. It addresses the whole education sector, from kindergarten to higher education, including TVET, non-formal education, and special education. These sub-sectors are mapped around three critical policy objectives: equitable access, quality teaching and learning, and sustainable and efficient management. The ESP development process was inclusive, participatory, and consultative, involving all key stakeholders. The key policy priorities and strategies articulated in the ESP reflect the shared goals in advancing access, equity, learning outcomes, and accountability in the education sector in Ghana.

ESP and ESMTDP and the accompanying financial simulation model were independently appraised and confirmed the comprehensive nature of the ESP, strong national ownership, evidence-based orientation, and identification of key performance indicators to track progress. The appraisal also highlighted areas that required additional scrutiny and work relating to educational outcomes among disadvantaged groups, costing of activities to ensure a realistic estimation of the funding gap, re-assessing the allocation of resources across sub-sectors, assessing need and developing a plan for capacity development, and further strengthening the monitoring and evaluation framework and risk assessment.

The Ministry of Education (MOE) took on board the recommendations and committed to addressing them as outlined in their July 18, 2018 memo to the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). The MOE initiated key actions: a) setting up of the Education Reform Secretariat to prioritize key reforms around basic education curriculum and teachers in the initial four years; b) factoring in relevant costs for additional classrooms and textbooks on an incremental and annual basis; and c) re-defining the indicative resource envelope based on a system of revenue and expenditure management which allows all sector related expenditures to be mapped and reported, including projections for both donor as well as internally generated funds.

In addition, the MOE also committed to further analysis of participation and educational outcomes among disadvantaged groups, including children living in the three regions of northern Ghana and those with disability, especially with reference to the upcoming national population census in 2020 to better inform targeted strategies. As part of its efforts to strengthen the inclusive and gender approach in the sector, the MOE will adopt a holistic approach to the curriculum review; and put strategies in place to increase recruitment of female teachers as part of the reforms.

The IDA/GPE financed basic education project - Ghana Accountability for Learning Outcomes Project (GALOP) – was also designed to support development and implementation of targeted strategies aligned with the ESMTDP and ESP to improve equity, learning outcomes, and accountability in Ghana. It will

support the delivery of key commitments made around capacity development and routine generation and use of data for decision-making and tracking progress.

The ESP and the ESMTDP were presented to the cabinet sub-committee and approved by Ghana's Cabinet in November 2018, subject to the MOE considering two main recommendations: a) review the total resource envelope to education and take into consideration the IGF and Donor funds as projected by the Ministry of Finance for 2018-21, which the initial ESP Financing Model noted but did not include in the presentation of the funding gap; and b) include a caveat to ensure that annual plans in the Medium-Term Plans are revised yearly in line with the national budgeting processes given by the Ministry of Finance. Although the MoF has medium term projections for 4 years, it calls for annual revision of the current year cost estimates, ensuring the alignment with provisions.

In January 2019, the Local Education Group endorsed the ESMTDP/ESP and highlighted the need to revisit the cost and financing framework to take on board the cabinet recommendations. The MOE responded positively and through a memo dated March 2018, discussed the subsequent revision of the ESP, ESMTDP, and the accompanying cost and financing framework during a Sector Working Group meeting in April 2019. The funding gap remains at 2.5% in 2018, 10.9% in 2019, 11.3% in 2020 and 11.1% in 2021. The estimation of the funding gap does not include the cabinet approved annual 3 percentage point increase of the education budget as percentage of the government national budget for 2018-2021 as this is subject for annual requests from MOE and hence is not fixed. Going forward, given the ambition of the ESP and the expected increase in the student flow expected in the coming years, the financing and budgeting will need to be keenly monitored and managed to ensure adequate financing for prioritized actions for improved equity and learning.

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

Please use the table below to provide information on external resource mobilization. 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.

Please provide the latest evidence of domestic resource mobilization using the template for Requirement Matrix Annex on Domestic Financing available on the GPE website via [this link](#).<sup>9</sup> Attach the completed template to this application.

**TABLE 1 | Evidence of external resource mobilization**

<b>Actual value for three years</b>	<b>Target values for the period of the Program</b>
<b>Data for the past three years</b> (Data for 2016-17 are from ESPR 2018 and reflect actual expenditure)	<b>Data for the relevant duration of the program</b> (Data for 2018-23 are from the updated ESP financing model, March 2019)

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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](mailto:gpe_grant_submission@globalpartnership.org).

2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
<b>Education sector plan</b>								
Education sector plan cost (GHS billion)								
6,922	8,544	11,905	11,145	13,567	14,326	16,425	17,140	
External funding – excluding GPE funds (GHS billion)								
0.370	0.137	0.278	0.292	0.248	0.144	0.126	0.082	
Funding gap as recorded in the ESP (GHS million)								
		271.6	1,321.7	1,438.4	1,422.4	949.5	941.0	
GPE support (local currency)								
GHS 125.29 million (\$24.4 million)								

**TABLE 2 | Major interventions of development partners**

Donor name	Major interventions	Financial scale (amount)	Years covered
JICA	<p><b>Project for Improving Learning Outcomes through Community Participation for Sustainable School for All” (COMPASS)</b></p> <p><b>Project Purpose:</b> By 2024, a model to improve learning outcomes at the primary level through collaboration with communities and schools is made available for scale-up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Output 1:</b> Participatory school management and information sharing mechanism is improved.</li> <li><b>Output 2:</b> Pupils' learning outcomes in numeracy are improved.</li> <li><b>Output 3:</b> SMC monitoring system at district and school levels is strengthened.</li> <li><b>Output 4:</b> A model is refined in terms of scalability in subsequent regions based on the lessons learned.</li> </ul>	Approx. USD 4,000,000	2019-2024
DFID	<p><b>Transforming Teacher Education and Learning (T-TEL) – under Girls-PASS (G-PASS):</b></p> <p><b>Outcome:</b> Over 30,000 beginning teachers demonstrating better skills and practice, applying student- centered and gender-sensitive approaches to teaching and learning.</p> <p><b>Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over 60,000 teachers going into basic education schools able to teach in a way more suited to the level of children in their classes, interactive, and gender-responsive.</li> <li>30,000 teachers gaining new 4-year Bachelor of Education degrees</li> <li>Established National education policy system to enable the implementation of teacher education reforms through effective performance monitoring and oversight</li> <li>Strengthened quality assurance and regulatory systems in the education sector.</li> <li>Curriculum reforms implemented through teacher education universities and affiliated Colleges of Education.</li> </ul>	£25 million	2014-2020

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthened institutional environment within Colleges of Education, enabling them to meet the new Teaching Standards.</li> <li>Capacity of 46 Colleges of Education, 5 universities, policy/regulatory bodies in MOE (NCTE, NaCCA, NIB, NTC) and partner schools enhanced to implement new B.ED, NTS, NTECF, conversion of CoEs.</li> <li>Partner schools aligned with the new curriculum and delivering effective teaching and learning.</li> </ul>		
	<p><b>Education Beyond Aid (EBA)</b>  <b>Outcome:</b> To increase the Ministry of Education’s self-reliance in managing the education sector and delivering quality education services to Ghana’s children, including to the most vulnerable  <b>Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry of Education owning and implementing reforms and driving delivery across education in Ghana, through support to the MOE for running a Reform Secretariat to help improve delivery of priority education reforms</li> <li>Ministry of Education able to effectively resource, manage and implement CBE programmes to reach out-of-school girls and boys - including supporting an additional 40,000 out-of-school children into primary school via CBE by the end of 2020</li> <li>Technical assistance is being provided to support implementation of key reforms aimed at improving the quality of teaching and learning in basic education (e.g. curriculum and assessment, inspections, teacher education, education workforce reforms), and to support MOE to take on effective management of CBE</li> <li>Research into ongoing issues related to CBE and transition to government</li> </ul>	£4.95 million	2018-2022
	<p><b>Girls’ Education Challenge programme (GEC)</b>  <b>Outcome:</b> Improved access to quality of education for girls in developing countries, including the most marginalized through non-state actors.  <b>Outputs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>163,100 marginalised girls supported to gain quality education in total</li> <li>MG-Cubed: 18,000 girls (both in-school and out-of-school), in 72 schools in Volta, and Greater Accra Regions (14,400 direct and 3,600 indirect), supported to complete primary school, transition into secondary and achieve higher learning outcomes.</li> <li>Discovery: 125,000 marginalised girls in 800 primary and secondary schools supported to gain better learning outcomes, life skills and aspirations.</li> <li>STAGE: 20,100 marginalised girls in Central, Northern, Upper East and West, Volta and the Eastern Regions, supported to gain quality education through CBE classes, and transition into formal school or jobs, of which 2,000 will be girls with disabilities</li> </ul>	£33.3 million	2012-2023
UNESCO	<p><b>Outcome: By 2022, more girls and boys (including persons living with disability) in Ghana complete quality electronic-based education with improved learning outcomes.</b></p>	USD7,220,640	2018-2022



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Output 1:</b> Improved access to Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) and HIV/AIDS information and services by young persons from the community to national levels.</li> <li>• <b>Output 2:</b> Improved capacity of teachers and students including persons living with disability in e- learning for enhanced teaching and learning in basic schools.</li> <li>• <b>Output 3:</b> Improved national framework for coordinating and monitoring teaching and learning processes at all levels.</li> <li>• <b>Output 4:</b> Increased availability information on the competence and conditions of service of pre-primary personnel to inform policy.</li> </ul>		
UNICEF	<p><b>Outcome: By 2022, more girls and boys in Ghana complete quality and inclusive basic education with improved learning outcomes.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Output 1:</b> Operational frameworks for improved kindergarten service delivery in place and implemented at national and subnational level.</li> <li>• <b>Output 2:</b> Effective and inclusive teaching and learning practices modelled in primary education</li> <li>• <b>Output 3:</b> Improved capacity at national and sub-national level to support inclusive education and adolescent girls to progress and complete basic education.</li> <li>• <b>Output 4:</b> Improved capacity for decentralized planning and monitoring for results in basic education.</li> <li>• <b>Output 5:</b> Stronger policy frameworks, coordination mechanism, and evidence-generation for improved equity and learning in the education sector.</li> </ul>	USD 23,000,000* (*indicative resource envelope submitted to the Executive Board)	2018-2022
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Output 6:</b> Technical support for development and implementation of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) in school strategy based on lessons learned in select districts/regions.</li> </ul>	USD 3,500,000*	2018-2022
USAID	<b>USAID Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS)</b> in process and discussion phase with GOG partners.	USD 18-20,000,000/year (est.)	2019-2025
World Bank	<p><b>Ghana Accountability for Learning Outcomes Project (GALOP)</b></p> <p>Key expected outcomes include an increase in the percentage of targeted schools with teaching practices meeting inspection standards; an increase in the number of students benefitting from direct interventions to enhance learning; an increase in the percentage of targeted kindergarten and primary schools with pupil trained teacher ratio below 50:1; and an increase in the number of schools where heads and teachers use the accountability dashboard data during meetings with their peers and their communities.</p>	USD 150,000,000	2019-2024
	<p><b>Secondary Education Improvement Project (SEIP)</b></p> <p>The development objective is to increase access to senior secondary education in underserved districts and improve quality in low performing senior high schools (SHSs) through: (a) carrying out the construction of 23 new senior high schools in selected districts; (b) improving 208 existing senior high schools through expansion and rehabilitation of</p>	USD 196,000,000 (including an additional financing of US\$40,000,000)	2014-2021

	existing structures and facilities; and (c) providing 20,000 scholarships and bursaries to students from low income families, especially girls.		
--	---	--	--

### II.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

#### II.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.<sup>10</sup>

The ESP is informed by the Education Sector Analysis which was specifically commissioned under the ESPDG. The analysis comprised of three cross-cutting thematic deep dives where there was an observed knowledge and evidence gap. These included:

- **Equity Analysis:** The deep dive explored the key social categories associated with disparities in education indicators in Ghana, relating to poverty, location/region, gender, and disability. It reflected on: a) the correlation of children who are not in school with the identified social categories; b) at which levels of education (kindergarten, primary school, JHS, SHS, tertiary education) do disparities in school participation and in learning outcomes appear and widen, for example girls in secondary education; c) how do these disparities reflect in education attainment and achievement among young people entering adult life; and d) to what extent do public policies, as reflected by public expenditure on education affect equity as well as state and non-state provisioning of education.

The equity analysis built on (did not replicate) on two ongoing analytical studies in 2017-2018. One of these included the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) report on [“Leaving no one behind in the education and health sectors”](#), which addresses the questions of who is being left behind, and why based on an integrated analysis of data, policy, financing and service delivery. The other initiative was the UNICEF led piloting of the draft Education Sector Analysis for Inclusive Education in Ghana, a partnership between UNICEF, GPE, and IIEP-Pole De Dakar, which helped in assessing the existing policy framework for inclusive education in Ghana, availability of data on disability and its limitations, systems capacity to implement inclusive education, and adequacy of financing. A draft report is available which is being used to advocate and inform within Ghana, including the Ghana ESA, while the sector analysis guidelines are being finalized globally. In addition, a social assessment was completed as part of the process of preparing GALOP and which also touches upon issues of social and gender equity and inclusion (and is attached).

<sup>10</sup> 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.

**System Capacity Analysis:** The deep dive reflected on two aspects of system capacity: capacity of the education system to enroll children and deliver learning outcomes and as the capacity of the MOE to manage the system. The former analyzed whether capacity to enroll was within acceptable teachers/pupil ratios (especially trained teachers/pupil ratios) and what were the prospects for the period of implementation of the new ESP 2018–2030, especially given the anticipated fertility rates. And whether these inputs can deliver improved learning outcomes at the different levels of education for all children, including analysis of key supply-side factors of variation in performance between schools. The latter focused more on institutional capacity of the MOE to design, implement and monitor policies through its headquarters, regional and district offices, and through its multiple agencies.

- **Cost and Financing Analysis:** The deep dive covered two main activities: a) assessment of the current cost and finance situation in the education system in Ghana to provide a realistic basis to cost and prioritize future policies; and b) development of a detailed financial model to derive costed policy scenarios, particularly for the ESMTDP (2018–2021).

Each of the deep dives is accompanied by a stand-alone analytical report as well as an integrated ESA (available on the GPE website). The analysis has also informed the ESP, and this was acknowledged and confirmed in the appraisal report in November 2018 as well as the QAR in January 2019.

### II.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.<sup>11</sup>

The last submission to UIS was in July 2018 and provided EMIS data for the 2017/18 academic year. The missing data was restricted to the number of students who participated in the pre-service training/internship at the Colleges of Education. Overall, the EMIS data is consistently disaggregated by sex and is available at school, district, regional, and national level.

MOE, in partnership with Social Impact, recently concluded a data mapping exercise. The mapping highlighted the multiplicity of data collection tools available and in use within different projects. There is a degree of overlap between the indicators across tools indicating duplication of efforts. Some of the data collected is not used, while there are certain data which are required but not collected. Additionally, the data collected may not speak to each other as the tools are often projectized and not aligned.

The annual school census EMIS was identified to be the only database with school level data representative on a national level but is underutilized with poor data sharing and feedback mechanisms. EMIS covers both public and private schools, collects data on key indicators including enrollment, repeaters, teachers, infrastructure and learning materials. However, EMIS lacks data on system performance at the school level such as learning outcomes, student attendance, teacher absenteeism or time on task. National data gaps also exist with reference to:

- Disaggregated data for vulnerable groups (OOSC, special needs, socio-economic groups, age-specific)

<sup>11</sup> 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.

- Human resource data (teacher deployment etc.)
- System performance indicators (learning outcomes, teacher and student attendance)

When and where data are collected, there are also challenges in expediting data analysis, reporting, sharing data with schools/districts, and data utilization. Limited use of technology to support school monitoring, inspections and data reporting constrains availability and use of data. Information is also stored across different databases, departments and paper files often preventing their availability and utilization. Available household surveys – GLSS, GDHS, & MICS – help to put the spotlight on educational attainment of vulnerable groups and highlight equity issues. However, household data is rarely used to analyze or inform education sector planning consistently in the sector

The MOE and its agencies are committed to addressing these challenges and relevant strategies are reflected in the ESMTDP/ESP 2018-2030:

- EM 3.8.1: Design, implement, and enforce an education accountability framework along the chain of education service delivery, from the MOE to the school level
- EM 3.8.2: Strengthen M&E units and processes throughout the education system to improve the EMIS
- EM 3.8.3: Establish and operationalize a reform secretariat to drive policy reform and associated delivery units to oversee implementation of reforms

In practical terms this will involve harmonizing all inspection tools, digitizing inspection tools and EMIS (data will be collected using tablets) and linking it to school mapping and student tracking; and this is being planned and financed through both government and DP funding. MOE and its agencies will initiate the development of a data strategy to improve country-level policy processes and systems that make data use – both traditional and new - integral to policy formulation, implementation, and monitoring. The GALOP project will create an accountability dashboard through the review and scale up of the mobile school report card (mSRC), linked with other relevant data bases. The mSRC indicators will be determined through a need based participatory data mapping exercise across MOE and its agencies. These interventions will lay the foundation of an accountability for learning framework which will inform frequency of data collection through monitoring at each level, consolidation of information for decision making, and protocols for data usage and sharing.

### II.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;
- Highlight any gaps and provide summary of strategies to address these, including how the implementation of the strategies will be financed.<sup>12</sup>

Currently, the only available national learning assessment is the Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) examination at JHS3 – which is conducted after 2 years of kindergarten, 6 years of primary, and 3 years of junior high school education. Other available assessments at the primary level are sample-based and statistically representative only at the regional and national level. These include biennial assessments – Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA), Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (EGMA), and National Education Assessments (NEA). The latter are helpful in benchmarking performance, however being

<sup>12</sup> 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.

sample-based are not adequate to identify schools or districts that require targeted interventions and support, nor sufficiently diagnostic to inform the content of the targeted support.

The ESP recognizes this and is committed to addressing the gaps through specific strategies at the basic and secondary level, including:

BE 2.2 Improved learning assessment to support learning achievement of basic school pupils

- BE 2.2.2: Promote the development of assessment systems for tracking both pupils and school performance on a periodic basis
- BE 2.2.3: Strengthen the learning assessment agencies under the MOE

SE 2.3: Improved quality and relevance of SHS curriculum and enhanced delivery of curriculum and assessment framework

- SE 2.3.4: Strengthen assessment to inform instructional interventions

As part of the comprehensive standards-based curriculum reform and as a zero-year deliverable under GALOP, the National Council on Curriculum and Assessment (NaCCA) is currently leading on the development of a National Assessment Framework for pre-tertiary education, including an assessment strategy for pre-primary (school readiness) and primary education administered in KG2 and grades 2,4, and 6 to better measure the quality of learning outcomes and inform targeted interventions in teaching and learning pedagogy in the classrooms. The framework is expected to be inclusive and take on board the needs of children with special education needs and disabilities. The same is expected to be operationalized during the GALOP time-frame with government as well as DP funding, with the former focusing on grade 4 performance.

### III. 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:	30,000,000
GDP Per Capita (USD):	2,046.11
School year runs from (month to month):	September to July
Budget cycle runs from (month to month):	January to December

### IV. PROGRAM

#### IV.1 Program description (extracted from program document)

Provide below the location (page numbers) in the program document where a description of the program can be found. This includes information on program objectives, and related expected outcomes, and the components and sub-components with financing amounts.

OR:

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.
- Indicate as relevant GPE's anticipated share by components and sub-components if this is a co-financed project.

**NOTE:** it is highly encouraged that a summary of the program description is provided. Unlike the program document, this application is translated to give non-bilingual GPC and Board members an understanding of the program during their review of the application package.

The Ghana Accountability for Learning Outcomes Project (GALOP) is a five-year project supported by IDA credit of US\$150 million and a GPE grant of US\$ 24.4 million. From the total grant amount, US\$ 500,000 will be allocated to support supervision costs and US\$ 23.9 million will support activities under below listed components. The project is targeted at the basic education sub-sector including KG (KG1 and KG2) and primary (P1 to P6) grades. While system-level interventions would be national in scope to ensure full harmonization, learning interventions would be implemented in selected basic schools that have the greatest challenges in terms of learning outcomes and resourcing. The proposal's theory of change address GPE's strategic goals of equity, efficiency and learning outcomes. The program is aligned with the ESP/ESMTDP and mainstreams implementation through the Ministry of Education and the Ghana Education Service; and promotes monitoring of the agreed results through existing EMIS/ESP indicators where relevant as well as inclusion of new indicators to better capture learning outcomes.

**The Project Development Objective (PDO)** is "to improve the quality of education in low performing basic education schools and strengthen education sector equity and accountability in Ghana". The PDO is measured by four indicators: (i) increased percentage of targeted schools with teaching practices meeting inspection standards; (ii) students benefitting from direct interventions to enhance learning (of which female); (iii) increased percentage of targeted KG and primary schools with pupil trained teacher ratio below 50:1; and (iv) increased number of schools using accountability dashboard data during cluster level meetings. PDO indicators measure improvements in the quality of education in low performing basic education schools (PDO indicators 1 and 2), strengthened education sector equity (PDO indicator 3) and strengthened education sector accountability (PDO indicator 4).

**The proposed project would include four components:** (i) Strengthen teaching and learning through support and resources for teachers; (ii) Strengthen school support, management and resourcing; (iii) Strengthen accountability systems for learning; and (iv) Technical assistance, institutional strengthening, monitoring and research. Components 1-3 use a results-based financing (RBF) modality and would build on lessons learned from completed and existing projects implemented in the education sector. Under Component 4, IDA/GPE funds would be disbursed based on World Bank financing guidelines, including regularly updated implementation, procurement and training plans, reviewed and cleared by the World Bank. Targeted interventions under Components 1 and 2 would be implemented in approximately 10,000 basic education schools.

***Component 1: Strengthen teaching and learning through support and resources for teachers (Total DLI allocation: US\$50 million; of which GPE grant is US\$5 million or 10 percent)***

**Sub-component 1.1: Teacher capacity building and innovative delivery of in-service training.** This sub-component would aim to improve teaching practices by providing in-service training (INSET) on the new curriculum, targeted instruction, structured pedagogy, play-based and active-learning pedagogy for KG, awareness and mitigation of school related gender-based violence, gender and disability inclusiveness, child protection and digital literacy. These INSETs will be embedded in a professional learning calendar and be supported by innovative delivery modalities for cost-effectiveness and standardization in the quality of modules being delivered.

**Sub-component 1.2: School-based support and instructional leadership.** This sub-component would aim to improve decentralized systems of school support, coaching and monitoring. It would provide training of support teams (Curriculum Leads, Circuit Supervisors, District Teacher Support Teams (DTSTs), and School Heads) to enable school-based support and instructional leadership. Circuit Supervisors will be trained to take on the role of an instructional coach rather than an inspector. School management and instructional leadership would be provided through the completion of specific courses (e.g. online management course).

**Sub-component 1.3: Provision of teaching and learning materials (TLMs).** This sub-component aims to ensure the provision of teacher guides for the new curriculum, and pupil books (e-readers and workbooks) for targeted instruction. Appropriate TLMs would be provided for early childhood education (KG1 and KG2) and for students with disabilities to support greater disability inclusion in mainstream schools.

For this component, release of IDA and GPE funds would be linked to achievement of Disbursement-Linked Indicator (DLI) 1: Improved teaching practices in targeted schools

***Component 2: Strengthen school support, management and resourcing (Total DLI allocation: US\$63 million; of which GPE grant is US\$5 million or 8 percent)***

**Sub-component 2.1: Learning grants to support activities focused on learning.** All targeted schools will receive a learning grant to implement activities focused on improving learning. Building on existing allocation systems (annual capitation grant), the learning grant will comprise a base grant and a per student allocation. Schools will be given and trained on guidelines on school self-assessments, learning grant utilization (including core activities for learning and a negative list) and templates for learning-oriented proposals and performance contracts. The guidelines will include a differentiated section on materials for kindergarten teaching and learning to promote school readiness. Each school will conduct a self-assessment that will inform the development of a three-year School Performance Improvement Plan (SPIP) proposal, based on which they will sign a performance agreement with the District Education Office. The learning grant will be disbursed annually conditional on grant utilization of at least 80 percent before subsequent disbursements; and the SPIP will be reviewed annually.

**Sub-component 2.2: Strengthening district education management capacity.** District education offices will be strengthened to support incremental costs associated with GALOP activities through existing systems such as the Annual District Education Operational Plans (ADEOPs). Districts will support schools with training on learning grant utilization, development of three-year learning-oriented SPIPs, and consolidation, supervision and monitoring of learning grant utilization. They will support Circuit Supervisors in their role as instructional coaches and facilitate teacher INSET. Additionally, districts will fund cluster-level meetings for heads of schools and SMC members at least once a year to discuss data collected on the accountability

dashboard and to encourage sharing of best practices, knowledge and innovation between schools within a cluster.

**Sub-component 2.3: Strengthening SMCs for enhanced citizen engagement.** This sub-component provides training to strengthen SMC capacity and involvement in improving accountability for learning. The training would (a) functionalize SMCs to ensure participatory and decentralized school-based management; and (b) strengthen capacity for accountable and transparent financial management of learning and capitation grants and resource mobilization. Additional training modules would also be included to extend outreach on gender related issues including School Based Violence (SBV) training sensitization.

For this component, release of IDA and GPE funds would be linked to achievement of DLI 2: Strengthened school support for learning in targeted schools.

***Component 3: Strengthen accountability systems for learning (Total DLI allocation: US\$47 million; of which GPE grant is US\$8 million or 17 percent)***

**Sub-component 3.1: Development and implementation of an accountability for learning framework.** The accountability for learning framework would provide an overview of accountability systems including levels of monitoring and reporting, roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders, key accountability indicators, purposes of assessments, targeted support measures for low performing schools, processes for compliance with the teacher code of conduct, and policy frameworks that guide system responsiveness. It will support the development of digitized accountability data systems including harmonized lesson observation, digitized EMIS annual school census, and real time accountability data dashboard.

**Sub-component 3.2: Development and implementation of a national assessment strategy.** This sub-component would support the development and rollout of a national assessment strategy and implementation of a national P4 learning assessment. The strategy will provide an overview of Ghana's assessment system covering national and international assessments (both census and sample-based). It will provide the purposes, grade levels, time frames, implementation mandates and costs for various assessments, and include a costed implementation, communication and results dissemination plan. Provisions for a simplified school-readiness assessment will also be incorporated. It will also have provisions to ensure students with special education needs are assessed along with their peers. The proposed project would initially support scale up of the P4 assessment in public schools to ensure baseline data and performance indicators are available to measure results. Teacher content knowledge will also be assessed through the marking of sample P4 assessment answer scripts.

**Sub-component 3.3: Policy reforms for efficient education sector human resource management, administrative and leadership practices.** The project would support the development, approval and endorsement of policy reforms to improve teacher efficiency related to (a) teacher recruitment, deployment, transfer and incentives; (b) merit based selection of head teachers; (c) introduction of an administrative fast track for teachers serving in rural schools; (d) staffing and roles of GES and District Education Offices (DEOs); (e) dedicated school leadership program and accompanying qualifications for head teachers; and (f) review of instructional calendar to include dedicated time for higher quality teacher professional development.

For this component, release of IDA and GPE funds would be linked to achievement of the following DLIs:

- DLI 3: Improved accountability for learning in public basic schools



- DLI 4: Improved proficiency in P4 mathematics and English in targeted schools
- DLI 5: Improved equity in the distribution of KG and primary trained teachers in targeted schools

**Component 4: Technical Assistance, institutional strengthening, monitoring, and research (total cost: US\$13.9 million; of which GPE grant is US\$5.9 million or 42 percent)**

The objective of this component is to strengthen MOE and GES implementation capacity and related implementing agencies to ensure effectiveness of the GALOP. This component would provide overall support to the other three components; and include two subcomponents (i) technical assistance for capacity building and institutional strengthening; and (ii) monitoring and evaluation, management, and operational costs. These activities would be financed following standard World Bank investment lending procedures. This component would finance technical assistance, strategic research and data analysis, targeted capacity building of implementing agencies, training, procurement of goods and incremental operating costs.

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:

Project effectiveness – January 2020

## IV.2 Expected Outputs<sup>13</sup> (extracted from program document)

Please complete the table below, extracting relevant information from the detailed program document. If the program plans to purchase and distribute textbooks, train teachers, or build or rehabilitate classrooms, please use the following indicators<sup>14</sup> (GPE Strategic Plan 2016-2020):

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

NOTE: These indicators are NOT compulsory. 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. Replace Year 1, Year 2, etc., with the actual year (for example, 2022, 2023, etc.).

**TABLE 3 | Target outputs per year**

Indicate if calendar year or implementation year <sup>15</sup> : <b>Implementation Year</b>	<b>Baseline (2019)</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2024</b>
Number of textbooks purchased and distributed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of teachers trained (cumulative)	0.00	36,000	60,000	65,000	70,000	76,000

<sup>13</sup> For sector-wide financing (through budget support or pooled funds), a reference could be made to the ESP results framework.

<sup>14</sup> See Annex 1 for definitions of these indicators.

<sup>15</sup> Implementation year begins with grant effectiveness/ signing of grant agreement.

Number of classrooms built or rehabilitated	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

### IV.3 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 4 | Program costs and expected disbursements by year**

Indicate years (e.g., 2023):	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total
Total program costs per implementation year <sup>16</sup> (US\$ millions)	12.750	5.000	1.275	1.575	3.800	24.4
Total program costs per calendar year (US\$ millions)	12.750	5.000	1.275	1.575	3.800	24.4

### IV.4 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 5 | Evolvement of grant financing modality**

	Previous GPE grant	Current application
<b>In relation to the ESP/TEP</b>		
Is the GPE-funded Program aligned with the Education Sector Plan?	Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Are the projected expenditures of the Program included in the multi-year forecast of the Minister of Finance (Medium Term Expenditure Framework)?	Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  <i>Please provide brief justifications/explanations</i>  If No, does the MTEF exist? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>  <i>To be included during the annual budget preparation for 2020</i>  If No, does the MTEF exist? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>In relation to the national budget and parliament</b>		

<sup>16</sup> Implementation year runs by 12-month cycle beginning with grant effectiveness/ signing of grant agreement. For example, if the grant start date or grant signing is expected to occur in July 2020 then the implementation year is July 2020 to June 2021, and July 2020 should be entered as Year 1. The program costs per calendar year for 2020 should reflect the estimated costs for the July – December 2020 period.

<p>Is the GPE funded program clearly indicated in the national budget?</p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Included in national budget as part of donor support</i></p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>To be included during the annual budget preparation for 2020</i></p>
<p>Does the national annual budget show specific appropriations for the different planned expenditures (economic and/or functional classification)? Is GPE funding reflected in the budget by area of allocation and planned utilization, using the existing national classification?</p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Please provide brief justifications/explanations</i></p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Confirmation with the Ministry of Finance on inclusion in GIFMIS in 2020;</i></p>
<p><b>In relation to treasury</b></p>		
<p>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?</p>	<p>Please choose a), b), or c) <i>Please provide brief justifications/explanations (c)</i></p>	<p>Please choose a), b), or c) <i>Please provide brief justifications/explanations (b)</i></p>
<p>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)?</p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>If there are any specific derogations or safeguards, please explain briefly</i></p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>If there are any specific derogations or safeguards, please explain briefly</i></p>
<p><b>In relation to procurement</b></p>		
<p>Are government procurement rules used? If so are there any derogations/safeguards on the use of these rules introduced?</p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>If there are any specific derogations or safeguards, please explain briefly</i></p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <i>If there are any specific derogations or safeguards, please explain briefly</i></p>

In relation to accounting		
<p>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?</p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>If No, are the accounting results afterwards integrated in government's accounting systems? Please explain briefly</i></p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Included in GIFMIS</i></p>
In relation to audit		
<p>Will the financial accounts be audited by the government's external auditor?</p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Please specify who audits the accounts of the financing modality funded or co-funded with the GPE grant</i></p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Please specify who audits the accounts of the financing modality funded or co-funded with the GPE grant</i></p>
In relation to reporting		
<p>Will the information on project execution be included in the Education Sector Plan Annual Implementation Report prepared by the Ministry of Education?</p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Please provide brief justifications/explanations</i></p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>Please provide brief justifications/explanations</i></p>
<p>Will separate / additional reports be required for the Program?</p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Please indicate Yes or No Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p>
IV.4.1 Evolution of aligned assistance		
<p>In 375 words or less, please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Describe how the proposed grant financing modality is evolving in comparison with the previous grant (if applicable) based on the table above.</li> <li>Explain what mechanisms are in place to mitigate fiduciary risks and why they seem appropriate.</li> <li>Detail how the proposed Program lays the foundation for more aligned assistance in the future.</li> </ul>		
<p>The current GPE grant will be included as part of the Ghana Accountability for Learning Outcomes Project (GALOP) through Project Pooled/ Co-financed grant modality. The grant financing modality for GALOP is an IPF with DLIs. The initial GPEG used only the IPF instrument. The advantage of using an IPF with DLIs for GALOP is that it incentivizes disbursements on results achieved. Under the GALOP, 92 percent of the financing will be based on DLIs and 8 percent will be IPF mostly under Component 4. Of the US\$ 23.9 million GPE grant allocation, 75 percent is based on DLIs under Components 1, 2 and 3 and 25 percent will be IPF under Component 4.</p>		

The projected expenditures of the program will be included in the 2020 annual budget preparation, as requested by cabinet following the ESP approval. Hence indicated “yes” in table 5.

The results-based financing modality will rely mainly on implementation through government systems for Component 1 to 3 and on World Bank systems for Component 4. Both, the earlier GPEG and GALOP, have implementation mainstreamed in the MOE and GES in the sense that there is no separate Project Implementation Unit (PIU) for implementing the project’s activities. The Project Technical Team which will coordinate implementation comprises of the MOF, MOE, GES, NaCCA, NTC and NIB officials.

Similar to the earlier GPEG, GALOP is rated *substantial* on institutional capacity and *moderate* on fiduciary assessment. This is because of the project’s reliance on multiple institutions and agencies, several of which are relatively newly established (NTC, NaCCA, and NIB), which may have an impact on the coordination of activities. The institutional capacity under GALOP is therefore rated *substantial*.

The risks associated with financial management and procurement are rated *moderate*, and existing systems are adequate and meet the minimum requirements per World Bank policy on Investment Project Financing. The MOE is also currently implementing an IDA funded project, the Secondary Education Improvement Project (SEIP) with procurement staff who are familiar with the World Bank’s New Procurement Framework (NPF). During the GALOP’s implementation, additional capacity building and continuous support will be provided to ensure successful implementation.

The previous GPEG was initially rated *substantial* on overall risk, however concluded with a *moderate* risk rating. The GALOP also has a *substantial* overall program risk, mainly due to the impending elections (currently scheduled for December 2020) and governance, and the institutional and capacity risks. As with the previous GPEG, the GALOP supports the Government’s current ESP 2018-2030, and hence contributes to enhanced government ownership of the project. Most development partners are also aligned with the ESP and hence complement the GALOPs scope of work.

## V. VARIABLE PART INFORMATION

### V.1 Proposed variable part strategies in equity, efficiency, learning outcomes

For each specific dimension, please:

- Describe the proposed variable part strategies/actions from the Education Sector Plan for each dimension, including the results’ chain (i.e., the link between activities and process, output and outcome indicators).
- For each dimension, explain how proposed strategy is transformational: how will it address a key challenge and lead to system level change over the medium term in basic education?
- For each dimension, provide a justification for how the strategy, inclusive of the proposed indicators and targets, constitutes a “stretch.”

#### 1. Equity

1. **Background and Rationale.** Under the current Education Strategic Plan (ESP), the target PTTR for Ghana through 2030 is 35 pupils for every trained teacher (35:1). While the PTTR in targeted KG and primary schools is roughly 39:1 and 37:1 respectively, which is not far from the ESP target, these figures mask important inequities among and within regions and districts. There are large regional disparities in pupil-teacher ratios and weak correlation at district level between the number of students and teachers, especially at the kindergarten level.

Pupil teacher ratios vary substantially across the country, with districts mostly in the north of Ghana having a shortage of teachers, while districts in the south of Ghana have a surplus of teachers. High pupil teacher ratios are present in both urban and rural schools, with high PTRs in urban schools driven by large class sizes and in rural schools by multi-grade or multi-class teaching<sup>17</sup>. Approximately 25 percent of targeted schools have PTTR above 50:1. Guidelines for the deployment of teachers are not finalized and drafts not clearly disseminated; deployment decisions are largely not driven by data. In addition, teacher turnover is high and variable, with a national average of 12 and 18 percent for KG and primary, respectively.

2. Sub-component 3.3 will support teacher policy reforms to improve teacher management thereby improving equity in the distribution of trained teachers. These will include teacher recruitment, deployment, transfer and incentive policies, merit-based selection of head teachers, review of teacher norms, review of teacher establishment and vacancies at the school level, and introduction of dedicated time for professional development in the instructional calendar amongst others. Further, targeting of low performing schools under GALOP will improve equity in resource allocation and performance in these schools.

3. **Indicator description.** This indicator measures the share of KG and primary schools that have PTTR above 50:1, which will allow for targeted interventions in 25% of the worst-off amongst GALOP targeted schools. Review and implementation of the teacher recruitment, deployment, transfer and incentive policies will allow for data driven reallocation of existing teachers and deployment of new teachers.

4. **Compliance with GPE requirements for stretch indicators.** Increasing the percentage of primary and kindergarten schools with pupil trained teacher ratio below 50:1 qualifies as a stretch indicator for the equity dimension of the GPE variable part funding. The MOE recognizes the dividends of rationalizing teacher deployment, providing specialized training for kindergarten teachers, and introducing merit-based school leadership but is aware of the political challenges and substantive risks involved in implementation, which has led to the inequitable teacher allocation in the past. This will also impact learning outcomes by reducing class sizes, boosting teacher morale and motivation in rural schools and increasing opportunities for teachers to engage in professional development. The baseline values for the indicator for kindergarten and primary are roughly 50 percent. The target for this indicator will be to increase the percentage of kindergarten and primary schools with PTTR below 50:1 to 90 percent, which represents a “stretch” as it focuses on the allocating teachers to schools that have insufficient trained teachers or that have struggled to retain trained teachers. Further, by disaggregating at the kindergarten level, the DLR focuses on improving quality at the early childhood education level, which is equity enhancing.

5. **Results Chain for Equity Dimension**

Sub-components	Activities/ Inputs	Intermediate Outputs	Outcomes
3.3 Policy reforms for efficient education sector	Teacher recruitment, deployment, transfer and incentive policies	Policy framework to increase transparency and accountability in	<b>Increased percent of targeted KG and primary</b>

<sup>17</sup> USAID, 2019. *Teacher Rationalization, Retention and Language Study: Final Report.*

<p>human resource management, administrative and leadership practices</p>	<p>Review of teacher establishment and vacancies for all public schools</p> <p>Merit based selection of head teachers</p> <p>Introduction of an administrative fast track for teachers serving in rural schools</p> <p>Staffing and roles of GES and District Education Offices (DEOs) based on a functional analysis of what is required to improve learning outcomes</p> <p>Dedicated school leadership program and accompanying qualifications for head teachers</p> <p>Review of instructional calendar to include dedicated time for teacher professional development</p>	<p>teacher deployment, transfers and incentives</p> <p>Synchronization of teacher payroll and deployment within districts</p> <p>Improved use of data for teacher deployment and allocation</p> <p>Improved capacity of school leadership</p> <p>Improved incentives for teachers serving in rural schools</p> <p>Improved opportunities for professional development</p>	<p><b><i>schools with pupil trained teacher ratio (PTTR) below 50:1</i></b></p>
---	--	---	---

## 2. Efficiency

1. **Background and Rationale.** Ghana collects a substantial amount of education data; however, data systems are not integrated and fail to inform decision making at various levels in an efficient and robust manner. This prevents education officials and stakeholders from efficiently allocating and monitoring limited resources. System efficiency gains in teacher allocation and management, targeted in-service training, improved student attendance, support to school leadership and monitoring of learning grants would lead to improvements in the utilization of both salary and non-salary public expenditure in education. Further, strong accountability systems can use student assessments to target school resources, set performance targets for schools, and ensure appropriate incentives are in place to realign the focus from inputs to learning outcomes.

2. Sub-component 3.1 will support the following activities: (a) harmonization of all inspection tools aligned to meet the needs of schools, districts, regions and Ministry levels, including digitization for improved data collection; (b) digitization of EMIS annual school census tool with digitized collection to ensure more timely collection and analysis of data, including school mapping and student tracking; (c) creation of an integrated dashboard through the review and scale up of the mobile School Report Card to include linkages with EMIS, HRMIS, inspection, assessment and other databases; (d) continuous and robust communication to stakeholders; and (e) regular monitoring and reporting on results from inspection findings and dashboard updates. These interventions will lead to improved efficiency in the management and allocation of resources with a focus on learning outcomes. The dashboard will ensure that school level data is available to heads of schools, CSs, District and Regional Directors, and stakeholders at MOE and GES headquarters. Sub-component 2.2 supports districts to organize annual cluster level meetings with school heads and SMC members to discuss data reported on the accountability dashboard. This will ensure that the data collected is used to improve teaching practices and school

management through sharing of best practices, knowledge and innovation within a cluster. Encouraging SMC members to attend these cluster level meetings will increase citizen engagement and allow communities to use school level data to hold their head teachers accountable for school performance, resulting in improved efficiency in the use of school resources.

3. **Indicator description.** Circuit Supervisors will organize cluster level meetings at least once a year to discuss accountability dashboard data and encourage best practices and knowledge exchange between schools. The key efficiency indicators from the dashboard to be discussed include teacher absenteeism, student attendance, amount of capitation grant received and number of CS visits. All meetings will be documented through minutes that will include a list of participants and actions taken/ school exchange visits organized.

4. **Compliance with GPE requirements for stretch indicators.** Number of schools participating in cluster level meetings held to discuss data from the accountability dashboard qualifies as a stretch indicator for the efficiency dimension of the GPE variable part funding since it requires the development of a functional accountability for learning framework, a complete integration of existing data systems, development of a dashboard that is accessible and informs decision making, collection of real time data on all basic education schools annually, automated development of school report cards, a comprehensive communications campaign to improve citizen engagement and finally organization of cluster level meetings with heads of schools as well as SMC members. Further, by including learning outcomes with accountability indicators in the dashboard, the framework allows for data to be used to improve learning. The end target for the indicator represents a stretch as it implies that the accountability dashboard data is being reported on and used in over 70 percent of public basic schools within four years of its development.

5. **Results Chain for Efficiency Dimension**

Sub-components	Activities/ Inputs	Intermediate Outputs	Outcomes
3.1 Development and implementation of accountability for learning framework	Harmonization of all lesson observation tools aligned to meet the needs of schools, districts, regions, and ministry levels  Digitization of EMIS annual school census tool with tablet-based collection to ensure more timely collection and analysis of data, including school mapping and student tracking  Creation of an accountability dashboard  Continuous and robust communication to stakeholders	Data-driven decision making for the allocation, monitoring and management of education resources  Improved data feedback to schools and communities  Decreased teacher absenteeism  Improved student attendance	Improved accountability for learning at schools, district and the MOE/GES



	<p>Regular monitoring and reporting on results from inspection findings and dashboard updates through circuit supervisor meetings</p>	<p>Improved management of school-based grants</p> <p><b><i>Increased number of schools using accountability dashboard data during cluster-level meetings</i></b></p> <p>Improved utilization of accountability for learning data</p>	
--	---	--	--

### 3. Learning outcomes

- 1. Background and rationale.** Ghana has low learning outcomes that have remained stagnant over the last five years. There were no changes in EGRA scores between 2013 and 2015, and high percentages of zero scorers in 2018 (85 percent for reading comprehension, 57 percent for oral reading fluency, and 64 percent for non-word reading). The 2015 Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (EGMA) found that higher order mathematical concepts were a challenge with 75 percent of P2 pupils unable to answer a single conceptual knowledge subtask (i.e., word problem) correctly. The 2016 National Education Assessment (NEA) confirms these findings with 29 percent and 45 percent of P4 pupils below the minimum proficiency for English and Mathematics, respectively; at the P6 level, these figures are approximately 30 percent for both subjects. Between 2016 and 2018, NEA test scores remained essentially the same, if not decreased slightly.
2. Component 1 would provide teacher training on the new curriculum, targeted instruction and structured pedagogy, training on school support and instructional leadership, and supplementary teaching and learning materials. Component 2 would provide learning grants as a top up to the capitation grant and expenditure guidelines with a menu of activities focused on improving learning. These interventions are expected to improve the quality of teaching practices and the resource level of the school, which will ultimately ameliorate low learning outcomes.
- 3. Indicator Description.** Learning outcomes will be tracked through the duration of the project through the introduction of an assessment at the P4 level that is at least representative of the GALOP targeted schools. The National Education Assessment Unit (NEAU) conducts a sample-based NEA at the P4 level biennially, with the last assessment conducted in 2018. “Proficiency” is defined as an (individual) test score with at least 55 percent of the items correct (19.25 items correct on the P4 tests). The project will support the assessment of P4 pupils in targeted schools in 2021 and 2023. It is expected that while the new P4 assessment will be modelled around the NEA P4 assessment, results from the 2018 NEA will not be comparable as it covers both public and private schools and might not be representative of the GALOP targeted schools. Given that the **risk of measurement error is greater for new assessments, mitigation measures have been put in place - including TA for test item development, IRT and analysis of results, as well as having an operational plan that will include piloting of the assessment before it is scaled. The IVA and the World Bank will provide quality assurance to minimize sampling biases and measurement error. The operational plan will also include revised definitions for “proficiency” based on the competencies measured in the new P4 assessment, as well as the parameters to measure an increase in number of students with “proficiency” from baseline. This DLI will measure changes in the**

percent of P4 pupils with proficiency in Math and English from the baseline to the endline. The Math and English assessments will have equal weightage in the measurement on the DLI i.e. a simple average will be used.

4. **Compliance with GPE requirements for stretch indicators.** Improvements in learning outcomes as measured by the increased percent of P4 pupils with proficiency in Math and English qualifies as a stretch indicator for the learning outcomes/quality dimension of the GPE variable part funding for several reasons. First, public expenditure in education is inadequate to cover improvements in quality or any other non-salary investments after spending over 99 percent on teacher salaries and compensation. In such a resource constrained environment, there are severe challenges to improving quality of learning and the quality of teaching practices, especially for existing teachers in low performing and under-resourced schools. Second, beyond having sufficient resources in terms of training and TLMS, achieving these targets requires behavioural changes in teachers arising from improved school leadership, mentoring and support. This represents a shift from the traditional business-as-usual teacher-inspector, teacher-school leadership and teacher-student roles to create a conducive environment for learning. Achieving these results will translate into improvements in learning outcomes and ensure sustainability through behavioural change. In 2016, percent of P4 pupils with proficiency in Math and English was 22 percent and 37 percent respectively. In 2018, these figures fell to 19 percent for Math and 25 percent for English. While a baseline for the assessment will be established in 2021, these figures provide evidence of the low learning outcomes and downward trend registered in recent years. While the assessment may cover all public schools (or a nationally representative sample), this indicator measures improvements in learning outcomes in the GALOP targeted schools, which are targeted as low performing from the onset – as such, achieving improvements in learning outcomes in these schools presents a greater stretch than at the national level.

5. **Results Chain for Quality Dimension**

Sub-components	Activities/ Inputs (across all components)	Intermediate Outputs	Outcomes
3.2 Development and implementation of a national assessment strategy	Teachers trained on new curriculum, targeted instruction and structured pedagogy  Schools resourced with appropriate teaching and learning materials  Schools provided with enhanced supervision and instructional leadership (coaching and mentoring)  Schools resourced with grants to improve learning  SMC strengthened to participate in the development of learning SPIPs and hold schools accountable for learning outcomes	Improved capacity of teachers to deliver new curriculum  Improved resource levels at schools  Improved capacity of school leadership and supervision  Enhanced citizen engagement in school functions  Improved utilization of data on accountability for learning	<b><i>Increased percent of P4 pupils with proficiency in mathematics and English in targeted schools</i></b>

	<p>Improved reporting and access to data on key accountability indicators</p> <p>Dissemination of school level results on national assessment</p> <p>Improved allocation and deployment of teachers</p>	<p>Increased number of schools with appropriate number of trained teachers</p>	
--	---	--	--

## V.2 Variable Part indicators, targets and means of verification

Please complete the boxes below to state indicators, targets and means of verification. Please add additional boxes as needed.

**NOTE:** According to ESPIG policy, if the grant agent in consultation with the LEG concludes that indicators have been reached, the grant agent will disburse the variable part in accordance with the terms of the application package as approved by the Board. Therefore, it is important that the following information be completed accurately.

### Dimension:

Use the drop down below to select a dimension

Equity

### Indicator Name / Definition:

Percentage of targeted KG schools with pupil trained teacher ratio (PTTR) below 50:1

### Definition of targets:

Provide definition of target, baseline if applicable, exact target(s) with deadline(s) to achieve and amount(s) to be disbursed. For example, if the target for learning outcomes indicator is to increase nationwide the proportion of students in grade 2 who are achieving proficiency in reading as measured by ability to read 40 words per minute; provide baseline if applicable (e.g., 50% of students in grade 2 can read an average of 40 words per minutes in November 2020), exact targets (e.g., increase to 70% the number of students in grade 2 that can read an average of 40 words per minute in November 2021 which triggers a disbursement of US\$XY million and 90% of students in grade 2 reading an average of 40 words per minute in November 2022 which triggers a disbursement of US\$XYZ million). Where applicable, indicate if there is a "grace" period for target attainment.

Baseline: 74% of targeted KG schools have PTTR below 50:1 (to be confirmed using EMIS 2018/19 data once list of targeted schools is finalized)

Target: 90% of targeted KG schools have PTTR below 50:1 in 2024

\* This baseline is only for KG schools; while the baseline for combined KG and primary schools is 75%. Please note that the baselines are likely to change once the new EMIS data is available and the list of targeted schools is finalized.

### Disbursement Rule:

State the conditions which must be met for funding to be disbursed against this target. Include whether the target is scalable.

For every additional percentage point increase year on year in percentage of KG schools with PTTR below 50:1, disburse US\$250,000. Target is scalable.

### Verification Process:

Describe the verification process for this indicator, including the responsible party, the data source, and the indicative timing of validation by the local education group.

MOE submits the percentage of targeted KG schools (counted individually) with PTTR below 50:1 using EMIS Annual School Census data.

Independent Verification Agency (IVA) verifies PTTR (using enrollment and trained teacher data) in a sample of schools.

**Dimension:**

Use the drop down below to select a dimension

Equity

**Indicator Name / Definition:**

Percentage of targeted primary schools with pupil trained teacher ratio (PTTR) below 50:1

**Definition of targets:**

Provide definition of target, baseline if applicable, exact target(s) with deadline(s) to achieve and amount(s) to be disbursed. For example, if the target for learning outcomes indicator is to increase nationwide the proportion of students in grade 2 who are achieving proficiency in reading as measured by ability to read 40 words per minute; provide baseline if applicable (e.g., 50% of students in grade 2 can read an average of 40 words per minutes in November 2020), exact targets (e.g., increase to 70% the number of students in grade 2 that can read an average of 40 words per minute in grade 2 in November 2021 which triggers a disbursement of US\$XY million and 90% of students in grade 2 reading an average of 40 words per minute in November 2022 which triggers a disbursement of US\$XYZ million). Where applicable, indicate if there is a "grace" period for target attainment.

Baseline: 75% of targeted primary schools have PTTR below 50: 1 (to be confirmed using EMIS 2018/19 data once list of targeted schools is finalized)

Target: 90% of targeted primary schools have PTTR below 50:1 in 2024

**Disbursement Rule:**

State the conditions which must be met for funding to be disbursed against this target. Include whether the target is scalable.

For every additional percentage point increase year on year in percentage of primary schools with PTTR below 50:1, disburse US\$200,000. Target is scalable.

**Verification Process:**

Describe the verification process for this indicator, including the responsible party, the data source, and the indicative timing of validation by the local education group.

MOE submits the percentage of targeted primary schools (counted individually) with PTTR below 50:1 using EMIS Annual School Census data.

IVA verifies PTTR (using enrollment and trained teacher data) in a sample of schools.

**Dimension:**

Use the drop down below to select a dimension

Efficiency

**Indicator Name / Definition:**

Number of schools using accountability dashboard data during cluster-level meetings

**Definition of targets:**

Provide definition of target, baseline if applicable, exact target(s) with deadline(s) to achieve and amount(s) to be disbursed. For example, if the target for learning outcomes indicator is to increase nationwide the proportion of students in grade 2 who are achieving proficiency in reading as measured by ability to read 40 words per minute; provide baseline if applicable (e.g., 50% of students in grade 2 can read an average of 40 words per minutes in November 2020), exact targets (e.g., increase to 70% the number of students in grade 2 that can read an average of 40 words per minute in grade 2 in November 2021 which triggers a disbursement of US\$XY million

and 90% of students in grade 2 reading an average of 40 words per minute in November 2022 which triggers a disbursement of US\$XYZ million). Where applicable, indicate if there is a “grace” period for target attainment.

Baseline: No schools use accountability dashboard data during cluster-level meetings.

Annual targets are as defined in the table below:

Year	Number of schools using accountability dashboard data during cluster-level meetings
2021	5000
2022	8000
2023	12,000
2024	15,000

In 2024, the target of 15,000 schools implies about 70 percent of all public basic schools use accountability dashboard data during cluster-level meetings.

**Disbursement Rule:**

State the conditions which must be met for funding to be disbursed against this target. Include whether the target is scalable.

For each school participating in annual cluster level meetings, disburse US\$150. Disbursements cannot be made against achievement of DLR for the same school more than once in an academic year. Targets are scalable.

**Verification Process:**

Describe the verification process for this indicator, including the responsible party, the data source, and the indicative timing of validation by the local education group.

Cluster level meetings will be held at least once a year to discuss data on key dashboard indicators using accountability tablets (i.e., teacher absenteeism, student attendance, capitation grant amount, CS visits). These visits will be funded with support from the district. CSs will record attendance of school heads and SMC members and will maintain minutes of the meetings, which will be collected at the district office.

IVA reports achievement using data from digitized monitoring system and verifies in a sample of clusters based on the minutes of cluster meetings.

**Dimension:**

Use the drop down below to select a dimension

Learning Outcomes

**Indicator Name / Definition:**

Percentage point increase from baseline in percent of P4 pupils in targeted schools with proficiency in mathematics and English

**Definition of targets:**

Provide definition of target, baseline if applicable, exact target(s) with deadline(s) to achieve and amount(s) to be disbursed. For example, if the target for learning outcomes indicator is to increase nationwide the proportion of students in grade 2 who are achieving proficiency in reading as measured by ability to read 40 words per minute; provide baseline if applicable (e.g., 50% of students in grade 2 can read an average of 40 words per minutes in November 2020), exact targets (e.g., increase to 70% the number of students in grade 2 that can read an average of 40 words per minute in grade 2 in November 2021 which triggers a disbursement of US\$XY million and 90% of students in grade 2 reading an average of 40 words per minute in November 2022 which triggers a disbursement of US\$XYZ million). Where applicable, indicate if there is a “grace” period for target attainment.

Baseline: To be determined in 2021

Target: Any increase from baseline

**Disbursement Rule:**

State the conditions which must be met for funding to be disbursed against this target. Include whether the target is scalable.

For any increase from baseline (as determined in the P4 assessment in targeted schools) in the percent of P4 pupils with proficiency in mathematics and English (averaged), disburse US\$4 million.

**Verification Process:**

Describe the verification process for this indicator, including the responsible party, the data source, and the indicative timing of validation by the local education group.

IVA report validates quality of assessment administration and report confirms assessment of P4 students in at least a representative sample of GALOP targeted schools. Data analysis and reporting on P4 proficiency will be supported by TA. TA submits report to MOE (PBME).

**V.3 Disbursement Mechanism: Briefly state the disbursement mechanism.**

*Into what mechanism will variable part financing be disbursed?*

Funds will be disbursed directly from the World Bank to the borrower's single treasury account once DLRs have been achieved for Components 1-3. The request for funds will be done based on Withdrawal Applications duly signed by the authorized signatories and supported by unaudited IFRs using the report-based modalities and will include Budget Execution Reports (BERs) generated from GIFMIS together with forecast expenditures against achievement of DLRs. According to the design, variable part financing under Components 1–3 provides for achievement of a total of five DLIs which will be measured and valued in monetary terms for each respective year through a set of identifiable and measurable DLRs (to be independently verified) over the five-year period. Meeting the defined DLRs as identified in the PAD and in the Financing Agreement will constitute the primary basis for triggering credit disbursements under the project's Eligible Expenditure Programs (EEPs). The EEPs are payment by the Government of basic education salaries. Financing will be disbursed once Government provides satisfactory documentary evidence including (a) acceptable IFRs, (b) EEP spending reports, (c) evidence of independent verification of the set of DLRs for that year which have been achieved, and (iv) acceptance of results by the World Bank. It is expected that results will be verified half-yearly; however, at any point that the Borrower has met results that have been validated, the MOE may submit a Withdrawal Application and this must be supported by all the documents listed above.

**VI. INCLUSIVE APPROACH**

**VI.1 Development Partners**

Please include as an annex to this application a list of the development partners in the local education group (LEG) that were consulted in the development of this application.

- DFID
- Ghana National Education Campaign Coalition\*
- JICA
- KOICA
- UNESCO
- UNICEF
- USAID
- World Bank
- Embassy of France
- World Food Programme
- African Development Bank

\*Includes teacher unions as part of the GNECC network

## Annex I:

<b>DEFINITIONS</b>	
The definitions below explain how certain terms used in the template should be understood within the context of the ESPIG:	
<b>Relating to funding modalities</b>	
<b>Sector Pooled</b>	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.
<b>Project pooled / Co-financed</b>	This refers to a scenario where the funding mechanism is made up of different source agency funds to support a common project.
<b>Project/ Stand-alone</b>	This refers to a scenario where the funding mechanism is unilateral, or in other words, not pooled with any other sources of financing.
<b>Relating to key indicators</b>	
<b>Number of textbooks purchased and distributed</b>	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.
<b>Number of teachers trained</b>	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.
<b>Number of classrooms built or rehabilitated</b>	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.