

**EFA FAST TRACK INITIATIVE**  
**Guidelines for Technical Assessment of the Primary Education**  
**component of an Education Sector Plan**

**Country: Vietnam**

**Overall comments of the Secretariat:**

The Vietnam EFA plan is one of the first comprehensive sector plans to be submitted for donor endorsement under the Fast Track Initiative. The Secretariat strongly commends the Government of Vietnam for its comprehensive attention to all of the Dakar EFA goals. This plan is commendably ambitious in its vision – universal basic education by 2015 with rising and internationally competitive standards of quality. It is also notable for its very clear strategic priorities vis-à-vis all of the Dakar goals. We found the diagnosis of key issues to be frank and thorough, with a clear focus on equity, quality, management weaknesses, and need for increased public funding of education.

It is a clear strength of this plan that it analyzes the four key sub-sectors (ECD, primary, lower secondary, and NFE) in a coherent way and proposes a well-integrated strategy to advance Vietnam's national goals in each area.

As the FTI is focused on the achievement of universal primary completion, however, and the Secretariat has neither a mandate nor the technical capacity for evaluating the other sub-sectors, our comments are limited to the issues, goals, targets, and financing proposals for the primary education cycle, and very much focused on Vietnam's comparative targets vis-à-vis the FTI Indicative Framework.

- 1. Accelerated achievement of UPC. Vietnam's context is distinctly favorable for achieving the MDG of universal primary completion. World Bank (population-based) estimates are that the primary completion rate in Vietnam is already approximately 95%. The country projects strong economic growth (7.5% per year in real terms) and there is a "demographic bonus" in the declining primary school aged population (-16% from 2001 to 2015). These factors, combined with a national commitment to investment in education, give Vietnam a unique opportunity to achieve the MDG very rapidly and indeed – as the Plan envisages -- to go beyond it, to achieve universal basic education. This in turn may be expected to further reinforce macroeconomic growth and productivity, creating the same kind of "virtuous circle" experienced in other East Asian countries.
- In this context, it is somewhat surprising that the Plan's target date for achieving UPC appears to be 2015. As the rationale for the Fast Track initiative is to help countries *accelerate* progress towards universal primary completion, it would strengthen the case for incremental support through the FTI process if the Plan provided evidence of intensified actions aimed at achieving UPC before 2015.
- The Secretariat fully supports the Government's goal of a thorough transformation of the quality, content, management structure and efficiency of primary education. Those aims are laudable and the proposed program is convincing. But within that overall

strategy, we believe there is scope for a priority emphasis on the specific actions needed to reach the last 10% of children with an adequate quality education and to lower the financial barriers to their attendance and retention in school. In our view, the plan identifies the key actions needed – i) school construction in the final under-served regions of the country; ii) effective, multi-grade schooling models in these areas; iii) special programs for minority-language students; and iv) provision of free textbooks and elimination of direct fees and other parental contributions for the poorest students. The issue is the pace at which these actions are phased in.

- Earlier achievement of universal primary completion would obviously be in the interests of the Vietnamese children currently left behind, and in Vietnam's national interest as an equity goal. But it is also of strong interest to the international community that Vietnam – like all of the FTI countries – pursue the fastest possible trajectory to the goal of universal primary completion with quality. This not only advances global progress, it also increases the possibilities for other countries to learn from Vietnam's experience. The FTI donors wish to send a clear signal that the FTI's promise of sustained financial support focused on the achievement of UPC should not create any disincentives to countries capable of achieving that goal in a relatively short period. On the contrary, we believe that early success in achieving UPC will create stronger incentives for expanded donor support for the achievement of remaining Dakar goals. Therefore, we urge the local donor group to work with the Government on accelerated actions within this overall plan for achieving UPC at the earliest possible date, and to ensure that the needed financing for this accelerated plan is mobilized.
- 2. Education share of public expenditure. Vietnam's baseline value for 2001/02 on this indicator – 13.9% -- is well below Indicative Framework target (20%) and the average for the first 10 FTI countries. This expenditure share already appears to be evolving in a very positive direction, however. Mobilizing a higher share of national resources for primary education is a crucial step towards Vietnam's ambitious goals, and it is important to take advantage of the current favorable economic context. Simply by maintaining the pace of progress already achieved over the past three years, Vietnam could reach the target of 20% of recurrent public expenditure for education by 2006. This would be a strong sign of national commitment to EFA and the MDG and would aid substantially in rapid achievement of the MDG, if feasible in the context of the fiscal strategy and MTEF.
- 3. Pupil-teacher ratio - Vietnam's PTR of 26.4 is the lowest of any FTI country to date. It is clear that in a heavily rural country such as Vietnam with many isolated areas, the FTI benchmark of 40:1 is neither feasible nor appropriate. However, two key strategies for any education system seeking to maximize efficiency are the appropriate use in rural areas of quality multi-grade schooling approaches which have been demonstrated to be effective in other countries, and actions to ensure efficient teacher deployment across the system as a whole.
- The flat evolution of Vietnam's proposed targets for the pupil-teacher ratio over the period – from 26.4 in 2001 to 26.6 in 2015 – suggests that there is further scope to

consider both the importance of increasing service delivery efficiency in this area and the potential gains from strategies such as those mentioned above. Carefully rationalizing the deployment of teachers – the most expensive resource in any education system – can be a key strategy for cost-effectiveness, given that international research supports the conclusion that increases in the PTR in the range from 26:1 to 30:1, for example, can be managed without adverse effects on student learning. Indeed, a core rationale for slightly increasing the PTR is to free up resources for alternative uses which research indicates have greater positive impact on student learning, notably expanded provision of learning materials, increased hours of instruction, and teacher professional development and incentives – all of which are priority investments in this Plan.

- **4. Hours of Instruction.** Vietnam’s current school calendar of 500 hours per year of instruction is very low by international standards and the Secretariat strongly supports the Government’s proposal to increase it significantly to a more competitive standard of 940 hours per year. Unlike other countries, where the implementation of a longer school day requires a major increase in the number of school classrooms, in Vietnam’s case the constraint appears to be less the physical capacity of the system and more the fiscal affordability of increasing teacher compensation to cover the extended hours. On equity grounds, it would appear to be especially important priority to finance the extended school day in schools serving the lowest-income and most disadvantaged populations.
- The high priority we see for implementing the reform of the curriculum and hours of instruction as early as possible is another argument in our view for moving more quickly than currently proposed on actions to increase the education share of overall public expenditure and to improve the efficiency of teacher deployment.
- **5. Teacher salaries.** Vietnam’s average teacher salary (in per capita GDP terms) is low compared with the Indicative Framework benchmark, but, more importantly, there are indications that it is currently creating incentives for informal payments to teachers that are, inevitably, regressive in their impact on educational equity goals. While the specific targets in this area must be driven by the local labor market context and national civil service remuneration policy, the Secretariat strongly supports the proposed direction of an upward adjustment, which can be expected to impact on both educational quality and equity.
- **6. Other indicative framework benchmarks:**
  - **Public expenditure as a % of GDP** – The fact that Vietnam currently mobilizes a share of GDP for public expenditures that is higher than the FTI 20% benchmark is propitious for the education sector and should be encouraged. Given the national priority of achieving the education MDG and the Dakar goals, we also do not think this favorably large overall budget envelope should be an argument for a lower target (below 20%) for the share of total public expenditure for education. And, in fact, as discussed earlier, we urge the

**Government to try to reach the 20% target for the education share of total public expenditure sooner than currently proposed.**

- **Public expenditure on primary education as % of public education expenditures – Vietnam’s share is currently 37%, below the 42% FTI benchmark for a 5 year primary system. However, given its proximity to achieving UPC, the declining size of the primary school aged population, and the national priority goals of achieving universal basic education and expanding pre-school access, the Secretariat believes that the lower targets on this indicator are appropriate in the Vietnamese context.**
- **Percentage of age group entering first grade of primary cycle – This indicator is already high. As part of an intensified program to achieve UPC at the earliest possible date, the Secretariat would expect the targets proposed here to be brought forward somewhat.**
- **Percentage of age group completing the 5 grade primary cycle – The estimates presented here appear to be on-time survival rates to grade 5, rather than a primary completion rate. They do not correspond to the World Bank’s estimate of the primary completion rate in 2001 of close to 95%, using the methodology that has been used to calculate completion rates in the other FTI countries. The Secretariat urges the Government to track the primary completion rate and – as discussed earlier – to seek to achieve 100% completion (which can allow for some grade repetition, but which assumes actions to reintegrate all children who dropout into school at least through the primary cycle) at the earliest possible date.**
- **Percentage of repeaters among primary school pupils – Vietnam’s repetition rate is already very low by international standards and the Government’s well-designed strategy for improving quality can be expected to reduce it further to the target levels.**
- **Recurrent expenditure on items other than teacher salaries – This figure is currently slightly below the Indicative Framework benchmark, but in a context of significant real growth in the overall budget for primary education, the proposed shares should be adequate.**
- **Percentage of pupils in non-public primary schools – Vietnam’s current share is low and the Government’s strategy in this area appears appropriate.**
- **Average construction cost – The evolution proposed seems appropriate, especially given the Government’s policy of assuming greater public financing of school construction and maintenance.**

## Other Issues

- **Growth projections – The financing projections include a high annual growth rate unbroken up to 2015. These figures are slightly more optimistic than IMF projections. There may be merit in building in some sensitivity analysis on growth projections in the financing plan.**
- **Financing Gap for Primary education – The estimated costs and financing gaps are very clearly laid out for EFA as a whole. For comparative purposes with other FTI countries, however, it would be useful to know the estimated financing gap for the primary education cycle, if this is possible. The Secretariat urges the Government to work with the local donor group to: i) clearly outline the costs, priority actions, and targets within this overall plan of an accelerated program to achieve UPC as early as possible; and ii) disaggregated financing details for this accelerated program. This will enable the FTI Secretariat to work with the local donors to track the evolution of the financing gap for primary education in Vietnam on a comparable basis with the other FTI countries and to report regularly to the Donors' Meetings on both progress and any shortfalls.**
- **Lack of explicit attention to HIV/Aids (summary of comments from UNAIDS IATT) The Plan, which was put together by a National EFA team and provided with technical assistance by UNESCO, World Bank and CIDA, contains no reference to HIV/AIDS. Given the current status of the epidemic in Vietnam, this is of concern. Specific questions and priority concerns conveyed by the UNAIDS task team in this connection are attached to this assessment.**
- **Lack of explicit attention to children with disabilities. The Vietnam EFA plan is generally commendable in its attention to the educational participation and attainment of disadvantaged groups, with specific analysis of gender, minority language populations, rural populations and populations in poverty. The Plan does not yet reflect any specific analysis of the issues faced by children with disabilities, although the Secretariat understands that work on a national policy in this area is underway. All EFA FTI countries are encouraged to develop a national policy for the education of children with disabilities.**
- **Learning outcomes. The ultimate goal of all EFA is to equip all children, youths, and adults with the basic skills and knowledge required for empowered and productive participation in society. Evaluating student progress and school system progress through regular measurement of learning outcomes are priorities for any education system. The Vietnam EFA plan gives clear attention to the need for standardized national assessment. Vietnam, like all of the EFA FTI countries, is strongly encouraged to participate in appropriate international learning assessments as well.**

- **Monitoring and Evaluation.** The Plan is excellent in laying out performance indicators and targets. This is crucial for the development of a performance-based M&E system. The Plan provides little insight, however, into how effective the M&E system in the sector is currently and how all of the needed information will be generated. The Plan also presents a super structure of groups with oversight functions (p. 81 and 82) and it is not very clear how these groups are linked with the existing organizations of MoET that are responsible for M&E. Clearer definition of the roles and responsibilities of these different groups and/or ways of mainstreaming these efforts are likely to be necessary for effective implementation.

## Section A. Evidence of Country Ownership

A.1. How comprehensive and convincing are available government documents that set forth national objectives, plans, and/or budgets for the education sector?

- **The sector plan is the result of intensive dialogue and discussion over a long period. The plan is very much in line with EFA goals and is a comprehensive strategy which tackles EFA goals broadly. The plan is well thought through and presented. Although the National EFA plan sets more specific and, in some cases, more ambitious goals than either the CPRGS or the ten year Education Development plan, these documents are consistent in portraying a strong national commitment to achieving EFA.**

**Table 1: Policy Targets for Primary Education in the PRSP and Sector Plan**

	Targets in PRSP (from policy matrix)	Targets in Sector Plan	
Access and coverage (enrollment)	<b>Strengthen and develop achievements of universalization of primary education</b>	<b>At least 250 new primary schools built every year up to 2005. 100 built in remote areas up to 2010.</b>	
Gender parity (access and coverage, repetition, dropout, completion, and achievement)	<b>Move towards gender equality</b>		
Internal efficiency (repetition, dropout, completion)	<b>Nothing specific</b>	<b>Repetition rate is 2.5% by 2010 and 1.0% by 2015. Dropout rate is 2.0% by 2010 and 1.0 by 2015. 70% of previous year's dropouts reintegrated by 2010 and up to 95% by 2015.</b>	
Quality of inputs (teachers, instructional materials, conditions of schools, parental involvement, pupil teacher ratios)	<b>Improved school infrastructure and facilities in difficult areas. Replacement of "leaf" schools.</b>	<b>All teachers receive 30 days in service training per year from 2003 All teachers meet national standards by 2010. All teachers receive "teaching guide"</b>	

		<p>every year.</p> <p>Primary teachers receive postgraduate scholarships and special IT training. Salary and allowances of primary teachers to be in line with socio-economic growth and government salary policies. Curriculum, teaching methods and textbooks continuously improved.</p> <p>All temporary classrooms replaced by solid structures by 2010 with priority to disaster prone areas.</p> <p>Full-day schooling implemented in all primary schools by 2015.</p> <p>Pupil class-contact hours increased to international level of 900 hours per school year by 2015.</p>	
Quality of outcomes (student achievement)	<b>Nothing specific</b>	<b>Continuous assessment system established.</b>	
Equity (poverty, rural/urban, ethnicity, disability)	<p><b>Continuing exemption from school fees for poor children</b></p> <p><b>Raising awareness among parents in remote, isolated and ethnic minority communities.</b></p> <p><b>Expanding lending of textbooks to children from ethnic minorities</b></p>	<p><b>All students have access to a full set of free textbooks in disadvantaged areas by 2005, (in all areas by 2015).</b></p> <p><b>Pupil related and school-related expenditures increased to US\$15 per pupil and US \$400 per school by 2015.</b></p>	
HIV/AIDS	<b>Nothing specific</b>	<b>Nothing specific</b>	

A.2. Has the sector plan been discussed with key stakeholders? With whom? How (e.g. via consultative meetings, workshops, regional and local levels)? What are the plans for dissemination if the sector plan has not been discussed with stakeholders, and when?

- **The document describes an extensive consultative process but local donors are best placed to evaluate how effective and representative this process has been and the extent to which different stakeholder groups (ie, teachers, central officials that may be affected by the decentralization process, district and school level personnel, parents) are allied in support of the EFA plan.**

**Table 2: Consultation with Stakeholders**

Stakeholders	Yes	How	If not yet discussed, when will it take place?
<u>Government</u> Legislature Finance ministry Other line ministries Regional govt Local governments			
<u>Civil Society</u> Civic and/or indigenous groups NGOs			
<u>Stakeholders</u> Principals Teachers Administrators/ Inspectors Parents Students			
Bilateral agencies			
Multilateral Agencies			
International NGOs			

## **Section B. Credibility and adequacy of strategies to address key issues**

B.1. What are the key issues and main constraints to achieving universal primary completion by 2015 and gender parity by 2005? How are these being addressed in the sector plan?

- **The principal issues identified for primary education are set out below. Other issues and constraints include the need for additional resources and improved education management systems at all levels.**

**Table 3: Sectoral Issues, Causes and Strategies**

<b>Issues</b>	<b>Underlying causes</b>	<b>Strategies to address</b>
Access and coverage (enrollment)	<b>Low enrolment and completion rates concentrated amongst certain groups. Direct and indirect costs beyond the means of poor families and deter participation.</b>	<b>Provision of an affordable school place for all children of primary school age. Gradual increase in state financing of construction, maintenance and learning materials and reduction in community contributions. Program to ensure that all children complete a full 5 year primary cycle</b>
Gender disparity (access, repetition, completion, and outcomes)	<b>Little gender-disaggregated information.</b>	
Internal efficiency (repetition, dropout, completion)	<b>Repetition, except in grade 1, is very low by international standards, but dropout in grades 5 and 6 is significant</b>	<b>Targets are set for reducing dropout and “reintegrating” dropouts, but few specifics on how to achieve this (eg, examples of successful programs?)</b>
Quality of inputs (teachers, instructional materials, conditions of schools, parental involvement)	<b>Curriculum outdated. Almost no in-service teacher training. Low salaries for teachers in formal system, creating incentives for private tutoring, which undermines equity. Shortage of basic learning materials Instructional hours extremely low by international standards</b>	<b>Reform of the curriculum to support “international levels” of quality. Teacher development and training. Gradual provision of teachers’ guides to all teachers. Gradual provision of full set of textbooks to all children. Maintenance of very low pupil-teacher ratio by East Asian and international standards.</b>
Quality of outcomes (student achievement)	<b>Widening gap in learning opportunities and achievement. No specific internationally benchmarked assessment data given.</b>	<b>Assessment of student learning achievement proposed</b>
Equity (Poverty, rural/urban differences, ethnicity, disability)	<b>Enrollment and completion rates lowest in rural areas and for minority language children</b>	<b>Special program to extend full primary education access for disadvantaged and excluded children. Targeted actions to support disadvantaged children:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>free provision of textbooks;</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Vietnamese language development programs in early grades for minority language children.</b></li> </ul>

HIV/AIDS	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
----------	---------------	---------------

### Access and coverage

### Gender parity

- Which of the following factors constitute key constraints to gender parity in access to and completion of primary education -- distance to school, physical insecurity in traveling to school, lack of toilet facilities in school, insufficient number of female teachers, insufficient supply of girls' schools, gender bias curriculum, cultural and religious norms for female role in society, parental preference for boys' education, lack of role models for girls, and lack of interest due to insufficient employment opportunity for women?
- What strategies are proposed to attract girls to school and retain them? On what evidence are the interventions based?
- In countries where boys' enrollment and completion lag behind girls', what are the constraints and what strategies have been proposed?

### Disability:

The FTI process encourages the development of an explicit national strategy on disability.

**There is no mention of disability issues or a national policy on educational access and equity for disabled children in the EFA plan.**

### Policy Environment:

- a) Does the Ministry of Education have, or is it developing a specific policy and strategy framework to collect data on disabled children?
- b) What definition of special education needs is currently used in collecting educational statistics in this education system?
- c) How are planning decisions made to ensure that students with special education needs receive appropriate additional resources?
- d) Is there specific coverage of special education needs in the legislative framework in place?
- e) What specific characteristics of the education system act as facilitators of equity and inclusive education?
- f) What specific characteristics of the education system which act as barriers to equity and inclusive education?

### Internal efficiency

- The pupil years invested per primary graduate (5.91 for the 5 year cycle, in 2001) reflects reasonable internal efficiency compared with other FTI countries. Repetition is very low in Vietnam, so the major source of internal efficiency is the relatively high dropout in grade 5 (7.4%), and to a lesser extent in grades 1 and 2.
- The plan appears to attribute dropout mainly to demand-side issues (family poverty and the burden of family contributions to schooling) and proposes actions to lower these costs. It also proposes “reintegration” programs, which are not well described. The Plan’s targets are to reduce grade 5 dropout to 5.5% in 2005; 3.6% in 2010; and 1.8% in 2015. These are quite gradual and therefore, fairly credible. But it would be highly desirable to accelerate this progress. If demand constraints are indeed the major underlying factor, moreover, it should be quite feasible to do so.

### Quality (inputs)

### Student Achievement

### Equity

HIV/AIDS Detailed comments provided by David Clarke on behalf of UNAIDS are annexed. The major issues flagged are:

- The Plan, which was put together by a National EFA team and provided with technical assistance by UNESCO, World Bank and CIDA, contains no explicit reference to HIV/AIDS in either its situational analysis or its action-planning framework.
- As a result, it is impossible to assess from the text itself the extent to which the plan addresses the EFA FTI assessment criteria for HIV/AIDS. Given the current status of the epidemic in SRV, there are areas of particular concern:
  - *Policy environment.* Does MOET have a specific HIV/AIDS policy or strategy? Has SRV draft policy relating to HIV/AIDS and sexual and reproductive health education been approved and if so does this have any implications for the EFA plan?
  - *Prevention.* How do curricula address HIV prevention? Is there provision for training teachers on HIV/AIDS (pre-service and in-service)? Is there a policy on peer education?

- **Workplace policies. Have education workplace policies taken into consideration HIV/AIDS and are these consistent with the ILO Code of Practice on HIV/AIDS in the Workplace?**

- *Policy Environment*

a) Does the Ministry of Education have, or is it developing, a specific HIV/AIDS policy and strategy framework as part of the National HIV/AIDS program?

b) Is the Ministry developing appropriate institutional capacity to ensure effective implementation of HIV prevention and impact mitigation activities at all levels including:

- Use of HIV/AIDS indicators in EMIS
- Appropriate dedicated HIV/AIDS management structure
- Training programs
- Appropriate attention to gender in all HIV responses

- *Teaching Supply*

c) Has there been a comprehensive analysis of the impact---actual and potential---of HIV/AIDS on the education sector, including:

- Increased teacher training needs due to increased teacher attrition
- Systems to provide substitute teachers to cover for teachers who are sick with opportunistic infections

- *OVCs*

d) Does the plan include policies and resources to ensure the continued access to schooling for orphans, children in AIDS affected households and other especially vulnerable children? (including resources and other inputs from welfare/social protection sectors).

- *Prevention*

e) Does the plan include appropriate curricula provision (participatory and/or skills based) for HIV prevention and impact mitigation among children, their families and their communities?

f) Is there a strategy and appropriate resources for training teachers (pre-and in-service) to deliver good quality educational modules on HIV prevention?

g) Does the strategy include a policy on, and resources for peer education?

- *Workplace policies*

g) Has the government developed legislation and policies to address workplace issues consistent with the ILO Code Of Practice including:

- Stigmatization and discrimination
- Access to health services
- Extended sick leave and early retirement
- Care and support for family members of teachers
- Zero tolerance of sexual abuse of pupils and teachers

B.2. What are the trends in education? Do the trends provide a realistic trajectory to the targets in the sector plan?

- **The major trends are a increasing national investment in education and a sharp decline in the size of the school aged population. Over the period 2001-2015, the primary school aged population is projected to decline by 16% and the secondary school aged population to shrink by 19%. This “demographic bonus”, combined with rapid economic growth and national commitment to investment in education gives Vietnam a unique opportunity to achieve the MDG very rapidly and – as the Plan envisages -- to go beyond it, to achieve universal basic education. This in turn may be expected to further reinforce macroeconomic growth and productivity, creating the same kind of “virtuous circle” experienced by earlier-developing East Asian countries.**
- **Given this very favorable context, a major question is whether progress towards the MDG (universal primary completion) is fast enough. Population-based estimates of the primary completion rate (using the enrollment data presented on p. but World Bank/UN population data puts Vietnam at about 95% completion currently. From this starting point, although improving the access and above all quality of education for the last 5%-10% is an undeniable challenge, the Government’s strategy is a convincing one, and it should be possible to finance its implementation fully and expeditiously. In this context, a clear question is why it wouldn’t be possible to achieve universal primary completion considerably before 2015. This would obviously be in the interests of the Vietnamese children currently left behind, and in Vietnam’s national interest as an equity goal. But it also must be said that it is of interest to the international community that Vietnam – like all of the FTI countries – pursue the fastest possible trajectory to the goal of universal primary completion with quality.**

**Table 4. Trends in Education**

	2000	2001	2002	2003
<b>Total Enrollment</b>				
Primary Public				
Total				
Male				
Female				
Primary Private				
Total				
Male				

Female				
Secondary Public Total Male Female Secondary Private Total Male Female				
Tertiary Public Total Male Female Tertiary Private Total Male Female				
Others (please specify) Total Male Female				
<b>Total No. of Teachers</b>				
Primary Public Total Male Female Terms of service of public Regular Contract Community  Primary Private Total Male Female				
Secondary Public Total Male Female Secondary Private Total Male Female				
Tertiary Public Total Male Female Tertiary Private Total				

Male				
Female				
Others (please specify)				
Total				
Male				
Female				
<b>Total No. of administrative staff</b>				
Primary Public				
Total				
Male				
Female				
Secondary Public				
Total				
Male				
Female				
Tertiary Public				
Total				
Male				
Female				
Others (please specify)				
Total				
Male				
Female				
Central line ministry				
Total				
Male				
Female				
Provincial/regional				
Total				
Male				
Female				
<b>Total No. of educational staff</b>				
Primary Education				
Public				
Private				
Secondary Education				
Public				
Private				
Tertiary Education				
Public				
Private				
Others				

B.3. Does the sector plan include any innovative approaches, and what are these?

## Section C. Policy commitments and annual targets for the indicative framework

C.1. What is the trend in public expenditure on education?

- **The trend is for a substantial increase in funds available for education due to significant increases in growth and an increase in the share of the total budget going to education.**

**Table 6.4: Sources of EFA Funding**  
(in million US\$; in constant 2002 prices)

Available Funding	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2015
<b>1 Public Sources (Govt budget)</b>									
Available public funds for education sector	1,332	1,512	1,715	1,859	2,057	2,274	2,512	2,773	3,852
Available public funds for non-EFA*	479	544	618	669	740	819	904	998	1,387
Available public funds for EFA	852	968	1,098	1,190	1,316	1,455	1,608	1,775	2,465
EFA funds as % of total education sector Public expenditure	64.0%	64.0%	64.0%	64.0%	64.0%	64.0%	64.0%	64.0%	64.0%
<b>2 Donor (ODA) Financing for EFA sub-sectors</b>									
Donor funding for EFA sub-sectors	80	120	150	150	150	150	150	150	40
Donor funding as % of public EFA funds	9.4%	12.4%	13.7%	12.6%	11.4	10.3%	9.3%	8.8%	1.6%
<b>3 Community contributions</b>									
From community (directly to schools)	88	87	85	81	19	77	76	72	69
Of which - primary schools	30	27	24	21	18	16	13	11	0
- lower secondary schools	58	58	61	61	61	62	63	61	69
Community as % of total EFA funding	10.4%	9.0%	7.7	6.8%	6.0%	5.3%	4.7	4.1	2.8%
<b>4 Total Available EFA Funding</b>	<b>1,020</b>	<b>1,175</b>	<b>1,333</b>	<b>1,421</b>	<b>1,546</b>	<b>1,682</b>	<b>1,833</b>	<b>1,967</b>	<b>2,575</b>

Note: \* includes higher, vocational and technical, upper secondary and all forms of education other than pre-school, primary, lower secondary and non-formal education

C.2. What are the total domestic public resources and external funds available for primary education? How much of total expenditures are financed by external donor flows?

- **The table below shows the financing plan for the whole EFA plan with the primary component listed. It also sets out the expected domestic and external resources available for the plan. It does not estimate a financing gap for primary education alone but for the whole of EFA and in this sense the gaps are therefore not comparable with those calculated in other FTI countries. At its highest level, anticipated external funding is just over 11% of total expected funding but would rise to about 20% if the full EFA gap were covered by external resources. By 2015 the need for external financing has reduced dramatically and the implication is that domestic resources will be sufficient to finance planned primary education expenditure by this time.**

**Table II: Financing of the EFA Plan**  
(in million US\$; in 2002 constant prices)

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2015
<b>1 Funding needs for EFA (recurrent+capital)*</b>									
<b>1.1 Total EFA Plan funding needs</b>	<b>1,187</b>	<b>1,329</b>	<b>1,467</b>	<b>1,527</b>	<b>1,642</b>	<b>1,734</b>	<b>1,843</b>	<b>1,976</b>	<b>2,585</b>
of which:	59.0	73.1	92.1	95.5	102.8	111.9	121.6	132.4	189.3
Target Group 1 (ECCE)	540.3	582.2	633.0	658.6	716.5	766.6	817.0	879.5	1,156.5
Target Group 2 (Primary Ed)	510.9	570.1	620.5	654.8	710.5	750.9	805.8	868.8	1,150.2
Target Group 3 (Lower Sec Ed)	76.9	103.2	121.4	118.1	111.6	104.3	98.3	95.1	89.2
Target Group 4 (Non-Formal Ed)									
<b>2 Available funding</b>									
2.1 Government budget	852	968	1,098	1,190	1,316	1,455	1,608	1,775	2,465
2.2 Donors	80	120	150	150	150	150	150	120	40
2.3 Sub-total (Govt. + donors)	932	1,088	1,248	1,340	1,466	1,605	1,758	1,895	2,505
2.4 Community (parents, etc.)	88	87	85	81	80	77	75	72	70
<b>2.5 Total (Govt.+donors+community)</b>	<b>1,020</b>	<b>1,175</b>	<b>1,333</b>	<b>1,421</b>	<b>1,546</b>	<b>1,682</b>	<b>1,833</b>	<b>1,967</b>	<b>2,575</b>
<b>3 Funding gap</b>									
Gap 1: Needs – Govt. funding [1.1–2.1]	334.9	361.0	369.2	337.0	325.2	278.6	235.3	200.9	120.1
Gap as % of total needs	28.2%	27.2%	25.2%	22.1%	19.8%	16.1%	12.8%	10.2%	4.6%
Gap 2: Needs – (Govt.+donor) [1.1–2.3]	254.9	241.0	219.2	187.0	175.2	128.6	85.3	80.9	80.1
Gap as % of total needs	21.5%	18.1%	14.9%	12.2%	10.7%	7.4%	4.6%	4.1%	3.1%
Gap 3: Needs – (Govt.+donor+community) [1.1–2.5]	166.6	153.8	134.2	105.7	95.8	51.3	9.5	8.6	10.7
Gap as % of total needs	14.0%	11.6%	9.1%	6.9%	5.8%	3.0%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%

Note: \* including government funding, donor funding and community contributions.

**Table 6. External Financing for Education**

	Average annual amount over last 3 years (US\$)	Expected average annual amount over next 3 years (US\$) (Existing commitments only)
<b>Education</b>		
Bilateral		
Multilateral		
HIPC debt relief		
<b>Primary education</b>	:	
Bilateral		
Multilateral		
HIPC debt relief		
<b>General budget support</b>		
Bilateral		
Multilateral		
HIPC debt relief		
<b>Education-related budget support</b>		
Bilateral		

Multilateral		
HIPC debt relief		

Note: the categories above should be adapted to the country context.

- C.3. What are the targets for 2015 set for domestic resource mobilization in the following indicators? Are these achievable targets?

**Targets for increased domestic resource mobilization are ambitious but should be achievable if overall growth is as predicted. Falling primary school population should assist in the sustainability of achieving UPC.**

- C.4. How do the cost parameters in the Proposal compare with those in the indicative framework? If some of them are outside the range of the indicative framework, what are the reasons and are they justifiable? Please fill in the following table.

**Table 6. Indicative Framework Benchmarking for EFA/Sector Plan**

Indicator	Indicative benchmark	Where country stands in 2001 or base year	Targets		
			2005/6	2010/1	2015/6
<b>Resource mobilization</b>			-	-	
Public domestically-generated revenues as % of GDP	14-18	23.0%			
Public Expenditure figures used in sector plan			22.0%	22.0%	21.0%
Public recurrent spending on education as % of public recurrent discretionary spending <sup>(a)</sup>	20	13.9%		18.0%	20.0%
Public recurrent spending on primary education as % of total recurrent spending on education <sup>(b)</sup>	42-64	37.0%		36.9%	31.7%
					30.0%
<b>Student flow indicators</b>					
% of age-group entering first grade in primary cycle <sup>(c)</sup>	100	97.0%		97.8%	98.9%
% of age-group completing 5 in primary cycle <sup>(d)</sup>	100	95%		89.3%	92.6%
% repeaters among primary school pupils	10 or less	2.2%		1.8%	1.3%
				0.8%	
<b>Service delivery indicators</b>					
Pupil-teacher ratio in publicly-financed primary schools <sup>(e)</sup>	40:1	26.4		26.4	26.9
Average annual remuneration of primary school teachers: <sup>(f)</sup>					
Existing teachers	3.5	1.45		1.82	1.87
New teachers					
Weighted average of existing & new teachers					
Recurrent spending on items other than teacher remuneration as % of total recurrent spending on primary education <sup>(g)</sup>	33	30.3%		30.7%	33.0%
Annual instructional hours for pupils in publicly-financed primary schools (indicate actual hours, not maximum)	850 --1000	500		602	771
				940	

% of pupils enrolled in privately-financed primary schools	10 or less	0.3%		0.4%	1.4%	3.7%
Construction cost per primary school classroom (furnished & equipped) US\$ (rate used for EFA FTI costing is \$8000)	-	5764		5846	6033	7016

Note:

a/ Discretionary spending is defined as public spending from all sources less debt service (interest payment only).

b/ Includes spending through ministries providing primary and secondary schooling, vocational/technical education and higher education; the target “indicative” benchmark by 2015 should be calibrated to the length of the first cycle of schooling, i.e. 5 years, 42% if it is 5 years, 50%, if 6 years, 58% if 7 years, and 64% if 8 years).

c/ Defined as non-repeaters in grade 1 as a percentage of the population cohort at the official age of entry to first grade.

d/ If data on students completing are not available, use non-repeaters in final grade as a percentage of the population cohort of the official graduation age.

e/ Denominator includes only teachers with teaching duties; publicly-financed schools refer to those whose teachers are fully paid by the government, either directly or indirectly.

f/ Refers to teacher remuneration at mid-career; remuneration includes salary and cash value benefits (i.e. pension, health services, transport, housing and other items paid for by the state).

g/ Spending on items other than teacher remuneration include: (i) the remuneration of non-teaching staff in schools, as well as staff at the district, regional or central levels; (ii) spending on pedagogical materials, maintenance and other running costs, (iii) in-service teacher training; (iv) running costs of student assessments and examinations; and (v) student subsidies, school feeding and other services included under demand-side financing.

H/. US\$8,000 was the average value used in the World Bank simulations to cost the education MDG.

#### C.5. What are the results of education finance simulation based on the indicative framework?

- **The Secretariat has not done any independent modeling or analysis in this area, since the Government has a comprehensive student flow and financing model developed with support from UNESCO.**

**Table 7: The results of finance simulation**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2010	2015
School age population (in thousands/millions)							
School-age population as % of total population							
<b>School-Age Population estimation</b>							
<b>Gross Enrollment Ratio Estimation</b>							
<b>Proportion of repeaters</b>							
<b>Completion rate</b>							
<b>Intake rate</b>							
Gross enrollment ratio (%)							
Number of pupils enrolled in primary education (5 or 6 years)							
Number of pupils in private primary schools							
Share of pupils in private schools (%)							
<b>Share of HIV/AIDS orphans</b>							
<b>HIVS (% + teacher salary bill)</b>							
Share of pupils in private schools (%)							
Number of pupils in public primary education							
Pupil-teacher ratio in public primary education (average grade 1 to 5 or 6)							
Number of teachers in public primary schools (grade 1 to 5 or 6)							
Cat 1							
Cat 2							
Teacher salaries (Cat 1) as multiple of PCGDP							
Teacher salaries (Cat 2) as multiple of PCGDP							
Average annual teacher salary as a multiple of per capita GDP							
Teacher salary in LCU							
Total teacher salary bill (million LCU)							
Non teacher salary spending (%)							
Non teacher salary spending (millions LCU)							

<b>Recurrent spending on public primary education (millions of LCU)</b>							
<b>Per pupil spending in public sector (LCU)</b>							
<b>Per pupil spending in public sector / PCGDP</b>							
Subsidy for private schools (millions LCU)							
Public subsidy per pupil in private schools (LCU)							
<b>Recurrent public spending on primary education (millions of LCU)</b>							

Orphans (Number of pupils)

HIVS (millions LCU)

**Public Finance**

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2010	2015
GDP (millions of LCU)							
Total Population (thousands)							
GDP/Capita							
Public domestic revenue (excl. grants) as % of GDP							
Public domestic revenue (excl. grants)							
Recurrent spending on education as proportion of Government revenues							
Total recurrent spending for education (millions of LCU)							
Spending on primary education as % of total spending on education							
Total available resources for primary education (US\$ million)							

<b>Financing Gap</b>							
<b>Capital cost</b>							
Cost per furnished and equipped classroom, includ. latrines (thous. Of US\$ & LCU)							
Number of teachers per classroom							
Number of physical classroom							
New construction / year							
<b>Total capital (millions of LCU)</b>							
<b>Summary of cost estimation</b>							
Recurrent							
Capital							
Total							

Key: LCU means local currency unit.

## Section D. Unit cost estimates and their consistency with long term sustainability

- D.1. How will the additional resources from the EFA FTI be used? What are the major categories of spending (e.g. capital, salaries, non-salary recurrent costs, HIV/AIDS related, school improvement funds, and demand side financing,)?
- D.2. How many grades is the primary education cycle?
- D.3. What is the total number of beneficiaries per year and over the funding period? How do these compare with the existing per student spending? What is the cost per primary school completer?
- D.4. If user fees are eliminated, are there measures to compensate schools for loss of revenue, what are the measures, and are they adequate?
- D.5. Can these resources be utilized and disbursed with the requested funding modality (e.g. co-financing of investment projects, parallel financing, budget support, SWAP and pooled funds, etc.) and within the stated time frame?
- D.6. How does the sector strategy address the issue of financial sustainability?

## Section E. Physical Implementation, Risks and Capacity

- E.1. What risks and constraints are likely to be encountered in implementing the sector plan? What are the mitigating measures? Please fill in the following table.

- **The local donor group is best placed to supply the relevant information and evaluate the issues in Section E.**

**Table 8. Risks and Mitigating Measures**

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk Rating</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Measure</b>
<b>From Outputs to Objective</b>		
<b>From Components to Outputs</b>		



**Table 10. Capacity Building Strategy**

<b>Proposed areas for capacity building</b>	<b>Yes /No</b>	<b>How?</b>
Teacher pre-service training	Yes	
Teacher in-service training	Yes	
Teacher recruitment		
Teacher evaluation	Yes	
School inspection		
Student assessment	Yes	
EMIS (# of indicators, standards for timeliness of core indicators)	Yes	
Procurement & contracting		
Delivery of instructional materials		
Targeting demand side financing to the needy		
Budgeting and financial management	Yes	
Expenditure tracking	Yes?	
Subnational government capacity (specify)	Yes	
School-level capacity Parent-teacher Association School council Student government Community participation		
Others		

- E.7. What are the measures to improve community and parents' participation and MOE transparency and accountability? Are they sufficient?
- E.8. Overall, does the country has the capacity to implement the proposed plan within the stated time frame? Which are the weakest links?

### **Section F. Monitoring and Evaluation**

- F.1. Do the education plan and/or sector strategy provide a basis for monitoring progress and evaluating accomplishments?
- Does the sector strategy define medium- and long-term goals for primary completion rates and other indicators of progress, and set annual and medium-term targets?
  - Are these indicators and targets appropriate, given the assessment of the issues, the expected results, and the institutional capacity to monitor?

- Are they consistent with the policy choices in the strategy?

F.2. What are the indicators, means of verification, and conditions for success in the results framework? Please fill in the following table.

**Table 11. Results Framework**

<b>Hierarchy of Results</b> <i>(With a causal linkage)</i>	<b>Performance Indicators</b> <i>(Describes results with quantity, quality and time dimensions and with realism)</i>	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b> <i>(Baseline, data systems, data collection analysis, reporting)</i>	<b>Conditions for Success and Sustainability</b> <i>(Analysis of systemic and external program factors that affect results)</i>
<b>Impact</b> <i>(on the economy, secondary education, lifelong learning, labor market)</i>		Program Impact/External	
<b>Outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender parity</li> <li>• PCR</li> <li>• Learning outcome</li> <li>• Institutional development</li> <li>• Aid effectiveness</li> </ul>		Program Impact/Internal to Education System	
<b>Outputs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coverage</li> <li>• Internal efficiency</li> <li>• Quality of the learning process</li> <li>• Enhanced capacity</li> <li>• Efficacy of aid provision</li> </ul>		Program Effectiveness	

<p><b>Output Strategy:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country-specific and could include the following: <i>Classroom construction;</i> <i>Recruitment and deployment of teachers;</i> <i>Innovations for girls education;</i> <i>In- service Training;</i> <i>Textbook provision;</i> <i>Decentralization</i></li> <li>Monitoring and evaluation system development and capacity building</li> <li>Donor harmonization strategy</li> </ul>		<p>Program Implementation: “Doing the Right Things” (relevance, appropriateness)</p>	<p>Measures assessed and revised.</p> <p>Capacity enhancement continued for administrative and regulations requirements.</p>
<p><b>Inputs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Country commitment and resource mobilization and restructuring</li> <li>Donor financing of gap</li> </ul>		<p>Efficiency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Statues and Regulations and Implementation plans adopted</li> <li>- Capacity building initiated</li> <li>- Macro-economic conditions favorable</li> </ul>

F.3. Are current and proposed monitoring and evaluation systems adequate and sustainable?

- What is the current time lag in production of annual enrollment data? (eg, how many months from start of school year to production of initial enrollments?)

- Are end-of-year enrollments, dropout, repetition and primary completion rates currently reported? Does the Government propose to do so? By when?
- What is the track record of past efforts to improve data collection and analysis?
- How transparent are the arrangements for monitoring education sector progress, including service delivery to the poor?
- Are parents and communities empowered to monitor and report on school performance – ie, teacher attendance, treatment of students – or to dispense incentives, such as teacher bonuses for good attendance?
- What is the track record of using the results of monitoring and evaluation in policy formulation and program improvement?
- How adequate are plans for enhancing capacity in measurement and evaluation, and for reporting and disseminating M&E results?

WB13414

F:\EFA PARTNERSHIP\ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES\Guidelines for Technical Assessment of the Primary Education component of an Education Sector plan.doc

April 21, 2003 4:39 PM