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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEDP 2</td>
<td>Basic Education Development Programme, Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMZ</td>
<td>Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Country Status Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Development Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCE</td>
<td>Early Childhood Care and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA/FTI</td>
<td>Education for All/Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRA</td>
<td>Early Grade Reading Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoY</td>
<td>Government of Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPI</td>
<td>Gender Parity Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSET</td>
<td>In-Service Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAR</td>
<td>Joint Annual Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSEA</td>
<td>Joint Social and Economic Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAEO</td>
<td>Literacy and Adult Education Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHESR</td>
<td>Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoF</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTRF</td>
<td>Medium Term Results Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>Net Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Net Intake Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>Technical Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>US Dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YER</td>
<td>Yemeni Rial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction
The MTRF is the Updated Sector Plan of the MoE for all level of education under its responsibility. It covers the period from 2013 to 2015 and outlines the policy framework and strategies for attaining the sector outcomes up to 2015.

The local Development Partner (DP) Group reviewed the MTRF through a series of formal and informal consultations and discussions of the Education Sector Working Group. It was decided to employ an external consultant for the appraisal.

The appraisal presented here is organized according to the requirements of the ToR formulated in the sectors “Justification” as aspects, and “Specific Tasks” (for details see the Annex ToR).

2 Relevance
2.1 Response to the developmental needs of Yemen

The MTRF covers a time frame of 3 years and focuses on the sub-sectors pre-primary, 9-year basic education, secondary education and (adult) literacy. Higher education and TVET are not covered. MTRF is therefore not a full sector plan. It would be more appropriate to refer to it as an interim plan in GPE terminology.

The MTRF responds very well to major developmental needs of the country. Given Yemen’s history of modernization that started only in 1962\(^1\), a modern education system has existed for 51 years only. Yemen desperately needs education and training at all levels in order to build up a productive economy beyond oil and gas extraction and to benefit from the huge labour market of the Gulf region. In addition, a well-educated population is a prerequisite for good governance with a well-functioning political and administrative system and a gradual, long term shift of its values towards gender equity and other aspects of inclusion. Chapter 1, Social-Economic Country Context, very ably summarizes the current challenges Yemen has to face, based on a recent Joint Social and Economic Assessment (JSEA) undertaken jointly by the World Bank, the United Nations, the European Union and the Islamic Development Bank. Under the heading “The main remaining critical education issues and challenges”, a honest description of the current situation in the education sector is presented.

Given the advances Yemen has made in terms of enrolment, the first priority of the MTRF is the quality of public education as measured by learning outcomes. This is very much in line with the current developmental needs. One very promising strategy is the focus on early grade reading, which figures prominently in the MTRF. The other priorities are (2) the reduction of disparities (social and gender), (3) capacity building in the sector administration, (4) pre-school education, and (5) literacy and adult education.

In a long-term perspective, a focus on pre-school education is correct, while the illiteracy of adults will be drastically reduced through universal basic education of the young generation. However, the cost estimates for pre-school education and literacy and adult education are inconsistent with the priority ranking: the amount requested for priority 5, literacy and adult education is about 70% higher than the cost estimate for priority 4, pre-school education\(^2\). If there is a shortage of funds for the first priorities, priority 5 might be left out.

2.2 Evidence

The MTRF presents evidence, particularly statistical data from the MoE EMIS. This evidence is presented in five tables (tables 2 – 6) across chapter 2, General Information on the Education Sector. There are approximate figures for schools damaged or occupied during the crisis years 2011 and 2012, and of the number of students affected, but they need precision. Again, data are scattered across a number of pages. Some of the evidence turns up as baseline figures in the MTRF priorities (chapter 3).

---

\(^1\) In 1962, the autocratic rule of the Imam was replaced by a republican constitution.

\(^2\) Adult education activities are estimated to be about 120 mio, ECCE about 70 mio.
However, not all the evidence needed to appraise the scope of the planned results is available. A suggestion to remedy this situation is made in section 8.

There has been quite a bit of analytical work in the preceding phase, e.g. on teacher absenteeism, school construction costs, girls’ education. Hardly any of it is referred to in the MTRF document. A full-fledged CSR was prepared but is not mentioned as a source for the MTRF. It is referred to as an important source for an integrated vision of education development in the future.

Strategically important interventions during the preceding phase are taken up again in the MTRF. Many of them have been going on for a long time, and will need more time given the difficult conditions under which the sector operates. But nowhere is there an account of what has been done, what remains to be done, and how much time would be needed to reach the objectives. Some interventions only need to be finalized and rolled out across the sector (EMIS, the reform of school inspection and guidance, the modernization of the MoE, the establishment of parental school councils, improvements in text book printing, etc.) or because there is an ongoing need for them (teacher in-service training, training of administrative staff, etc.).

In general, the document does not sufficiently critically assess the lessons from past experience in order to provide credible evidence and measures that recurrent/on-going activities will yield the desired results and outcomes. In particular, some activities that are clear carry-over processes of the past need to be better contextualised. A good example is teacher in-service training. There are already initiatives to improve co-ordination between the two ministries involved (MoE and MHERSR). Although fast progress cannot be expected, activities need to be planned, even if they would not be very costly until an agreed reform package needs financing.

2.3 Reduction of disparities in the provision of education

The second priority of the MTRF is devoted to this. Its objective is “Closing the gap of social and gender disparities through an equitable education system able to give equal opportunities at the start to every child, so they could compete fairly in the labor market of tomorrow”. Evidence is presented concerning the gender gap in basic and secondary education; the indicator used is the Gender Parity Index\(^3\). It clearly shows past improvements. Overall data are presented on students with special needs and out-of-school-children. Other social categories mentioned are internally displaced people (IDP), and children in remote and/or fragile areas.

3 Coherence
3.1 Consistence with previous recommendations

The recommendations of the 7th JAR (October 2012) relate to six topical clusters, (1) planning, follow-up and evaluation, (2) education funding, (3) improving education, (4) access and equity, (5) co-ordination with the different partners, and (6) general recommendations. All major clusters of recommendations are covered by the MTRF. The following table shows how far they have found their way into the MTRF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>considered</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>planning, follow-up and evaluation</td>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>Annual progress reports from governorates identify cost of each plan activity policies and plans for ECCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>education funding</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>provide operational expenses to schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>improving education</td>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>teacher absenteeism teacher absenteeism quality – student based focus curriculum development and EGRA inputs to the educational process selection and recruitment of teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) This term is not used in the text that only mentions the gender gap, but the index formula can be deduced from the data reported.
While less than half of all recommendations seem to have been considered in the MTRF, this is not really a concern. Some of them are too detailed and specific to be considered in an MTRF. The cluster best covered is (3) improving education.

The evaluation of the FTI Catalytic fund Grant, Phase 2 makes seven recommendations. Two of them refer to the need for additional FTI support. Recommendations 3, 4, and 5 have been considered in the MTRF, if not in detail, then at least in spirit. Recommendation 6 refers specifically to quality. It has four sub points, (1) INSET for teachers, headmasters, and supervisors, (2) measuring the impact of training by comparing actual school and classroom practices of trained staff against standards of good teaching on the one hand, the practice of those not trained, on the other; (3) establishing private and independent training agencies supervised by recognized academic institutions; and (4) expanding the scope of the training on planning and the use of computers. Sub points 1 and 4 have been covered by the MTRF. Recommendation 7 refers to capacity building with three sub points, (1) new curricula, teaching equipment and solar equipment, (2) appropriate learning resources based on a needs survey of rural schools, and (3) strengthening the capacity building of central, governorate and, most important, district officials and school headmasters on planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. These issues are covered by the MTRF.

3.2 Internal cohesion in the strategies developed by units responsible for different sub-systems?

As formulated, this issue does not exist. MoE runs only one single planning process. This helps to avoid an isolated department-based or donor-funded programme-based structure and establishes links between each other’s activities and objectives.

4 Comprehensiveness

4.1 Coverage of the whole sector ranging from Early Childhood Development to Literacy Education and Teacher Qualification

The MTRF addresses the whole sector. The issue of pre-service teacher qualification is not sufficiently addressed. The need for INSET will be permanent as long as there is no adequate qualification for

---

teachers of the early grades. This concerns any graduate of the education faculties recruited to teach in the early grades of basic education.

The MTRF mentions “policy reforms in coordination with teacher training colleges to ensure adequate performance at basic education” (p.12). But since teacher pre-service education is done in universities, this would refer to continued INSET.

4.2 Coverage of the whole country
The MTRF contains all cost items related to general education. It therefore covers the whole country.

4.3 Coverage of special needs for disabled, out-of-school, orphans, and vulnerable children and illiterates
It contains activities for disabled students, referring to the latter as students with special needs. Out-of-school children are mentioned in programme 1, Strengthen School-based Development. Illiterates are the target group of programme 10, Illiteracy and Adult Education. Education activities in favour of internally displaced populations are planned under priority 2, Access and Equity. Orphans or vulnerable children in general are not mentioned.

4.4 Fair balance of attention to aspects of gender and HIV/AIDS
Gender is a long standing priority of the Yemeni education policy. It is mainstreamed since many years. During the first decade of the century, a sector (department) for girls’ education and community participation was established in the MoE. Provision of female teachers in rural areas where girls’ education needs to make most progress is an ongoing concern and figures in the MTRF. HIV/AIDS is not considered in the MTRF. For the age group between 15 and 25 years, the Ministry of Health had developed an information programme for youth and young adults that was then very well received.

4.5 Appropriate understanding of cross-cutting issues within MoE sub-sectors
The concept as such does not figure in the MTRF. However, the issue of improved coordination between MoE departments does come up, though without identifying the topics and issues where such coordination is most necessary.

4.6 Sufficiency of proposed policies, priorities, and programs to reach the goals
This is difficult to assess. The MTRF uses the term “goal” in a rather casual way. The implicit overall goal is education for all of good quality, where quality would be measured by the competencies acquired by students. The simulations used show that “education for all” will not be achieved by the end of the plan period, but progress is expected. The same is true for quality, the MTRF expects gradual improvements.

There is no list of well-defined goals while there are five priorities, three of them formulated in some detail, and two of them simply enunciated as “Preschool Education” with expansion as an implicit goal, and “Literacy and Adult Education”, also with implicit goals, expansion and skill development for the labour market.

There is currently no operational plan attached to MTRF; the only costing elements present in the MTRF are projected costs per programme. The critical questions of operational readiness and efficiency are therefore not yet addressed; there is little visibility on, and analysis of, unit costs. Ideally the MTRF operational plan needs to identify: (i) activity items or targets (i.e. classrooms to be built, school manuals to be bought, people to be trained, salaries to be paid, grants to be disbursed, etc.); (ii) item/target numbers; (iii) unit cost per activity; (iv) total cost; (v) provisional source of funding (national budget, GPE modality, etc.)

The reform approaches used for planning the MTRF concern a more effective use of resources – a move towards higher student : teacher and student : classroom ratios (MTRF p.48). The MTRF specifies only in rather general terms (see Reform Scenario Assumptions) reform activities planned.
The average student: classroom ratios hide large differences, in large cities, classrooms could easily have 60 to 120 students. Construction activities under BEDP 2 will provide more classrooms to ease overcrowding and thus contribute to better learning, i.e. education quality.

Restricting hiring to certain categories of teachers would still increase the number of teachers. Encouraging “ghost teachers” to retire might not have the desired effect, strong administrative measures might be required.

In addition, there is a governance issue associated with the existence of “ghost teachers”. A certain number of teachers are on the pay-roll without teaching; their number was estimated at about 27,570\(^6\) in the school year 2004/05. It is not known to the author whether the situation has improved since then. Using the annual salary estimates for basic education and secondary education teachers in 2013 and the current exchange rate (214 YER = 1 USD at the beginning of February 2013), this yields an estimate of about 84 million USD of salaries per year paid to teachers who do not teach. Removing them from the pay-roll needs a major political and managerial effort. What is more, these teachers have not been considered in the official student : teacher ratio since those are calculated not on payroll data but on school census data.

In the past, the chances for such reform attempts were considered as low\(^6\). Yet, they would free up funds commensurate to the GPE grant expected.

4.7 Possible risks, vulnerabilities and mitigating factors

The MTRF lists five risks, three external ones, and two internal ones. External threats are:

Reduction in the international prices of oil, the major source of public funding

natural or man-made disasters, which will cause a shift in government priorities

Reductions in foreign aid

Internal threats are related to the ability of the MoE to implement the MTRF programs:

Loss of commitment of the MoE leadership and senior management to the MTRF

Low institutional capacity in implementing MTRF programs, especially at the decentralized levels.

This underestimates the risks. The draft submission to the GPE lists the following risk factors with a residual risk after having applied mitigation measures\(^7\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>residual risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proper use of funding (additional)</td>
<td>moderate to substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Management and Accountability (additional)</td>
<td>moderate to substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit and Reasonable Assurance (additional)</td>
<td>moderate to substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and security (see MTRF risk 2)</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and socio-psychological (additional) referring to values related to women, certain social categories, etc.</td>
<td>moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) The World Bank. Main Findings of the Teacher Absenteeism Survey, 2006, p.17 “The average gap in number of teachers between TAS and PR is -1.0, which means PR [Pay-roll, HB] data has on average 1.0 teacher more than the number of teachers recorded by TAS [Teacher Absenteeism Survey, HB]. P17, footnote 15: According to the AES [Annual Education Survey, HB] 2004/05 data, there are 171,101 teachers in public schools. However, for the same school year, the salary report of December 2004 shows there are 198,671 teachers (both data exclude all administrative workers).

\(^6\) Smith, Ian. Study on the Capacity of the Ministry of Education to Support the Implementation of the Basic Education Development Strategy - Draft Report, Sana’a 2006, p12, footnote 1: “. In the medium term salaries are subject to government discretion in so much as it can change pupil teacher ratios, eliminate ghost teachers, negotiate salaries etc. But in reality progress in that part of the reform has been so slow that it cannot be considered a strong possibility that major savings with be realized within the medium term.

\(^7\) Government of Yemen and UNICEF. Proposal to the Global Partnership for Education for a Catalytic Contribution Towards Implementation of Yemen’s Education Sector Plan 2013-2015, Sana’a, Jan 2013, Risk Matrix, pp. 58 to 71
There are additional risks, experience shows that one of them is the slow pace of reforms in the public sector. This has major consequences for the efficiency of spending: the slow pace of reform of human resource management leads to a high amount of in-service training in the sector administration that cannot become effective. The lack of teacher qualification for classroom teachers in the early grades of basic education leads to a need for INSET programmes for newly recruited teachers.

**Major risks that could affect effective implementation of the MTRF at the level of MoE and central structures and the wider national context of development**

The reform scenario as the basis of the MTRF planning and costing predicts a decrease in the number of teachers both in basic and, to a much smaller extent, in secondary education. This could imply dismissing teachers, and might lead to labour unrest. Even more important, the education sector could no longer be used to absorb unemployed university graduates.

Indicator 9, quality improvement, states “All basic and secondary schools receive all textbooks before the start of the school year”. This obviously means that so far, this is not assured. As early as 2007, a study was presented and corresponding action undertaken to tackle this issue. The school book printing press is currently equipped with up-to-date machinery. Despite all this, the objective mentioned in indicator 9 could not be achieved. There is a great risk that it will remain elusive during the period of the MTRF since the structural issues causing the delays are not addressed.

Regular salary payments (see indicator 18) are at risk. This is a major risk as valuable teaching and learning time might be lost due to industrial action of the teaching force.

The mitigating activities mentioned in the MTRF are (1) to “employ a participatory and collective decision-making style that encourages all involved actors to contribute in an open atmosphere. This is expected to promote a high level of motivation among all stakeholders.” The second line of action is “a capacity building approach according to the needs of each level of education system”. As already mentioned, this alone is not enough given the structural and governance issues of the sector. The third line of action is the restructuring of the MoE, a process that has been going on for more than ten years. This is a difficult process with the risk that political factors outside the education sector interfere. Whether these can be neutralized in the situation of a difficult political transition seem doubtful.

Given the risks inherent in any period of political transition, all planned activities should be reassessed as to whether (1) they are feasible and (2) sustainable during the current period of political transition. Depending on the magnitude of the risk, they might be dropped. This would also help in reducing the funding gap.

**4.8 Are funding projections commensurate with the magnitude of the program?**

This can be confirmed.

**4.9 Reliability and Sufficiency of disaggregated baseline data**
After consulting the simulation covering the period from 2010 to 2015, this can be confirmed. The simulation (Excel file “الإستحقاقات التشكيل الثاني - بديل الإصلاح آخر” = projections of the second alternative, latest reform scenario) uses a template developed by UNESCO. It draws its statistical data from EMIS, prices and salaries from MoE and MoF sources.

4.10 Clear descriptive or quantitative outcomes demonstrating impact for the planned strategies and programs

The MTRF contains quite a few results indicators and too many process indicators. The results indicators come closest to demonstrating impact. Ten of them are quantitative in nature and allow an unambiguous monitoring. The two results indicators on priority 3, capacity building, are purely descriptive and do not provide any criteria to decide whether the results have been reached. Some of the process indicators could be considered as intermediate or first level impacts. Some look like results indicators.

Practically none of the process indicators includes milestones or deadlines. The conclusion is that all of them would have to be achieved by the end of the MTRF period. But some are linked and depend on each other in time, e.g. the matrix of learning outcomes (quality process indicator 7) textbook improvement (quality process indicator 8) and competency-related teaching materials (quality process indicator 10). Achieving all this within three years is difficult if not impossible.

5 Feasibility, Cost Effectiveness, and Sustainability:

5.1 Is the plan realistic, affordable, and cost effective?

As far as this can be assessed based on the MTRF and additional documents consulted, this seems to be the case. But targets cannot be assessed thoroughly since their baseline data are not easily available.

Since the inception of work on the MTRF, drafts have been reviewed by members of the Local Education Group, and particularly during the planning of the IDA-programme BEDP 2. As a result, initial, unrealistically high estimates of the funding gap have been reduced.

5.2 Exploration of alternative policy and costing scenarios before strategic choices and operational decisions

The MTRF presents three development scenarios focusing on population growth as the major driver of resource requirements, a high, medium, and reduced alternative. For planning, the medium alternative has been used as recommended by Yemen’s Central Organization of Statistics.

For the cost estimates, three scenarios were developed, scenario 1, based on the current reality without any reforms, and scenario 2, based on reforms at a gradual pace. Under this scenario, improvements are introduced without abrupt changes. A third scenario based on quick reforms in the educational systems was abandoned because of the limited time at hand and the experience with previous reform initiatives. It does not allow for full development of institutional capacities of the MoE, and of governance.

5.3 Availability of sufficient resources, human, financial, and material

Human resources: Well qualified human resources at all levels of the education system are still in short supply. This is no surprise given the short period of modernization and development of Yemen.

---

8 E.g. indicator 12 for quality: “Students’ abilities to read and write are improved through teacher training on reading and writing, and provision of adequate teaching materials on reading.” The process elements are not student abilities to read and write but rather the provision of the corresponding teacher training and of teaching materials.

9 The linking of teaching posts to schools and not to teachers might serve as an example. Several years ago, the then Prime Minister issued a decree to this effect. It has not been implemented and figures among the process indicators of programme 1, Quality of basic and secondary education, as indicator 27: The Prime Minister’s decree of linking teachers posts to schools is adopted and is implemented in all governorates, MTRF p 61
Material resources depend mostly on funding. The availability of budget funds is somewhat doubtful as discussed in the next paragraphs.

Financial resources: The MTRF has a funding gap of 461.5 Mio USD. This takes into account agreed resource projections on the national budget and current resource projections from development partners. The possibility of GPE funding would still leave a funding gap of 378.9 Mio USD. **Such a large funding gap makes the MTRF look financially unsustainable.** The document does indeed almost say so much: “Only by closing this funding gap, this MTRF for 2013-2015 can be implemented.” Concerning donor funding, see next section.

Savings could possibly be made in the area of capacity building. There are generous provisions in this area, and many of these activities depend on structural reforms needed to make administrative, managerial, and technical work more effective and efficient. Training to continue working in institutional settings that constrain the scope and the effects of such work should be avoided.

5.4 Adequacy, Credibility, and Scope of the financial plan in terms of sources of funding, both domestic and external

Total funding, including Government funding of education has been projected until 2015. In tables 20 to 23, the MTRF presents the available resources for the results in basic education, secondary education, literacy and adult education as well as the whole MTRF. But the GoY’s financial constraints are mirrored in process indicator 18, programme 1, Quality of basic and secondary education: “Salaries for teachers and other educational staff are provided in monthly basis.” Up till about 2010, civil service salaries were paid on time. In the difficult economic situation after the political crisis, automatic availability of Government budget funds cannot be assumed as given.

The MTRF contains no detailed analysis of future donor funding but limits its analysis to the proportion of donor funding, past and projected, in the education sector. It is **estimated at 3.2% of the annual budgets from 2013 to 2015.** This might not seem important, but these funds finance strategically important programmes since most of the GoY contribution is used to pay staff salaries.

Yemen has become a donor orphan. Direct contributors to the education sector are the World Bank/IDA, BMZ (Germany) with KfW and GIZ as implementers, UNICEF, USAID, and maybe UNESCO. The UK contributes indirectly through funding the Social Funds for Development (SFD), and the Netherlands continue funding secondary education development through their past involvement in SEDGAP. IDA has appraised a project in the amount of 70 million USD, of which 65 million USD are an IDA grant. BMZ intends to contribute funds through KfW to BEDP 2, also as a grant, but has not yet made a pledge. A 20 million EURO project\(^\text{10}\), mostly for school construction, has become effective in 2012, plus 2 million EURO for Technical Assistance per year. This makes a total of about 90 million USD with an unknown amount from the BMZ in addition.

5.5 Integrated financial analysis or projection

An analysis whether the goals can be delivered within a reasonable domestic financial envelope has not been done. However, the MTRF compares the costs of scenario 1 (no reforms) and scenario 2 (gradual reforms), showing how much money would be saved by the reforms advocated.

6 Monitoring and Evaluation

The MTRF contains a section on Monitoring and Evaluation. The MoE unit in charge is the Technical Office (TO) that also prepared the cost estimates. It will focus on the output indicators. Local MoE units at governorate and district level will monitor progress in their area, supported by the TO, and submit annual progress reports. The JAR is the occasion where the MoE and its development partners will annually monitor progress. The EMIS referred to in this section has been developed over a

---

\(^{10}\) About 27 million USD at an exchange rate of 1.35 USD to the EURO
period of more than 10 years but needs to be rolled out to all administrative units involved, and staff thoroughly trained in all steps, from data collection to analysis, interpretation of results, and writing action-oriented reports.

Given the lack of experience with monitoring, the revised Annex will not be sufficient as a monitoring tool. Recommendations can be found under section 8.

7 Clarity
7.1 Structure and Intelligibility

The structure of the MTF is clear and straightforward. A few minor points need revision in order to facilitate understanding:

The MTRF rightly mentions a decrease of the gender gap in both basic and secondary education. The indicator used is the Gender Parity Index (GPI), which shows an increase. (see Table 1, p.13) Therefore, the GPI should be explicitly introduced as the measure of the Gender Gap.

7.2 Priorities, linkages, and sequencing of different interventions, (quality, human resource development, and institutional capacity building)

Priorities are clearly focused, as discussed further above. Intervention linkages and sequences are not analyzed, although they need to be taken into account, e.g. the link between capacity development and the elaboration, in the curriculum field, of a matrix of learning outcomes (for more details, see the discussion of process indicators above). Institutional capacity building is mentioned under the topic of the modernization of the MoE. But the emphasis is with human resource development in the sense of in-service training. Structural issues are mentioned in general when the lack of coordination is highlighted, but they are not identified in any detail. Therefore, there are no detailed activities that address clearly identified structural challenges. The “Expected Programme Results” for Program 7 show this very clearly.

8 Recommendations

Two kinds of recommendations are presented, (1) on changes to the current MTRF, and (2) on actions to be taken after the start of implementation.

8.1 Changes to the MTRF

1. In the analysis of the current situation of the education sector, more attention should be paid to structural issues in the education system, and particularly in its administrative and managerial set-up.

2. A summary table with baseline data on schools (basic, secondary), students, teachers, inspectors, children with special needs, administrative staff according to administrative level (central authority, governorate and district level), instructors and learners at adult literacy courses, LAEO administrative staff, etc. would be very useful. Where hard data are not available, estimates would be sufficient. Also needed: a consolidated table with numbers or estimates of schools, pupils, and teachers in conflict-affected areas, remote areas, and fragile areas, together with a definition of fragile areas.

3. A section on previous efforts, their results, and what remains to be done should be added before presenting the details of the 10 programmes.

4. A short assessment about the constraints on reforms during the political transition (government of national unity) should be included.

\[\text{11 The author can imagine that the number of children with special needs is not known exactly but could be estimated, e.g. from household surveys or with the help of the health authorities.}\]
5. Concerning capacity building, the proposed activities should be limited to such capacity building programmes that would not be affected by such constraints (e.g. purely technical training courses for officers who most probably would continue working after the reforms).

6. Given the risks inherent in any period of political transition, all planned activities should be reassessed as to whether (1) they are feasible and (2) sustainable during the current period of political transition. Depending on the magnitude of the risk, they might be dropped. This would also help in reducing the funding gap

7. Given the poor validity of net enrolment and intake rates, among other things for lack of precision of age data, net rates should be replaced by the corresponding gross rates.¹²

8. The indicator table in Annex 2 needs a thorough revision of the process indicators. No administrative unit can continuously monitor such a large number of indicators. As mentioned above, many of them need criteria of time and substance in order to become monitorable. Their number should be reduced substantially, restricting them to basic issues and processes. Major processes need to be defined and the detailed indicators grouped under them. The units in charge of each process need to be identified and made responsible for self-monitoring. Indicators covering processes that started already earlier on need to be more specific in terms of what has been achieved already (as a baseline value), what remains to be achieved, and what can realistically be expected during the duration of the MTRF (as the medium term target value).

9. Careful editing is still required.¹³

8.2 Actions after the start of implementation

10. A separate monitoring manual needs to be provided to all concerned. It should contain a careful, operational description of what the MoE is looking for. A wording such as “Improved effectiveness of management of education system, through informed planning, and better delivery of educational services” (results indicator 1, capacity building) does not tell what exactly to look for.

11. An MTRF operational plan needs to be prepared and broken down by years. It needs to identify: (i) activity items or targets (i.e. classrooms to be built, school manuals to be bought, people to be trained, salaries to be paid, grants to be disbursed, etc.); (ii) item/target numbers; (iii) unit cost per activity; (iv) total cost; (v) provisional source of funding (national budget, GPE modality, etc.), vi detailed responsibilities, vii linkages among activities.

¹² It would appear that some donors insist on net rates despite their inherent methodological weakness. In a country like Yemen with inaccurate age data, one has every reason to argue against such a position.

¹³ As an example, see the GPI values of .0805 where the correct value, calculated from the enrolment rates, is 0.805.
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Annex: the ToR

Terms of Reference
Individual Consultant
Appraisal of the Medium term result Framework for Education 2013 - 2015

Extract

Background

The GPE is a partnership of developing country partners, bilateral and multilateral development agencies, CSOs, and private sector foundations that supports the development and implementation of sound education sector plans in developing countries with a view to accelerating progress toward the Education for All (EFA) Goals. This is mainly done through the funding of a Program that emanates from the Country sector plan and that leverages more resources and technical support.

In January 2012, the Secretariat of the GPE announced an indicative allocation of US $ 82,600,000 for Yemen to support the Mid Term results Framework (MTRF) 2013-2015 implementation. However due to the crisis of 2011, the ensuing elections and the cabinet, the Ministry of Education (MoE) was unable to engage in the process of application earlier this year.

On September 19, 2012, the Minister of Education of Yemen asked UNICEF to be the Supervising Entity (SE) of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Grant. The request was endorsed by the Local Education Group (LEG) in Yemen. The Supervising Entity performs the control function of the GPE Program. First, in the preparatory phase of the GPE Proposal, the SE facilitates the development of the Proposal together with the government counterparts and development partners. It also completes a fiduciary assessment of the implementing partners’ (in principle the governments) financial and control systems so as to determine the right implementation modalities and risk control and monitoring/audit mechanisms. Second, in the implementation phase, the SE is responsible for supervising the activities financed by the GPE Fund as agreed between the government counterparts, the LEG and the SE.

UNICEF in cooperation with LEG, GPE Secretariat and MoE has come up with roadmap which states timelines and roles and responsibilities for all players in this process. The roadmap is attached.

This process of the application preparation is being supervised closely from the UNICEF Yemen management and on day-to-day basis by Education Sector composed of one professional staff and one support staff. An international consultant with experience in GPE application is on board from October 15, 2012 with the following assignment 1) up-dating the Education Sector a Strategy 2013-2015 2) drafting a roadmap for entire GPE application process 3) facilitating the preparation for the QAR 1 and QAR 2 phases 4) coordinating the work of the writing team for drafting of the Program Document, 5) providing direct substantial inputs to the GPE application package, as per division of work among the writing team 6) consolidating the final draft of the application package 7) reviewing draft 1 and 2of the application package as per comments of GPE secretariat and LEG 8) drafting the application of UNICEF for GPE Project Development Grant of US$ 200,000 which will cover cost of the entire application process of the GPE Program Development and application process.

Justification
One of the requirements of the GPE application submission that an appraisal is done on the education sector Plan (MTRF). The appraisal should be done, preferably, by an independent consultant who will submit his finding to the Coordinating Entity (GIZ) and the secretariat of the GPE.

The appraisal will look into the empirical evidence available for the development of the plan; whether the proposed priorities and programs are sufficient to reach the goals; and if the strategic policy and plan priorities informed by the empirical evidence presented in the sector analysis.

The appraisal report will reflect on these aspects:

**Relevance:**
Does the MTRF 2013 – 2015 respond to the developmental needs of Yemen? Is it based on evidence and analytical work such as the results of the interventions of the earlier phase? Does it respond to reduction of disparities both geographical and population in the provision of education?

**Coherency:**
Is it consistent with the recommendations of the 7th JAR in October 2012 and the FTI evaluation report? Is there internal cohesion in the strategies developed by different directorates/units within MoE which are responsible for different sub-systems?

**Comprehensiveness:**
Does the plan address the whole sector ranging from Early Childhood Development to Literacy Education and Teacher Qualification? Does it cover the whole country? Does it cover special needs for disabled, out-of-school, orphans and vulnerable children and illiterate people? Is there a fair balance of attention given to aspects of gender and HIV/AIDS? Is there an appropriate understanding of the cross-cutting issues within the sub-sectors of MoE?

**Feasibility, cost effectiveness and sustainability:**
is the plan realistic, affordable and cost effective? Have alternative policy and costing scenarios been explored before strategic choices and operational decisions have been made? Are sufficient (human, financial and material) resources available?

**Clarity:**
Is the MTRF well-structured and clearly written. Does it provide a clear focus on priorities, linkages and sequences of different interventions, such as quality, human resource development and institutional capacity building?
- Identify areas that might require improvement and formulate specific recommendations/strategies/policy options to address challenges in identified areas referred to above;
- Identify major risks that could affect effective implementation of the MTRF at the level of MoE and central structures and the wider national context of development;
- Propose strategies to address identified risks as an input to the GPE proposal.

**Specific Tasks**

Under leadership of the Chief of Education, the consultant will work closely with Education team of UNICEF Yemen and will:

1. Analyze the evidence used in the development of the plan, its sufficiency and if covers key areas of the basic education system in the country.

2. Review and analyze if proposed policies, priorities and programs are sufficient to reach the goals and possible risks, vulnerabilities and mitigating factor; if funding projections are commensurate with the magnitude of the proposed program And if all these are based on relia-
ble and sufficient disaggregated baseline data. Are clear descriptive or quantitative outcomes laid out for the planned strategies and programs that demonstrate impact?

3. Review the MTRF to see if the education marginalized and at-risk groups (such as underserved communities, girls, the poor, children with disabilities, orphans, children in hard to reach communities, ethnic minorities, refugee and internally displaced populations are addressed and mainstreamed.

4. Analyze if the financial plan is adequate and credible and takes all sources of funding into account; compare domestic and external funding; review if the targets and costs of post primary education described in the ESP are reasonable in relation to the goals in primary education and if there is an integrated financial analysis or projection that ensures goals can be delivered within a reasonable domestic financial envelope.

5. Review if the M&E system provides robust indicators and valid and reliable data to monitor the progress toward the achievement of the inputs, outputs, and outcomes described in the results framework and are the reporting, feedback, and consultation mechanisms transparent and adequate to maintain broad ownership during implementation and if the plan contains key indicators for M&E? Is there a results framework and clear presentation of priorities and if institutional responsibilities for reporting are clearly identified.

Methodology

The GPE consultant will:

- Work under the direct supervision of the chief of education with close liaison with the Coordinating Agency and MoE technical team.
- Will undertake desk review of the MTRF
- Will be working from Home in Wiesbaden in Germany.

Duration of the consultancy:


Expected Deliverables

Desk review: 10 – 13 November 2012 (4 working days in remote)

- Review general documents on Yemen;
- key UNICEF materials on education in Yemen and MENA
- Yemen MDG reports;
- Yemen government education plan;
- Fiduciary aspects of the public administration of Yemen;
- UNICEF CPD

Review Medium Term Results Framework, outcomes and outputs

- Telecommuting with frequent Skype and email contacts with LEG, Gov, and GPE contact.
Contribute to drafting Appraisal Report that will be submitted to the GPE Secretariat
**Expected background and Experience**

- Ph.D. degree or equivalent, and a minimum of 15 years of relevant professional experience, or equivalent combination of education and similar experience in several other countries.
- Solid experience in leading large scale project preparation, results frameworks, design of monitoring & evaluation systems, and instrument development.
- Experience in working with international organizations.
- Familiar with the education system of Yemen.
- Preferred (but not mandatory) criteria: Long experience in education reform in Yemen, MENA countries, or other same level in-come countries.