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### ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWP</td>
<td>Annual Working Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEAM</td>
<td>Basic Education Assistance Module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSPZ</td>
<td>Better Schools Programme of Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuing Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRT</td>
<td>Cluster Resource Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>Detailed Establishment Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>United Kingdom Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECG</td>
<td>Education Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education For All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMTP</td>
<td>Education Medium Term Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMTP-OP</td>
<td>Education Medium Term Plan- Operational Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSP</td>
<td>Education Sector Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF</td>
<td>Education Transition Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACE</td>
<td>Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTI</td>
<td>Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Gross Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoZ</td>
<td>Government of Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Global Political Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACT</td>
<td>Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immune Deficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO/HQ</td>
<td>Head Office/Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRTS</td>
<td>Human Resource Training System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAR</td>
<td>Joint Annual Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>Learning Achievement Tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Developmental Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoESAC</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoF</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHTE</td>
<td>Ministry of Higher and Tertiary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoLSS</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour and Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP</td>
<td>Medium Term Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>Net Enrolment Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIR</td>
<td>Net Intake Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVCs</td>
<td>Orphans and Vulnerable Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Primary School in low density urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Primary School in high density urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Primary School in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PED</td>
<td>Provincial Education Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICES</td>
<td>Poverty, Income, Consumption and Expenditure Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAP</td>
<td>Performance Lag Addressing Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMT</td>
<td>Project Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMU</td>
<td>Project Management Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>Public Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>Post and Telecommunications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTR</td>
<td>Pupil Teacher Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Secondary School in low density urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Secondary School in high density urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Secondary School in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Sport, Arts and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA</td>
<td>School Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>School Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STERP</td>
<td>Short Term Economic Recovery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STWG</td>
<td>Teacher Standards Technical Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDIS</td>
<td>Teacher Training and Development Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIS</td>
<td>Teacher Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMS</td>
<td>Teacher Minimum Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRAT</td>
<td>Wide Range Achievement Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZDHS</td>
<td>Zimbabwe Demographic Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZELA</td>
<td>Zimbabwe Early Learning Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIMSEC</td>
<td>Zimbabwe School Examinations Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

This Project Document is prepared as a proposal for presentation to the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). The document supports an application by the Government of Zimbabwe for a GPE Project Implementation Grant of US$23.6 million. It was prepared on the basis of extended interactions between the MOESAC officials at Head and Provincial Offices, and the project preparation team commissioned by UNICEF on behalf of the Education Coordination Group (ECG).

Project preparation built on ongoing engagement between the Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture (MOESAC), Zimbabwe civil society and development partners since early 2010, which led to the development of an Interim Education Strategy (2010 – 2012), the Education Medium Term Plan (2011 – 2015) and the EMTP Operational Plan (2013 – 2015). The activities to be financed by the proposed Project Implementation Grant have been identified in consultation with stakeholders as high priority activities provided for in the EMTP Operational Plan (EMTP-OP).

2. Country Context, Recovery Strategy & Rationale for Proposed Project

The impact of the economy on quality education service delivery

Zimbabwe, a land-locked nation in southern Africa gained independence from Britain in 1980 after a protracted liberation war. At 390,580 square kilometres (150,804 square miles), the country shares borders with Zambia to the north, Mozambique to the east, Botswana to the west and South Africa to the south. The country has a centralised government and is divided into ten administrative provinces – Manicaland, Mashonaland Central, Mashonaland East, Mashonaland West, Masvingo, Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands, Bulawayo and Harare. The latter two are metropolitan provinces that include, respectively, the second largest city and the capital city.

Preliminary figures for the 2012 census released by ZimSEC indicate that the population of Zimbabwe is 12.973 million (6.234 million males, 6.738 million females, GPI 1.08). Zimbabwe's population is presently growing at nearly 1.1 percent per annum. It is estimated that 62 percent of the population lives in rural areas and the remaining 38 percent of the population in urban/peri-urban areas. Harare and Bulawayo account for most of the approximately 30 percent in urban areas. Zimbabwe is characterized by cultural, ethnic, and religious diversity. The largest ethnic group, which makes up about seventy-six percent of the population, is collectively known as the Shona. The Ndebele, who are second largest ethnic group, make up about eighteen percent of the population. Other ethnic groups, each constituting between one and two percent of the population, are the Batonga in the Zambezi Valley, the Shangaan or Hlengwe in the low veld, and the Venda on the border with South Africa and a largely urban-based white and Asian population.

Historically, agriculture, mining and tourism sectors as well as their related industries earned the bulk of the country’s foreign exchange, employed the majority of the population and contributed the bulk of the national Gross Domestic Product (GDP). A decline in production levels of primary commodities such as platinum, gold, cotton and tobacco and a reduction of tourist visits contributed to the slow decline of the economy in 1990s and its near collapse at the height of hyperinflation in 2008. This resulted in widespread shortages of basic commodities, drugs, electricity, food and fuel and a collapse in delivery of social services, including health and education.
Budget cuts in real terms plus massive capital and skills flight accelerated the decline of already fragile health and education sectors as well as water and sanitation services. Declining budgets resulted in deterioration of physical infrastructure, lack of teaching and learning materials, including textbooks and deteriorating standards of performance in schools. At the height of the crisis, a national cholera outbreak killed thousands of people.

The signing of the Global Political Agreement (GPA) in September 2008 and the subsequent formation of the Inclusive Government in February 2009 marked a turning point and improved the country’s prospects for economic stability and development. Real GDP grew by about 6 per cent in 2009 and is estimated to have grown by 9 per cent in 2010 (Africa Development Bank, 2011). By the end of April 2011, inflation was down to about 3 per cent, mainly because of the adoption of the multi-currency regime and the implementation of a cash-based budget system\(^1\). In 2011, the government presented a Medium-Term Plan for 2011-2015 to set the stage for Zimbabwe’s further recovery.

Despite the modest economic recovery and social stability witnessed since 2009, recent evidence suggests that there is a far slower recovery in social service delivery. There are still numerous systemic challenges associated with access to health care, education, housing, water and electricity. Key among these challenges is the shortage of public resources to respond to growing demands for social services. The Ministry of Finance (MoF) data show that economic growth in 2012 is now projected to be 4.4% by the end of the year, and expected to increase over the medium term to 5.0% in 2013, 6.3% in 2014 and down to 5.5% in 2015, with inflation contained at 4.5% (Figure 1). While inflation rates are projected to be stable, single events such as a drought and consequent food shortages and increases in prices may have a magnified impact on overall public expenditure, the cost of living as well as the demand and delivery of social services. It is expected that Zimbabwe will continue to work under the current cash budgeting system with Government expenditures matching revenues, which are projected to stabilise around 30% of GDP over the next three years. Public Expenditures are expected to increase at the same rate as GDP reaching US$5.2 billion by 2015. Employment costs account for more than 70% of the budget leaving only 30% for other current expenditures as well as capital investment. In 2013, employment costs are projected at US$2.6 billion leaving a balance of US$1.2 billion- very little to no resources to meet existing and future economic demands and growth. If present trends continue, Government revenue will be unable to meet adequately the demand for social services, which is already constrained by the shortage of resources, without substantial medium-term external assistance. Figure 1 below shows the various macro-economic indicators for the period of 2009 to 2015.

---

The political and socio-economic situation remains precarious. The final status of negotiations relating to the constitution, clear policies regarding indigenization and investment and a clear roadmap to elections are yet to be finalized. The legacy of decades of economic decline coupled with a large external debt burden, lack of resources to rehabilitate ailing infrastructure and unreliable power supply present potential threats to the future economic and social development of Zimbabwe.

**Education Situation**

*In the 1980s, Zimbabwe's education system earned a reputation as one of the best in Africa.* By 1990, the country had met the original Education for All (EFA) target of universal primary access and was able to report among the highest adult literacy rates in Africa well into the early 2000s. At Independence in 1980, the Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) declared education free for all, abolished all forms of racial discrimination in education, widened access and expanded teacher education. As a result, the number of primary schools increased by 88% from 2,401 in 1979 to 4,504 in 1989. The number of teachers increased and the quality of education improved dramatically. By 2004, there were 4,779 primary schools. This increased further to 5,690, including 701 “satellite schools” in 2006 (MOESAC, 2007). By 1982, primary net enrolment rates were at almost 100%. From 1980 to 1989, enrolments at secondary level increased by 913%. By the early 1990s, however, this surge in enrolments became financially burdensome and began to overwhelm the education system.

*Despite the increasing demand for education, systematic underfunding for the sector beginning in the late 1980s continued well into this decade, with negative effects on access, quality, equity and learning outcomes.* The fiscal challenges experienced between the late 1980s and 2008 reduced the GoZ’s capacity to provide adequate remuneration for staff, plan, implement policies, and assess learning in schools. Infrastructure deteriorated and schools experienced severe shortages of materials. The quality of teaching and learning declined together with transition rates from Grade 7 to Form 1. National pass rates at primary level dropped and from the late 1990s only 20% of students who entered for the examinations were able to pass 5 or more subjects at O-level. Following the

2 “Satellite schools” are schools established as an extension of an existing school, on a new site.
election violence in 2007-8 and the collapse of the currency in 2008, service delivery almost ground to a standstill, with 2008 widely regarded as a “lost year” for education.

**Following the GPA, MOESAC estimates that more than 20,000 teachers returned to teaching.** This was helped by the increased availability of new teaching and learning materials, the blanket amnesty policy for teachers who had left the sector during the hyperinflationary period, and the establishment in 2009 of a stipend, later to become a salary for all public servants. Increased freedom to supplement teachers’ salaries from pupil levies also helped attract teachers to return.

**Government expenditure and external financing for education increased substantially from 2009.** Public expenditure on primary, secondary and tertiary education accounted for 23% of the total budget in 2010 and 25% in 2011, respectively. There was a 46% increase in overall spending between 2010 and 2011. Actual annual spending almost doubled between years 2010 and 2012, from US$513 million in 2010 to the expected US$ 1,053.8 million in 2012. As of September 2012, US$673.20 million was spent as part of the revised 2012 budget, with the remainder expected in the last quarter. This is in line with the Ministry’s mission statement expressed in the Ministry Integrated Agreement, namely, “to promote and facilitate the provision of high quality, inclusive and relevant Early Childhood Development (ECD), Primary and Secondary Education, Life-long Learning and Continuing Education, Sport, Arts and Culture”.

**This was accompanied by an increase in external support from development and multilateral partners through BEAM and the ETF.** Between 2009 and 2010, the donor community contributed $20 million to revitalize funding for BEAM. The GoZ also resumed funding for BEAM in secondary schools in 2010, with DfID solely providing funding for primary schools in 2012. Donors have also continued to support orphans and vulnerable children through the Child Protection Fund (CPF). The development of Government-led strategic plans and donor coordination mechanisms have helped build and maintain stability in the education sector. While this external support represents a small percentage of total national expenditure, it has been targeted at critical non-salary expenditure which could not be financed from the budget.

**Operational costs are underfunded due to high employment costs, which continue to take up a significant portion of the actual recurrent expenditure.** Employment costs increased from 79.2% in 2010 to 88.2% in 2011 and 91.3% in 2012, while the share of recurrent expenditure allocated to operations decreased from 18.5% to 9.8% and 7.8% of the expenditure during the same period (Table 1). Payroll data show that between January and September of 2012, MoESAC had a total of about 116,000 employees on the Government payroll out of a total of 200,000 civil service employees.

---

3 This was largely a result of substantial increases in teacher salaries, along with all public servants.
4 BEAM is a social protection programme designed to reduce the cost barriers (tuition, levies and examination fees) affecting the ability of orphans and vulnerable children (OVC) to access education due to increasing poverty levels in the country. The major objective of BEAM is to prevent households from withdrawing children from school, in response to worsening household poverty. The GoZ wholly funded BEAM until the end of 2008. At its peak, it reached a total of 900,000 school children. However, with the advent of hyperinflation, BEAM resources became negligible and failed to support access to education by the poor and most vulnerable. The programme resumed in 2009 following contributions by donors.
Table 1: Primary & Secondary Expenditure by Category (2010 - 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOESAC Expenditure</th>
<th>2012 (to Sept) (US $m)</th>
<th>2011 (US $m)</th>
<th>2010 (US $m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sport, Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets/ Transfers</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Costs</td>
<td>457.5</td>
<td>486.9</td>
<td>286.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Costs</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>501.2</td>
<td>548.2</td>
<td>362.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GoZ and ETF Financial records

Expenditure on infrastructure and operating costs has not benefited from the increase in expenditure. Capital Transfers decreased from 1.6% of total expenditure in 2010, to 0.5% and 0.4% in 2011 and 2012, respectively. Operating costs are also low, and subject to reduction in the face of increases in salaries, as in 2011. While external sources provide additional funds for some non-salary expenditure such as learning materials and textbooks, the cost of running schools and purchasing teaching and learning supplies and equipment falls almost completely on parents.

The burden of financing school level costs has fallen on families, with negative impact on both access and equity, especially in poor rural areas. 2012 EMIS data show that schools now primarily rely on levies and tuition fees to cover operational expenses, “teacher incentives” and even levies to finance national programmes such as the BSPZ. This amounted to US$415 million in 2011, or about 43% of total primary and secondary expenditure. Over half the students in most schools are in arrears for levy payments, and a small percentage reported that all students were in arrears (ZELA 2012). Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) statistics indicate that the nation’s rural and poor citizens are substantially overrepresented in drop-out rates and repetition rates. The Rural Livelihoods Assessment Report of May 2012 found that about 14% of children of school-going age in the sampled rural households were not attending school largely due to the financial constraints.

These results highlight the disproportionate effect current patterns of public expenditure in education have on access and equity: schools with relatively well-to-do populations can collect higher levies, provide better resources and attract better teachers compared to their peers. Household poverty and the shortage of teaching and learning materials intersect with the challenge of recruiting and retaining qualified teachers to create mutually reinforcing disadvantages and poor learning outcomes for most children from poor economic backgrounds.

Despite challenges, there is a steady growth in enrolments at primary and secondary levels since 2008. EMIS data show that access to education is improving: there has been a steady rise in enrolments at primary and secondary levels. Since 2009 there has been an increase in the percentage of children in the population participating in primary education as a proportion of the correctly aged children. The gender parity indices for the same years, ranging between 0.96 and 0.98, show marginal gender disparities overall.

---

5 This is based on the 2012 EMIS data. Out of the US$415 million, US$ 183 million were for primary school while the remaining US$232 million were for secondary schools.
While overall gender disparities in both access and performance are low, data related to gender suggest a complex dynamic. At a national level gender disparities in access are marginal. Disaggregation by province and location reveals that there are areas where girls’ access is significantly lower, and some areas where boys’ attendance is lower. In learning achievement, girls outperform boys on most measures, except in A level, where their access is also significantly lower. These patterns suggest a more nuanced approach to gender issues in education in Zimbabwe is required, including the need for systematic disaggregation of data and good analysis to identify the dynamics that are operating and to inform appropriate responses. The prevalence of gender-based violence in the society also impacts, and is impacted by schooling. The ETF is financing a number of initiatives that target gender issues directly, and a charity CAMFED runs a substantial girls’ education programme with funding support from DFID.

More than half the identified Orphans and Vulnerable children (53.5%) presently receive no support from BEAM. The steady growth in school levies has meant that fewer children are covered by the allocation to each school. This varies also by province, as in some provinces the proportion not receiving support is closer to 60%. Outstanding claims still represent a challenge to the BEAM programme.
While enrolment has increased and the provision of learning materials has improved, the supply of qualified and competent teachers to all schools represents the most significant challenge to quality of learning. The total number of teachers has seen a steady increase at both primary and secondary level of education. At the primary level this has resulted in the pupil:teacher ratio continuing to decline. However, when the qualifications of teachers are taken into account, the ratio of pupils to trained teachers has increased (Figure 4). With respect to the availability of qualified teachers, ministry data also show disparities between schools, rural and urban areas as well as provinces: schools in urban areas and those with better resources tend to attract the most of the trained teachers.

Within the primary system, efficiency is relatively high, with high promotion and low drop-out during the year and low repetition. The higher repetition rate in Grade 1 is largely attributed to underage children enrolled in Grade 1 where there is no ECD class. Transition from Grade 7 to Form 1, however, is relatively low, and transition from Form 4 to Lower 6 (A-Level) is extremely low, at less than 20 percent. However, the actual number of pupils completing the secondary cycle successfully through to Upper 6 is only 168 in every 1000 pupils\(^6\). This gives a high wastage ratio of 4.14 and a

\(^6\) 2012 school census data also recorded 2011 secondary enrolments. The analysis is based on a subset of a total of 2274 schools (98.4% of schools) from the school census for 2012 for enrolments in years 2011 and 2012 and repeaters in year 2012.
low coefficient of efficiency of 24%. The main source of wastage is dropout, most of which occurs between Grade 7 and Form 1, and Form 4 and lower 6. The average duration a pupil studies through to grade 7 is 7.12 years owing to the low level of repetition. The average pupil who drops out remains in the system for only 3.05 years. The average duration a student participates in primary education is only 4.78 years of the full 7 year cycle. The number of students transitioning into the non-formal, vocational or college education system is presently unknown.

**While enrolment and teacher numbers have recovered from the crisis, indicators of learning outcomes point to a persistent and serious problem.** The recent ETF-financed Zimbabwe Early Learning Assessment (ZELA) revealed alarmingly low performance in early learning, with average scores below 35% for both English and maths. While girls marginally outperformed boys in English and maths, there were substantial variations across provinces and between rural and urban areas. The ZELA assessment provides a baseline for early learning performance, but also lays the technical, institutional and human resource foundations for an ongoing learning assessment system. The ZELA results confirmed the findings of the Manicaland Learning Achievement Tracking (LAT) study in 2010, which used an existing Zimbabwean psychometric instrument known as the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) to assess the learning achievement gaps of students at all levels in Manicaland schools. The results showed that there were very significant achievement lags, and that these appear to be longer, the higher up the system pupils move.

**Table 2: Percent of Learners performing at or below grade level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Primary Level</th>
<th>Secondary Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below grade</td>
<td>At or above grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Manicaland Learning Achievement Tracking, 2010.

**LAT also highlighted the critical role of reading and concluded that given the centrality of English and Mathematics in the learning of other subjects,** poor performance in these subjects suggests that performance for other subjects may be at the same level or worse. The study further reported that children in rural and peri-urban areas perform significantly worse than those in urban areas, which is consistent with other research on disparities in education.

**These early learning gaps are manifested in poor performance in the Grade 7 and O-Level public examinations.** Grade 7 examinations pass rates have not recovered since 2007 when the national pass rate was 70.5%, however they have increased marginally since reaching a low of 39.7% in 2009 to a present level of 49.6% in 2012. A 49.6% pass rate still indicates serious deficiencies in the level of learning achievement of primary school pupils. Without assessing the quality of learning in early grades, both the system and teachers are not able to effectively deploy the already scarce resources in a more targeted and systematic way to improve the quality of learning. Of the students who sat for examinations, girls outperformed boys by 3.95 percentage points at grade 7 and at A’ level examinations (3.21%) while boys outperformed girls by 3.83 percentage points at O’ level, in 2011. A
level examination results have steadily improved reaching a low in 2008 however enrolments in A level are very small with a 19% promotion rate from Form 4 to Lower 6 (2012 EMIS). The performance in O level exams is very low at 22.1% pass despite almost doubling from its low in 2007 of 11.9%.

**Figure 6**: Examination Pass rates 2005 - 2011

![Graph showing examination pass rates from 2005 to 2011](image)

*Source: MOESAC Primary and Secondary Departments, 2012.*

Poor examination results, and low transition rates between grade 7 and Form 1 as well as the number of students who are leaving primary school without acquiring the most basic skills have heightened calls to increase the number of qualified teachers and improve teaching in schools. While the number of trained teachers is one indicator of the quality of education service delivery, it is no guarantor of quality learning outcomes. International experience supports the call of almost all education officials for strengthening of ongoing teacher professional development and coaching to deepen professional capacities.

**In 1996, the GoZ adopted the Better Schools Programme Zimbabwe (BSPZ)** through a funding agreement with the Royal Netherlands Government, to improve the quality of teaching through ongoing in-service training for teachers, head teachers and education officers. The BSPZ was a whole school development programme that included a wide range of activities at school and district level, but a particular focus of the programme was school and cluster-based teacher professional development, for which resources were transferred directly to schools. By 2002, however, in-service training opportunities had become limited because hyperinflation eroded allocated funds for programmes. With the withdrawal of donor support for the programme, the Ministry sustained the programme through a per pupil levy on schools. However, as economic conditions tightened and the pressure on pupil levies to finance teacher salary supplements increased, payment of BSPZ funds to the BSPZ Committees at district level declined, so that most schools are now in arrears, although many continue to pay. A result of this is that very few schools receive the small grants that were made back to schools (about 20c per head per term) to cover school and cluster based professional development of teachers. In consequence teacher professional development at the school level has declined dramatically, and what little takes place is not effectively coordinated through the BSPZ. The in-service training that BSPZ continues to finance tends to be largely course-based and provided in district training facilities. While an important component of any professional development programme, international experience confirms that such course-based training out of schools have
little impact on teacher practice unless consolidated by school-based, on the job professional development and supervision.

**Spurred on by the findings of the LAT study, the Ministry has piloted and now plans to take to scale a programme designed to address learning achievement gaps, known as the Performance Lag Addressing Programme (PLAP).** The PLAP was piloted in schools in Manicaland in 2011. PLAP operates through a programme of accelerated learning that mobilised the School Psychological Services specialists and the District Remedial Tutors to train teachers to provide remedial learning to students. It also involved District Education Officers, Inspectors and school heads in the programme to support and assess progress. Internal evaluation of the programme showed very promising results in closing learning gaps. As a result of this success, the Ministry has launched PLAP as a national programme, and is presently developing an implementation strategy and budget to take the programme to scale.

**For the first time since 2006, the 2012 EMIS results were available and analysed in the year of collection.** MOESAC, with technical and financial assistance from ETF, has commenced the revitalization of the national EMIS system. This has greatly strengthened the Ministry capacity to analyse the education situation, and establishes a foundation for more effective monitoring and management of the system, and improved policy and strategic planning capacity. This is reflected in the EMTP Operational Plan which accompanies this Programme Document. This strengthened platform for planning will be bolstered by a proposed Teacher Training and Development Information System (TDIS) to help keep track of teacher training and professional development needs, and to target teacher in-service training more strategically. This places the MOESAC in an excellent position to prepare for the next medium term planning cycle (2016 – 2020), and ensure that the next Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP 2020) will lay a solid foundation to enable the sector to play its role in the development of Zimbabwe.

**Strengthened school supervision and management is a key objective of EMTP, and training of supervisors and administrators is a key activity financed through ETF II.** Significant advances in the frequency and quality of school supervision have been made since 2009, with the provision of at least 70 vehicles for districts (financed by both government and ETF II). The adoption of Whole School Development model has helped to integrate school and district level supervision. A recent MOESAC report cited evidence that 50% of schools had received a supervision visit in the past year, and the target for 2015 is at least one visit per school per year. Many Districts already exceed that target. School supervision is often supported by BSPZ human and financial resources. Linkage of teacher supervision and a common set of performance standards remains a significant challenge.

**A detailed situation analysis of the education sector is contained in the EMTP-Operational Plan, on which this summarised version drew.** The key elements to emerge from this overview are:

(i) Although it suffered serious setbacks, the Zimbabwe primary and secondary education system has made strides towards recovery since 2009;

(ii) The financing of the system remains a serious challenge, with little chance that even recurrent expenditure can be financed adequately from public resources for the next few years;
(iii) Public expenditure is almost totally consumed by personnel costs, with very little for non-salary operating expenditure or capital investment;

(iv) Households have to bear a very substantial share of education costs, including almost all school level operating expenditure, but also employment costs for supplementing teachers’ income, and for privately employed teachers;

(v) This has impacted negatively on access, and greatly exacerbated inequalities, especially between rural and urban areas;

(vi) While the number of teachers in the system has increased, the proportion of qualified teachers has declined as many untrained teachers recruited in the crisis continue to fill supply gaps;

(vii) Learning outcomes, measured both through public examinations and recent sample based learning assessment initiatives reveal a serious problem, particularly in the lower grades, which cause learning achievement lags that persist, and worsen, as pupils progress through the system;

(viii) Financing for in-service education of teachers, especially school and cluster-based teacher professional development has seriously declined, with the result that delivery of school-based professional development is very limited in many schools;

(ix) The Ministry is committed to a number of initiatives to strengthen the level and quality of service provision, including re-invigoration of BSPZ, scaling up of PLAP, improving teacher supervision and monitoring through TMS, and strengthening planning and policy capacity through a revitalised EMIS, and a new information system to help track teacher training and development needs.

3. Institutional Context: National Strategy and Donor Collaboration

Education has been central to government strategy for recovery and development. As part of its recovery strategy in 2009, the Inclusive Government adopted a Short Term Emergency Recovery Program (STERP) which provided a basis for economic stabilization and initiated the economic recovery. The STERP also addressed recovery in the social sectors, including a commitment to ensuring payment of salaries to teachers, provision of learning materials for students, and reviving the examinations system. From February 2010 the Ministry of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture (MOESAC), with support from Development Partners (DPs) engaged in an extensive process of consultation and analysis to develop and refine a strategy for the sector. The process began with a national consultation exercise carried out in all 10 Provinces in early 2010, which provided a basis for the 2010 Situation Analysis. This informed the first Interim Education Strategy (2010 – 2012) presented to Cabinet in July 2010, and an accompanying Strategic Investment Plan (2010 – 2011). These initial steps in developing a sector strategy fed into the development of the Education Medium Term Plan (EMTP) 2010 – 2015, completed and endorsed by the government in May 2012.

The Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM) and the Education Transition Fund (ETF) were the two major frameworks for development partners and government to work together for education recovery and development during this period. BEAM focused on reducing economic obstacles to educational access for the poorest and most marginalised children. BEAM channelled cash grants directly to schools to help offset unpaid fees and levies incurred by orphans and vulnerable children (OVCs). The program was administered by the Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare, and was financed by both donor partners (primary) and government (secondary) from 2009. The
education Development Partners also opted for the establishment of a multi-donor fund administered by UNICEF – the Education Transition Fund (ETF). ETF I (2009 – 2011) largely focused on emergency recovery strategies such as purchase and distribution of textbooks, and reflected the priorities identified in the Interim Education Strategy and Strategic Investment Plan. ETF II (2012–2014) was informed by the strategic planning priorities emerging from the strategic planning process and is well aligned with both the Interim Strategy and the EMTP and its Operational Plan.

In 2010 the government of Zimbabwe entered initial discussions with the GPE’s predecessor, the Fast Track Initiative (FTI) regarding possible support from this global fund to supplement government and ETF resources for education recovery, reconstruction and development. The advice from the FTI Secretariat was to continue to refine the emerging education strategy and convert it into a credible transitional strategic plan, which would provide a framework for FTI/GPE support. In 2012 the MOESAC was formally advised of an indicative allocation of US$23.6 million and invited to submit an application, and was provided support for the development of an EMTP Operational Plan, covering the period 2013 – 2015.

The November 2012 review of the Zimbabwe National Medium Term Plan (2011 – 2015) also indicated a concern that plans and financing priorities should reflect a stronger awareness of the financial position of government and the forecast fiscal prospects, which were substantially lower than projections in sector plans provided for. Within the education sector, availability of recent assessments of early learning in the first three grades of primary school (ZELA 2012), plus a regional assessment of performance lags in primary schools (LAT 2010) revealed that the long recognised poor performance of students in Grade 7 and O level examinations had its origins in very poor learning achievement in the early grades. While efforts to provide basic inputs to support learning, especially textbooks and learning materials, had had a small impact on performance, it was increasingly recognised that greater support was needed to strengthen the basic teaching skills of teachers.

Because GPE funds are unlikely to be available for release until late 2013, the proposed project to be financed by GPE will run from 2014 – 2016, with 2013 (“Year 0”) to include preparation activities and piloting. Financing of these initial activities has been secured from ETF for 2013. The relationship of these major interventions with the emerging strategy in wider government and within the education sector is reflected in the diagram below:
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Donor coordination and effective partnership between government and development partners has been critical to achievements in education in Zimbabwe to date. The current coordination arrangements started from a low point in 2009 when some economic sanctions were lifted as part of the donor response to the Short Term Economic Recovery Plan. Prior to this what little donor support for education in Zimbabwe was provided by donors was directed around government, with funds and projects managed by various non-government organizations. Donor support for resuscitation of BEAM in 2009, and the ETF established shortly thereafter, provided a more direct mechanism for support to the education system working closely with government. In the case of BEAM, donor funds were initially administered by UNICEF and provided directly to school accounts.

The responsible ministry in Government was the Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare which worked closely with MOESAC to coordinate the initiative. The establishment of the ETF provided a more direct relationship between development partners and MOESAC. ETF Plans are developed in collaboration with MOESAC teams in alignment with MOESAC strategy (Strategic Investment Plan 2010-2011, EMTP 2011 – 2015), and all expenditure of funds is reflected in the ETF Annual Plans approved by the Education Coordination Group (ECG) chaired by the Minister of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture, and with membership that includes MOESAC, Ministry of Higher and Tertiary Education (MoHTE), funding partners, Civil Society Organization (CSO) representatives, UNICEF and UNESCO. The implementation of ETF programmes is monitored by the ETF Steering Committee, co-chaired by the Minister of Education, Sport, Arts and Culture and the Permanent Secretary for Education, Sport, Arts and Culture with membership from education funding partners and UNESCO, and Secretariat provided by UNICEF.

Current international sanctions and other circumstances prevent many development partners from channelling funds directly through government accounts. Instead, development partners have opted for a form of “shadow alignment” so that wherever possible funds are disbursed directly on the basis of decisions made through the normal ministry decision-making procedures. These arrangements provide for the highest possible degree of alignment of expenditure with government
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8 Since 2012 BEAM for primary schools has been funded solely by DfID, through a contracted implementing agency.
plans and procedures, and are helping to lay the foundations for more direct funding relationships once conditions permit. The specific arrangements to achieve optimal alignment are described in the Project Description and Implementation Arrangements, below.

**Recovery of Zimbabwe’s education system builds on a robust, if centralised, institutional network.** Within the Ministry there is a well-established network of provincial offices and district offices with well-defined responsibilities and functions and good reporting systems. The system suffered considerably from underfunding over the past decade through decline in communication systems and loss of key personnel. However, the challenging times have in some ways strengthened these offices which have found ways to continue to function with very little financial support from the centre. The resilience of the system at provincial and district level is a key asset on which recovery has been built. Current plans to link the provincial offices (and eventually district) offices electronically, with networked access for EMIS and teacher training and development information systems will greatly strengthen this institutional capacity and provide a good basis for both improved planning and better teacher professional development.

4. **The Project**

The project described in this document is located within the framework of the EMTP and the EMTP Operational Plan, and targets three key areas of intervention that are not adequately addressed by current government programmes and donor plans, including through the ETF. These are: (i) strengthening teaching skills of teachers to reduce or eliminate performance lags in primary grades and improve learning outcomes; (ii) improving the supervision and management of teacher performance and development; and (iii) incorporating the growing evidence base into a comprehensive education sector strategic plan for the period 2016 – 2020.

**Improving the professional status of teachers was identified as priority number one in the Interim Strategy (2010) and the EMTP (2011).** This is reflected in the need for not only improved pay and conditions of service to build morale and motivation, but also in strengthened competence and skills of newly recruited teachers, and upgrading the skills of all teachers. A workshop of senior officials, head-teachers, development partners and civil society in November 2012 identified teacher professional development as the most critical intervention to address the issues of access and quality in Zimbabwe. While government continues to prioritise improved pay and service conditions for teachers, it is seeking assistance from development partners to address the urgent need for upgrading teaching skills of teachers in service, particularly in light of the serious lags in learning achievement highlighted by ZELA and LAT. Thus the EMTP-OP (2013-2015) has a more focused Operational Objective One: “Strengthen teacher development and management”.

**The importance of good evidence-based strategic planning and policy development** has emerged as a key lesson from the period since 2009. From early consensus building and prioritising exercises at Nyanga and Leopard Rock in 2009 and 2010, through extensive stakeholder consultation exercises in the period since, strategic planning has been supported by the World Bank directly, and by other partners through the ETF. Strengthening the evidence base for policy and strategy has also been a consistent focus so that, for the first time since 2006, up-to-date information on the education
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system is now available through the Education Management Information System (EMIS). While the ETF II provides for ongoing support for implementing and operationalizing the EMTP and for further strengthening and institutionalising the evidence base for policy and planning, it does not make provision for supporting the development of the next five year plan for the period 2016 – 2020. This project will address that issue and help ensure that there is a comprehensive Education Sector Strategic Plan for the period 2016 – 2020 (ESSP 2020).

Alignment and Sustainability
Zimbabwe has a long history of educational innovation and the history of education development in Zimbabwe is rich with experience of promising projects, and littered with acronyms of past initiatives. In designing this project every effort has been made to ensure that support is given to existing initiatives and programmes of the MOESAC rather than to create new initiatives with new acronyms and different implementation arrangements. In addition, every effort has been made to ensure that the support provided through the project does not overwhelm the system but enriches and strengthens government programmes, leaving them with greater institutional capacity in terms of technical skills, administrative infrastructure, information and reporting systems and stronger accountability mechanisms.

While the prohibition on channelling the GPE funds through government accounts remains in place, every effort has been made to ensure alignment of the financial management and accountability arrangements with those of government so that these can be incorporated into the government system when conditions permit. This is bolstered by intensive financial management training supported by ETF. Working through existing government programmes means that decisions will, as far as possible, be made through the existing consultation and management arrangements that have been put in place for each initiative supported by the project, even while funds are not disbursed through government accounts.

Project Development Objective
The Development Objective for this project is:

To boost learning outcomes in basic education through continuous professional development of teachers, improved teacher supervision and management as well as strengthened evidence based policy and strategic planning.

Overview of Project Components
The Project consists of three components, each with several subcomponents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>SUB-COMPONENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT ONE: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR BETTER TEACHING AND LEARNING</td>
<td>1.1 In-service support to teachers in Grades 1 - 3: Strengthening skills to teach reading, working through the Better Schools Program of Zimbabwe (BSPZ) arrangements for teacher professional development in schools and clusters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Catch-up remedial education for grades 4 - 7: Strengthening remedial education skills for Grades 4-7 teachers to bridge the performance gap among affected learners through the PLAP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component One: Professional Development for Better Teaching and Learning

The major focus of this component is the strengthening of the system of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) for teachers in service. It constitutes an important element of the Teacher Education and Professional Development Strategic Framework which is articulated in the EMTP-Operational Plan (EMTP-OP). The component provides for financing activities implemented under two MOESAC projects: BSPZ and PLAP.

The objective of the component is to improve the quality of teaching and learning in Zimbabwe schools, with a special focus on teaching of reading and writing in grades 1-3, and on remedial teaching activities for primary students with significant learning achievement gaps.

The component consists of two sub-components that address, respectively, teaching of reading in lower grades and remedial teaching of English and Maths for primary students with significant learning achievements gaps.

Sub-Component 1.1: In-service support to teachers in Grades 1 - 3

Evidence from the situation analysis reveals that a substantial proportion of students are “falling at the first hurdle”, failing to acquire basic skills of reading and writing upon which all other learning depends. While considerable resources have been directed at improving the learning environment, particularly through the provision of textbooks and learning materials, the strongest need articulated by almost all stakeholders in all consultations has been for some intensive professional development for teachers to develop and update their skills in teaching of reading. This applies to all teachers, including both the unqualified or under-qualified teachers, and those qualified who have many years of experience but who have not been exposed to modern approaches to the teaching of reading.

Over the past decade, international research on early learning has yielded substantial new knowledge and understanding of the process of inculcating literacy. The capacity-building component of the ZELA program has helped develop familiarity with this knowledge within the Ministry and within ZIMSEC.

The program will operate by strengthening and supplementing the existing MOESAC institutional mechanism for continuous professional development of teachers – the Better Schools Programme of Zimbabwe (BSPZ). The BSPZ was launched in the 1990s as whole school development initiative, establishing a network of school clusters which provided a framework for district, school and cluster-based professional development of teachers. In its initial form, BSPZ was centrally concerned with in-
service professional development of teachers through the cluster system. It was well established in every district, and when, in 2003, external financing ended, MOESAC continued its operation, financed largely through a per pupil levy on schools. Initially this levy was relatively small (20c per child per term), but this has grown to around USD1 per child per year, and in some districts, per term.

This financing system enabled professional development activities to continue through very difficult circumstances. While BSPZ was initially intended to transfer funds to schools to support school and cluster-based activities, this flow of funds to schools has almost completely ceased, seriously constraining the school and cluster-based professional development that BSPZ was initially intended to promote. Thus most teacher in-service education currently takes place at district level in course-based training.

An important first step will be to strengthen and/or rebuild the institutional, human and technical capacity of the BSPZ within the Ministry. This will involve review and updating of the school cluster system, support for additional human and technical resources at district and cluster level, and revision/preparation of operational manuals to support the new focus on Early Grade Reading.

Zimbabwe has made significant strides in expanding Early Childhood Development (ECD), so that some 50% of children now have access to some form of ECD. This rapid expansion has been achieved through a two-pronged approach, requiring schools to establish early learning programmes at primary schools, and promoting the appointment and training of para-professional teaching staff, supported by a cohort of ECD teachers trained through courses run by Colleges of Education. Support for quality of ECD has been provided through design of a national curriculum, provision of learning and play supplies and recently an initiative to develop learning materials and readers to enhance the development of pre-literacy skills. These materials are developed in Zimbabwe in each mother-tongue that is a medium of instruction. For many years, community-based ECD initiatives have provided opportunities for early learning to the majority of the 3–6 year-olds before the introduction of formal ECD A and ECD B in Zimbabwe’s education system. This approach should be viewed as an alternative for those children who cannot access ECD in formal school settings, and emphasis could be on the strengthening of parenting skills.

The GPE financed subcomponent will build on these preliteracy skill materials, and integrate them into the Early Reading Modules. Using the BSPZ school cluster system, the focus of continuous professional development for teachers in grades 1 – 3 will be on early reading skills, taking children from preliteracy and school readiness into early reading. Activities will be focused on cluster-based training using the modules and student workbooks, with regular follow up by the trained Cluster Resource Tutors (CRT) in each cluster. Orientation to the programme and materials will be provided to head teachers and District Education Officers (DEOs) to ensure that supervision supports the new approach.

The Ministry will work with the PSC to request secondment of one qualified teacher in each District (72) to serve as BSPZ Coordinator. Until 2012 each District Office had one full-time staff member appointed as BSPZ Coordinator to manage the complex activities of the BSPZ program. In 2012 these staff were returned to their teaching posts in schools on the instruction of the PSC on the
grounds that qualified teachers were required in schools, and the duties of District BSPZ Coordinator were largely administrative. The focus on teacher professional development and early reading in primary schools requires direction by a person with suitable pedagogical skills and experience.

GPE supported activities include:
- Design, development and production of training modules for teaching of reading in Grades 1-3, with teacher guides
- Design, development and production of student workbooks to take students through the modules
- Development and production of readers in all official languages of instruction used in grades 1 – 3
- Provision of equipment and supplies to District BSPZ Teacher Resource Centres/Libraries
- Provision of equipment and supplies to clusters to facilitate training
- National, Provincial and District Orientation workshops to ensure orientation to the programme and familiarity with the materials (1 day)
- District training workshops for early learning cluster coordinators (1 – 2 per cluster) (3 day)
- Cluster workshops with early grade teachers from each school, one per module (4, one day)
- Regular school visits (2 per term) by Cluster Resource Teacher for early learning to each school

MOESAC activities that support the project include:
- Normal school visits by District Education Officers/inspectors from District Office
- Monitoring of performance of Cluster Coordinators by District Education staff

**Progress in the implementation of this component will be assessed** (i) at the output level on production and distribution of equipment and materials, completion of courses and number of school visits and reports, and (ii) at the outcome level, on the performance in ZELA reading assessments. Details of the M&E arrangements are included in the Results Framework (Annex 1).

**Subcomponent 1.2: Catch-up remedial education for grades 4-7**

Evidence from the situation analysis identified serious early learning achievement gaps as a major factor in the consistently poor performance in Grade 7 examinations. Learning achievement gaps are up to five years in some cases, with indications from the LAT exercise that performance lags tend to increase the longer children are in school.

MOESAC has piloted and is presently taking to scale a national program to address these learning gaps. The program, known as “Performance Lag Addressing Programme” (PLAP) is described in more detail elsewhere in this document. PLAP is a core project of the MOESAC for which the government is currently developing a national roll-out plan to reach every school over three years. Current proposals for this roll-out are based on a cascade training model that is very workshop intensive. The GPE financed sub-component will involve development of a materials-driven school
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10 Existing BSPZ arrangements provide for a Cluster Coordinator, who may be a school head, and is not infrequently based in a secondary school. The Cluster Committee will identify a suitably qualified teacher in a primary school in the cluster as the Early Reading Cluster Resource Teacher (CRT)

11 “Lag” is itself an acronym for “Learning Achievement Gap”, the gap between a student’s current learning level and her/his present grade.
and cluster-focused learning model that targets the teachers at school and cluster level, with supervision and support from District Remedial Tutors. This will complement the present district-based in-service courses. Shorter orientation courses will be provided for district, provincial and national officials.

**Activities will be coordinated at the District level to ensure alignment with Component 1.1 activities for Grades 1—3 teachers.** District level activities will be coordinated by the seconded BSPZ District Coordinator. The implementation strategy will make use of the revived BSPZ school cluster system and aligned at District level with GPE supported BSPZ activities for teachers in Grades 1 – 3, to economise on travel to schools and cluster centres, and optimise sharing of equipment and facilities. Each District has a Remedial Education Tutor, who will receive support and guidance from the School Psychological Services personnel at Head Office and Provincial level.

**Logistical support for PLAP implementation will be provided by contracted implementation support providers.** PLAP is and will remain a MOESAC programme and not a GPE “project”. All policy and strategic decisions will remain the responsibility of the relevant school, cluster, District and Provincial authorities, under the overall supervision of the Head Office team responsible for roll-out of PLAP. However, in order to reduce the logistical demands on MOESAC, the Ministry will contract, with GPE funds through UNICEF, the services of three or more implementation support contractors through competitive selection. It should be noted that the first PLAP initiative, in Manicaland, was initiated with this kind of support. MOESAC has experience in selecting and managing implementation support providers in the recent launch of the Out of School programme supported by UNICEF and financed from ETF II. The contracting out of this logistical support will permit the District and Cluster personnel to focus their energies on conducting the LAT, and implementing the remedial programmes using the modules and materials developed for the programme.

**Districts and Clusters will receive operational grants** paid into District BSPZ accounts and cluster sub-accounts of the school account of the central school in each cluster on the basis of an approved action plan approved by the District BSPZ Committee. In addition, small grant allocations will be made available to Districts and Clusters for them to identify needs from a list of equipment, furniture and teaching supplies which will be centrally procured and delivered by UNICEF. Cluster requisitions will be forwarded by District Coordinators, with support from the logistical support contractor. Districts will be asked to plan on a six month delivery cycle, so that requisitions will be received by UNICEF six months ahead of planned delivery date, to permit central procurement.

**GPE financed activities for this subcomponent include:**

- Development and distribution of learning modules for English and Maths Grades 4 – 7
- Printing and distribution of Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) assessment tests
- Provision of equipment and supplies for producing assessment reports
- Selection and contracting of implementation support providers
- Conducting LAT assessment in clusters using WRAT
- 1-Day orientation workshops for PEDs, DEOs, relevant Inspectors
- 3-Day Training workshops at District Level for Inspectors, Cluster Coordinators and Remedial Tutors
• 1 day training for school heads in clusters
• 1 Day Training at Cluster level for teachers in schools (1 per module)
• 3 follow-up visits per term to each school by PLAP Cluster Resource Teacher.

**MOESAC activities that complement this component include:**

• Regular school visits by Inspectors/District Education Officers
  Regular review of school leadership performance by DEOs/Inspectors

**Evaluation of implementation of this sub-component will focus** (i) at the outcome level on learning achievement gaps measured through the LAT tests using WRAT; and, (ii) at the output level on production and completion of key outputs, such as materials prepared and delivered, courses completed, school visits completed. Details of the M&E arrangements are included in the Results Framework (Annex 1).

**Component Two: Supervision and Management of Teacher Performance and Development**

*The situation analysis identified weaknesses in teacher supervision and management as a major challenge to education quality.* This component will complement the teacher professional development addressed in Component One with a focus on strengthening the existing arrangements for teacher supervision and management using the framework of Teacher Minimum Standards (TMS) and better information on training needs of teachers. Teacher supervision via head teachers with supervision visits by the DEOs means that more attention is being paid to the supervision of teachers. However, while existing supervision procedures are based on best practice principles, the instruments do not provide a set of common standards that can be used for teacher career development, performance management and continuous professional development.

**The objective of this component is to improve the monitoring and management of teacher performance and in-service professional development.**

**Subcomponent 2.1: Improved Teacher Performance Management through Supervision and Monitoring Using the Teacher Minimum Standards (TMS)**

The EMTP identified the improvement of the professional status of teachers as the highest priority objective for the period 2011 – 2015. In addition to the need to improve teachers’ salaries and working conditions (which are largely beyond the scope of MOESAC as teachers are employed by the Public Service Commission), the EMTP proposed the introduction of Teacher Minimum Standards as a mechanism for monitoring and improving teacher performance in a fair and transparent way.

*Previous teacher minimum standards initiatives have not been robust and coherent, clearly articulated, fully communicated to all relevant stakeholders,* or applied in a manner that reflects consistency over time. There is no single document that summarises the expectations for teacher standards. As a result, a very heterogeneous teaching force has come into being in the country.

**MOESAC has identified TMS as the starting point for Teacher Education reform.** The TMS, when finalised, can provide a mechanism for improving quality as well as equity. They impact quality
because the TMS focuses on the skills a teacher should demonstrate to improve learning outcomes and equity as they provide an agreed standard for all teachers wherever they may live and work.

**MoESAC is leading the development of the TMS** with a process involving all main stakeholders including representatives from MoHTE, head-teacher and teacher organizations, partner organisations and national parent associations.

The table below outlines the beneficiaries of the TMS:

**Table 3: Beneficiaries of the TMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User of TMS:</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>to self-assess their own skills and to identify further professional development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents</strong></td>
<td>to understand the complexity of the teacher’s work,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentors</strong></td>
<td>to identify the support needed for their teacher colleagues,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head teachers, inspectors and district education officers</strong></td>
<td>to observe the level of competence of their teaching staff and provide support and supervision,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum reviewers</strong></td>
<td>to link teacher competence with curriculum implementation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colleges and universities with responsibility for initial teacher education</strong></td>
<td>to realign their courses to ensure graduating teachers have all the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes to meet the demands of the TMS and for educating learners in the 21st Century,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The MoESAC</strong></td>
<td>to design their systems and strategic planning to ensure improvement in learning outcomes through providing a cadre of teachers who are “highly motivated and professionally competent” (EMTP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The MoHTE</strong></td>
<td>to help produce “a unique brand of a teacher, with norms and values consistent with the philosophy of unhu/ubuntu” (MoHTE Strategic Plan, 2011-2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MoESAC created a Standards Technical Working Group (STWG) to guide the process** of developing, piloting and monitoring the introduction of Teacher Minimum Standards (TMS). The group of 15 members represent the range of stakeholders such as MoESAC principal directors and provincial directors, MoHTE (including Department of Teacher Education, Teacher College Principals, Universities, Polytechnics) partner organisations who have been working in the field of teacher Education, UNICEF and UNESCO. The Working Group will continue to meet as long as it has value to development and piloting of the modules.

**In 2013 the TMS will be finalised, piloted and revised.** Examples of how each standard could be observed during classroom observation will be developed and supported by video clips. During the same year preparatory work will be undertaken to align pre-service teacher education courses to the TMS.
In 2014, a TMS manual will be developed and training will be provided to district education officers, cluster coordinators, head teachers and school instructional improvement coaches with a focus on structured observation, recording and feedback. The TMS will also be incorporated into the teacher induction procedures. Currently all beginning teachers have a two year probationary period, but lack of common standards and resources has meant that most are confirmed in their posts without any rigorous performance assessment. Induction has largely been the responsibility of head teachers and has been of varying quality. For all new teachers and untrained teachers a period of one year will be dedicated to induction where each teacher will be offered two structured classroom observations as part of a formative process to align their teaching with the demands of the TMS. Each structured observation will be preceded with a pre-observation interview with the teacher and followed by a post observation interview with oral and written feedback.

During the second probationary year the teacher will receive a structured classroom observation from the cluster coordinator or district education officer which will be supportive but evaluative in nature and will ensure that prior to receiving fully qualified teacher status the teacher will have met all the requirements of the TMS. The value of this process is that supervision is kept close to the teacher and is focused on supportive supervision. The TDIS will track probationary and confirmed status of teachers.

TMS Professional Development self-instruction modules will be developed in 2015 for use in 2016 and beyond. One of the purposes of the TMS instrument is to identify teachers’ strengths and weaknesses. If a teacher does not meet some of the standards they will be directed towards various activities that will help them to improve their skills in a specific area e.g. lesson planning or using local materials for teaching maths. The limited number of self-instruction modules developed for TMS will focus on the areas that are most commonly missing in teachers’ assessments.

Once the themes for the modules have been identified (following the pilot of the TMS instrument) a process for identifying potential authors will be put in train. The modules will be trialled and adapted ready for production and distribution. The modules will be available at cluster centres to encourage more collaborative learning to take place. All inspectors and other supervisors will be cognisant about the various interventions that can be used to ensure teachers can work towards achieving minimum standards. The modules will also be available in District Resource Centres and Cluster Central Schools to help new teachers reach fully qualified teacher status.

Implementation of sub-component 2.1:
The activities planned under this sub component will be to refine and disseminate TMS through Districts to cluster and school CPD planning processes and to support District Education Officers, Inspectors and other supervisory staff to adapt teacher performance appraisal tools to incorporate TMS.

At the school and cluster level, cluster coordinators and head teachers, school supervisory staff and mentors will be trained in structured observation and feedback so that performance appraisal can be implemented using widely accepted standards and procedures.
Proposed activities:

For 2013 (financed from ETF resources)

- Support for the Teacher Standards Technical Working Group (STWG).
  - 5 one day meetings for 25 people
  - 5 research days for researchers to support the work of the group - 5x5 days
  - 10 Provincial 1-Day consultation workshops to build consensus and ownership by both teachers and managers

- Piloting in 2013
  - Piloting of TMS in 6 districts in 3 provinces (3,000 sets of pilot materials)
  - 2 training days for cluster coordinators, head teachers and inspectors
  - 2 research days to compile results of pilot

- Adjusting of standards in light of results of pilot - 2 research days, 1 meeting of STWG

For 2014

- Design, printing and distribution of materials, posters and manuals -
  - 115,000 copies of the standards, descriptors, examples for teachers
  - 10,000 copies of manuals for all schools, district education officers and inspectors
  - 5,000 posters and 10,000 brochures for advocacy

- Training of head teachers, district supervisory staff, and cluster coordinators in structured observation, recording and feedback.
  - Training (1 day) - application + review (1 day)

For 2015

- Monitoring at province and district level of quality of supervision processes
- Monitoring at school level of quality of classroom observation and feedback

For 2016

- Piloting of portfolio assessment – 3 districts (total) in 3 provinces
- Training of head teachers, district supervisory staff and mentors in development of guidance for utilising portfolios. 2,500 number for 1 day.
- Costs of providing 5,000 portfolios

MOESAC activities that support this component include:

- Organisation of cross ministry coordination meetings
- Regular school visits by Inspectors and cluster visits by district education officers

MOHTE activities that support this component include:

- Training of school mentors by teacher colleges
- Adaptation of in-service modules by the University of Zimbabwe
- Quality control of assessment of Teacher education students across provinces

**Subcomponent 2.2: Teacher Training and Development Information System**

*The MOESAC currently uses a manual system for teacher files,* so that an individual file for each teacher is maintained in hard copy, and very little information on individual teachers is electronically available except that which has been captured in the salary payment system. Even this information is not electronically available to MOESAC for professional development planning. The establishment of an information database that would provide up-to-date information on teachers by training,
location, age, experience, qualifications, performance and training received or recommended etc. is necessary to permit the planning of human resource development activities, and to target teacher professional development in the most efficient and effective manner. The establishment of a Teacher Training and Development Information System (TDIS) has strong support from the HR Division in the Ministry, and of senior management, and has been cleared by the PSC. Initial preparation activities and scoping have been undertaken in the preparation of this system.

During the period 2005 to 2008 the education sector was severely starved of resources and teachers were deprived of opportunities for professional growth and development. Resources to support the on-site supervision of teachers as well as different forms of in-service training became more and more scarce. By 2008, some 20,000 teachers had left their positions, which led to the greatest brain drain that the sector had ever experienced. The Public Service Commission (PSC) responded, inter alia, by drawing in many unqualified and under-qualified teachers. By 2010, there were 19,732 temporary teachers which at the time represented over 17% of the teaching workforce. The problem was further compounded by the fact that temporary teacher distribution was uneven across the Provinces such that in some Provinces as many as 45% of teachers were unqualified.

According to the 2012 census, the total number of all teachers in Zimbabwe was 125,188 – across 8,065 schools. This figure includes permanent, relief and temporary teachers at the Early Childhood Development (ECD), Primary and Secondary school levels. The census data also shows that the quality of teachers (in terms of qualifications and experience) varies widely across the ten provinces, across the different types of schools, by location (urban, rural) and by responsible authority (government and the various non-government authorities).

Trained teachers are unevenly distributed. An analysis based upon the data collected from this census shows the overall teacher training status as follows:

a) The national average proportion of trained teachers at the ECD level was 26.78% (the lowest ratio being Matabeleland South at 9.2% and the highest ratio being Harare at 62.8%).

b) The national average ratio of trained / all teachers at the Primary School level was 89.59% (the lowest ratio being Matabeleland North at 66.98% and the highest ratio being Masvingo at 98.08%).

c) The national average ratio of trained / all teachers at the Secondary School level was 71.93% (the lowest ratio being Matabeleland North at 56.31% and the highest ratio being Harare at 86.95%).

Teacher qualification levels in terms of the numbers of qualified teachers are further described based upon the data collected from the 2012 census. The various levels of teacher qualifications are described as Degree, Diploma, Para 1 – full certificate in-service training, Para 2 – 2 weeks in-service training, Para 3 – less than 2 weeks in-service training, ECD + Primary certified, Certified graduates, Uncertified graduates, Non-teaching qualification, ECD + Primary trained, Trained, Other and ECD + Primary untrained. The number of unqualified teachers (i.e. those without any of the above levels of qualification) revealed by the 2012 census stands at around 27,000 – representing about 21% of the teaching staff.

At all levels within the teaching profession in the MoESAC, there is a clear need to improve upon the quality of teaching professionals. At present, there remain many gaps in the MoESAC’s knowledge of the other dimensions of teacher quality. For example the distribution of teachers by
teaching experience, their fields of specialisation, and the staff development programmes that they have undertaken.

**There is very limited evidence to support teacher human resource development planning and utilisation initiatives.** There is a requirement to ensure better information on this situation is made available to the MoESAC for management and planning purposes in respect of teacher training and development.

**The establishment of a TDIS with supporting databases is necessary in order to provide for the proper planning of teacher development activities,** and to be able to target teacher professional development in the most efficient and effective manner. The overall benefits of such a system would be to strengthen the MoESAC’s ability to monitor and supervise teacher performance.

**Two main aspects are to be supported** as follows:

a) To ensure that there is adequate information on teacher skills and competencies that would be the foundation for improving the overall quality of teachers - by triggering the identification of skills enhancement programmes.

b) To ensure - as far as possible - a balanced provision of good quality education in all schools in Zimbabwe through a just and fair teacher allocation as well as a just and fair utilisation of the teaching resource.

**The functionality of the TDIS will include the continuous monitoring of teacher performance and training needs** in order to be able to improve upon the management of teacher professional development. One particular example of this would be to monitor the teachers’ ICT literacy rate. The TDIS will provide up to date information on teachers by the level of training, location, age, experience, qualifications, roles, performance and training received and recommended etc. It should also be able to provide detailed information on pre and in-service training for all active teachers.

**The TDIS will also provide for the monitoring of teacher deployment and utilization,** and training needs etc., and will support the HR functions of recruitment, training and development, and the decision making involved in the assignment of teachers to specific posts. It will also enable career planning and other HR management functions based on best practices to ensure fair and equitable treatment of teachers.

**The teacher personnel records could be used to compare their skills, competencies and experiences against the requirements of the positions to which they are currently assigned.** This would be undertaken to determine whether they are qualified to perform the duties and undertake the responsibilities as per the job description for the position. If they are not qualified then a determination has to be made in terms of what type of training and capacity building will equip them to qualify for the position or, alternatively, what job they should be reassigned to.

**The MoESAC will then have a complete and accurate picture on the skills gaps, both in terms of positions as well as in the types of skills.** This would the help the MoESAC in defining the scope and size of the problem and serve as a valuable input to formulate a program for improving teaching skills and their geographic coverage.
Activities financed by GPE for this component are to include the following:

- Technical assistance for implementation planning
- Support for data definition and collection
- Definition of the functionality of the TDIS
- Procurement of hardware and software
- 1-Day training for Managers at HO, Provincial and District Offices
- 5 Day training for operators at National, Provincial and District levels
- Training HR (training) decision makers in the analysis and the use of data – “...how to use information as a resource and for decision making...”

For 2013 (financed under ETF II):

- Data collection of all teacher bio data with emphasis on skills, qualifications and experience
- Assistance with the definition of teacher skills, qualification and experience requirements and the capture of such data
- Data collection of the DETs
- Data collection of teacher training courses
- Procurement and installation of supporting IT infrastructure
- Customisation of training software
- Train HR (training) operators and management in the TDIS in 2 selected pilot Provinces and 4 Districts (2 in each Province)
- Train HR management in the analysis and the use of data in the 2 Provinces and 4 Districts
- Pilot test the TDIS in the 2 Provinces and 4 Districts

For 2014:

- Continue to Pilot test the TDIS in the 2 Provinces and 4 Districts
- Train HR (training) operators and management in the TDIS in all remaining Provinces and Districts
- Train HR management in the analysis and the use of data in all remaining Provinces and Districts
- Roll out the TDIS in the remaining Provinces and Districts

For 2015:

- Assess the usage and impact of the TDIS, identify areas for improvement, and implement improvements where reasonable.

Component Three: Strengthened Strategic Planning Leading to ESSP 2020

The Zimbabwe National Medium Term Plan (2011 – 2015) marked a return to strategic development planning in Zimbabwe. The National Medium Term Plan (MTP) outlined the framework for consolidating the macroeconomic stability achieved under the Short-Term Emergency Recovery Programme (STERP), and advanced the mandate to support the restoration of economic stability and growth in Zimbabwe espoused in Article III of the Global Political Agreement (GPA). The Education Medium Term Plan with its shorter term predecessors (the Interim Education Strategy and the Interim Strategic Investment Plan 2010-2011), set a precedent for widespread consultation with stakeholders and more systematic financial modelling of the plans to aid the process of prioritisation.
The EMTP Operational Plan (2013-2015) built on these achievements and provides a foundation for the development of the next education sector strategic plan (ESSP 2020).

This component will support the development of the Education Sector Strategic Plan 2016 – 2020 and help to ensure that (i) it builds on the momentum of the current planning process, (ii) has wide acceptance and commitment within and outside the education sector, and (iii) is aligned with national priorities and plans reflected in the Zimbabwe National Medium term Plan 2016-2020.

The Objective of this component is to improve education strategic planning in Zimbabwe through support to the development of the next five year education sector strategic plan (ESSP 2020)

The component will be implemented in six overlapping phases as reflected in the diagram below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of lessons learned from EMTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Sector Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Debate and Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of ESSP 2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination of ESSP and media campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial and District Operational plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The process will start with a review of progress, achievements and challenges in developing and operationalizing the EMTP and the EMTP-OP to distil the lessons learned from that exercise. This will build on initial lessons that include: the benefits of wide ranging stakeholder consultation, the need for resources and sufficient time to conduct studies that will fill information gaps (such as ZELA, LAT); the importance of focusing on outcomes and results rather than only inputs; the importance of good statistical information on the education system and its workforce; and the need for realistic targets based on a range of different revenue scenarios, informed by a good cost simulation model.

This will lead to the completion of a full Sector Review, which will start with identification of existing information gaps and commissioning of research to fill them. In turn, this will lead to the drafting of a comprehensive sector analysis which identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the education system, and points to opportunities that can be pursued and threats to be avoided in shaping the system for the next medium term period (2016 – 2020). While the focus will be on the education system, its location within and linkages to the wider society, economy and polity will be an important frame of reference. The Sector Review will assess the feasibility and strategic approach to the government’s commitment, emphasised in numerous statements by the Minister, to improve teacher’s pay and conditions and direct resources to the country’s most disadvantaged schools so that the current system of school fees and levies can be phased out.

Once the sector analysis has been drafted it can provide the starting point for the stimulation of a national debate on education in Zimbabwe. Extensive media coverage and highlighting of issues by leading figures can help to facilitate local and community level debates that raise the public profile of education issues. This will lay the ground for a comprehensive stakeholder consultation exercise.
involving meetings in each province, and targeted consultation visits in a range of districts around the country. The stakeholder consultation exercise conducted in 2010, and the extensive consultation as part of the 1999 Presidential Commission of Inquiry into Education and Training ("Nziramasanga Commission") provide precedents for this exercise. Feedback from the consultations will be shared in a National Consultative Conference, and the report published and distributed.

*Preparation of the ESSP 2020 should begin in late 2014, on a timetable to incorporate the input from the national consultation exercise and update the data from the 2014 Sector Analysis.* The plan will be developed by a team led by the Planning Division, with structured input from the key stakeholders. The plan will be supported by a cost simulation model that will permit the exploration of different cost and revenue scenarios, and exploration of different priority options. This will include an external appraisal of the ESSP 2020 and the process leading up to it.

*The completion and official acceptance of the ESSP 2020 mark the beginning of the implementation phase.* This component proposes that support be provided for dissemination of the plan nation-wide in 2016, including a media campaign to raise awareness of the key recommendations. The component will also support the development of a rolling operational plan for each province, which would provide a key input to the annual operational plans and budgets prepared by MOESAC, and for annual workplans in each province. It will also provide a basis for the ongoing mobilization of external resources to support key activities in the sector.

Activities financed by GPE funds for this activity include:

- Media campaigns and public relations programs using all media
- Travel for key stakeholders to provinces and target districts and communities for 1/2 day consultation meetings
- Provincial meetings of key stakeholders to consolidate output from consultations
- National Consultative Workshop with representatives of national level stakeholders, rapporteurs from provincial consultations.
- Preparation and printing of a national report on the consultation
- Technical assistance for cost modelling and sector review
- Travel and subsistence for researchers to key provinces
- Meetings and workshops of key stakeholders
- Printing and publication of the plan.
- Dissemination of the ESSP 2020
- Media campaigns to raise public awareness of the key elements of the Plan
- QA and appraisal of the ESSP 2020
- Production of short summarised versions of the plan for key stakeholders

In conclusion, it is important to note that the objective of the project is to boost learning outcomes in basic education through continuous professional development of teachers, improved teacher supervision and management as well as strengthened evidence based policy and strategic planning.
5. Implementation and Financing the Project

This section of the Project Document builds on some key lessons learned from experience in other projects and on a summary of the economic and financial analysis of the project. In this draft there remain some aspects of implementation that still require further analysis and discussion. This document lays out some principles that will frame this process. Final agreement on some of these implementation issues will be addressed in the January workshops prior to finalising the Project Document.

Lessons Learned

Some important lessons from recent experience relate to the focus on teachers:

- **Salaries and conditions of service for teachers and officials** has tended to dominate **planning**, especially when teacher incomes were, at one stage, less than 20% of the national poverty datum level. While this key issue remains a vital concern for the MOESAC, it is largely beyond the control of the ministry, and needs to be balanced by a focus on other aspects of teacher wellbeing.

- **Focus on teacher qualifications**, while a critical concern for the system, needs to be balanced by a focus on **teaching skills**, which do not necessarily align with qualifications.

- International experience suggests **that teachers’ most important skills are developed in the classroom**, through practical on the job experience supported by mentoring and leadership at the school and cluster level.

- **The decline in frequency of supervision visits to schools** had an effect of lowering morale and performance monitoring of teachers, and can weaken pedagogical leadership in the schools from head teachers and senior teachers.

The issue of learning assessment provided some important lessons:

- **Limited assessment of learning in early stages of primary schooling** left the system without any reliable mechanism for detecting learning achievement gaps until they emerged in Grade 7 and beyond.

- **ZELA demonstrated that early assessment of learning** can help identify where foundational skills are not being developed. It also showed how early learning assessment approaches and capacity could be built in Zimbabwe.

- **Learning achievement gaps once established tend to grow wider** the longer children are in school, unless addressed by effective remedial programmes.

Some of the most important lessons for education planning can be drawn from the process pursued since 2009 in developing the EMTP and its Operational Plan:

- **Building on analysis of past planning initiatives is critical** to ensuring relevance and continuity. While the Presidential Commission of Inquiry into Education in 1999 (Nziramasanga Commission) was at the back of many minds in the early stages of planning, an exercise in 2012 to review that exercise critically proved to be very valuable in giving a perspective on the challenges, and in identifying ways in which the context had changed.
- Wide stakeholder consultation as part of the problem identification proved to be an invaluable investment, in that it raised public awareness of the initiative, and gave those engaged in the planning process direct contact with some of the aspirations, fears, hopes and challenges that were affecting the education system and the society.

- Ongoing engagement of key stakeholders, such as civil society, teacher unions, other government departments and non-government Responsible Bodies\(^\text{12}\) is critical to ensuring that the planning process reflects the concerns of the non-government education providers, and the wider society the education system serves.

- An early focus on results or outcomes of the education system can help to balance the focus on inputs which tends to dominate planning processes especially when directly linked to budget preparation. Clearer articulation of outcomes strengthens the basis for results-based planning.

**Summary of Economic Analysis**

This summary draws on the financial and economic analysis undertaken for the EMTP-OP, with support from the GPE project preparation team. For more details on this analysis, the reader is referred to the relevant sections and annexes of the EMTP-OP.

**GDP growth projections for 2015 and beyond are modest.** The most recent available macro-economic projections from the Ministry of Finance (MoF) on expected economic growth is now projected to be 4.4% by the end of the 2012, and projected to increase over the medium term to 5.0% in 2013, 6.3% in 2014 and down again to 5.5% in 2015, with inflation contained at between 4.0 and 4.5%\(^\text{13}\). Because Zimbabwe operates on a cash budget system, public expenditure is expected to track GDP growth, reaching US$5.2 billion by 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Key education Expenditure data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education public expenditure as % of GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education private (school level) expenditure as % of GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total education expenditure as % of GDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education share of govt expenditure (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education share of govt current expenditure (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education share of govt capital expenditure (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education share of govt education expenditure (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-salary share of govt primary education expenditure (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annex 4 Economic and Financial Analysis

Key issues highlighted by the table are:

- **Private (household) financing accounted more than 86% of school level revenue and expenditure in primary schools in 2011**, with government financing accounting for less than 6%, and external financing, largely through donor financing of BEAM, accounting for 8%.

---

\(^{12}\) Responsible Bodies is the term applied in the Education Act to the entities that own and operate non-government schools. They include Rural District Authorities, churches, mines, farms and private trusts.

\(^{13}\) 2013 National Budget Statement.
The share of government education expenditure spent on primary education is close to international benchmarks at 45% (2011), but this is almost totally consumed by personnel costs, leaving only 2% in 2011 for non-salary recurrent expenditure.

Education share of capital expenditure is less than 6%, while the sector accounts for a large proportion of public recurrent expenditure because of the high personnel costs.

The analysis of public education spending reveals the following key trends:

- **Education expenditure has almost doubled from 2010 to 2012**, from US$513 million actual annual expenditure in 2010 to the expected US$ 1 billion in 2012.
- **The sub-sector which has increased the most, in absolute and relative terms, is school education** (primary and secondary education), which has seen its budget increase from about US$360 million to US$780 million from 2010 to 2012 (subject to final 2012 figures).
- **The relative weight of each subsector has not changed significantly**. School education has represented between 70% and 74% of the budget; higher and tertiary education has represented between 25% and 30%; and sport, arts and culture has represented between 0.5% and 0.8%.
- **Teacher education has increased significantly its share from 1.6% in 2010 to an expected 3.4-3.7% in 2012**; while expenditure on administration has decreased its weight by significant amounts.
- **Cash flow constraints make for slow budget releases, which limit the efficiency of public spending**. In 2012, up until September, MoESAC had only been released and spent a total of US$6.3 million in non-salary current expenditures, out of a budget of US$46.5 million. Most of the monies released had to be employed for the operational costs of the ministry, including utilities, rents, fuel, domestic travel and ongoing training.
- **Very little funds for school grants had been released by October 2012 due to the lack of funds because of the high payroll bill**. School grants (tuition and per capita grants for government and non-government schools respectively) amounted to US$13 million and US$8 million in 2010 and 2011 respectively.
- **Budget execution rates for capital have been extremely poor in recent years**. Up to September 2012, only US$1.8 million for capital expenditure had been released and spent, out of a total of US$32.4 million in the original budget. The monies were mainly employed on the construction of Government schools (US$1.4 million) and in the rehabilitation of the ministry’s headquarters. In 2011, the original budget was cut by 83% during budget revision, and even this reduced budget was not completely spent: actual expenditure was 20% lower than the revised estimate.

Analysis of school level spending drew on recently available data for 2011 from the 2012 EMIS returns, and reveals the following important issues:

- **The highest expenditure item in primary schools in 2011 was salaries, accounting for 26%**, mostly from supplementary salary payments to teachers out of school funds. These are most commonly termed ‘teacher incentives’ in the schools.
- **Similar patterns persist in secondary school financing**, although household contributions constitute a higher proportion because of higher fee structures and lack of external financing through BEAM (BEAM in secondary schools was financed by government in 2011).
• **Very high income inequalities exist between the different types of schools.** While P3 satellite schools had an average total income of only $7,315 in 2011, the total average income of P1 satellites schools was $73,507. Total per capita income in P1 registered schools (US$483) was 14 times greater than in P3 registered schools (US$33) and 20 times greater than in the limited number of P3 satellite schools (US$24).

• **These inequalities were significantly greater in non-government schools** compared to government schools, primarily due to the limited number of non-government registered P1 schools having far higher incomes on average, with an average total income of $494,770 and a relatively high total per capita income of $1,016.

*The main conclusions to be drawn from this analysis can be summarized as follows:*

• **Public expenditure for education is really very limited.**

• **Personnel expenditure ‘crowded out’ funding for non-personnel items** to the extent that monies spent on non-salary expenditure are minimal, although the original budget in 2010, 2011 and 2012 allocated significant funds for operational and capital items.

• **Capital expenditure has been very limited in the last three years.** In 2012 US$1.4 million was spend on construction work on schools while another US$0.4 million was spent on the rehabilitation of the headquarters.

• **Schools are not provided with sufficient funds to meet their running costs or purchase adequate teaching and learning materials or to support teacher professional development.** Parents are paying for an estimated 86% of education costs in the case of primary education, and 93% in the case of secondary education.

• **What little in-service training of teachers that does take place is largely financed by levies on households through the BSPZ program.**

*Institutional arrangements for implementation*

**Project governance**

In line with the principle of alignment, the proposed Governance Structure for the GPE project will make use of the existing structure that governs the Education Transition Fund (ETF).

**The existing coordination arrangements recognise that it is the MoESAC’s role to take leadership in directing the education sector** through national planning and review processes which articulate national priorities, strategies and operational objectives, such as the Education Medium-Term Plan and the EMTP Operational Plan.

**The Education Coordination Group (ECG) provides the sector wide framework for donor support to the MoESAC priorities.** It is an umbrella mechanism to monitor all existing bilateral and multilateral education aid and its impact on progress towards the Education for All and MDG goals. The ECG includes all funding Development Partners working in education, supporting the Zimbabwe recovery plan which aims to effectively mobilize funds needed to accomplish the Education for All agenda. The ECG is chaired by the Minister of Education and the Permanent Secretary is a member of ECG.

---

14 P1, S1 and corresponding numbers describe schools by type. P1 and S1 schools are primary and secondary schools in low density urban areas, P2 and S2 are schools in high density urban areas and P3 and S3 schools primary and secondary describe schools in rural areas.
The EMTP-OP Steering Committee (EMTP-OPSC) comprised of MOESAC directors and funding partners, which should reside under and report on a regular basis to the ECG chaired by the Minister of Education. The EMTP-OPSC will meet on a quarterly basis to review all aspects of the implementation of the EMTP-OP. The specifics of the relationship between this Steering Committee and the GPE/ETF Steering Committee have yet to be finalised by the ECG, but the intention is to align as far as possible the meetings and streamline wherever possible.

The Education Transition Fund is currently the largest donor supported programme in the education sector. Its Steering Committee is co-chaired by the Minister and the Permanent Secretary. Given the synergies and complementarities between the ETF and the GPE, they will share the same Managing Entity (UNICEF Zimbabwe). Therefore the Steering Committee will be shared by the two programmes. The GPE & ETF Steering Committee will therefore be responsible for the oversight of the GPE and the ETF. It will ensure alignment of GPE and ETF allocations with the MoESAC planning. Regular members of the Steering Committee are: MoESAC, funding partners contributing to the fund, UNESCO and UNICEF, which will also serve as the Secretariat. It reports to the ECG, and will also provide reports to the EMTP-OPSC through institutional arrangements yet to be finalised.

Key roles of the Steering Committee with regard to GPE management include:

- Reviewing and approving the annual Mid-Term Review;
- Reviewing and approving the end-of-year programmatic and financial progress report submitted by UNICEF. The project report will include results-based progress against the log frame indicators; and
- Agreeing on the scope and timing of the joint annual reviews.
The Steering Committee will track progress on the three Components of the GPE. It is important to note and emphasise how these components fit into the existing structure of Thematic Areas within the ETF:

- Component 1: Professional development for better teaching and learning, and Component 2: Supervision and management of teacher performance and development, both fall squarely under the ETF Thematic Area 2 on Teaching and Learning.
- Component 3: Strengthened Strategic Planning Leading to ESSP 2020 fits into the Thematic Area 1 on School and System Governance (this was the case of the preparation of the 2012-2015 Education Strategic Plan which was funded by ETF within Thematic Area 1).

Articulation of GPE Supported Activities with ETF and Other Donor Initiatives

The GPE is one external funding source from a number which were identified in the EMTP-OP and mapped against the six EMTP-OP Operational Objectives. The Table below provides an overview of this financing over three years. Note that the GPE financed activities cover three years 2014 to 2016, and do not map exactly to the EMTP-OP time frame (2013 – 2015), but the table gives an indication of the scale of external financing and the objectives to which it is directed. The ETF II is the greatest single funding source, and the activities it finances cover all six Objectives. The GPE-financed activities are integrated well with the ETF activities, and will be managed and reported on within a

---

15 The EMTP-OP covers 7 Operational Objectives, the last of which is Strengthening Sports, Arts and Culture. This is not included in this analysis, as it falls outside of the education activities of the Ministry.
single framework to the same Steering Committee to ensure alignment and complementarity. They are targeted largely at Continuous Professional Development of teachers, while the ETF focuses on upgrading of teacher qualifications, and strengthening overall teacher policy. GPE is financing the establishment of the TDIS, while ETF is supporting EMIS. GPE will finance the development of ESSP 2020, while ETF is financing the development and operationalization of EMTP-OP. An illustration of this is the agreement by ETF to finance the start-up costs of GPE activities in “Year 0” (2013) of the GPE plan.

The DfID financed activities are largely targeted at supporting access and achievement of girls, especially in disadvantaged communities. These activities will be implemented by contracted INGOs. Some $30m is designated from the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) Fund.

**Table 5: External Financing by Source and Operational Objective.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen teacher development and management</td>
<td>11,400,000</td>
<td>20,459,298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,859,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve learning quality and relevance</td>
<td>10,772,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,772,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve conditions of learning in schools</td>
<td>69,669,962</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99,669,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Education Service Quality through improved supervision</td>
<td>5,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen school and system governance and management</td>
<td>25,241,000</td>
<td>3,340,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,581,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen support to those learners with greatest need</td>
<td>18,325,000</td>
<td>70,353,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,394,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>99,072,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125,808,165</td>
<td>23,600,000</td>
<td>70,353,600</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
<td>10,394,000</td>
<td>260,155,765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Management**

UNICEF as the Managing Entity will be responsible for overall management of the programme, and will manage disbursement of all funds using the institutional arrangements that have been put in place for other ETF financed initiative. The procurement, financial management and sector teams in UNICEF have been managing ETF financed projects since 2009, and have excellent relations with government and other partners. The UNICEF education team in Zimbabwe comprises of 14 full time education and programme assistant staff with an additional 4 high level international technical advisors. The programme is supported by a fully staffed team in supply, finance, logistics and procurement. In addition to the UNICEF team, additional technical expertise will be placed within MoESAC to support the implementation of the programme. Details of which will be decided during 2013.

In line with the commitment to use as far as possible existing institutional arrangements, the Project will build on the Project Management arrangements being put into place for the (ETF-financed) School Grants Program.

The project budget provides for costs of contracted personnel, implementation and M&E costs under the cost head of “Project Management Support”. Provision is made for a dedicated Project Manager, a Financial Manager, Administrator and Assistant. The specific institutional arrangements for project management have yet to be finalised, as the MOESAC is currently reviewing proposals for project implementation arrangements and personnel for several different projects, and is seeking an institutional arrangement that will minimise the existence of multiple implementation units. These project management arrangements will only come on line in 2014 when GPE funds are released, by
which time the Ministry’s development project coordination arrangements should be finalised. In 2013 ToRs, advertisement and selection will take place for appointment in 2014.

The project management arrangements will build on the following principles:

- **The project will work through existing MOESAC programmes**, and operate through the decision-making mechanisms and procedures in place for implementation of BSPZ, PLAP, School and District management and supervision, and planning and policy development processes.

- **A project management team will be established** with a mix of designated officials and contracted national specialists. The PMT will report both to the designated MOESAC manager for each Component, and to UNICEF BEGE Section, which will have final decisions on disbursement and management of funds. Details of this team’s reporting to MOESAC will depend on the final development project coordination arrangements.

- **The PMT will include a full-time accountant with responsibility for financial management**, and will be assisted by a designated official from MOESAC. The Project will keep detailed records of all income and expenditure. These records should be aligned as far as possible with existing government systems.

- **Grant allocations (not cash) will be made for significant recurrent and all equipment costs**, including conferences, furniture and office equipment. Grant allocations will include a designated amount and a list of eligible expenditure items, with costs. These will be selected by each cluster SDC or BSPZ District Committee, and compiled and centrally procured by UNICEF. Because of inevitable delays in central procurement and delivery, requisition lists will be submitted six months prior to planned utilization. Initial lists at the District level will be prepared during 2013 for payment and delivery early in 2014.

- **Some logistical support for training activities** will be provided through contracted agencies such as NGOs. Such agencies would be contracted by UNICEF with a reporting relationship to MOESAC. These contractors will work closely with relevant officials in MOESAC or schools to develop local capacity for direct grants when such transfers become possible.

- **Cash grants to cover school and cluster level recurrent expenditure** will be made through existing non-government accounts (school, cluster and district level) using the same institutional and reporting arrangements in place for School Grants

**Financial Management and Disbursement Arrangements**

The Financial and Disbursement Arrangements for the GPE will be in line with those currently in place for the Education Transition Fund and for the School Grants Programme in Zimbabwe. These are governed by the UN’s Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT).

**Most of the activities at the central level will be implemented directly by UNICEF** (e.g., Teacher Training and Development Information System, development of the ESSP 2020, etc., will use the Direct Agency Implementation method). UNICEF, through the Education Transition Fund has carried out a number of these activities already and they do not present additional or new challenges to the current system.
Activities at the district and cluster level include most of the activities under Component 1, framed within the BSPZ and the PLAP programmes. A significant part of the costs of these programmes are transport and communications costs for the in-service training at cluster and at district level. In the case of BSPZ, this includes regular meetings of teachers at the cluster level as well as visits by the cluster coordinator to the schools. In the case of PLAP, this includes visits to undertake the assessments in schools and training on remedial action. Some logistical support under PLAP will be managed by contracted logistical support agencies, in which case the funds will be channelled through that entity with a Direct Cash Transfer to the Implementing Partner. For others, however, it is proposed that a grant allocation is given per cluster as the basis for financial and disbursement arrangements. The details of these are presented below.

**Budgeting**

A preliminary budget has already been prepared with detailed costs estimates. These, however, will be adjusted when each annual work programme is finalised. During the project implementation, annual budgets will be monitored closely by MoESAC and UNICEF to ensure that the project resources are used within the agreed upon allocations and for the intended purposes. Budget information will be disclosed to beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

**Indicative Project Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td>$16,414,325</td>
<td>$3,272,745</td>
<td>$5,738,725</td>
<td>$7,402,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Inservice support to teachers in Grades 1-3</td>
<td>$7,958,581</td>
<td>$1,831,345</td>
<td>$2,825,185</td>
<td>$3,302,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Catch up remedial education for Grades 4-7</td>
<td>$8,455,744</td>
<td>$1,441,400</td>
<td>$2,913,540</td>
<td>$4,100,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Component 1</td>
<td>$16,414,325</td>
<td>$3,272,745</td>
<td>$5,738,725</td>
<td>$7,402,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2</td>
<td>$3,458,725</td>
<td>$2,049,000</td>
<td>$723,550</td>
<td>$686,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Improved teacher performance management</td>
<td>$1,346,125</td>
<td>$680,000.00</td>
<td>$351,750.00</td>
<td>$314,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Teacher training &amp; devt Information System</td>
<td>$2,112,600</td>
<td>$1,369,000.00</td>
<td>$371,800.00</td>
<td>$371,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Component 2</td>
<td>$3,458,725</td>
<td>$2,049,000</td>
<td>$723,550</td>
<td>$686,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3</td>
<td>$703,400</td>
<td>$171,600</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Situation Analysis</td>
<td>$171,600</td>
<td>$171,600</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 National Debate</td>
<td>$420,100</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$420,100</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 ESSP</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Finalisation and Operationalization</td>
<td>$50,200</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$50,200</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Component 3</td>
<td>$703,400</td>
<td>$171,600</td>
<td>$531,800</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GPE Components Budget</td>
<td>$20,576,450</td>
<td>$5,493,345</td>
<td>$6,994,075</td>
<td>$8,089,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Management Support Costs</td>
<td>$1,994,886</td>
<td>$532,200</td>
<td>$721,350</td>
<td>$741,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% UNICEF Harare Overheads</td>
<td>$1,028,822</td>
<td>$274,667</td>
<td>$349,704</td>
<td>$404,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GPE Budget</td>
<td>$23,600,158</td>
<td>$6,300,212</td>
<td>$8,065,088</td>
<td>$9,234,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Control**

The Project Management Team will set up an acceptable internal control system which should help the management of the project in achieving the development objectives in an orderly and efficient manner. Thus, the main focus of the internal control is placed on the following: (i) clear channels of command, (ii) physical control of assets (for Components 1.2 and 2.2), (iii) Authorization and approval, (iv) financial and accounting accuracy, (v) integrity and performance of staff at all levels, (vi) supervision. The Project Manager will be in charge of managing the project flow of funds in line with the UNICEF disbursement guidelines (HACT).
**Disbursement of funds and financial reporting**

HACT recognises four main types of payments:

- **Direct cash transfers** to Implementing Partners, for obligations and expenditures to be made by them in support of activities agreed in annual work plans (AWPs);
- **Direct payments** to vendors and other third parties, for obligations incurred by the Implementing Partner in support of activities agreed in AWPs;
- **Reimbursement** to Implementing Partners for obligations made and expenditure incurred by them in support of activities agreed in AWPs; and,
- **Direct agency implementation** through which the UNICEF makes obligations and incurs expenditure in support of activities agreed in AWPs.

When UNICEF does not implement the activity, there will be a Micro Assessment of the Implementing Partner. Some of the foreseen Implementing Partners have already been assessed as low risk under the Education Transition Fund (e.g., PLAN, Save the Children, etc.); while others have already been assessed as high risk (e.g., government bodies).

The disbursement of funds for the grants at the district and cluster level will be done in line with HACT guidelines:

- **Disbursement of the district and cluster grant allocations to each district and cluster through a dedicated bank account** opened purely for the receipt and expenditure of the GPE programme funds. Operation, signatories and management of this dedicated bank account will be under MoESAC financial procedures (with at least one of the signatories being a parent), in order to support the eventual incorporation of the BSPZ and PLAP programmes into government funding and management.
- **The district office will be required to acknowledge receipt of funds by the clusters** within the district. The district will be responsible for acknowledging receipt of funds on behalf of all its clusters.
- **Reporting of cluster grants disbursement and expenditure will use the Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE) form**, which reports on requested disbursements and actual expenditure against the programme Annual Work Plan (AWP). The FACE form provides for rolling financial management reporting which indicates planned disbursements for the next period while reporting on expenditure against these disbursements in the completed period under the AWP.
- **Authorisation of full and complete expenditure of funds, or ‘liquidation’, is required from the district through the FACE form** by the end of six months after the cluster grant has been disbursed.
- **Where the reporting entity is the BSPZ District Committee**, if full and complete liquidation is not reported for even one cluster in the district by the end of six months after funds disbursement, disbursement of cluster grant allocations could cease for all clusters in the district. It is therefore vital that clusters report rapidly and accurately to the district on their

---

16 These Committees consist of representatives of the District Office, local Head Teachers and representatives of parents and community. Designated GPE Project Accounts will be managed by these existing bodies. They have the same non-government status as School Development Committee accounts.
expenditure of funds and that the district closely monitors their clusters to ensure that all funds are spent within the six month period.

The cluster grant allocations will be distributed termly to match the school planning time frame. The cluster grant allocations need to be disbursed early enough in the term that funds can be used in that term and to ensure that financial reporting on disbursement of the grant and expenditure of funds can be given to the district in good time to meet UNICEF financial reporting time frames under FACE.

Financial reporting will be provided using the UNICEF FACE format accurately and in good time to provide strong evidence of both authorisation and full liquidation of funds and reduce the risk of cluster grant disbursement in the district being frozen due to failure to meet these requirements. The recommended FACE reporting timeframes and the responsibilities of the school and district within the school year coincide with the other major programme to support school education in Zimbabwe, i.e., the School Grants programme.

Financial monitoring

UNICEF will carry out regular spot checks in the districts and the clusters to monitor the financial management of the grants as per HACT guidelines.

Accounting

The GPE project will maintain a computerized accounting system to record its transactions, prepare interim financial reports and annual financial statements in line with UNICEF procedures. The books of accounts for the project will be maintained on double-entry bookkeeping principles. Commitments will be monitored and tracked to ensure that a full picture for the projects is available. This will cover all sources of project financing, all transactions and utilization of said funds. All supporting documents will be kept at the district and cluster level respectively for their funds. Direct disbursements made by UNICEF will be included in the project accounting system. Funds received from different sources would be identified separately and reflected in project accounts, interim financial reports and annual financial statements.

Project-related transactions and activities will be distinguished at the data-capture stage. A Chart of Accounts for the project will be developed which will conform to the classification of expenditures and sources of funds of the project. The Chart of Accounts should allow data to be captured in a manner to facilitate financial reporting of project expenditures by: (i) project components; (ii) subcomponents, and (iii) contracts.

Auditing

Clusters and districts will be required to produce annual audited accounts, either by being directly audited by the provincial internal audit office or by providing independently audited accounts to the same office in line with the HACT established thresholds. Internal auditing of disbursement and expenditure of the grant allocations to clusters will be required. The principles under which the auditing will operate are as follows:

- Provincial internal auditors will undertake checks in the form of an audit of financial records and a verification of proper use of funds. This will not be a full audit, but will ensure
that all financial procedures for disbursement and expenditure of funds are being followed, funds are only being spent on eligible expenditure, all financial monitoring and reporting requirements are being met accurately and in good time, and there is no evidence of the misuse or misappropriation of funds.

- **The prime purpose of the auditing is to ensure that clusters and districts** realise that any departure from the financial management procedures and the misuse or misappropriation of funds is likely to be rapidly identified and corrective action taken, up to and including disciplinary or legal action.

**GPE will also finance a share of the external financial monitoring contract being put in place by UNICEF for the School Grants Programme.** Provision has been made in the cost estimates for this external monitoring to serve as a back-up to the internal audits referred to above.

**Financial management at the cluster and district level**

**The project will make use of the manual on financial management procedures** that the School Grants Programme is developing. The procedures for the GPE will be no different. It is anticipated that the cluster coordinator (from the cluster central school) will be in charge of the cluster level finances, which will have at least one parent as a co-signatory, and the DEO will be in charge of the district level finances, which will also have at least one parent as a co-signatory. The financial management procedures will be based on three main existing documents:

- The financial and procurement sections of the new MoESAC Regulations when these regulations have been finalised.

**These documents set out strong and accountable financial and procurement systems** that clearly specify roles and responsibilities, management requirements, operational procedures and monitoring and reporting formats. They provide for a robust system of financial management that is already well understood and widely used in the schools and districts.

**Social accountability arrangements are of special importance**, given the size and nature of activities at the cluster level. Accordingly, public dissemination of information at the cluster and school level and community oversight will be used to verify service delivery and to provide a control measure over the use of funds. The minimum required arrangements include:

- Funds received and their use will be publicly disseminated to the community through notice boards and/or leaflets.
- Use of pictorial messages on community signboards.
- Clear protocol of sanctions for misuse of funds is determined, applied and well publicized.

---

17 The GPE team will be supporting and reviewing the manual along with the School Grants Programme team.
18 UNICEF will be reviewing these when they are finalised.
Results monitoring and evaluation

The progress and performance of the project will be subject to ongoing monitoring and systematic internal and external evaluation. The M&E process will be structured around the Project Results Framework (Annex 1). Project performance will be monitored at the Goal, Outcome and Output levels.

As far as possible performance monitoring will draw on data from existing information systems. The principal source will be the EMIS system, which is now able to produce up-to-date data with a good and improving level of validity and reliability. Other key performance data will be obtained from learning assessments undertaken as part of the institutionalisation of ZELA being financed by the ETF II, and by the WRAT which will be financed as part of the GPE Education Support Project. Both instruments have been piloted and field tested. Information on teacher training and professional development needs, which is limited at present, will improve as the Teacher Training and Development Information System in operationalized.

Performance assessment will also be supplemented by targeted evaluation studies which address key issues that are identified during implementation. This will include impact evaluation studies for Component 1, where phased implementation will provide an opportunity for assessment of the impact of the interventions in schools in Years 1, 2 and 3 compared to schools that are not yet included in the program.

Key risks and mitigating measures

The existing strengths of the Zimbabwe Education System and the success of the current largest education support programme (ETF) provide important foundations for the GPE project. Lessons from the Education Transition Fund will also help mitigate potential pitfalls in the GPE. Financial fiduciary risks and mitigating measures are covered in the section on Financial and Disbursement Arrangements.

The system strengths include:

- Key government planning documents and strategies developed (such as MoESAC 2010 Draft Interim Strategic Plan Report and the Operational Plan);
- A strong network of partners working to improve Education in Zimbabwe;
- MoESAC’s functioning operational mechanisms and structures including technical working groups, aid coordination and planning to which the GPE will interact and strengthen;
- Zimbabwe consistently maintaining relatively high levels of primary school enrolment with an ongoing high demand across the country for the provision of educational services;
- International and national commitment to restoring the education system to what it once was. Such commitments are outlined in the government Interim Investment Plan\[19\].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks and Assumptions</th>
<th>Planned Risk Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Political and economic situation does not worsen to civil conflict or collapse of service delivery.</strong></td>
<td>UNICEF and other UN agencies are working closely with government Ministries responsible for social service sectors to ensure good relations and delivery. UNICEF was able to support the provision of services through various mechanisms during very difficult circumstances in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Government commitment to finance education sector could decline in the event of change of government in the forthcoming election.</strong></td>
<td>All parties in the Inclusive Government have committed themselves to support for the sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. The entrenched inequalities in the system, exacerbated by the current system of levies to pay teacher incentives, could result in disaffection with the system in poor communities, and lead to withdrawal of children from schools.</strong></td>
<td>The structural inequalities in the education system are not directly addressed by this project. However, the very substantial school grants program being administered by UNICEF, will help to redress some of the inequities by subsidising operating costs of schools which will both improve the quality of the learning environment and help to reduce the burden on households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. UN security phase rises to level 3 or above</strong></td>
<td>The UN system has risk mitigation strategies to continue support should the security phase increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. UNICEF is not able to work effectively with all partners, including Government, as well as have full access to implement and monitor its programmes.</strong></td>
<td>UNICEF engages with key ministries to advocate for separation of politics from provision of social services and conducts regular field monitoring of programme activities to report operating risks and programme activities. Furthermore, UNICEF is cluster leader for Education, WASH, and Nutrition as well as fully engaged with other sectors. It maintains close links with government structures and the donor community, ensuring close coordination and consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. UNICEF’s internal procurement and contracting systems are not able to effectively expedite and manage large scale programmes.</strong></td>
<td>Education donors and UNICEF agree on the realistic in-country technical and operational capacity required to effectively implement and monitor the programme’s progress. The project management arrangements provide for a project management team to ensure the necessary personnel is in place to support to and provide oversight of the implementation of the GPE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Risks and Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planned Risk Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall costs of procurement of goods and services escalate beyond projected levels</td>
<td>UNICEF has a comprehensive procurement process with a strong track record of supplying the best services and goods at the best cost and can access global markets to ensure economies of scale where necessary. Nevertheless as a principle local procurement is encouraged to develop the local economy wherever possible – but not at the risk of compromising implementation or quality. In the event of prices rising due to factors beyond UNICEF control, project activities will be restructured to reflect this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Collaboration between implementing organizations encounters political or other challenges.</td>
<td>MOUs between implementing partners will emphasize the need to work together and commit to a transparent process free of politicization. Interventions are designed to support national strategic plans, coordinated by Government and implemented through government systems whenever possible. UNICEF has a good track record in collaboration with other partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Government is not able to facilitate policy reform quickly and contribute adequate domestic financial resources.</td>
<td>The GPE will allow government appropriate flexibility in implementation across different components of the Education strategy. Ministry of Finance has been involved in the development of the EMTP-OP on which this project is based. It has committed in writing to work to protect non-personnel recurrent allocations for Education. Policy and strategic planning support and technical assistance will assist in strengthening government capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. UNICEF lacks the capacity to manage the additional demands of administering a substantial program in addition to its current commitment to implement the ETF activities, including school grants.</td>
<td>UNICEF is currently substantially strengthening its human and system resources, and will ensure that sufficient staff and institutional capacity are assigned to support the implementation of the project. The complementarity of activities between ETF, School grants and GPE mean that their implementation can be coordinated in an integrated manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PSC may be unwilling to approve secondment of one experienced teacher full-time to each district as BSPZ Coordinators.</td>
<td>The current PS was formerly PS of PSC, and understands well how the case can now be made that the BSPZ Coordinator is now playing an important education role in managing the Early Reading programme, and the PLAP Remedial Education Programme. 72 posts out of over 100,000 will not have a significant impact on the system, and the cost benefit is easy to make. In the event this is not approved, 2013 will provide a breathing space to find solutions. BSPZ has been running in most districts without the Coordinators, but its places extra burden on the DEOs and Inspectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results monitoring and evaluation

Overview of GPE Monitoring and Evaluation

The monitoring and evaluation framework for GPE is presented in Annex 1. The framework is structured in three levels: the Overall Goal, with relevant overall goal indicators and targets; the Project Outcomes, with relevant indicators and targets, and the Key Project Outputs, with relevant definitions and targets. Care has been taken to keep the framework simple and aligned with EMTP-OP M&E Framework, where relevant. It is intended for use in monitoring and evaluation of the progress of the project. Detailed monitoring of project implementation on a day to day basis will be based on this framework, plus the outputs of detailed activities outlined in each annual implementation. This framework is aimed at ensuring a comprehensive but simple and understandable evaluation framework which will yield timely, relevant and evidence-based information for decision-making.

The indicator system addresses the following requirements for GPE performance:

a) The need to have a holistic and comprehensive grasp of the state of implementation in relation to GPE Targets
Policy makers and decision makers, including managers of implementing agencies and other stakeholders at all levels, will be informed about the issues, challenges, successes and progress in implementation of the GPE so that evidence-based analyses are made and decisions are taken that address the issues identified and promote progress towards the objectives.

b) The need to maintain focus on problem areas, key issues, critical concerns and priorities
As well as the three component objectives detailed in chapter X, there should be provision for special and possibly unforeseen policy directions which may need particular monitoring. The tracking of higher level outcome and result indicators will provide an early warning of unexpected circumstances.
c) The need to generate support for educational interventions
Support for specific interventions may be necessary in order to increase the probability of successful implementation for the GPE. This may call for a revision of indicators and targets and implies that the system must be flexible.

d) The need to provide feedback to all stakeholders
The indicator system should assist in providing clear and unambiguous feedback to stakeholders through periodic reporting procedures. A draft set of overall, outcome and output Indicators and Targets is provided in Annex 1.

e) The need to derive information from active systems or processes so as not to create new and unnecessary expenses, procedures and units
Wherever possible, indicators and targets have been selected so that information can be derived from existing, or planned systems, processes or activities such as surveys.

Monitoring and Evaluation Reporting

Monitoring of the GPE Project: ETF/GPE Steering and Implementation Committee
Continuous internal monitoring and evaluation should take place at all levels of the project. The detailed implementation plan for each year will be developed by the Project Management Team, and will provide the basis for day to day monitoring of progress. An internal monitoring and evaluation report will be generated annually and will contain recommendations based upon analysis of the data, the present political and funding situation, interviews with stakeholders involved with the project at all levels of government and other criteria relevant to the implementation of each component and activity. It will report on progress against the annual targets in the Results Framework. The report will be presented before the ETF/GPE Steering Committee chaired by the Minister of Education comprised of representatives from the donor community, the Permanent Secretary, key multilaterals with UNICEF as the Secretariat. Any recommendations will be referred to the ETF/GPE Implementation Committee, chaired by the Permanent Secretary, and including Principal Directors (PD) and Directors from each relevant department. The ETF/GPE Steering Committee should in turn present an annual monitoring report specific to the EMTP Operational Steering Committee.

Evaluation of the GPE: Joint Mid-term and End of Project Review:
The process of accountability, to which the MOESAC is committed, dictates that there should be at least two external reviews of the GPE Project during its lifespan. The first review should take place after the project has had time to commence affecting beneficiaries. It is proposed that the first review therefore take place at the mid-term of the GPE project 18 months into its implementation. As far as possible the GPE reviews will be aligned with the ETF II review process, and outcomes tables. A final review will be undertaken within two months of the conclusion of the GPE project but while the full implementation team is still active and present. The final review should inform future direction for the reforms undertaken and make recommendations on the impact and sustainability of initiatives.

Both joint reviews will be conducted jointly by MOESAC and its internal and external development partners. The purpose of each review process is to ensure that there are effective returns on the investments being made by the GPE Project and that the intended beneficiaries (children, students, teachers and all other stakeholders) are indeed benefiting. In addition each the review should give
an external and expert evaluation of progress making recommendations to ensure that the project has the greatest likelihood of success throughout its lifespan, and that the changes it has initiated are sustainable.

The Joint GPE Reviews will be scheduled to align with school year performance assessment and to complement the budgetary cycle so that informed decisions can be taken prior to budget preparation. Likewise the mid-term review will inform revision of the annual rolling work programme for the GPE Project. It is expected that the two reviews will eliminate the need for individual development partners to request separate reviews. The review will cover whole GPE project and will, of necessity, cover all aspects of the relationship between the medium term and annual educational planning and other partner initiatives. Wherever possible, GPE Joint Progress Reviews will be timed back to back or overlapping with the EMTP-OP Joint Annual Reviews (JAR).

**Critical Information Systems**
The draft GPE frameworks presented in Annex 1 is heavily reliant on the efficient operation of the following systems without which contingency for special surveys and census may have to be made:

- **a) EMIS:** The Education Management Information System provides information on enrolments, teachers, facilities, ﬁnances, pedagogical material and other aspects of the school and has recently undergone revitalization and will undergo decentralization to provincial level during 2013 using funds provided under the ETF II.

- **b) TDIS:** The Teacher Development Information System will be supported under this project and will provide comprehensive information on teachers for performance management, assessment against standards and other functions relating to the teacher. The TDIS will only be active at the end of 2013.

- **c) ZELA:** ZELA is assessing the reading and numeracy of grade 2 pupils and is funded under the ETF II. It is scheduled for continuation for the duration of this project.

- **d) LAT:** Students’ Learning Achievement Tracking (LAT), measured using the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) will be available each year for schools supported by the GPE grant. It will provide data on learning achievement gaps denominated in years for maths and English for Grades 4-7.

- **e) Financial Management Information System:** The government’s financial information system will be expanded under the School Grants programme funded through the ETF II. The expanded system will include development partner financial inputs to schools and pupils and may be used to produce financial information for cost comparison, unit costing etc. relevant to the monitoring and evaluation process.

**Exceptional Items for Monitoring and Evaluation**
The following items require specific budget provision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Mid Term and End of Project Review team (4 weeks 2 international consultants and 2 local consultants)</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1: Results Framework and Monitoring

Results and monitoring indicators

Overall Results Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>December 2014 (end of Y1)</th>
<th>December 2015 (end of Y2)</th>
<th>December 2016 (end of Y3)</th>
<th>Data source, periodicity, &amp; data collection agency</th>
<th>Indicator description/definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examination pass rates at Grade 7(^20)</td>
<td><strong>2012 Grade 7</strong> 49.6% (Male 46.7%, Female 56.4%)</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>MOESAC Primary and Secondary Departments Annual</td>
<td>Using the MOESAC calculation of pass rate. For Grade 7 a pass defined as % of candidates obtaining a total of 4 to 24 units from all subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% teachers having achieved minimum standards</td>
<td>Data not available Teacher minimum standards are being developed</td>
<td>Systems established</td>
<td>Baseline established</td>
<td>20% increase over the baseline Note (% increase on previous year)</td>
<td>TDIS Annual Report HR Department</td>
<td>The number of teachers deemed to have reached teacher minimum standards as a percentage of the total number of teachers in Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures will be reported by gender, urban/rural and province.

\(^{20}\) MOESAC and ZimSEC calculate pass rates using different methods. Figures presented in the table are defined by the MOESAC as follows: Grade 7 pass defined as % of candidates obtaining a total of 4 to 24 units from all subjects. Each subject is valued at a certain number of units, the number of which varies for each subject.
### Outcome Indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPE Objective</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>December 2014 (end of year 1)</th>
<th>December 2015 (end of year 2)</th>
<th>December 2016 (end of year 3)</th>
<th>Data source, periodicity, &amp; data collection agency</th>
<th>Indicator description/definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1:</strong> Improve the quality of teaching in grades 1 through to 7</td>
<td>The percentage of pupils achieving at or above the grade-appropriate level after completing Grade 2 in Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2012: Establishing baseline % of students achieving at or above the appropriate band</td>
<td>2% increase from baseline of students achieving at or above the appropriate band for the age of a typical Grade 3 pupil in Zimbabwe</td>
<td>5% increase from baseline of students achieving at or above the appropriate band for the age of a typical Grade 3 pupil in Zimbabwe</td>
<td>15% increase from baseline of students achieving at or above the appropriate band for the age of a typical Grade 3 pupil in Zimbabwe</td>
<td>ZELA Annual ZELA assessment</td>
<td>Increase over baseline score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The average performance lag of students in Grades 4-7</td>
<td>2013 Baseline (LAT)</td>
<td>10% decrease from baseline</td>
<td>12% decrease from previous year</td>
<td>15% decrease from previous year</td>
<td>LAT conducted Annual MOESAC-PLAP</td>
<td>The average number of years that students tested are behind their grade level, measured using the LAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2:</strong> Improve the monitoring and management of teacher performance and in-service professional development</td>
<td>% of teachers who have been supervised using TMS</td>
<td>Collect baseline information</td>
<td>Baseline established</td>
<td>20% increase of teachers who have been supervised</td>
<td>43% increase of teachers who have been supervised</td>
<td>TDIS Annual HR Department</td>
<td>Number of teachers who have received at least one supervision report as a percentage of total number of teachers in employment in year (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of teachers who have an approved Professional Development Plan</td>
<td>Collect baseline information</td>
<td>Baseline established</td>
<td>20% Have an approved Professional Development Plan</td>
<td>40% Have an approved Professional Development Plan (cumulative)</td>
<td>TDIS Annual HR Department</td>
<td>Number of teachers who have an approved PDP as a percentage of total number of teachers in employment in year (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3: Improve education strategic planning through support to the development of the next five year education sector strategic plan (ESSP 2020)</td>
<td>Evidenced based ESSP completed and endorsed through broad consultation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Education Sector Analysis (ESA) completed</td>
<td>Evidence based ESSP 2020 completed and endorsed</td>
<td>National budget reflects ESSP 2020 priorities</td>
<td>2015 External review team Annual National Budget</td>
<td>ESA completed and approved by MoESAC; 2015 External Review of ESSP assesses ESSP as satisfactory or better; National Medium Term Budget (2016 – 2020) includes ESSP priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Output Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>December 2014 (end of year 1)</th>
<th>December 2015 (end of year 2)</th>
<th>December 2016 (EOP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1: Improve the quality of teaching in grades 1 through to 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.1: Train teachers of Grades 1 – 3 in use of Early Reading materials</td>
<td>Number of teachers trained in use of Early Reading materials</td>
<td>7,839 teachers (25% of all teachers)</td>
<td>18,813 (50% of all teachers, including new teachers)</td>
<td>31,354 (100% of Grades 1 – 3 teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.2: G1-3 Teachers visited by Cluster Coordinator in schools</td>
<td>Number of teachers visited at least 3 times by Cluster Coordinator</td>
<td>7,839</td>
<td>18,813</td>
<td>31,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.3: Administration of LAT test to students.</td>
<td>Number of students completing LAT</td>
<td>56,700</td>
<td>357,000</td>
<td>567,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1.4: Train teachers in use of PLAP materials</td>
<td>Number of teachers trained in use of PLAP materials</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>26,344 (total)</td>
<td>41,855 (cumulative total)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 2: Improve the monitoring and management of teacher performance and in-service professional development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A2.1: TMS (i) Training of supervisors to use TMS instrument.</th>
<th>TMS instrument developed, piloted and finalized during year</th>
<th>75% supervisors trained – provincial, district, cluster and school.</th>
<th>Quality assurance of 50% supervisors at cluster and school levels undertaken.</th>
<th>TMS system evaluated through analysis of 10% supervision reports for quality improvement in supervision reports.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A2.2: TMS (ii) Teachers supervised, PD needs identified.</td>
<td>TMS instrument developed, piloted and finalized during year</td>
<td>Supervision process piloted in 3 provinces. Revision and finalisation of supervision process.</td>
<td>50% teachers supervised, PD needs identified and PD plans in place.</td>
<td>All teachers supervised, PD needs identified and PD plans in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2.3: TDIS</td>
<td>Formalized data held on teacher qualifications</td>
<td>Teacher qualification data captured and held in electronic form.</td>
<td>TDIS operational review document produced</td>
<td>TDIS operational improvements resulting from review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Objective 3: Improve education strategic planning through support to the development of the next five year education sector strategic plan (ESSP 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A3.1: Develop a comprehensive Education Sector Analysis (ESA)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Sector Analysis complete (ESA) approved by MOESAC and validated by an external review team</th>
<th>ESA updated and approved by MOESAC</th>
<th>ESA updated and approved by MOESAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Annex 2: Summary of Estimated Project Costs

The total cost of the GPE Project is US$23.6 million (Error! Reference source not found.). This includes the costs of the three components, as well as the management costs (Project Management Unit), and a 5% overhead recovery cost for UNICEF Harare. This percentage is the same as the Education Transition Fund which all participating donors are in agreement with.

Table 6: Project Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Inservice support to teachers in Grades 1-3</td>
<td>$7,958,581</td>
<td>$1,831,345</td>
<td>$2,825,185</td>
<td>$3,302,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Catch up remedial education for Grades 4-7</td>
<td>$8,455,744</td>
<td>$1,441,400</td>
<td>$2,913,540</td>
<td>$4,100,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Component 1</td>
<td>$16,414,325</td>
<td>$3,272,745</td>
<td>$5,738,725</td>
<td>$7,402,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Improved teacher performance management</td>
<td>$1,346,125</td>
<td>$680,000.00</td>
<td>$351,750.00</td>
<td>$314,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Teacher training &amp; devt Information System</td>
<td>$2,112,600</td>
<td>$1,369,000.00</td>
<td>$371,800.00</td>
<td>$371,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Component 2</td>
<td>$3,458,725</td>
<td>$2,049,000</td>
<td>$723,550</td>
<td>$686,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Situation Analysis</td>
<td>$171,600</td>
<td>$171,600</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 National Debate</td>
<td>$420,100</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$420,100</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 ESSP</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$61,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Finalisation and Operationalisation</td>
<td>$50,200</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50,200</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Component 3</td>
<td>$703,400</td>
<td>$171,600</td>
<td>$531,800</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GPE Components Budget</td>
<td>$20,576,450</td>
<td>$5,493,345</td>
<td>$6,994,075</td>
<td>$8,089,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Management Support Costs</td>
<td>$1,994,886</td>
<td>$532,200</td>
<td>$721,310</td>
<td>$741,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% UNICEF Harare Overheads</td>
<td>$1,028,822</td>
<td>$274,667</td>
<td>$349,704</td>
<td>$404,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GPE Budget</td>
<td>$23,600,158</td>
<td>$6,300,212</td>
<td>$8,065,088</td>
<td>$9,234,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As highlighted throughout, the GPE project builds and complements current activities that in most cases have already been costed or even piloted but have not been fully implemented due to lack of funds. This proposal uses existing unit costs. The quantities for each activity have been calculated taking into account the following:

- There are 2.98 million pupils in primary schools.
- There are 5,656 primary schools.
- There are 73,610 teachers in primary schools, of which approximately 31,354 teach in grades 1 to 3 and 41,806 teach in grades 4 to 7.

The costs are very different across components and in particular, the BSPZ will take up about half the total budget (Figure 10). This is as expected because the BSPZ covers the in-service training of teachers across the country requires a minimum amount of funds per teacher. It is estimated that the project will cost a total of about US$330 per teacher and cover all Grade 1-3 teachers. This is equivalent to about US$1,840 per school.
PLAP accounts for approximately 27% of the budget with the carrying out of the assessment and it’s review at the end of the year as the main cost driver; the Teacher Minimum Standards Component about a tenth; the Training Information System about 5%; and the development of the ESSP 2020 for the remaining 4% or so.

The cost is spread more or less evenly across the years, as some sub-components require larger expenditures up front (Training IS), while others will start small and scale up (PLAP). (Figure 11).

UNICEF and the Project Management Unit will execute about 40% of the budget. This includes the whole sub-component on the Training Information System; the management of equipment grants; the development, printing and distribution of training materials; as well as the hiring of trainers and technical assistance for some of the sub-components. A bit over a third of the budget will be spent by the clusters mainly for the in-service training, while districts will be spending about a fourth, mainly for the implementation of PLAP and the TMS. (Figure 12)
Figure 12: Project Costs by Managing Agency (level)
Annex 3: Project Preparation Team Members

*Project Preparation Team:*

- Peter Buckland (Team Leader)
- Ray Harris (Teacher Education and Development Strategy and Teacher Minimum Standards)
- Sue Kageler (School mapping, research and documentation)
- Dominic Muntanga (Research and document coordination)
- Clara Picanyol (Financial and Economic Analysis, Financial management and project costs)
- Barry Scutt (Teacher Training and Development Information System)
- Jim Shoobridge (EMIS, data and M&E)

The team worked closely with the MOESAC Planning team identified for the purpose, under the leadership of Mr Peter Muzawazi, Director of Planning.

The team also drew heavily on, and worked closely with the WB led team coordinating the development of the EMTP Operational Plan, and was guided and assisted by the UNICEF Education Team, especially Jeaniene Spink, Saul Murimba and Hideko Miyagawa. The insightful and constructive peer review by Jim Ackers, UNICEF Regional Adviser, Khassoum Diallo, Senior Research and Evaluation Specialist, and Daniel Kelly, Data Analysis and Knowledge Management consultant, all from UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO) were much appreciated.