

The Assessment of the Nicaraguan Proposal

(This report was prepared by the Secretariat. It incorporated donors comments in the sections on strengths, concerns and recommendations)

Summary

A. Country Ownership

There is clear evidence of country ownership. The Proposal was built on the PRSP and the National Education Plan for 2001-2015, both of which have been widely consulted internally and with development partners. The alignment between the vision, the philosophy, and the strategies in the National Education Plan and the FTI Proposal is tight. The FTI targets are more ambitious than those in the PRSP.

B. Matching of strategies with issues

The strategies matches the issues. Coverage of primary education and gender parity are not the major problems. Quality enhancement and equalizing opportunity for all are the central focus. The key issues are (i) poor school quality (supply side), which contributes to internal inefficiency and low achievement, and (ii) poverty (demand side), which is the major cause of non-enrollment, poor attendance and dropout. The key strategies are as follows:

- School improvement program will address the supply side problems of poor quality and inefficiency. It will provide guidelines and funding to school councils, based on their own generated proposals, to bring schools up to different levels of standards (fundamental, satisfactory, and superior) in school development planning, management, pedagogical conditions, educational materials, security and infrastructure, health, teacher professional development, and monitoring of results. This aims to reduce teacher absenteeism, and student non-attendance, repetition and dropout, as well as improve learning outcomes. In the Atlantic coast, a special fund will be set up to be accessed by the schools in the region to a variety of special services. The program is an incentive scheme to motivate school councils to achieve higher and higher levels of school quality and student outcomes. Although the standards and measures of schooling quality will be predefined, school councils will be responsible for achieving the improvements using financing from the EFA-FTI Schooling Improvement Fund.
- Student scholarship program will address the demand side issues by providing scholarship to defray the direct and indirect cost of schooling for poor children in order to raise enrollment, attendance and achievement.

C. Costs and Financing

Between 2003 and 2015, US\$180 million (11%) will be needed from external donors to achieve the EFA goals, while 89% of the total resources will be generated domestically. The dependence on external assistance will start to decline by 2013 and the financing gap will be closed by 2015, as the domestic resources increase will replace external funds and efficiency gains will expand the system's capacity.

For 2003-2005, US\$75 million is requested, of which \$50.9 million is for the school improvement program, and \$25 million is for scholarship. This represents 25% of the total resources needed for primary education, not counting the current level of external funding. The Ministry will finance \$277 million.

Domestic resource mobilization is within the range of the parameters of the indicative framework.

The FTI program is expected to provide benefits to approximately 220,000, 244,000, and 245,000 children in 2003, 2004, and 2005, respectively. FTI costs per student work out to about \$80, \$103, and \$131 per year during these three years. The costs are expected to stabilize per student after 2005, and will begin to decrease starting around 2008.

The preference for external financing mechanism is through an EFA Trust Fund. There is no request for budget support.

D. Risks and capacity

The main risks are macroeconomic downturn, which puts financial pressure on parents to pull their children out of school, and which leads to revenue shortfalls and reduction of education expenditure. The mitigating measures are to use targeted scholarships for the poor to offset their hardship, and to invoke the PRSP agreement to protect education spending. The other risk is logistical, and the mitigating measure is to incorporate key implementation indicators into its MIS to allow for rapid detection of problems.

The proposed interventions build on the success of autonomous schools in improving internal efficiency, parental participation and quality of service delivery. In addition, autonomous schools will be reinforced to become Model Schools, a successful system now ending its 8th year pilot phase, which has been supported by USAID. The stable institutional and legal foundation provides the necessary condition for sustainability of the interventions.

E. Monitoring and evaluation

Nicaragua has conducted three living standards measurement surveys (1993, 1998, 2001) which provides the historical trends, baseline measures and the trajectory basis in the proposal. The capacity exists to monitor whether the targets of enrollment and completion rates have been achieved. The school census of 2001, which surveyed the conditions of schools facilities and teachers and student information, has provided data for the Education Map. The Map contains a cartographic digital database of the entire

country. The Map will be used to administer, monitor and evaluate field information on the scholarship program and the school improvement program.

Summary – What can be achieved with additional FTI funding

Under the current trend, the number of repeaters exceed 100,000 annually (or 11% of enrollment), while 102,285 children between the ages of 7 and 12 do not attend school. With full FTI funding, the increase in internal efficiency is expected to reduce repeaters by half. Meanwhile, about 52,000 children cite economic reasons for their non-attendance. By halving the repeaters and giving scholarship to some 60,000 children, there will be school places to accommodate them. Without EFA, there will be 100,000 fewer children enrolled per year. The improvement in internal efficiency will pay for itself, with a declining of the total financing need by 2014.

In 2002, only 30% of schools have reached fundamental quality level in management, learning, health and safety conditions. With FTI financing, the % of schools reaching fundamental level will rise to 45% in 2005, 62% in 2008, and 100% in 2015. Because the enrollment in these schools are much larger than the recipients of the scholarships, the actual number of beneficiaries of the project is over 200,000 per year.

Strengths

Donors at the in-country review enthusiastically supported the proposal and commended the Ministry for being able to put together a sound proposal so quickly.

Concerns

1. The in-country review by local-based donors recommended wider consultation with domestic stakeholders and making the report (to be translated into Spanish) more accessible to the general public. (Note: the MECD's reason for not doing it prior to the endorsement is the fear of raising expectation that cannot be met if the proposal is not accepted).
2. More discussion with donors is also needed to work out the technical aspects.

Scholarships: There were concerned about how the scholarships would be implemented, mechanisms to assure equitable selection, control compliance and so forth. There was recommendation that scholarships be made conditional on parent/community involvement in the schools and sharing of responsibilities in the education of their children.

Quality: Heavy investment in capacity building upfront is needed to improve the quality of primary school teaching throughout Nicaragua. The proposal does not provide a plan for making this happen. Nicaragua's teacher salaries, the lowest in Central America, remain an impediment to attracting qualified professionals to the field and the proposal does not adequately address this issue.

School funds: Schools will need some parameters in using these effectively, especially with regard to reforming teaching practices, curricula, and improving the quality of education. Many, many schools lack basic facilities and infrastructure, water, latrines, etc., and school funds could be spent legitimately on basic infrastructure. But instruction remains paramount and the MECD will need to ensure that local school funds also address this issue.

Bilingual education: The proposal gives inadequate attention to this issue, especially in development of specialized curriculum, teacher training and work with regional governments (RAAN and RAAS).

Conclusion

The donors concluded that the proposal provide the basis for donors concenssional assistance conditional on working out the details mentioned above.

Section A. Evidence of Country Ownership

A.1. How closely is the Proposal related to PRSP and the national or sectoral development plans and/or budgets?

The Proposal was built on PRSP and the National Education Plan for 2001-2015. The FTI Proposal is more ambitious than the PRSP because additional financing would make it possible to attain the EFA goal. The PRSP sets the target of net enrollment ratio of 90% for 2015, but the Proposal aims at universal enrollment. The PRSP does not have a target for completion rate, while the Proposal aims at 95%, allowing for some dropouts, death and emigration.

The National Education Plan focuses on systematic and equitable enhancement of school quality. The Plan stresses the importance of...”improving all of the qualitative aspects of education and guaranteeing higher standards of schooling to promote well recognized and measured learning levels, especially in reading, writing, arithmetic, and essential practical competencies.” The improvement will include “the creation of a safe school setting” and “an equitable distribution of educational resources ”.

The FTI Proposal of quality improvement supports the decentralized model of school-based management. Nicaragua has established the autonomous school since the early 1990s. The school is run by a parent-managed school council, which has the legally sanctioned authority to withheld payment to teachers for absenteeism, to raise funds, and to manage the school; it is held accountable for student welfare and achievement. The FTI Proposal also builds on the National Plan’s strategies to provide incentives to poor families to attend schools through a student scholarship program. To the extent that the Proposal is built on existing institution, it is consistent with the National Plan.

A.2. What are the targets in the PRSP, the sector plan and the EFA FTI Proposal? Are they consistent and achievable?

There is a difference in the methodological approach between the 6 grade completion rate in the target of the PRSP and that in the FTI Proposal. The PRSP’s target of raising grade 6 completion rate from 35% in 1999 to 44% in 2005 is based on how many percent of the cohort who have entered grade 1 would reach grade 6 without ever repeating. The FTI Proposal conforms with the template used by many FTI countries in estimating grade attainment by the right age group as a % of the population of that age. This is far below the 87% existing completion rates reported in the Proposal, which is based on % of age-group reaching grade 6 in primary cycle, allowing for repetition along the way. The EFA work will monitor both indicators.

The PRSP’s target of building 2,630 additional classrooms by 2005 were not included in the FTI Proposal because it is financed by a Social Fund, outside the education sector. Therefore, it is not included for costing purposes, and will be monitored separately under PRSP.

Table 1: Quantitative Targets of PRSP, Sector Plan and the EFA FTI Proposal

	Targets in PRSP	Targets in Sector Plan	Targets in Proposal
Access and coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual increase in PNER to reach 90% from 75%. construct and replace 2,630 primary school classrooms in 2001-2005 	The National Education Plan provides an overall strategic framework to guide sector-wide reform. It did not articulate specific quantitative targets.	<u>Baseline in 2001 and target in 2015</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> % of age-group entering first grade in primary cycle to increase from 44% to 100%
Internal efficiency (repetition, dropout and completion)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual increase of 1% point in promotion rate of 3rd graders in rural areas; Annual increase in 2% point in completion rate from 32 to 44% 1999- 2005 	See above comments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase in completion rates from 87% to 100%
Gender	No an issue overall	Not an issue overall	Not an issue overall
Quality (inputs)	Not mentioned	See above comments.	Upgrade 70% of all schools to fundamental level -
Quality (student achievement)	Put in place an assessment system in 2001	See above comments.	No target has been set because the baseline is yet to be done.
HIV/AIDS	Not an issue	See above.	Not an issue
Equity: Poverty Rural/Urban Ethnicity Disability	Other than the target to reduce extreme poverty, no mention is made of educational disparity between the rural and urban areas, ethnicity and disability	See above	Proposal documents disparity of enrollment, attendance, and repetition between income quintiles, regions, and ethnic groups. The equity target is to provide the minimum learning opportunity to all children.

A.3. Has the Proposal been discussed with key stakeholders? With whom? How (consultative meetings, workshops, regional and local levels)? What are the plans for dissemination if the FTI has not been discussed with stakeholders and when?

Table 2: The Consultative Process

Stakeholders	Yes	How	If not yet discussed, is dissemination Planned? When?
<u>Government</u> Legislature Finance ministry Other line ministries Regional govt Local governments	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Internal Consultation and Discussion of National Plan and FTI Proposal	
<u>Civil Society</u> Civic and/or indigenous groups NGOs (please specify)	>3,000 members of civil society and education community Pastoral Educativa Vicariato Aplostolico de Bluefields	Public for a to discuss National Plan Public fora to discuss National Plan	
<u>Stakeholders at the implementation level</u> Principals Teachers Administrators/ Inspectors Parents Students	> 3,000 members of the education community and civil society Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes	Public for a to discuss National Plan	To hold public for a with parents and teachers is funding is secured.
Bilateral agencies	USAID, JICA, OEI, Spain, Finland, Luxembourg		
Multilateral Agencies	EC, IDB, UNESCO, UNICEF, WFP, OAS		

International NGOs	Terra Nuova Centro Per Il Volontariato; CARE		
--------------------	---	--	--

Section B. Key Sector Issues, Constraints, and Strategies to Achieve the Expected Results.

B.1. What are the main constraints to reaching the EFA goals of gender parity and 100% primary completion rate and how are these being addressed in the proposal?

Table 3: Sectoral Issues, Constraints and Strategies

Issues	Constraints	Strategies
Access and Coverage GER is 113% NER is 83% Not a general issue	However, increase school-age population need to be attended to.	Aim to improve student flows to accommodate additional students. See strategies under the equity section.
Gender GER is 112% NER is 82%		Not a general issue, but some disparity in indigenous areas in the Atlantic Coast
Internal efficiency (repetition, dropout, completion) 1 st grade 25% repeat and 6% drop out 50% of out-of-school kids attribute to financial problems.	<u>Supply side</u> : poor teacher quality, poor quality school; multigrade teaching. <u>Demand side</u> : age-by grade misalignment due to late entrance, opportunity cost of schooling and student lack interest in continuation	<u>Supply side intervention</u> : School funds to improve schools in order to reduce repetition, improve flow and reduce drop out. Funding to autonomous schools with parent-operated council to improve teachers skills, reading materials, basic health services, furniture, lighting, functional roofs and drainage, physical security, windows, water and sanitation. <u>Demand side intervention</u> : scholarships to poor children to provide incentives to enroll and complete primary education
Quality (inputs)	Same as above	Improve school quality by enhancing school development planning to increase retention and raise completion rates. Program to provide guidelines and funding to school councils, based on own proposal, to bring schools up to different levels of standards (fundamental, satisfactory and superior) in the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School development planning;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School based management; • Pedagogical conditions; • Educational materials; • Security and infrastructure; • Teacher professional development; and • Monitoring of results.
Quality (student achievement)	Same as above	Improve school quality to raise achievement
HIV/AIDS		Not an issue
Equity (poverty, rural/urban differences, ethnicity and disability)	Supply and demand side constraints	The Proposal is very specific on how it intends to work to increase coverage in hard to reach areas in specific geographic location. -- use scholarships to reduce the opportunity cost of schooling, for the poor and the indigenous peoples, and use a special fund to support schools in the Atlantic coast.

B.2. Does the Proposal include any innovative approaches, and what are these?

The schooling improvement incentive fund is innovative in that it provides incentives for parents and teachers to improve their educational indicators. Direct funding to schools and demand side financing, while not entirely new, represent a shift from the traditional supply driven, top down approach of financing education.

The schooling improvement program is an incentive scheme to motivate school councils to achieve higher and higher levels of school quality and student outcomes. Although the standards and measures of schooling quality will be predefined, school councils will be responsible for achieving the improvements using financing from the EFA-FTI Schooling Improvement Fund. A prerequisite of participating in the Schooling Improvement Program is that the school enter into Nicaragua's autonomous school regime, which is a key determinant of school quality improvement.

Section C. Costs and Financing

C.1. Define as clearly as possible the difference which FTI funding will make by elaborating a “with and without” scenario. In other words, state clearly the expected impact—in terms of access, coverage, quality, equity—of the additional resources requested?

Under the current trend, the number of repeaters exceed 100,000 annually (or 11% of enrollment), while 102,285 children between the ages of 7 and 12 do not attend school. With full FTI funding, the increase in internal efficiency is expected to reduce repeaters by half. Meanwhile, about 52,000 children cite economic reasons for their non-attendance. By halving the repeaters and giving scholarship to some 60,000 children, there will be school places to accommodate them. Without EFA, there will be 100,000 fewer children enrolled per year.

In 2002, only 30% of schools have reached fundamental quality level in management, learning, health and safety conditions. With FTI financing, the % of schools reaching fundamental level will rise to 45% in 2005, 62% in 2008, and 100% in 2015.

The FTI program is expected to provide benefits to approximately 220,000, 244,000, and 245,000 children in 2003, 2004, and 2005, respectively. FTI costs per student work out to about \$80, \$103, and \$131 per year during these three years. The costs are expected to stabilize per student after 2005, and will begin to decrease starting around 2008.

C.2. What are the targets for 2015 set for domestic resource mobilization in the following indicators? Are these achievable targets? How do they compare with the parameters in the “indicative framework”? If user fees are eliminated, are there measures to compensate schools for loss of revenue?

The targets are within the ranges of the indicative framework and are achievable.

Table 4: The Indicative Framework Parameters and FTI Proposal Targets

Parameters	Indicative Framework	2001 (base year)	2015 target	Comments
Domestically generated revenues as % of GDP	14-18%	23%	18%	GDP growth of will make revenue smaller in %, but bigger in real terms
Domestic spending on education as % of domestic revenues	20%	No information	No information	
Public recurrent spending on primary education as % of total recurrent spending on education	42-64%	65%	65%	
Recurrent spending on items other than teacher remuneration as %	33%	35%	35%	

of total recurrent spending				
Teacher salaries as a multiple of per capita GDP	3.5	2.6	3	To implement a new career track for teachers
Pupil-teacher ratio	40:1	36:1	35:1	Expand multigrade rural schools
User fees eliminated?		No change in policy	No change in policy	Poverty targeted scholarship to offset costs.
Subnational government contribution?		No	No	

C.3. What is the total domestic public resources and external financing available for primary education?

Table 5: Domestic and External Financing for Education

(In Million US\$)

	Average annual amount over last 3 years (US\$)	Expected average annual amount over next 3 years (US\$) (For programs already in place)
All Educational Levels		
Government	69	75
Multilateral	31	34
Bilateral	20	33
HIPC debt relief		
Primary education		
Government	50	56
Multilateral	22	25
Bilateral	15	18
HIPC debt relief		
Education-related budget support		
Multilateral		
Bilateral		
HIPC debt relief		

Note: the categories above could be adopted to fit the country.

C.4. How will the additional resources from the EFA FTI be used? What are the major categories of spending (e.g. capital, recurrent)?

The Proposal requested for US\$ 75Million over the three year period from 2003-2005, representing 24% of total funding for education, but excluding the current level of external funding. The Ministry budget will finance the salaries and all operating costs of the system. The FTI funding will finance quality enhancement, efficiency improvement, and poverty related demand side needs. The breakdown is as follows:

In Million US\$

	2003	2004	2005	Total 03-05
Total Needs	\$92.08	\$103.19	\$114.29	\$309.57
MECD Budget	\$82.04	\$92.08	\$103.19	\$277.32
School improvement	\$10.04	\$17.05	\$23.8	\$50.89
Scholarship	\$8.86	\$8.03	\$8.217	\$25.11
Total FTI funds requested	\$17.90	\$25.08	\$32.06	\$75.04

The FTI Schooling Improvement Program is composed of two cost elements:

- the investment costs of upgrading schooling quality to fundamental and higher standards, including infrastructure, equipment, material, and training costs; and
- the incremental annual costs associated with bringing all of these schools into the autonomous schools system.

To participate in the Schooling Improvement Program, schools must enter into the school autonomy program. These incremental annual costs of the autonomous school program will be fully absorbed by the MECD budget by 2015.

About 83% of the school grants will support school development planning, management, pedagogical conditions, educational materials, security, health, teacher professional development, and monitoring of results, while 14% will support repair and maintenance, water and sanitation. The scholarship should be treated as a grant. The Proposal did not envisage financing of teachers' salaries and pension.

The school construction targets in the PRSP will be taken care of by the Social Fund (FISE) in new areas, financed out of non-education sector budget, and the Schooling Improvement Program's SIMCEP mechanism to expand existing school space as needed to achieve Fundamental Level Standards with their definition of normal teacher/student ratios is included in the proposal. No additional education sector budget is anticipated as required to finance primary school construction.

C.5. How comprehensive and realistic are the cost estimates, taking into account current expenditures and current levels of donor flows?

The cost estimates for grant for each school range from US\$5,000 to raise up to fundamental level without infrastructure improvement to \$15,000 with infrastructure improvement, and an additional \$8,000 to raise from fundamental to satisfactory level, and \$8,000 from satisfactory level to superior level.

A condition of participating in the Schooling Improvement Program is that the school become autonomous. Autonomous schools have a slightly higher per-student cost associated with consumable materials, self-administration, and support. In particular, as centralized schools are reclassified as autonomous schools, unit costs increase by US\$9 (10%) per student. As centralized multigrade schools become autonomous multigrade schools, which in turn become autonomous multigrade model schools, unit costs increase by \$9 (10%) and \$36 (38%), respectively. As a result, during the first few years of the FTI program, investment costs represent a smaller share of the Schooling Improvement Program than the recurrent costs due to the funding requirements of autonomous schools. This trend is reversed in later years (starting in 2011) as the additional impact of autonomy is absorbed by the ordinary MECD budget.

The cost estimates for scholarship are derived from analysis of household expenditure and the opportunity cost of schooling in 2001. It ranges from US\$90 for children aged 7, increasing to \$140 for children aged 12+ to reflect the rising opportunity cost.

C.6. What is the total number of beneficiaries per year and over the funding period? How do the additional funds translate into unit costs per student for the FTI? How do these compare with the existing per student spending?

See comments above.

C.7. How does the Proposal address the issue of financial sustainability?

See comments above.

Section D. Risks and Capacity

D.1. Does the Proposal provide sufficient analysis of risks? What are they and what mitigating measures have been proposed?

The main risks are macroeconomic downturn, which puts financial pressure on parents to pull their children out of school, and which leads to revenue shortfalls and reduction of education expenditure. The mitigating measures are to use targeted scholarships for the poor to offset their hardship, and to invoke the PRSP agreement to protect education spending. The other risks is logistical, and the mitigating measure is to incorporate key implementation indicators into its MIS to allow for rapid detection of problems.

The legal framework that support the parent-directed autonomous schools and the successful implementation of the existing programs provide an assurance of institutional stability, governance and accountability.

D.2. Does the Proposal include any plans to improve implementation capacity as it scales up activities and reaches underserved populations in the following areas?

Areas for capacity building	Yes or No	How? Is it sufficient?
Teacher pre-service training	N	
Teacher in-service training	Y	Part of model school
Teacher recruitment	N	
Teacher evaluation	Y	
School inspection	Y	Covered by monitoring of schooling improvement program, which includes school self assessment and targets in educational outcomes at the higher standards of quality
Student assessment	Y	On-going at present
MIS (including keeping track of personnel and school facilities)	Y	On-going
Procurement & contracting	Y	On-going
Delivery of instructional materials	Y	On-going
Targeting demand side financing to the needy	Y	On-going
Budgeting and financial management	Y	Through the management of the fund for school improvement

D.3. What measures would be adopted to improve the administrative capacity in these areas?

Not mentioned in the proposal. However, Nicaragua appears to have a good administrative capacity at the central level. Its track record of project implementation is good.

Section E. Monitoring and Evaluation

E1. Does the Proposal provide a basis and standard for monitoring progress and evaluating accomplishments? Does it cost out the resources needed for M&E?

M&E in the school funds components and the scholarship components need to be more detailed. It has not costed out the resources needed to undertake the work.

E2. What are the indicators, means of verification, and conditions for success in the results framework?

Table 7: Results Framework

Hierarchy of Results	Performance Indicators	Means of Verification or Basis for Data Collection	Conditions for Success
-----------------------------	-------------------------------	---	-----------------------------------

Hierarchy of Results	Performance Indicators	Means of Verification or Basis for Data Collection	Conditions for Success
<p>Key Outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gender parity in first grade intake in primary school attained by 2005. 2. 100% primary school completion by 2015 3. Increased learning outcomes in primary school. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. % of girls entering first grade 2. Average years of schooling for 6-15 yr. Cohort. 3. Language and math scores 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tabulation of school reports during the first semester of each year. 4. School records 5. MECD Achievement tests 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reinforce current policies 2. Implementation of scholarship program and improvement of school quality 3. Improved school and teacher quality
<p>Outputs and Service Delivery</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved coverage, especially of girls, disadvantaged and at-risk children 2. Increased internal efficiency 3. Improved quality of learning inputs or activities <i>(set of minimum standards to be country determined.)</i> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gross and net enrollment rates. 2. Repetition and drop out rates. 3. Sampling of schools to determine compliance with minimum standards. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Calculated from school reports and verified by LSMS data 2. Calculated from school reports and verified by LSMS data. 3. Monitoring plan of EFA 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. retention of new entrants through scholarships and improved school quality. 2. Implementation of EFA plan 3. Reinforcement of school councils and improved training of school directors
<p>FTI Strategy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Critical country-specific interventions or strategies necessary for accelerating progress via FTI are operationalized and implemented successfully 2. A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system developed or upgraded for accountability, improvement and lessons, and capacity for operation assessed and enhanced 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Progress indicators in implementation plan. 2. Monitoring system in place at the start of EFA initiative. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monitoring reports from EFA implementation unit at the MECD. 2. Initial monitoring reports. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Timely disbursements of EFA resources. 2. Implementation of monitoring system already in place

Hierarchy of Results	Performance Indicators	Means of Verification or Basis for Data Collection	Conditions for Success
<p>Inputs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Domestic resource mobilized for EFA and FTI 2. Donor commitment to EFA-FTI concretized and maintained on a long-term basis 3. Country commitment to quality education and service delivery maintained 4. The financing of FTI is sustainable 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Budgetary allocations by Ministry of Finance. 2. Donor commitments pledged on the third quarter of each fiscal year. 3. Enrollment and achievement indicators. 4. Budget allocations by Ministry of Finance 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National budget approved by legislature. 2. Pledge reports from MECD and Ministry of Foreign Relations. 3. School data and LSMS surveys. 4. National budget approved by legislature. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Approval and Implementation of current budget plan. 2. Timely lobbying of donors by MECD on the third quarter of each year. 3. Proper and timely implementation of EFA. 4. Budget growth in agreement with EFA plan, and timely donor resources.

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

Nicaragua has conducted three living standards measurement surveys (1993, 1998, 2001) which provides the historical trends, baseline measures and the trajectory basis in the proposal. The capacity exists to monitor whether the targets of enrollment and completion rates have been achieved. The school census of 2001, which surveyed the conditions of schools facilities and teachers and student information, has provided data for the Education Map. The Map contains a cartographic digital database of the entire country. The Map will be used to administer, monitor and evaluate field information on the scholarship program and the school improvement program.