



<b>1. Project Data:</b>		<b>Date Posted :</b> 08/06/2004	
<b>PROJ ID:</b> P006891		<b>Appraisal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Project Name:</b> Co Antioquia Education	<b>Project Costs (US\$M)</b>	80	53.1
<b>Country:</b> Colombia	<b>Loan/Credit (US\$M)</b>	40	39.5
<b>Sector(s):</b> Board: ED - Central government administration (25%), Pre-primary education (21%), Secondary education (20%), Primary education (20%), Sub-national government administration (14%)	<b>Cofinancing (US\$M)</b>		
<b>L/C Number:</b> L4243			
	<b>Board Approval (FY)</b>		98
<b>Partners involved :</b>	<b>Closing Date</b>	06/30/2003	12/31/2003

<b>Prepared by :</b>	<b>Reviewed by :</b>	<b>Group Manager :</b>	<b>Group:</b>
Helen Abadzi	John R. Heath	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST

**2. Project Objectives and Components**

**a. Objectives**

The development objectives of the Antioquia Basic Education Project in Colombia were to (a) contribute to the Antioquia ' s goal of improving student learning, access, and school retention among the rural and urban poor at-risk-of-violence communities; (b) improve the capacity of schools/communities, municipalities, and the Department to effectively provide their respective education services; and (c) provide lessons for a national strategy to support municipal and departmental education management and investments.

**b. Components**

The project had three components: (a) The School and Community Strengthening component to finance (through nonrefundable financial transfers) the development and implementation of school improvement plans and municipal training and technical assistance to strengthen pedagogy, curriculum, management, planning and community participation (US\$49 million at appraisal, US\$16.4 at completion); (b) The Municipal Education Management and Investments Component to finance municipal education plans and provided information and technical assistance to develop institutional capacity (US\$20 million at appraisal, US\$25 million at completion); and (c) The Departmental Education Services component (US\$11 million at appraisal, US\$11.7 million at completion) to finance (i) training and technical assistance to strengthen the nonmanagerial functions of the Departmental Secretariat of Education (consulting, communications, and ex post evaluation); (ii) the consolidation and integration of the existing computerized systems and tools for education evaluation; (iii) a communication network between three levels -the Department, Municipal, and local education administration offices; and d) a Department-wide communication strategy to disseminate project objectives and lessons learned in implementing a national strategy to strengthen departmental and municipal management of education

**c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates**

The project was reduced in scope from US\$80 million to US\$57 million during mid-term review in June 2001. Eventually it was completed after an extension of six months, and US\$0.5 million was cancelled at closing.

**3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:**

Objectives were partly achieved, as follows :

- **Improving student learning, access, and retention** among the rural and urban poor; partly achieved . Enrollment rates increased at most levels between 1998 and 2002 in urban areas but remained static in rural areas, possibly as a result of the armed conflict. The project reached 473,995 students with
- **Improving capacity to provide educational services** - achieved. The targets of reaching 1200 schools were often surpassed in the tasks of implementing classroom projects, pedagogical innovations, school councils of parents .
- **Providing lessons for a national strategy** . Outcome unclear. A decentralization law was passed, facilitating decisionmaking in municipalities. The ICR does not clearly state which lessons were learned .

**4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:**

Overall, preschool coverage increased from 76% to 88%, primary from 90.3% to 97%, lower secondary from 73% to 89%, and in higher secondary enrollment was slightly reduced from 63.5% to 62.9%. Large numbers of people

participated in training courses, including 4149 parents and 259 administration staff.

**5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):**

Implementation was severely affected by a fiscal crisis, the armed conflict and the frequent turnover of mayors and municipal officials who were involved in project implementation. Teachers affected by redeployment at the municipal level strongly protested, bringing the project to a standstill. There were internal conflicts and insufficient evidence of positive results with the participatory approach. Participation in school grant proposals was limited. Dropout and repetition rates were not significantly reduced, and targets were not met. Test results improved in language but dropped in math for some grades. Communities proved less capable of managing schools than expected, and the community strengthening component was reduced at midterm review. Overall, there is no clear picture of what the many planning processes achieved.

6. Ratings :	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
<b>Outcome :</b>	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	[The ICR's 4-point scale does not allow a "moderately sat." rating]. Changes in certain monitoring indicators were small and could happen by chance; some are deteriorating. Targets in dropout and repetition were not met. Many project activities consisted of processes (making use of planning tools, motivating, providing advice), whose outcomes were not clarified.
<b>Institutional Dev .:</b>	Substantial	Substantial	
<b>Sustainability :</b>	Likely	Non-evaluable	Many of the activities carried out were plans, but it is unknown whether the execution of the plans is sustainable. The document on p. 16 is vague and does not offer sufficient reassurances or evidence for sustainability (e.g. "clear definition of spheres of competence", "ownership"). Rating will be revisited at PPAR time.
<b>Bank Performance :</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Borrower Perf .:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Quality of ICR :</b>		Unsatisfactory	

NOTE: ICR rating values flagged with '\*' don't comply with OP/BP 13.55, but are listed for completeness.

**7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:**

- Although processes and plans are very important in decentralization and quality improvement, clear outcomes are also needed. It is difficult to establish benefits of these plans without adequate expectations and measurements of results.
- Rigorous diagnostic studies are important when undergoing profound sectoral transformation; strong technical assistance is needed to achieve the expected results.
- Empowering local communities to manage schools and monitor quality offers many advantages to education. However, communities need considerable development and encouragement to perform financial and accounting functions.

**8. Assessment Recommended?  Yes  No**

**Why?** The full project effects cannot be ascertained from the ICR descriptions.

**9. Comments on Quality of ICR:**

- The ICR had a number of shortcomings, which made rating this project difficult. Specifically:
- Extensive use of opinions and vague expressions without any evidence to justify them. For example, it is unclear what evidence there is of 'ownership', how Law 715 was evaluated to enable the readers to ascertain that it provided 'tools for schools managers to diagnose school performance ...' (p. 16)
  - Although two external studies were conducted, little evidence is attributed to them, and the reader does not know what they concluded or how they are linked to the opinions presented in the document.
  - The achievement test score table has an unclear heading (B, C, D). It appears that although language scores improved in some instances, math scores dropped, but the text makes little mention of that.
  - Thousands of people participated in some type of training, but no information is given regarding its quality or utility.
  - Unclear explanations regarding the use of loan funds (table 6). Of the schools and communities component apparently 30% was implemented rather than 70% as compared to appraisal estimates.