Program Development Objectives

Program Development Objective (from Program-for-Results Appraisal Document)
A. Program Development Objective(s) Improve education quality in Tanzanian primary and secondary schools.

Overall Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Previous Rating</th>
<th>Current Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards achievement of PDO</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Implementation Progress (IP)</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Risk Rating</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation Status and Key Decisions

This Implementation Status and Results Report reflects results from the Year Two Annual Supervision Mission combined with the Mid-Term Review (MTR) from August 29 to October 4, 2016. This joint review included participation from MoEST, PO-RALG, Bank, DFID and SIDA.

The overall assessment of this MTR and the Year Two Annual Supervision Mission is that the program is on track, largely because of a wide and impressive engagement from the Government during the program implementation. Although significant challenges persist, new initiatives from the Government in terms of substantial education reforms, the planning of an improved school inspection system, the in-service teacher training framework and the agreement of comprehensive support to improve the overall textbook system, are all important steps in the right direction to achieve the overall program objective and improve the education system in Tanzania.

Moving forward, the GoT is emphasizing empowering head teachers/principals through resources, training and support to effectively manage influx of pupils at primary and secondary level particularly in response to its recent free education policy, reducing shortages in teacher and learning materials including textbooks at the school level, and responding to high classroom absenteeism rates by strengthening school inspection system. Furthermore, the GoT will emphasize strengthening of the school inspection system, expanding the school improvement grants, ensuring provision of adequate budget for EPforR implementation and timely release of funds to LGAs and schools per EPforR budget framework to support schools and LGAs to meet their annual operating expenses and targets, adequacy of capitation grants and their effective utilization, and further incentivizing LGAs to improve deployment of teachers across and within districts, with a focus on hardship schools.

The GoT has expressed interest to expand the focus of the EPforR program, through additional financing combined with program restructuring, to address some of these challenges.

This Implementation Status and Results Report reflects results from the Year Two Annual Supervision Mission combined with the Mid-Term Review (MTR) from August 29 to October 4, 2016. This joint review included participation from MoEST, PO-RALG, Bank, DFID and SIDA.

The overall assessment of this MTR and the Year Two Annual Supervision Mission is that the program is on track, largely because of a wide and impressive engagement from the Government during the program implementation. Although significant challenges persist, new initiatives from the Government in terms of substantial education reforms, the planning of an improved school inspection system, the in-service teacher training framework and the agreement of comprehensive support to improve the overall textbook system, are all important steps in the right direction to achieve the overall program objective and improve the education system in Tanzania.

Moving forward, the government is emphasizing empowering head teachers/principals through resources, training and support to effectively manage influx of pupils at primary and secondary level particularly in response to its recent free education policy, reducing shortages in teacher and learning materials including textbooks at the school level, and responding to high classroom absenteeism rates by strengthening school inspection system.
Furthermore, the government will emphasize expanding the school improvement grants, ensuring provision of adequate budget for EPforR implementation and timely release of funds to local government authorities (LGAs) and schools according to project budget framework to support schools and LGAs to meet their annual operating expenses and targets, adequacy of capitation grants and their effective utilization, and further incentivizing LGAs to improve deployment of teachers across and within districts, with a focus on hardship schools.

Data on Financial Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disbursements (by loan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P147486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Dates (by loan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Loan/Credit/TF</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Signing Date</th>
<th>Effectiveness Date</th>
<th>Orig. Closing Date</th>
<th>Rev. Closing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Risks

Systematic Operations Risk-rating Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Rating at Approval</th>
<th>Previous Rating</th>
<th>Current Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political and Governance</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroeconomic</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Strategies and Policies</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Design of Project or Program</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Capacity for Implementation and Sustainability</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiduciary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Social</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disbursement Linked Indicators (DLI)

- Recipient has completed all the Foundational Activities (DLR 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 5.1 and 6.1) (Yes/No)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR 2.1: Recipient has evidenced timely and adequate resource flows for the Program (%) (Yes/No)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Actual (Previous)</td>
<td>Actual (Current)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. On average, 75% of funding has been released against agreed budget lines for the second year of the PForR (74% CGs, 66% STEP activities, 87% school ranking, 26% school incentive grants, 9% 3R training, and 283% clearance of teacher claims). The low release of funds for 3R training was due to slow implementation of the LANES program. Over-funding of the budget for teacher claims also constrained funding for other budget lines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DLR 3.1 and 3.2: The Recipient has produced an Annual Summary Education Performance Report (ASEPR) in acceptable format, and an annual school-level EMIS data by each LGA (Yes/No) |
|---|---|---|
| Baseline | Actual (Previous) | Actual (Current) |
| Value | N | N | Y |
| Date | 10-Jul-2014 | -- | 04-Oct-2016 |
| Comments |
| (i) DLR 3.1: ASEPR: In Year 2 the detailed data were uploaded in full to the various websites within the end-July 2016 deadline and the draft ESPR was made available by August. The final version will be produced incorporating comments from the MTR and from the Joint Education Sector Review (JESR) scheduled for November. The final version will be published online. (ii) DLR 3.2: EMIS: In Year 2 it was found that on the 31st July 2016, complete data was made available online for 4,773 secondary schools (100% of total) and 17,134 primary schools (99.9% of total) including both government and non-government schools. |

| DLR 4.1: Recipient has met the annual target for number of LGAs achieving the acceptable range for primary PTRs (Number) |
|---|---|---|
| Baseline | Actual (Previous) | Actual (Current) |
| Value | 109.00 | -- | 126.00 |
| Date | 10-Jul-2015 | -- | 04-Oct-2016 |
| Comments |
| Target numbers of LGAs achieving the acceptable range for primary PTRs. The number of LGAs has changed from 164 at project inception to 180 now. In % terms the achievement in Yr 2 at 126/180 i.e. 70% is short of the Year 2 target of 117/164 i.e. 71%. |
### DLR 5.2: Number of schools receiving SIG as indicated in the Program design (Number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>122.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>19-Aug-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
The target was 120 schools in Year 2.

### DLR 6.2: Recipient has met the annual target of improvement in words per minute (wpm) in national 3R average in early grade Kiswhili reading assessment (wpm ())

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>19-Aug-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
Improvements have exceeded the end-target.

### Results

#### Results Area

Intermediate Results Area

#### Project Development Objective Indicators

### PDO 3: Percentage of teachers found in classroom during unannounced visit (primary & secondary schools) (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
<td>53.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>08-Dec-2015</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
The baseline value is based on the SDI 2010. Present value is based on SDI 2014. SDI survey is conducted every two years.
## PDO 1: National average for reading correct words per minute in Oral Reading Fluency (ORF) sub module of EGRA assessment among Grade 2 students (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>21.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
This is based on results of EGRA 2015/16. In future assessments, results will be captured every two years. The next EGRA will be available in 2018.

## PDO 2: National average on Level I Subtraction sub module of EGMA assessment among Grade 2 students (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
This is based on the results of EGMA 2015/16. End target was revised from 6.0 to 6.72 at the MTR to encourage the Government to sustain gains in numeracy with massive influx of students.

## PDO 4: Percentage of teachers with minimum knowledge in Mathematics and Languages (primary schools) (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>08-Dec-2015</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
The test instrument administered to determine minimum competency has changed between the pilot (2010) SDI and first SDI (2014) which has contributed to the differences in the results. The number of teachers tested are 504 from 180 schools in 2010 whereas a sample of 2150 teachers from 400 schools were tested in 2014 SDI. Variation in performance is largely driven by the share of teachers who meet minimum teaching standards in Mathematics which changed from 75% in 2010 to 25.5% in 2014. At MTR it was decided to review and rework the definition of the indicator, baseline value and end-targets in the restructuring paper for the AF.

### Overall Comments
The performance on PDOs is moderately satisfactory with 3 out of 4 PDO indicators exceeding end-targets. There is a risk that improvements in learning might drift as a result of the large number of students entering the system at both primary and secondary levels.
### Intermediate Results Indicators

#### % of districts submitting school-level EMIS data in revised format (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**
- Baseline: 10-Jul-2014
- Actual (Previous): 07-Dec-2015
- Actual (Current): 04-Oct-2016
- End Target: 30-Jun-2018

**Comments**
At MTR, it was agreed to revise the indicator to "LGAs submitting annual school-level EMIS data with unique school identifiers in revised format." The target is also to be raised from 80% to 95%. The changes will be formalized at program restructuring.

#### No. of primary and secondary schools receiving performance-based incentive rewards (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td>4006.00</td>
<td>4000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**
- Baseline: 10-Jul-2014
- Actual (Previous): 07-Dec-2015
- Actual (Current): 04-Oct-2016
- End Target: 30-Jun-2018

**Comments**
Values are sums of monetary school improvement grants and non-monetary performance-based incentive awards. In Year 2 (2015/16), 118 schools received SIGs.

#### % of primary schools participating in 3R assessment (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**
- Baseline: 10-Jul-2014
- Actual (Previous): 07-Dec-2015
- Actual (Current): 31-Mar-2016
- End Target: 30-Jun-2018

**Comments**
Data was collected in March 2016 for 650 primary schools. Percentage number not provided in the report. At MTR, this indicator was dropped.

#### Average student to textbook ratio (primary & secondary schools) (Number, Custom)
The World Bank  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>5.00</th>
<th>--</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>1.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
At MTR it was agreed to revise the indicator to "Average student to textbook ratio primary composite across subjects (primary schools)." Details will be confirmed at program restructuring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of schools receiving school improvement toolkit (Number, Custom)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
The Government has reported on number of school kits for the current figure, not number of schools. It is assumed that one kit was provided to primary schools (17,174), two to secondary schools (4,772*2=9,554), including private schools. Hence in total 26,178. The rest would have been distributed to education offices, inspectors, etc.

The target has already been exceeded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financing gap for BRNEd activities (as per agreed sector-wide framework) (Percentage, Custom)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Actual data is for percentage of funds released by the Treasury during the year. At MTR, it was agreed to modify the wording to "Total levels of funds released biannually as per EPforR budget framework." New targets are proposed to be 80% in Year 3 (2016/17), and 85% in Year 4 or end year (2017/18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official school ranking (performance-based) published (Yes/No, Custom)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments
At MTR it was agreed to track this indicator separately for primary and secondary schools, starting for Year 3 of the Program. This change will be reflected at program restructuring. Until Year 2, the indicator was tracked for primary schools only.

Volume of outstanding teacher claims older than three months (Tanzania Billion Shillings) (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>13298693.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Teacher claims are for salary. At MTR, it was agreed to revise targets to TSh 3 billion in Year 3 and Year 4 from Tsh 10 billion (previous end-target).

Teacher awards announced yearly to high-performing teachers (Yes/No, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>25-Sep-2014</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of schools receiving capitation grants on time (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>31-Jul-2014</td>
<td>07-Dec-2015</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments
Since December 2015, CGs have been disbursed to schools directly from the Treasury on a more regular, monthly basis, making the transfer of CGs to schools more timely and efficient. The risk of leakage during the transfer of CGs has also been reduced. In the second year of the program (FY2015/16), the DLR 2.2 on the full release of CGs to schools within each LGA was 89% achieved.

At MTR, it was agreed to revise the indicator to "Released full amount of capitation grants to schools within each LGA," and to track the revised indicator separately for primary schools and secondary schools. Targets for Year 3 and 4 are yet to be agreed upon. Changes will be reflected in program restructuring.
### No. of teachers participating in the 3R training program (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33502.00</td>
<td>57739.00</td>
<td>12300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>16-Feb-2016</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Actual (Current) is cumulative: The Government is planning to integrate 3R training in an in-service training program and therefore 3R training by itself cannot be tracked. Indicator is likely to be dropped.

### No. of primary schools conducting STEP (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5484.00</td>
<td>5018.00</td>
<td>11000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>07-Dec-2015</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

The STEP training is now mainstreamed in the in-service teacher training program and is therefore no longer a stand-alone program, making it difficult to track. At MTR it was agreed to drop this indicator.

### No. of secondary schools conducting STEP (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1557.00</td>
<td>2372.00</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>10-Jul-2014</td>
<td>16-Feb-2016</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Actual (Current) number is cumulative: The STEP training is now mainstreamed in the in-service teacher training program and is no longer a stand-alone program, making it difficult to track. At MTR it was agreed to drop the indicator. Annual target of schools conducting STEP activities was also a DLI 5.3 (both primary and secondary).

### Number of primary schools achieving the acceptable range of primary PTR (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>5266.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5672.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### No. of districts where PTR is in acceptable range (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>109.00</td>
<td>112.00</td>
<td>126.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>03-Nov-2014</td>
<td>07-Dec-2015</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
This indicator was added at MTR. the baseline is equivalent to achievement in the first half of 2015 (hence FY 2014/15).

### Released Summary of Education Performance Report (ASEPR) in acceptable format (DLR) (Yes/No, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>03-Nov-2014</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
New Indicator added based on DLR 3.1 at MTR.

### Direct program beneficiaries (Number, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10400000.00</td>
<td>10700000.00</td>
<td>10130000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td>31-Jul-2014</td>
<td>07-Dec-2015</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
End of the program target exceeded.
Female beneficiaries (Percentage, Custom)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Actual (Previous)</th>
<th>Actual (Current)</th>
<th>End Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-Jul-2014</td>
<td>07-Dec-2015</td>
<td>04-Oct-2016</td>
<td>30-Jun-2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Comments

The program has made good progress towards achieving the results targets for the program development objective (PDO) indicators and intermediate outcome (IO) indicators. For two of the four PDO indicators, namely national average reading oral proficiency and national average on level 1 subtraction competency, end program targets have already been exceeded. 2014 SDI data for PDO 3 (percentage of teachers found in classroom on unannounced visit) shows that it is at the same level as the end-program target. For PDO 4 (percentage of teachers with minimum knowledge in Mathematics and Languages), the baseline at program appraisal was inaccurate and requires revision of the targets which would be completed as part of the program restructuring.

Progress towards the achievement of IO targets (except for two IO indicators) has also been good and is on track. There is, however, need for increased efforts to improve performance of two IO indicators in particular: (i) ensuring that financing gap for the program activities as per agreed sector-wide framework is further reduced or total level of funds are released on time as per agreed program budget, and (ii) achieving PTRs in districts within acceptable range.

Government and DPs also agreed at the MTR to continue efforts to further strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems to improve quality of data collection and analysis and timeliness of the annual census and EMIS as well as strengthen capacity of NECTA. The TAS team will support MoEST and PO-RALG/LGAs in this important area.