A. INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. A mission visited Ghana from December 2-16, 2013 to supervise the education portfolio and carry out a joint implementation support mission for the Ghana Partnership for Education Grant Project as per the SMO issued on November 21, 2013. The mission reviewed implementation progress, conducted field visits to beneficiary regions/districts/schools and discussed key recommendations for improving project performance.

2. The team is grateful for the cooperation and support provided by the Government counterparts, especially the Minister of Education, Hon Naana Opoku-Agyemang; Mr. Enoch H. Cobbina, Chief Director, Ministry of Education; Ms. Naana Biney, Director General, Ghana Education Services (GES); Mr. Akilagpa Sawyerr, Director, External Resource Mobilization, MOFEP, Mr. Emmanuel Adjetey, Head, World Bank Unit, MOFEP; Mr. Lawrence Agyekum Nyanor, Economics Officer, World Bank Unit, MOFEP; Mrs. Emelia Aning, Director PBME, MOE; Mr. Charles Aheto Tsegah, Deputy Director General, GES; Mr. Stephen Adu, Ag. Deputy Director General, GES; Mr. Chris Koramoah, Financial Controller, GES; Mr. Peter Ahlijah, Mr. Elliot Lampetey and Mr. Ernest Otoo, Planning Officers, PBME; Mr. E.B. Amuah, Budget Officer, GES; Mr. Philip Donkor, Budget Officer, GES; Ms. Beatrice Zalia Ali, Director Supplies and Logistics, GES; Mr. Adams Zuwi, Procurement Officer, GES; Ms. Nicola Ruddle, ODI fellow, MOE; Mr. Samuel Ansah, Director, TED; Jacob Molenaar, UTDBE Coordinator TED; and Gershon Dorfe, NIU Coordinator, TED.

3. Mission members included the following staff from the World Bank: Deborah Newitter Mikesell (Senior Operations Officer), Peter Darvas (Senior Education Economist), Eunice Ackwerh (Senior Education Specialist), Charles Ashong (Procurement Specialist), Robert Wallace De-Graft Hanson (Financial Management Specialist); Paud Murphy (Teacher Development Consultant), Bernardo da Cruz Vasconcellos (M&E Consultant), Kabira Namit (Economist). Stephen Tettevie, Team Assistant, provided mission support in Accra and Janet Adebo, Program Assistant, provided mission support from Washington DC. Mission members from the Local Education Group (LEG) included Lucinda Ramos, Chief of Education, UNICEF; Nicole Goldstein, Education Advisor, DFID; Steve Passingham, Education Advisor, DFID; Enyonam Azumah, Senior Program Officer, DFID; Marisol Perez, Education Office Director, USAID; and Sarah Banashek, Deputy Education Office Director, USAID.
B. CONTEXT

4. The objective of the GPEG is to improve the quality of planning, monitoring and effectiveness of basic education services in deprived districts in Ghana. The GPE grant was prepared in collaboration with all key development partners supporting education in Ghana (World Bank, UNICEF, DFID, USAID, JICA). The World Bank is supervising entity of this three year grant for US$75.5 million, implemented by the Ghana Education Service in 57 deprived districts in 8 out of 10 regions. Criteria for selection of districts was carefully applied to ensure that the neediest communities are receiving grant funding in an effort to target much needed non-salary resources to improve teaching and learning. The GPEG framework works through existing government systems and focuses on strategic priorities such as access, equity and quality of education services and on efficiency and accountability of education management. The largest share of funding supports **Component 1, Sub-Grants to Deprived Districts** to support equity, access, quality and management improvements in addition to upgrading untrained teachers through the Untrained Teachers Diploma in Basic Education (UTDBE). **Component 2, School Sub-Grants**, provides a supplemental base grant to the ongoing capitation grants for all public basic (KG-JHS) schools in the 57 districts, with an explicit focus on improving access and quality as specified in the School Performance Improvement Plans (SPIP). **Component 3** provides the resources for **Project Management and Institutional Strengthening**, particularly supervision of decentralized services, monitoring and evaluation and impact evaluation. An extensive Project Implementation Manual (PIM) has been prepared to guide implementation at all levels.

5. The GPEG application was approved by the GPE Board on July 31, 2012. The project package was approved by the World Bank Regional Vice President on October 11, 2012. The grant agreement was signed on November 22, 2012 and declared effective on February 15, 2013. A minor restructuring was completed in order to include works category under District grants on June 6, 2013. **The project has disbursed US$22,685,456 million to date (30%). Three withdrawal applications have been made and a fourth application is being prepared to be submitted.** Of the disbursed amount, approximately US$17 million is expended by districts and schools to improve learning and teaching in the 57 deprived districts.

C. KEY FINDINGS

6. **Excellent status of project implementation:** The mission is pleased to report that significant progress has been made in the short time the GPEG has been effective. The project is off to a great start and the mission was impressed by the level of engagement, enthusiasm and commitment by the project beneficiaries. The mission received an excellent progress report that provided comprehensive analysis and assessment of project achievements, implementation, and ongoing challenges to be addressed. This report is attached as an annex to this aide memoire. Therefore, the following few pages highlight where more information was gathered during the implementation support mission, feedback on current issues and challenges and elaboration on some of the key activities. Site visits to selected districts in each region were conducted with representation from government and development partners to conduct a joint monitoring and collect further information.
The mission noted the strong collaboration between the monitoring functions of the PBME/MOE and operational roles of the GES. **Therefore the project continues to be rated Satisfactory for PDO and Implementation Progress at this time.**

7. Approximately 67% of the 2013 project budget has been spent to date and 42 districts have spent more than 70% of their first year district and school grants. Approximately 7,000 untrained teachers are enrolled in the UTDBE and have completed the first year of the program. Significant training has been provided to district and regional staff in financial management, procurement, monitoring and evaluation, School Report Cards and District operational planning.

8. **Field visits** to 7 regions were jointly conducted during the mission. Most of the teams found the district offices very well versed in GPEG, using the tools effectively and disbursing funds in an effective manner. The capacity of district education offices overall appear good and key personnel interviewed were enthusiastic about the implementation of the GPEG. One of the main findings is that circuit supervisors are conducting more regular visits to the schools, and overall monitoring at all levels has increased. This increased communication has been credited by beneficiaries as having a positive effect on teacher attendance and pupil attendance. The teams discovered more significant challenges at the school level where school grant funds were often delayed, SPIPs not signed or approved, and in several instances, some ineligible expenditures of school grant funds. It appeared that in these instances, unfamiliarity with GPEG guidelines and minimal support of training from districts contributed to the problems. The teams also reported that the School Report Cards were available and visible in most schools; however, the new versions did not have the teacher attendance information because of a software issue. The collated findings of the monitoring teams will be compiled and collated in a simple monitoring report.

9. **Annual Programs of Work (APW)** for 2014 have been completed by the districts and a review of the plans and cash flow for the 2014 APW will be conducted in January. The mission recommended improved advocacy and information sharing on less well-known activities and continuous orientation of the District offices about the objectives and performance indicators for the GPEG.

10. **School level SPIP and grant implementation:** There is a need for much more capacity and guidance on kinds of activities that would help schools with teaching and learning. Schools will benefit from more training and support on the SPIP preparation, execution, and implementation of the school grants. The lack of awareness has led to some schools not using their funds especially where there were gaps in District Director leadership. Delays in transfers or approvals by the Districts also limit implementation of SPIP. The progress report reported on school grants in aggregate and only showed expenditure as part of overall district expenditure, making it difficult to ascertain execution of school grants separate from district activities. **The mission noted that complementary activities and interventions, such as the distribution of core textbooks to all schools, were having a very positive impact on the schools.** It would be good to highlight some of these activities in the progress report as they contribute to the objectives of the GPEG.
11. **Training plans**: A more detailed cost table will be shared to provide details on the breakdown of costs of undertaken activities, especially with respect to various trainings. The current report does not include role and expenditures at the Regional Education offices. The summaries of HQ expenditures will also be disaggregated to better understand which activities have been conducted.

12. **Project Steering Committee** has met twice in the past year. The mission recommended that the PSC meet on a regular basis to provide guidance and oversight to project activities. The mission requested further information on the outcomes (minutes) of these meetings to date.

13. **Project Implementation Manual**: The PIM has been printed and distributed. In addition the School Grant manual has been extracted, printed and distributed to most schools. The mission advised that districts assure that all schools have a copy and that additional training be provided to those schools experiencing difficulties accessing or utilizing their school grant allocations.

14. **Monitoring and Evaluation- Results Framework**: In order to report on the activities, outputs and expenditures under the GPEG in 2013, a data collection workshop will be held in January to collect information related to district and school grants. The workshops will last three days and will be held in three batches in Kumasi from January 20-29, 2014. The workshop will be used to submit and vet the following data collection templates captured in the GPEG’s Project Implementation Manual (PIM): (i) Annual Work of Work—Execution Against Plan; (ii) Interim Financial Report; (iii) School Grant Report; and (iv) Training Report. In addition, the regional education officers will also attend the workshop in order to complete the regional consolidation templates. These templates will provide a summary of all district level information captured in the APW Execution Sheet, the Interim Financial Report (IFR), the School Grant Template and the Training Template for each district at the regional level. Once the district and regional data is aggregated and analyzed in January/February 2014, the GPEG results framework will be updated (Annex # 7).

15. The **Girls PASS Scholarship** pilot phase training has been carried out in Kumasi in November for 21 districts (15 original pilot districts + 6 newly created districts carved from the original 15). The 3-day training for District and Regional Girls' Education Officers, District Accountants and District Directors of Education, covered IT skills and completing monitoring templates, a full overview of the program, and how to train school-based facilitators and sensitize communities about the program. At this training, each district received a computer set and a UPS. A modem for internet access is now being sent to the districts separately- and printed materials to facilitate the program. These include information sheets and application forms for all JHS girls in the district to be well-informed about the scholarship, booklets for recipients to ensure they understand what they are entitled to receive, manuals for school-based facilitators in Girls PASS schools, and posters to advertise the program. Funds are in the process of being disbursed to districts and districts are working on the selection of girls, training school-based facilitators and raising awareness of the program in communities.
Newly created districts will receive a quota for scholarships and funding for the implementation of the program from their mother districts, as enrolment for the new districts has not yet been captured by EMIS and GPEG bank accounts do not yet exist for these districts. Districts have been asked to finalize selection before Christmas, so the two-week appeal window at Head Office level can be completed by the start of the new school term. Distribution of the first two terms' worth of scholarship package items is therefore scheduled for the start of the second term in January.

16. **School Report Cards (SRC):** Problems remain with the revised SRC software and the latest version of the School Report Card no longer includes critical information on teacher attendance. The districts visited expressed disappointment that this was no longer highlighted on the SRC as they believed they started to see traction in addressing the attendance issues by collating and posting this data. The mission learned that the software glitch is being resolved so that the next report card will include this data. It was agreed that the format for the cards be made more user-friendly and legible once printed. And support from the Regions could be made available to help districts collate and send data electronically as requested. Significant funds have been provided to conduct training in the generation of the cards with support from USAID. The mission reiterated that SRCs will be an important source of information for monitoring school-level activities and interventions and for measuring progress towards the key performance indicators.

17. **Untrained Teachers Diploma in Basic Education (UTDBE):** The mission acknowledges the excellent report on UTDBE within the GPEG Progress Report and welcomes the progress that has been made, including the decongestion of Colleges offering residential courses, the printing of modules in time for the December residential course, the release of funds for the August course, the progress in contracting the QA agency for UTDBE and the monitoring that has taken place. **However, the mission notes that the enrolment cleaning has not been completed,** that training manuals for District staff in support for students between residential courses have not been developed and training for staff has not taken place, and resources for the December residential course were released quite late to Districts (and Districts have still to release the resources to Colleges). **Action plan for next 6 months:**

- Finalise list of enrolled and eligible students, distribute to all districts and CoEs. Communicate and enforce the policy on ineligible students.
- Monitor the December 2013 face to face, particularly regarding boarding facilities and inclusion of the new CoEs.
- Finalise contract with UEW and begin Quality Assurance consultancy.
- Finalize selection, contracting of UTDBE impact assessment
- Finalise, distribute and train relevant personnel in the field support handbooks.
- Monitor districts are using funds to organise field support – in January to March 2014.
- Receive exam results from UCC and write UTDBE annual report – March 2014.
18. These are critical and involve action by GES HQ particularly, in close collaboration with TED. For example, TED will finalize its qualifications check during the December course and GES will in tandem take a decision on whether ineligible student-teachers can continue on the course. GES will also make resources available to TED in good time to take critical actions. For example, TED will train relevant personnel to develop field support manuals and train critical staff on these. Resources should also be released in good time for the April and August residential courses. In addition, resources are needed to organize the rewriting of Years 3 & 4 math and science modules. Year 3 modules should be revised before March and then typeset to ensure that all Year 3, Semester 1 modules are printed before July and provided to students at the end of the August residential course. More details and a 2014 action plan for TED and GoG are provided in an annex.

19. In-Service Training (INSET): The mission notes the structures in place in all Deprived Districts and the existing INSET modules in Math and Science. Significant progress has been made on national delivery of INSET, including the two five-day workshops for 228 District Master Trainers in Math, Science, English and Ghanaian languages; the follow-up monitoring in 45 Districts; and the monitoring of school- and cluster-based activities in all 57 Districts. At District level, INSET is mandatory and many Districts visited during the mission were delivering Cluster-based INSET in math, science and English. While the report of the SBI, CBI monitoring exercise is still under preparation, the mission was informed that about one-third of districts were supporting SBI and CBI as intended while another one-third had just begun. Training for assessment officers and coordinators of the UTDBE program in Districts and Colleges on the use of the Lesson Observation Sheet (LOS) is planned. As national, District level CBI and SBI are expanding; the critical issue now is measuring and ensuring quality. In this regard the use of the LOS will be important. The mission encourages NIU to refine and develop these assessment instruments, have them administered and the results monitored and used to improve INSET. NIU should also work with Eden Teaching Solutions on the development of the literacy training manual and finally develop TORs for the Kg manual and submit these to the GES Procurement unit.

20. Impact Evaluations. The Government has requested the raw data from the recently conducted NEA 2013 and EGRA/EGMA baseline assessment in order to conduct a district level assessment—this will be necessary to elaborate on the learning outcome performance indicator in the GPEG results framework and to inform the impact evaluation. In addition, USAID has shared a summary report on the NEA and EGRA results and they both signal significant deficits in fundamental skills in primary students. The mission agreed to provide more outreach and orientation on early grade reading and math skills for district and school grant activities.
21. **Financial Management**: The FM team conducted a detailed review and assessment of the financial management arrangements in place for implementing the project. FM performance is rated as **Highly Satisfactory** implying that the FM system efficiently and reliably provides timely information required to manage and monitor the implementation of the project. Key reasons for the good financial management performance include:

- Personal commitment of the Financial Controller
- Supervisor oversight by the Deputy Director General
- Building on lessons learned during previous IDA implementation
- Continuous capacity building for district accountants in budgeting, financial reporting
- Effective on-site financial monitoring and coalition of returns

22. **External Auditor**: The first project audit is due for the year ending 2013 and must be submitted by June 30, 2014. The auditor has still not been selected, although the GES has written to the Government Audit Service to obtain clearances to engage an external auditor. The process will be monitored by the Bank to ensure that there are no delays in the submission and during the mission, it was agreed that selection would be finalized by end of January. During the mission it was understood that the draft 2014 budget and work plan is being finalized and will be submitted to the Bank before the end of January for approval. In addition, it was agreed that visits by the Internal Audit Unit be documented in a report and shared with the Bank.

23. **Procurement**: The overall procurement risk is rated Moderate and procurement performance is rated Satisfactory. An updated procurement plan was reviewed and found to be missing some items and the actual dates that reflect performance. The mission noted that the large procurement contracts are behind schedule and advises the expedient evaluations of the remaining contracts. The mission also requested better reporting on how training is procured, costed and monitored. In addition, a **procurement audit is being recommended to support district level procurement and to help report on decentralized activities and areas/challenges**. The Bank agreed to share some draft TOR for Government to hire additional support to carry out such an audit. Key surveys will need to be carried out to update the results framework, but the contracts have not yet been awarded to the firms who will support their design and implementation. The mission recommended that the UTDBE impact assessment and Project Impact Evaluation consultancy services be finalized before March.

24. **Disbursement estimates** for January through June will be submitted to the World Bank with the 2014 budget, and these forecasts will be shared with GPE Secretariat so that allocations are available from the umbrella trust fund before the next withdrawal application is submitted.

25. **Safeguards**: An environmental and social safeguards **review will be conducted by the Safeguards specialist during early 2014**. This will provide an opportunity to conduct some site visits to ensure procedures are being followed under the district and school grants.
D. AGREEMENTS REACHED

26. The project team met with the MOE, GES, DPs and other stakeholders to discuss the mission findings at a wrap up meeting held on December 16, 2013.

27. The mission congratulated the team on all of the excellent work to date and encouraged everyone to continue to expedite implementation of the GPEG. It was agreed that the World Bank and LEG would continue to provide implementation support. The next formal implementation support mission would be held prior to pre-NESAR.

28. Key documents are requested to finalize the review. They include the (i) revised and updated national level Procurement Plan; (ii) Revised Implementation/Work Plan for HQ; (iii) Training Plan from 2013 with cost details at national level; (iv) 2014 APWs; and (v) summary report on SRC roll out.

29. It was agreed that GES senior management will provide a final decision on how to clean the UTDBE enrollment.

30. It was agreed that the GES would complete the engagement of the external auditor.

31. A post-procurement review (PPR) and safeguards review will be conducted in early 2014.

32. An updated ISR will be provided in February once the annual progress report is received with data updates on the results framework.

E. DISCLOSURE

The Bank and Government of Ghana confirm their understanding and agreement to publicly disclose this aide-mémoire. The disclosure of this Aide Memoire was agreed to with project counterparts led by Hon. Professor Jane Naana Opoku Agyemang, Minister of Education, Mr. Alex Kyeremeh, Deputy Minister Pre-Tertiary; Mr. S. Okudjeto Ablakwa, Deputy Minister Tertiary; Mr. Enoch Cobbinah, Chief Director, Ministry of Education, at the wrap-up meeting held on Monday, December 16, 2013. In addition it was agreed that the aide memoire would be classified as Public.
### F. PENDING ACTIONS/NEXT STEPS for GPEG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of ACTION/Condition/Covenant</th>
<th>Date Due</th>
<th>STATUS and Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covenant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Auditor Selected</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>GES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Procurement Plan submitted to the Bank</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>GES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costed Training Plan</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>GES, PBME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit 2014 APWs for no objection</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>GES, PBME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit disbursement estimates for next six months</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>GES, WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit fourth withdrawal application to World Bank</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>GES, MOE, MOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Report Card summary data report (district level) and include teacher attendance</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>GES, PBME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTDBE final eligible list of enrollees</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>GES, TED, PBME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTDBE Impact Assessment contract finalized</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>GES, MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTDBE Quality Assurance contract finalized</td>
<td>January 2014</td>
<td>GES, MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Evaluation contract finalized</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>GES, MOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Procurement Review</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>WB, GES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguards review</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
<td>WB, GES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Strategy/Outreach</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>GES, MOE and DPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated Results Framework</td>
<td>February 15, 2014</td>
<td>GES, MOE PBME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Emmanuel Adjetey  Director World Bank Unit
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Emelia Aning  Director, PBME  0541834520  emeliaaning@hotmail.co
Dominic Pealore  Director, SRIMPR  0244610466  dpealore@hotmail.com

Peter Ahlijah  Head of Planning
Elliot Lamptey  Planning Officer  0244872354  ellampsus@gmail.com
Ernest Otoo  Planning Officer  0244101822  Ernest7000@gmail.com
Monica D. Tandoh  Planning Officer  0244478235  Monic1tee@gmail.com
Nicola Ruddle  ODI Fellow  0509041922  nicola.ruddle1@gmail.com
Ernest Ansah  M&E Officer

Ghana Education Service

Stephen Adu  Ag. Deputy Director General  0244256976  stephen.adu56@gmail.com
Chris Koramoah  Financial Controller  0204343020  yawkriss@yahoo.com
Fiifi E.B. Amuah  Budget Officer  0208238457  ebamuah@yahoo.com
Beatrice Zalia Ali  Procurement Specialist  0208110079  brownzalia@yahoo.com
Philip Donkor  Accountant  0208191863  p.donkor@hotmail.com
Adams Zuwi  Procurement Officer  0248454999  zudams@gmail.com
Edem Keelson  Finance Officer  0201462748  edemkeelson@yahoo.com
Robert Intseful  Finance Officer  0277581942  Kojokonu2000@yahoo.com
Samuel Ansah  Director, TED  0244112802  Samansah54@yahoo.com
Jacob Molenaar  UTDBE Coordinator, TED
Philip Akoto  IT Officer, UTDBE, TED
Gershon Dorfe  National Inset Unit Coor., TED
Matilda Bannerman Mensah  Director, Girls Education Unit  0208190425  Malash88@yahoo.com
Rebecca Molyneux  Girls Education Unit  0509041923  Rebecca.molyneux@gmail.com
George Kusi Appiah  Girls Education Unit  0243425354  Kagbest2012@gmail.com
Bismark A. Akandi  Internal Auditor  0208188744  Akandiba2006@yahoo.com

Development Partners

Lucinda Ramos  Education Officer, UNICEF
Steve Passingham  Education Advisor, DfID  0244313219  s-passingham@dfid.gov.uk
Nicole Goldstein  DfID
Enyonom Azumah  DfID  0264786688  e-azumah@dfid.gov.uk
Jennifer Randolf-Koranteng  USAID  0208112498  Jrandolph-koranteng@usaid.gov
Marisol Perez  USAID
Sarah Banasheck  USAID
Wendy Aboadi  USAID


Annex 3: Financial Management review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period Covered by Review:</th>
<th>January 2013- September 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous ISR Rating:</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous FM Risk Rating:</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART I- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In line with the regular World Bank mandate of implementation support and fiduciary oversight, the FM team conducted a detailed review and assessment of the financial management arrangements in place for implementing the project. The objective of the FM work was to ascertain the continuing adequacy or otherwise of the existing systems, validate the expense incurred under the project and determine the fiduciary risk associated with use of project funds.

In addition the review sought to determine the extent to which the key FM sub systems such as budgeting, accounting, internal controls, funds flows processes, financial reporting and external auditing are functioning effectively. The work also reviewed a sample of transactions incurred prior to effectiveness and a sample of financial transactions (SOE) was reviewed for verification of controls and eligibility of expenditure.

i. Asides the above mentioned objectives, the review also focused on:
  ii. Reviewing the financial systems for monitoring district and regional activities and use of funds;
  iii. Adequacy of supporting documentation and quality of periodic returns submitted by the districts
  iv. Obtain assurances on the oversight and supervisory role of the HQ accounts team; and
  v. General compliance with IDA procedures and the PIM

Based on the review, the conclusion is that that the existing arrangements for the continuing adequacy and reliance of the financial management systems for the project as reviewed are adequate and meet the minimum requirement for financial management under OP/BP 10.00 and there has been no adverse change in the financial management systems.

**ISR FM Rating**

Generally there has been no adverse change in the FM arrangements which are likely to affect fiduciary risk, and the FM performance rating is rated as Highly Satisfactory implying that FM system efficiently and reliably provides timely information required to manage and monitor the implementation of the project. Appropriate internal controls are in place and function effectively. Key reasons for the good financial management performance include:

- Personal commitment of the Financial Controller
- Supervisory oversight by the Deputy Director General
• Building on lessons learnt during previous IDA implementation
• Continuous capacity building for district accountants in budgeting, financial reporting etc.
• Effective on-site financial monitoring and coalition of returns

The above measures have gone a long way to ensure reliable projects financial management systems and the quality of reports.

**FM Risk Rating**

As a result of this proactiveness on the part of management the FM risk is maintained as being moderate. A review of transaction indicates that generally most expenditure were duly authorized and approved in line with GoG guidelines and IDA requirements and there is minimal risk of funds being misappropriated or misused.

**PART II- FM REVIEW: FINDINGS AND ACTION PLAN**

• **Budgeting:**
The main GES has a functioning internal audit department and in line with the decision to adopt aspects of country systems for implementation, the project’s internal controls have relied on the government established accounting and internal control guidelines as supplemented by the PIM. The review notes that the internal audit and control environment is adequate for project implementation. It was also observed that financial monitoring visit was undertaken of beneficiary districts to assess and verify the use of GPEG funding. It has been agreed that subsequent visits by the Internal Audit Unit should be documented in a report and shared with the Bank.

• **Accounting**
The Financial Controller (GES) is responsible for all financial management functions within the GES and specifically for this project has direct oversight of all transactions, though the daily routine activities are handled by a Project Accountant. The accounting functions is adequate and has in place a reliable accounting tool to record and report on expenditure (SEFRIS) at all levels of implementation i.e. district, regions and headquarters.

• **Internal Controls:**
The main GES has a functioning internal audit department and in line with the decision to adopt aspects of country systems for implementation, the project’s internal controls have relied on the government established accounting and internal control guidelines as supplemented by the PIM. The review notes that the internal audit and control environment is adequate for project implementation. It was also observed that financial monitoring visit was undertaken of beneficiary districts to assess and verify the use of GPEG funding. It has been agreed that subsequent visits by the Internal Audit Unit should be documented in a report and shared with the Bank.

• **Funds Flow & Disbursements:**
A review of the funds flow arrangements indicate that there have not been any adverse changes and that the processes and procedures are in line with the PIM and the PAD and adequate supports implementation. The project was declared effective February 15th, 2013 with a signed amount of US$75,500,000. As at the date of the review the total funds disbursed to the project amounted to US$22,684,789.62 representing, a disbursement rate of 30.05%. In sum, the review of the funds flow
and banking arrangement noted that the systems (banking, authorization controls and reconciliations) are satisfactory and adequate to ensure smooth transfer of funds to support implementation.

- **Financial Reporting:**
The Project is expected to prepare half-yearly Interim Financial Reports (IFR) indicating the financial transactions incurred under the project and also as a basis for requesting for funds. Since inception of implementation the project has fully complied with and produced satisfactory financial reports. As part of the mission the FMS reviewed the September 2013 IUFR and this was found acceptable and will be used to document and request for funding. Generally the quality (content, format, details etc.) of the financial reports have been highly satisfactory and provide details to aid management and the Bank to monitor implementation and fund utilization.

- **External Audit:**
The project was declared effective in February 2013 and received it initial disbursements in April 2013; thus the first project audit is due for the year ending 2013 and must be submitted by June 30, 2014. From discussions with the FC we understand that the GES has written to the GAS to obtain clearances to engage and external auditor. The process will be monitored by the Bank to ensure that there are no delays in the submission.

- **Transactions (including SOE/interim report) Reviews:**
Part of the review included a sample review of transactions incurred expenditure incurred by the project at all levels to date. The exercise was to help in verifying the authorization and approval processes, determine if all expenses were eligible and also to verify adequacy of documentation, filing, tracing expenditure to cashbook and bank statement, referencing and effectiveness of document management processes. The review noted that all expenditure had been duly authorized and approved in line with the GoG guidelines and the PIM and that there was adequate supporting documentation as evidence of expenditure.

- **GAC – Fraud and Corruption:**
No issues of fraud or corruption came to our attention and a review of the internal control procedures including the different levels of authorization and approvals should minimize any such risk. All transactions reviewed were supported by the necessary approvals and adequate third party documentation exists on files. Filing, references and document storage processes were highly commendable.

**FM Action Plan**

In order to strengthen the internal control environment and prevent downgrading of the risk assessment the following action plan has been discussed and agreed with the client.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreed Actions</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Current Status/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete the engagement of external auditors.</td>
<td>Financial Controller</td>
<td>Not later than the end of January 2013</td>
<td>Some actions have been initiated in this regard and the Bank will want to be informed of the outcomes., in order to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conduct Excel and spreadsheets training for all district accounts staff. Financial Controller Not later than the end of 2013 This will build capacity of district accountants in the preparation and consolidation of accounts for 2013

Appendix: Updated FM Risk Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Risk</th>
<th>*Residual Risk Rating</th>
<th>Risk Rating</th>
<th>Brief Explanation of Changes and any New Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previou s</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INHERENT RISK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Level</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity Level</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Level</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL INHERENT RISK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL RISK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal controls</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Flow</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Reporting</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Risk</td>
<td>*Residual Risk Rating</td>
<td>Risk Rating</td>
<td>Brief Explanation of Changes and any New Mitigation Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL CONTROL RISK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 4: Procurement Assessment

Reviewer: Charles John Aryee Ashong
Employer: Min of Education–GES H/Qtr-GPEG
Dated: 10 December 2013

During the mission fruitful discussions were held with the Director of Supplies & Logistics Division and her staff of the Procurement Unit of the GES in charge of procurement under the GPEG project. The mission also (i) reviewed the status of procurement carried out by the project to date; (ii) reviewed and agreed on plans for outstanding procurement; (iii) discussed main procurement challenges identified in the post procurement and prior reviews; and (iv) examined procurement documentation to assure conformance with agreed procurement procedures and processes per the legal agreement. is the mission team noted the considerable procurement progress made since project effectiveness 8 months ago.

Status of Procurement: The government implementation team submitted the current project procurement plan. To date, 8 consultancies including 4 for which the procurement process has just been initiated, and 3 out of 5 Goods procurement, have been completed. The other 2 Goods procurement are yet to be initiated. There are no Works procurement on the plan.

In summary, out of the 13 planned procurements, 23% has been completed; 31% yet to sign contracts (pre-contract stage); and 46% yet to initiate procurement process. Similarly out of planned disbursement of US$1,967,566, only 16% has been committed (i.e. signed contracts). Thus although 23% contracts has been signed, only 16% of the planned disbursement has been committed, implying that most of the big tickets item contracts are yet to be signed, although most of them are not behind schedule.

Critical Procurements: The 4 critical procurements are at various stages of procurement as follows: (i) UTDBE Quality Assurance- the consultant submitted the proposal on November 29, 2013 and evaluation has started which will lead into negotiation and preparation of Draft negotiated Contract; (ii) UTDBE impact assessment combined with the sample survey of Lesson Observation Sheet- Shortlisted consultants have submitted technical and financial proposals as at December 4, 2013. Evaluation has started; (iii) Project Impact Evaluation, combined with sample survey of schools and districts for monitoring – Consultants have submitted EOIs and they are being evaluated; In addition the process for the procurement of an External Auditor is yet to be initiated; and Regarding the Consultancy services for the Developments of Literacy Training Manual for INSET, the consultant has submitted the proposal and evaluation has started which will lead into negotiation and preparation of Draft negotiated Contract. It is however noted that these procurement are behind schedule, per the procurement plan for GES H/Qtrs presented to the mission. The procurement unit indicated that the delay was largely due to the preparation and approval of the TORs which took longer than expected.

Procurement Planning Processes: It is noted that the procurement plans are prepared based on the approved annual work planned. Thus far, all procurements that have been undertaken are in the approved procurement plan and follow the approved procurement methods and related procedures. However some officials of the procurement unit indicated that some of the items for consultancies which have been combined are yet to be reflected in the procurement plan. Furthermore the procurement plan is missing the actual dates that reflect procurement performance, even though the progress report indicates the actual procurement time lines. The mission advised the Procurement Unit to address the situation and accordingly revise and update the procurement plan for re-submission. The mission also informed the procurement unit about World Bank plan to issue a comprehensive threshold- Methods and Prior Review based on the Risk rating of the project. The Bank expects all projects to use these in finalizing their procurement plans for bank review and clearance. The mission indicated that these thresholds are dynamic based particularly on the risk rating.
Regarding the procurement plans at the district and school level, the mission advised that the GES HQtrs should continue to assure quality of the Procurement plans and ensure that copies of the plans are kept at the GES H/Qtrs to support the procurement performance monitoring at the district and institutional levels. The Project should not be seen as having given clearance on the procurement plan but should allow the PPA system to operate as indicated in the PIM, PAD and the legal agreement.

**Procurement Arrangements and Staffing:** It is noted that the procurement arrangement as described in the PIM and the PAD is in operation. Thus the procurement is being handled by the head of the Supplies and Logistics Division of the GES with a focal person on GPEG in the Procurement Unit. The staff has received the basic training in procurement for Consultancy, Goods and Equipment Management, at GIMPA, 2011. The Procurement Unit of the Supplies & Logistics Division is directed by the approved PIM and PAD. The staff also attends the monthly procurement clinics and workshop organized by the Bank to update project procurement staff about current changes in Bank procurement procedures and other relevant procurement issues.

**Records Keeping:** The mission noted the existence of a filing system to ensure proper record keeping and easy retrieval of information/data. The procurement files are in the custody of the Procurement Unit, safe from fire, theft, and unauthorized access. However the files do not contain all relevant and critical procurement documents including correspondence relating to the entire procurement process. The staff indicated that these documents are filed elsewhere at Administration unit under the Division and they will immediately re-organize the filing to cover the entire procurement cycle. The mission reminded the PU to ensure that all the procurement files are accounted for and all documents properly filed, while maintaining a complete and sequenced arrangement of documents on the files at all times to depict the procurement cycle and stages.

**Procurement Systems:** It was noted that the project has adhered to the general procurement arrangements put in place in the project’s legal agreement and the PAD. The legal framework of the country’s public procurement law and practice is also satisfactory.

**Post Procurement Review (PPR).** The mission informed the project to prepare for the planned PPR which will be conducted early 2014. The PPR is expected to reflect good procurement practices, since the observation has a bearing on the procurement risk rating and performance rating of the project.

**Procurement Risk Rating:** Following the review, the overall Procurement risk is rated *Moderate* while procurement performance is rated *Satisfactory*. 
Annex 5: Observations\(^1\) on UTDBE for GPEG

Paud Murphy

**Progress in 2013.** This has been a challenging first year for student-teachers from the 57 deprived districts studying UTDBE. This UTDBE course (termed Phase 5) began in August 2012 in 13 Colleges of Education, of which 7 (now 10) enrolled student teachers from Deprived Districts. Preparations were not in place for the residential courses and modules were not ready and Directors of Education in Deprived Districts had not been adequately briefed. In the event 4,213 student-teachers from deprived districts enrolled. It was subsequently agreed that the course proper could begin in December and a total of 7,043 student-teachers attended from Deprived Districts. However, many of those nominated by Districts did not meet the standards required to enter the course but this was only discovered on monitoring visits during the course and afterwards. While some modules were not ready in time for this second course, preparations for tutoring and student support were in place in Colleges. But numbers in at least three Colleges catering for Deprived Districts were in excess of capacity and inadequate arrangements had to be made to accommodate these, mature, students. In addition, student teachers from Deprived and non-Deprived Districts attend some Colleges together and this can cause problems\(^2\). While modules have now been made available for all Year One courses, the Year Two modules will only be available in December when Year 2 began in September! All of these difficulties are in addition to the fact that these mature students had their regular teaching duties and there was no support for their studies between residential courses. Unsurprisingly, the initial indications are that examination results are poor\(^3\). Many of these problems were identified and elaborated in the March Aide-Memoire but not solved by December.

In regard to GPEG finance, no support was provided for the first three residential courses and student-teachers had to pay their own way\(^4\). For the fourth course in August 2013, 70 percent of the cost of the residential course was paid by Districts to Colleges in advance and these payments included reimbursement for costs borne by student-teachers for the second and third residential courses. The balance has not been provided to Colleges by some Districts. Limited financing was provided to Districts to provide support to student-teachers between residential courses but not all Districts understand this and student-teachers are sometimes charged for these. Finally, the release of funds for the December residential course had not been disbursed to Districts by December 10 and the course was to begin on December 14! As a consequence, at least one College is asking student-teachers from Deprived Districts to pay for food, accommodation and modules in advance!

**Expectations for 2014.** As the student-teachers face into the second year of the UTDBE, there are some grounds for greater optimism regarding their academic support. First, training and orientation courses have now been held for all College of Education Principals and Deputies, as well as for District Education

\(^{1}\) These observations are based on the GPEG Progress Report of November 2013, visits to Deprived Districts and Colleges of Education and discussions with TED staff, student-teachers, MoE and GES

\(^{2}\) Students from non-Deprived Districts pay for food and accommodation as well as modules. Those from Deprived Districts don’t. All student teachers pay for travel to Colleges, Examinations and the Student Union.

\(^{3}\) Exams took place in April (end of first semester) and August (end of second semester) and these have been marked. Resits will take place in December and the results will be made public thereafter

\(^{4}\) GPEG became effective in February 2013 and, as an exception, finance was provided retrospectively for the second and third residential courses
Directors and Coordinators. Second, the enrolment list is being cleaned and steps will then be taken to remove unqualified student teachers from the course. Third, modules for all second year subjects are being delivered to Colleges before the December 2013 residential course commences (though not in time for the start of the year). Fourth, with help from a DFID consultant, modules for mathematics and science in years one and two have been revised before printing. Fifth, again with support from a DFID consultant, preliminary work has been completed on the design of support between residential courses and training manuals and a training program are planned. Sixth, a consultancy is being awarded to provide quality assurance support to TED and the selected firm is expected to begin this work in January 2014. (In addition, bids for an impact assessment of UTDBE were received on December 3 and these will be evaluated and a contract awarded before year-end.) Finally, an additional 2 Colleges have been identified to take student-teachers and some of the student-teachers have now been reallocated to these.

In regard to financing, the modalities of transfer are now widely understood by most (but not all) districts and finance has been made available to Colleges in advance of the December course and resources are being made available for Districts to provide supervision and support to student-teachers between residential courses.

Next steps

The GPEG Progress Report identifies the following important activities over the next six months.

- Finalise list of enrolled and eligible students, distribute to all districts and CoEs. Communicate and enforce the policy on ineligible students.
- Monitor the December 2013 face to face, particularly regarding boarding facilities and inclusion of the new CoEs.
- Finalise contract with UoE, Winneba and begin Quality Assurance consultancy.
- Finalize contract for Impact Assessment for UTDBE
- Finalise, distribute and train relevant personnel in the field support handbooks.
- Monitor districts are using funds to organise field support – in January to March 2014.
- Receive exam results from UCC and write UTDBE annual report – March 2014.

The three most pressing priorities are: (i) cleaning the enrolment list and informing ineligible and eligible student-teachers as well as Colleges and Districts; (ii) updating the database and integrating with UCCs and with CoEs; and (iii) establishing support systems for student-teachers in between residential courses, developing training manuals and training District staff. These and the other steps outlined below can be supported by (iv) contracting QA firm to provide support for data framework and (v) enhancing capacity of TED through greater cooperation with GES HQ and speedy release of finance to support critical activities.

- GPEG financial support is needed to enable TED (a) to bring together teams of writers to develop training manuals for supporting students between residential courses and subsequently (b) to train key personnel in Districts on student support.
- The selected QA firm should be contracted to begin its work and this should include urgent attention to supporting TED train District staff and establish a comprehensive accessible database. Ideally the firm should commence work during the December residential course.
- GPEG financial support should be provided to TED to enable module writers to be brought together with the DFID-supported consultant to complete years three and four rewrites of maths and science modules. This replicates the support provided to rewrite years one and two modules.
- The impact assessment bids should be evaluated as soon as possible and the contract awarded.
- The remaining Year Two modules must be printed and made ready for the April course. In addition, Year Three modules should be revised and printed in time for release at the end of the August course so that student teachers can study them between August and December.

**Monthly UTDBE Actions for TED and Government (GES and MoE) 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Actions by TED <em>(Student activities in italics)</em></th>
<th>Actions by GoG (GES and MoE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td><em>Residential course for Year 2, Semester 1, underway.</em> Identify status of remaining 839 student-teachers and await final decision from GOG/GPEG re underqualified exam passers, finalize enrolment list, inform CoEs and Districts Commence work with UEW/IEDE Complete monitoring of December residential Plan for development of training manuals for District support Plan rewriting Years 3 and 4 maths and science modules Commission printing of remaining Year 2, Semester 2 modules <em>District supports recommence</em></td>
<td>Decide whether to allow underqualified student-teachers who have passed the examinations to continue. Communicate decision Finalize contract with UEW Complete monitoring of December residential Transfer funds to Districts for field support up to Mar/Apr residential Finalize UTDBE GPEG budget requirements based on final enrolment Select firm to carry out UTDBE Impact assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Develop training manuals (DFID consultant support) Commission printing of Year 2, Semester 2 Modules Rewrite Year 3 modules in maths and science (DFID consultant support) <em>District supports continue</em></td>
<td>Review lessons from Monitoring exercise Release funds for manual-writing workshop Release funds for module rewriting Contract selected firm to carry out impact assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td><em>Mar/April residential begins</em> <em>District supports continue</em></td>
<td>Release funds for Mar/ Apr residential Monitor residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Tasks and Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Apr   | Deliver Year 2, Semester 2 modules to CoEs  
Analyze exam results and report to GoG  
Prepare annual report on UTDBE  
Initiate training for Districts on support between residential (DFID consultant support)  
Monitor Mar/April course  
Year 2, Semester 1 exams administered Mar/April residential ends  
District supports continue  
Complete monitoring of residential  
Monitor type-setting of Year 3, Semester 1, maths and science modules  |
| May   | District supports continue  
Review monitoring reports and share with UEW/GoG  
Commission printing of Year 3, Semester 1 modules  |
| June  | District supports continue  
Review progress with UEW/IEDE on QA  |
| July  | Deliver Year 3, Semester 1 modules to CoEs in time for August residential  
Workshop to rewrite Year 4 maths and science modules (DFID consultant support)  
Plan to implement UEW/IEDE recommendations  |
| Aug   | Third residential and second semester examinations take place in CoEs  
Monitor course  
Continue to implement UEW/IEDE recommendation  |
| Sep   | Break for students  |
|       | Discuss and complete UTDBE Annual Report and share with GPE  
Complete monitoring of residential  
Review Monitoring report and share with TED  
Release funds to Districts to cover support up to August residential  
Review progress with UEW/IEDE and TED  
Release funds for Aug residential  
Release funds for workshop to revise Year 4 maths and science modules  
Monitor course  
Review progress with UEW/IEDE |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Oct  | Training for District staff (DFID consultant support)  
Continue to implement UEW/IEDE recs |
|      | Transfer funds to Districts to cover field support up to December residential |
| Nov  | District support continues based on training and using Year 3, Semester 1 modules  
Year 3, Semester 2 modules commissioned |
|      | Release finance for Dec Residential |
| Dec  | Semester 1 Year 3 Residential course  
Monitor residential |
|      | Monitor residential |
Annex 6: Monitoring and Evaluation data collection schedule

January 20 – 22 (reporting on January 19)

Upper East
1. Bawku Municipal
2. Bawku West
3. Bongo
4. Builsa
5. Garu-Tempante
6. Kassena-Nankani East
7. Talensi-Nabdam
8. Kassena-Nankana West
9. Upper East Regional Office

Upper West
10. Jirapa
11. Lawra
12. Nadowli
13. Sissala East
14. Sissala West
15. Wa East
16. Wa West
17. Lambussie-Karni
18. Upper West Regional Office

Western
19. Amenfi West
20. Bia
21. Juaboso
22. Sefwi Akontombra
23. Western Regional Office

January 23 – 25 (reporting on January 22)

Northern
1. Bole
2. Bunkpurugu-Yunyoo
3. Central Gonja
4. East Gonja
5. West Gonja
6. Gushiegu
7. Karaga
8. Mamprusi East
9. Mamprusi West
10. Nanumba North
11. Nanumba South
12. Saboba
13. Savelugu Nanton
14. Sawla-Tuna-Kalba
15. Tolon-Kumbungu
16. Yendi Municipal
17. Zabzugu-Tatale
18. Kpandai
19. Chereponi
20. Northern Regional Office

**January 27 – 29 (reporting on January 26)**

**Ashanti**
1. Ahafo Ano South
2. Ejura Sekyidomase
3. Bosome Freho
4. Offinso North
5. Ashanti Regional Office

**Brong Ahafo**
6. Asunafo South
7. Atebubu-Amantin
8. Kintampo North Municipal
9. Kintampo South
10. Pru
11. Sene
12. Tain
13. Nkoranza North
14. Brong Ahafo Regional Office

**Eastern**
15. Afram Plains (Kwahu North)
16. Eastern Regional Office

**Volta**
17. Kadjebi
18. Krachi East
19. Krachi West
20. Nkwanta South
21. Nkwanta North
22. Volta Regional Office
Annex 7: Ghana Partnership for Education Grant Results Framework

PDO Statement
The Project Development Objective is to improve the planning, monitoring and delivery of basic education services in deprived districts of the Recipient’s Territory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Core Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>YR1</th>
<th>YR2</th>
<th>YR3</th>
<th>YR4</th>
<th>YR5</th>
<th>End Target</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Data Source/Methodology</th>
<th>Responsibility for Data Collection</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deprived districts disbursing 75% or more of their district education grants as planned in their APW</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Report of financial analysis of APWs</td>
<td>DED provides data to RED which consolidates the information and submits a report to GES HQ &amp; PBME. Inputs are incorporated into the NESAR.</td>
<td>APW Execution is completed in January. GES HQ &amp; PBME to calculate how many of the 57 deprived districts disbursed 75% or more in the previous FY. This will compare the total actual expenditure against the budgeted total cost in the APW Execution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public basic schools in deprived districts with up-to-date School Report Cards</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Sample survey of schools</td>
<td>GES/PBME oversees a firm undertaking a sample survey of schools.</td>
<td>Defined as the school having completed the SRC Data Capture Format within the most recent of term 1 or term 3. A representative sample of the 6,600 schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 students achieving proficiency in English and Math (NEA results for deprived districts)</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>P3 English: 12.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P3 Math: 9.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P3 English: 15%</td>
<td>P3 Math: 11%</td>
<td>Biennial</td>
<td>National Education Assessment</td>
<td>GES overseeing National Education Assessment</td>
<td>National Education Assessment Results. The end target was established with GoG during the negotiations as a 20% increase from the baseline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Baseline figures correspond to the 2011 National Education Assessment (NEA) results for deprived districts.
Teachers trained under the project in deprived districts who obtain satisfactory rating or higher in the SBI/CBI Lesson Observation Sheet for (a) lesson planning (b) teaching methodology (c) classroom organization and management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Sample survey using SBI/CBI Lesson Observation Sheet</th>
<th>NIU overseeing sample survey on the SBI/CBI Lesson Observation Sheet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Direct project beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.2 mill.</th>
<th>1.6 mill.</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>1.6 mill.</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Report of analysis of APW, UTDBE and INSET</th>
<th>Schools, DEDs, and REDs collect data which are then consolidated by GES HQ &amp; PBME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Female beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Report of analysis of APW, UTDBE and INSET</th>
<th>Schools, DEDs, and REDs collect data which are then consolidated by GES HQ &amp; PBME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Intermediate Results Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Name</th>
<th>Core</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Cumulative Target Values</th>
<th>Data Source/Responsibility for Data Collection</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers and Circuit Supervisors in deprived districts trained under the project in the use of School Report Cards</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Capacity building and training reports Where appropriate data is collected from training providers by DEDs who submit to REDs for regional consolidation, or by GES HQ centrally. Then GES HQ &amp; PBME produce a national report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional and District education officers trained under the project (e.g., financial management, data collection and analysis, etc.)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Capacity building and training reports Where appropriate data is collected from training providers by DEDs who submit to REDs for regional consolidation, or by GES HQ centrally. Then GES HQ &amp; PBME produce a national report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 1: Teachers trained under the project (disaggregated by UTDBE and INSET)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000 UTDBE: 5,000 INSET: 30,000</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Reports of training providers, APW, UTDBE and INSET</td>
<td>DEDs collect data from training providers, submits to REDs for regional consolidation and to TED, and the GES HQ &amp; PBME produce a national report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDs collecting School Reports Cards from at least 70% of schools within the district</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component 2: School Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic schools in deprived districts participating in all INSET core courses supported under the project</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>45%</th>
<th>65%</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>65%</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>School Grant Report from January, and INSET annual report on capacity building and training.</th>
<th>DEDs collate data from the circuit supervisors’ School Grant Report template, submits to REDs for regional consolidation, and the GES HQ &amp; PBME produce a national report.</th>
<th>Basic schools which offer the three core INSET courses: Mathematics, Science, and Literacy. This is captured in the School Grant Report template. The INSET annual report can be used to cross-check.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools that have received and displayed the most recent School Report Card on their notice board</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>School Grant Report Template from January</td>
<td>DED collates data from circuit supervisors’ School Grant Report, submits to REDs for regional consolidation, and the GES HQ &amp; PBME produce a national report.</td>
<td>This refers to the most recent district-level School Report Card, produced by the DED to collate the schools’ data using the SRC software.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Component 3: Project Management and Monitoring and Evaluation**

<p>| Schools visited by Circuit Supervisors at least two times in a year | Percentage | 0 | 50% | 70% | 100% | - | - | 100% | Annual | DED annual report based on Circuit Supervisors Report | DED collates data from circuit supervisor reports, submits to REDs for regional consolidation, and the GES HQ &amp; PBME produce a national report. | DEDs can cross-check circuit supervisor reports and School Grant Report templates. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REDs submitting annual M&amp;E reports to GES HQ &amp; PBME by incorporating data from all districts in the region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>GES HQ &amp; PBME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 8 REDs submit the M&amp;E consolidation templates to GES HQ and PBME, which incorporate available data from the GPEG districts and schools in that region.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools in deprived districts with completed SPIPs approved by SMCs using the revised template</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>School Grant Report Templates from January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DED collates data from circuit supervisors’ School Grant Report, submits to REDs for regional consolidation, and the GES HQ &amp; PBME produce a national report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Grant Report Template collects the number of schools which have the SPIP signed by the SMC chairman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>