



<b>1. Project Data:</b>		<b>Date Posted :</b> 09/22/2003	
<b>PROJ ID:</b> P006543		<b>Appraisal</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<b>Project Name:</b> Br- Minas Gerais Basic Edu.	<b>Project Costs (US\$M)</b>	302.0	309.6
<b>Country:</b> Brazil	<b>Loan/Credit (US\$M)</b>	150.0	147.1
<b>Sector(s):</b> Board: ED - Primary education (58%), Tertiary education (22%), Sub-national government administration (20%)	<b>Cofinancing (US\$M)</b>	152.0	162.5
<b>L/C Number:</b> L3733			
	<b>Board Approval (FY)</b>		94
<b>Partners involved :</b> Federal Republic of Brazil	<b>Closing Date</b>	06/28/2000	06/28/2002

<b>Prepared by :</b>	<b>Reviewed by :</b>	<b>Group Manager :</b>	<b>Group:</b>
Lenor Armstrong	Andres Liebenthal	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST

**2. Project Objectives and Components**

**a. Objectives**

The Project was intended to improve educational attainment, evidenced in significant increases in student learning and completion rates at elementary school. Specifically, the objectives were: (a) an enhanced capacity of managers to make information-based decisions, (b) enhanced school leadership within a more decentralized system; (c) enhanced teacher capacity (d) increased and enhanced supply of instructional materials, especially textbooks, for students in public schools; and (e) improved management of school facilities to ensure equitable access for students and promote the rational use of school space .

**b. Components**

The components were: (a) improving system-wide management with a focus on education monitoring systems, student learning assessments, and the promotion of information- based decision making (US\$20.2m, 6.7% total project costs); (b) strengthening of school administration through systematic school planning , school leadership development, enhanced office technology systems, and school development grants ( US\$45.9 m. 15.2% of total project costs); (c) developing teaching competence through in-service teacher training in classroom management, development of the elementary school curriculum, and support for evaluation of education interventions (US\$56.2m, 18.6% of total project costs); (d) providing instructional materials (US\$123.6m, 40.9% of total project costs); (e) upgrading facility management through school construction which would facilitate two day time shifts at all state primary schools, and the rationalization of school facilities (US\$51.8m, 17.2% of total project costs); and (f) project management ( US\$4.3m, 1.4% of total project costs).

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

Total project costs amounted to US \$309.6 m, 102.5% of SAR estimates. Disbursements totaled US\$147.1 m.(98 % ). More than 88% of the loan had been disbursed by the fourth year of implementation; however, subsequent financial difficulties led to a slow down of implementation and a two year extension . There were cost-over-runs of 54% for the instructional materials component, and 82% for project management. Only 13% of the estimated budget for upgrading facility management was utilized, because it was decided that the state would fund the majority of the planned infrastructure investments . The loan funds earmarked for the infrastructure component were allocated for instructional materials .

**3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:**

Project objectives were mainly attained. Completion rates surpassed targets, and more than 79% of students complete grade 5 with no more than one repetition, compared with the projected 50%. Repetition rates decreased by more than 10% in grades one to three, and by 8% in the fourth grade. National Test scores (SAEB) revealed significant increases in achievement during 1995 to 1997 but a decline in 1999.

The capacity to make informed decisions has been enhanced through improvements in data collection, student testing, information generation, technology and reporting systems and upgrade of the Minas Gerais Public Education Evaluation System (SIMAVE), which now allows for disaggregation of data at the school level. Unfortunately, the results from this system were not used to demonstrate changes in student achievement during project implementation.

School leadership capacity within the more decentralized system was strengthened through training of 22,000 administrators. Planning at school level has been improved with support from the Program for Support of School Innovations.

Teacher competencies were enhanced in areas such as pedagogic planning, and classroom delivery, and evaluation of student performance through in-service training for approximately 177,000 teachers, and provision of over 240,000 teacher-guides.

The quality and quantity of instructional materials in the classroom were increased through the provision of eight to ten million textbooks annually, the establishment of reading corners in all classrooms serving grades 1 to 4, and school libraries in 3,910 schools with grades 5 to 8, and the supply of teaching kits to 28,000 classrooms.

State administrators were trained in facilities management. There is more equitable access in rural areas through the construction of 51 nucleus schools. All but 9 schools are operating with a maximum of two shifts as a result of the construction of 1500 classrooms to reduce overcrowding.

#### 4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:

The construction of 51 modern nucleus schools offering grades 1 through 8 in the poorest rural areas of the Northern region has facilitated increased educational opportunities where previously only four grades were offered.

The process of upgrading the testing program has led to greater collaboration between the Education Secretariat and the university community, development of research linkages with international universities with expertise in student learning assessment.

Reading corners and school libraries were established in 60,000 classrooms, more than double the estimated 28,000.

Approximately 83% more school administrators were trained than estimated.

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

The project did not appear use results of achievement tests (national and project-developed) to document student learning gains over the life of the project, nor did it adequately explain test score declines in 1999. Some activities were not implemented due to budgetary constraints, such as curriculum laboratories for the continuous updating of the curriculum guides, piloting of science kits for grades 5-8, and allocation of 15% of the original teaching kits budget to replace damaged or missing items. Special tutoring was to be established in 1000 schools. However, it was implemented in 37 schools but not expanded.

6. Ratings:	ICR	OED Review	Reason for Disagreement /Comments
<b>Outcome:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Institutional Dev.:</b>	Substantial	Substantial	
<b>Sustainability:</b>	Likely	Likely	
<b>Bank Performance:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Borrower Perf.:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Quality of ICR:</b>		Satisfactory	

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

#### 7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

Student learning assessment systems are most effective when principals and teachers are trained in interpreting results and are able to utilize these to improve pedagogy, and when parents gain a better understanding of the assessment and its importance in improving outcomes.

Competitive funding at school level serves as a useful incentive for enhancing planning and managerial capacities to improve the quality of education, increase school autonomy and accountability and promote decentralization.

Teacher development outcomes are highest when there is a close collaboration between Education Secretariats and universities and appropriate distance-learning technologies are used.

High level Project Advisory Committees can be useful in resolving coordination and providing continuity

during administrative changes.

**8. Assessment Recommended?**  Yes  No

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

The ICR is basically satisfactory. It is generally comprehensive and provides informative insights on project implementation. However, it would have strengthened by a more complete treatment of the student achievement results (see item 5 above); in addition, it made claims about the international impact of the project's school-based management system which were not substantiated.