**Zambia**

Engaging the Private Sector in Education

### Policy Goals for Independent Private Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. <strong>Encouraging Innovation by Providers</strong></th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school has the legal authority to appoint, deploy and dismiss teachers as well as set teacher salaries without review by central authorities. Schools can set their own curriculum but final review of their operational plan is carried out by the Ministry of Education. The Education Board has the legal authority over how resources are allocated to classrooms with final review from central authorities.</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. <strong>Holding Schools Accountable</strong></th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The government sets standards for what students need to learn and also indicates by when or how well they need to be learned. Standardized exams are administered annually. The government requires schools to undergo a standard term inspection. Inspections reports outline priorities for improvement. Sanctions are not administered based on the results of school inspections or performance on standardized exams.</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. <strong>Empowering All Parents, Students, and Communities</strong></th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No information is provided to parents on the results of standardized exams or inspection reports. Neither students nor parents are surveyed as part of an inspection process. The government does not provide tax subsidies or cash transfers for families attending private schools.</td>
<td>Latent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. <strong>Promoting Diversity of Supply</strong></th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The government allows all of the following types to operate a school: Community, not for profit, faith based and for profit. Certification standards require schools to own the land. Registration/certification guidelines are made public and from multiple sources. Schools are required to pay a registration fee and renewal fee in order to operate.</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Policy Goals for Government-Funded Private Schools (Grant-aided and Community schools)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. <strong>Encouraging Innovation by Providers</strong></th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools have legal authority to appoint, deploy and dismiss teachers with the final review from central authorities. The central government has the legal authority over how the curriculum is delivered. The school (school principal, school council, parent association etc.) has the legal authority to manage school operating budgets without review by central authorities. The Education Board has the legal authority over how resources are allocated to classrooms with final review from central authorities.</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. <strong>Holding Schools Accountable</strong></th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The government sets standards for what students need to learn and also indicates by when or how well they need to be learned. Standardized exams are administered annually. The government requires schools to undergo a standard term inspection. Inspections reports outline priorities for improvement. Sanctions are not administered based on the results of school inspections or performance on standardized exams. The government requires schools to report on the use of public funds as a condition for the continuation of funding during a standard term.</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. <strong>Empowering All Parents, Students, and Communities</strong></th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc information is provided to parents on standardized exam results or inspection reports / available on demand. Neither students nor parents are surveyed as part of an inspection process. Schools are allowed to select students based on both academic performance and geography. Parental choice is restricted by voluntary non-monetary parent contributions i.e. in kind labor or goods.</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. <strong>Promoting Diversity of Supply</strong></th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The government allows all types of providers to operate. Aided schools must pay a fee to apply for aided status. All budgets academic and additional budgets (facilities and transport) are equivalent to per student amounts in public schools.</td>
<td>Established</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

In recent years, private sector engagement in education—which includes a vibrant mix of non-profit, for-profit and faith-based organizations—has grown significantly around the world. In the last two decades, the percentage of students in low-income countries attending private primary schools doubled, from 11 percent to 22 percent (figure 1). This growth in private provision is closely connected to the boom in access that has taken place in low-income countries over the same two decades: primary net enrolment increased from 55 percent to 80 percent between 1990 and 2010.

As countries redouble their efforts to achieve learning for all at the primary and secondary levels, the private sector can be a resource for adding capacity to the education system. By partnering with private entities, the state can provide access to more students, particularly poor students who are not always able to access existing education services (Pal and Kingdon 2010; Patrinos, Barrera-Osorio, and Guáqueta 2009; Hossain 2007). Additionally, evidence shows that governments have been successful at improving education quality and student cognitive outcomes in many countries through effective engagement with private education providers (Barrera-Osorio and Raju 2010; French and Kingdon 2010; Barrera-Osorio 2006).

Figure 1. Private enrollment as a percentage of total primary enrollments, by country income level

This report presents an analysis of how effectively the current policies of Zambia engage the private sector in basic (primary and secondary) education. The analysis draws on the Engaging the Private Sector (EPS) Framework, a product of the World Bank’s Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER). SABER collects and analyzes policy data on education systems around the world, using evidence-based frameworks to highlight the policies and institutions that matter most for promoting learning for all children and youth.

SABER-EPS research in Zambia has found that despite impressive gains in enrollment, education quality remains a serious concern, as does equity—especially beyond the primary level. School providers in Zambia include private schools, community schools, and grant-aided schools. Non-government schools account for a sizable share of education service provision in the country. In 2009, roughly 22 percent of students in grades 1–9 were enrolled in private schools, with community schools making up the largest share. Based on a review of existing policies, SABER-EPS offers the following recommendations for Zambia to enhance its engagement with the non-state sector in education and to meet the challenges of access, quality, and equity:

- Strengthen system accountability measures; consider a needs-based inspection system where underperforming schools receive greater scrutiny and support.
- Increase the information available to parents on school quality, including via school report cards.

The remainder of the report provides an overview of SABER-EPS, followed by a description of the basic education system in Zambia, with a focus on the non-state sector and government policies related to the private provision of education. The report then benchmarks Zambia’s policy environment utilizing the SABER-EPS Framework and finally offers policy options to enhance learning for all children in primary and secondary school.
Overview of SABER-Engaging the Private Sector

In many countries, the extent and activity of the private sector in education is largely undocumented and unknown. SABER-EPS is working to help change that. SABER-EPS assesses how well a country’s policies are oriented toward ensuring that the services of non-state providers promote learning for all children and youth.

The aim of SABER-EPS is not to advocate private schooling. The intention is to outline the most effective evidence-based policies specific to each country’s current approach toward non-state provision of education. SABER-EPS assesses the extent to which policies facilitate quality, access, and equity of private education services. Data generated by SABER-EPS can further the policy dialogue and support governments in engaging private providers to improve education results.

Four policy goals to engage the private sector

SABER-EPS collects data on four key policy areas that international evidence has found effective for strengthening accountability mechanisms among citizens, policymakers, and providers (box 1). These policy goals were identified through a review of rigorous research and analysis of top-performing and rapidly improving education systems.

The four policy goals enable a government to increase innovation and strengthen accountability among the critical actors in an education system (figure 2). Empowering parents, students, and communities enhances the ability of parents to express their voice and hold policymakers accountable for results. Additionally, when parents are empowered, in most contexts they can have greater influence over provider behaviors. Increasing school accountability strengthens the quality- and equity-assurance mechanisms between the state and education providers. Encouraging innovation and promoting diversity of supply can allow providers to respond to local needs. Increasing school-level autonomy in critical decisions improves the services provided to students. Allowing a diverse set of providers to enter the market can increase client power and enable citizens to choose from a wider range of models. By developing these policy goals, a government can improve the accountability of all providers in an education system and, subsequently, have a positive impact on educational outcomes.

Box 1. Key private sector engagement policy goals

1. **Encouraging innovation by providers.** Local decision making and fiscal decentralization can have positive effects on school and student outcomes. Most high-achieving countries allow schools autonomy in managing resources (including personnel) and educational content. Local school autonomy can improve the ability of disadvantaged populations to determine how local schools operate.

2. **Holding schools accountable.** If schools are given autonomy over decision making, they must be held accountable for learning outcomes. Increases in autonomy should be accompanied by standards and interventions that increase access and improve quality. The state must hold all providers accountable to the same high standard.

3. **Empowering all parents, students, and communities.** When parents and students have access to information on relative school quality, they can have the power to hold schools accountable and the voice to lobby governments for better-quality services. For empowerment to work equitably, options for parents and students should not depend on wealth or student ability.

4. **Promoting diversity of supply.** By facilitating market entry for a diverse set of providers, governments can increase responsibility for results, as providers become directly accountable to citizens as well as to the state.

Figure 2. Relationships of Accountability for Successful Service Delivery

Source: Adapted from the World Bank (2003).

SABER-EPS recognizes that the four policy goals outlined in box 1 can assist governments in raising accountability.
for the education services provided in their countries. The tool allows governments to systematically evaluate their policies and implement practices that are effective across multiple country contexts.

**Four types of private provision of education**

Across the world, governments can implement numerous strategies to improve educational outcomes by supporting non-state education provision. SABER-EPS benchmarks key policy goals across the four most common models of private service delivery:

1. **Independent private schools**: schools that are owned and operated by non-government providers and are financed privately, typically through fees.
2. **Government-funded private schools**: schools that are owned and operated by non-government providers, but receive government funding.
3. **Privately managed schools**: schools that are owned and financed by the government, but are operated by non-government providers.
4. **Voucher schools**: schools that students choose to attend with government-provided funding; these schools can be operated by the government or non-government providers or both, depending on the system.

SABER-EPS analyzes laws and regulations to: (1) identify the types of private engagement that are legally established in each country and (2) assess each education system’s progress in achieving the four policy goals. The aim of the SABER-EPS Framework is to provide policy guidance to help governments establish strong incentives and relationships of accountability among citizens, governments, and private education providers, with the goal of improving education results.
Benchmarking Education Policies: The SABER-EPS Methodology

The World Bank has developed a set of standardized questionnaires and rubrics for collecting and evaluating data on the four policy goals for each type of private school engagement established in a given country.

The policy goals are benchmarked separately for each type of private engagement. A point of emphasis here is that these tools only assess official and established policies governing private education provision. Additional tools determine on-the-ground implementation of these policies. The SABER-EPS information is compiled in a comparative database that interested stakeholders can access for detailed reports, background papers, methodology, and other resources; the database details how different education systems engage with the private sector.

For each indicator associated with the respective four policy goals, the country receives a score between 1 and 4 (figure 3), representing four levels of private sector engagement: 1 (latent), 2 (emerging), 3 (established), or 4 (advanced).

Figure 3. SABER Rubric Benchmarking Levels

Source: Baum et al. (2014).

The overall score for each policy goal is computed by aggregating the scores for each of its constituent indicators. For example, a hypothetical country receives the following indicator scores for one of its policy goals:

- Indicator A = 2 points
- Indicator B = 3 points
- Indicator C = 4 points
- Indicator D = 4 points

The hypothetical country’s overall score for this policy goal would be: 
\[
\frac{2+3+4+4}{4} = 3.25
\]

The overall score is converted into a final development level for the policy goal, based on the following scale:

- Latent: 1.00 – 1.50
- Emerging: 1.51 – 2.50
- Established: 2.51 – 3.50
- Advanced: 3.51 – 4.00

The ratings generated by the rubrics are not meant to be additive across policy goals. That is, they are not added together to create an overall rating for engaging the private sector.

Use of the SABER-EPS tool

SABER-EPS is not intended to be used as a prescriptive policy tool, but rather, as a tool to generate an informed assessment of a country’s policies vis-à-vis current knowledge about effective approaches. The results of this benchmarking exercise serve as a good starting point to discuss potential policy options that could be considered, based on the nuances of the local context and national education system. Education systems are likely to be at different levels of development across indicators and policy goals. While intuition suggests it is probably better to be as developed in as many areas as possible, the evidence does not clearly show the need to be functioning at the advanced level for all policy goals. National education priorities lay at the center of recommended policy options; countries may prioritize higher levels of development in areas that contribute most to their immediate goals.

For more information on the global evidence underlying EPS and its policy goals, see the SABER framework paper, “What Matters Most for Engaging the Private Sector in Education” (Baum et al. 2014).
Education in Zambia

Zambia is a lower-middle income country in Sub-Saharan Africa. GDP per capita in Zambia is (current) US$ 1,469. The country’s average annual growth rate from 2004 to 2012 was 6.3 percent, with stable growth between 6 and 7 percent throughout the recent global financial crisis (World Development Indicators). However, as noted in Zambia’s Sixth National Development Plan 2011–2015 (Zambia MOFNP 2011), the economic growth experienced by the country has neither sufficiently impacted poverty reduction nor improved general living conditions for most Zambians.

There is a high incidence of financial deprivation in Zambia, with roughly 75 percent of the population living below the international poverty line of US$ 1.25 per day in 2010 (World Development Indicators). Zambia scores “low” on the UN’s Human Development Index (HDI), which benchmarks countries based on a composite of life expectancy, years of education, and income: Zambia ranked 141st among 187 countries in 2014 (UNDP 2014).

In its efforts to improve the living conditions of its citizens, the government of Zambia has made improving the current state of education in the country one of its key objectives. The government has the responsibility of ensuring that education is available to all citizens. Due to limited resources, there is not adequate provision for everyone, although this remains a key objective for the education system. The Ministry of Education, Science, and Vocational Training and Early Education (MOE) is the primary provider of education services in the country, including primary, secondary, and higher education.

Education expenditures in Zambia between 2006 and 2013 ranged from 15.3 to 20.5 percent of total government expenditures, which translates into 3.7 to 4.4 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) (World Bank 2016).

The adult (ages 15+) literacy rate at the national level was 61 percent in 2007, on par with the 60 percent average in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). The literacy gap between men (72 percent literate) and women (52 percent literate) in the country is large, although the gap is again similar to the SSA average: 51 percent of women and 69 percent of men are literate across Sub-Saharan Africa (Edstats).

Access to basic education services in Zambia has improved dramatically in the past decade. Following the introduction of free basic education (grades 1–7) in 2002, participation in government primary and secondary schools grew exponentially. Between 2002 and 2005, net primary school enrollment grew from 73 percent to 94 percent (Zambia MOE 2010). During this three-year period, 1.6 million new students enrolled in government primary and secondary schools—an increase of 48 percent (Edstats). Implementation of free basic education in Zambia reflects both high demand and the potentially detrimental effects of education costs. Prior to the 2002 abolition of school fees, over 28 percent of primary-age children in the country were out of school; in 2001, one-half of the parents of these children reported that school costs were a substantial barrier to accessing educational services (Wiener 2010).

Since 2005, enrollments have increased at a nearly constant rate of 3 percent per year, consistent with national population growth. The primary net enrollment rate was 89.0 percent in 2015. Currently, of greater concern than initial entry into school are issues of student persistence and learning. Although schools have maintained high rates of primary student enrollment since the abolition of school fees, only 57.3 percent of students reach grade 9 and only 30.8 percent reach grade 12 (Zambia MOE 2015). The net enrollment rate for Zambia’s secondary level in 2015 was 28.1 percent (Ibid).

After experiencing rapid growth in school enrollment, a country’s education system naturally faces the challenge of insufficient infrastructure and teaching and learning materials. The government has been addressing these issues gradually, with measurable levels of success. The

---

1 This report presents country data collected in 2014 using the SABER-EP5 policy intent data collection instrument. It thus offers a specific snapshot in time. Additional data was incorporated into the background and context sections at the request of the government, following the data collection exercise.
pupil-teacher ratio for grades 1–7 has improved from 70:1 in 2007 to 41:1 in 2013 (World Bank 2016). The pupil-textbook ratio has improved from 3:1 in 2007 to nearly 2:1 in 2010 (Zambia MOE 2007, 2010). In 2015, the pupil-textbook ratio for the primary level was 0.86, and for the secondary level, 0.59 (Zambia MOE 2015).

Students’ learning levels could benefit from targeted and sustained interventions proven to increase learning levels. Grade 6 students in Zambia perform roughly 0.75 standard deviations below their regional peers on the SACMEQ (Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality) assessment (table 1).

Table 1. Mathematics and Reading Achievement of Grade Six Students (Zambia, SACMEQ Regional Average)^2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Region^a</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>435.1</td>
<td>507.1</td>
<td>-0.72 SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Std. Err.)</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>434.5</td>
<td>509.3</td>
<td>-0.75 SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Std. Err.)</td>
<td>(1.50)</td>
<td>(0.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACMEQ 2012.  
^a. See www.sacmeq.org for a description of participating countries.

Private Education in Zambia

Zambia’s National Policy on Education (Zambia MOE 1996) expresses a national policy objective of establishing new partnerships with all types of education providers, including private sector providers, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), local communities, and religious groups. The Sixth National Development Plan 2011–2015 (Zambia MOFNP 2011) outlines the government’s desire to enhance public–private partnerships (PPPs) for effective delivery of social services.

Any person, community, or organization in Zambia is free not only to apply to set up a school, but also to apply to receive government funding as an “aided” school. There are three types of non-government schools in Zambia, as defined by the state:

1. **Private schools.** These schools are owned and managed by religious institutions, private individuals, or groups. They receive no subsidies from the government and collect user fees from parents.

2. **Community schools.** These schools are run by parents, teachers, and local communities. They began primarily in rural areas as the result of insufficient government school supply or the previous high cost of public schooling. Some community schools receive grants from the government. These schools have been recognized by the government since 1998. The government has a collaborative relationship with the community schools’ umbrella organization, the Zambia Community Schools Secretariat (ZCSS) (DeStefano 2006).

3. **Grant-aided schools.** These schools are owned and managed by private individuals or groups. They receive subsidies from the government in the form of cash, teaching staff, and learning materials.

Non-government schools account for a sizable share of educational service provision in Zambia (table 2). In 2009, roughly 22 percent of grade 1–9 students were enrolled in private sector schools, with community schools making up the largest share (table 3).

Table 2. Number of Schools by Type (Grades 1–9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Schools</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant-aided</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/church</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,535</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Zambia MOFNP 2011.

---

There is still much to be known about the performance of the non-state education sector in Zambia. To date, empirical research on the learning outcomes of non-government schools is not extensive. Private school students outperform their public counterparts in both reading and mathematics on the SACMEQ assessment (table 4). These results show only raw differences in student scores without accounting for student background differences; however, it is worth noting, these students are statistically equal in terms of family socioeconomic status (as measured by a SACMEQ composite score of parent education level and home possessions).

According to the SABER-EPS Framework, Zambia’s private and faith-based institutions are considered independent private schools while grant-aided and community schools are considered government-funded private schools. As such, community and grant-aided schools will be integrated into the section on government-funded private schools and discussed in tandem.

---

Benchmarking Zambia’s Private School Policies

This section of the report presents the results of the SABER-Engaging the Private Sector analysis of laws, policies, and regulations governing independent and government-funded private schools, as Zambia has decided to involve these providers in offering basic education services. The report discusses the benchmarking results against established recommended practices. For more information on the global evidence underlying these policy goals, see the SABER Framework paper, “What Matters Most for Engaging the Private Sector in Education” (Baum et al. 2014).

Goal 1: Encouraging innovation by providers

The highly particular and contextualized nature of education delivery necessitates decision making at the school level. To be aware of and adapt to changing student needs, school leaders require autonomy in the most critical managerial areas.

The methodologically rigorous studies assessing the impacts of local school autonomy on student learning outcomes generally find a positive relationship (Hanushek and Woessmann 2010; Bruns, Filmer, and Patrinos 2011). A few studies find evidence that local autonomy for school leaders is associated with increased student achievement, as well as reduced student repetition and failure rates (King and Özler 2005; Jimenez and Sawada 2003; Gertler, Patrinos, and Rubio-Codina 2012).

Box 2. International Best Practice – Encouraging Innovation by Providers

The following decisions/processes are made at the school level:
- Establishment of teacher qualification standards
- Appointment and deployment of teachers
- Teacher salary levels
- Teacher dismissals
- The way in which the curriculum is delivered
- Class-size decisions
- Management of the operating budgets

Development level:

Independent private schools: Established

Government-funded private schools: Emerging

The overall score is established for independent private schools in Zambia, suggesting good practice in allowing school autonomy via critical decision making. The overall score for government-funded private schools is emerging.

Independent private schools have the legal authority to appoint, deploy, dismiss, and set the salaries of teachers.

The central government outlines in the Education Act of 2011 that by 2015, community school teachers shall be required to have a basic school teacher's qualification. The level of personnel autonomy given to two different types of government-funded private schools, grant-aided schools and community schools, varies. The board of management in grant-aided schools appoints the school’s own teachers, determines teacher salaries, and dismisses teachers. In community schools, the ministry of education may appoint and deploy some teachers where qualified teachers are lacking. These teachers may also work under different terms and conditions.

In independent private schools, the minister specifies the curriculum, syllabi, books, and other materials to be used; however, the school is responsible for setting out its operational plan, including modes of delivery.

In government-funded private schools, the central government has even more control over:

(a) the annual academic calendar, the duration of any academic year, and the terms of an academic year for educational institutions;
(b) the minimum number of days in a year in which instruction shall be given;
(c) the minimum hours of instruction that educational institutions must provide;
(d) the total learning time with respect to each study area in the curriculum;
(e) the number of working days and holidays during any given academic year; and
(f) textbooks used.
In government-funded private schools, the schools’ operational budgets are controlled by school management boards.

### Table 5. Goal 1: Encouraging Innovation by Providers

| A. Common policies for independent private schools and government-funded private schools |
|------------------|-----------|------------------|
| **Item** | **Score** | **Justification** |
| Who has the legal authority to determine maximum class size? | Emerging ³³³ | The Education Board has the legal authority to decide how resources are allocated to classrooms, with final review by central authorities (on class size). |

| B. Policies particular to independent private schools |
|------------------|-----------|------------------|
| **Item** | **Score** | **Justification** |
| Who has the legal authority to set teacher standards? | Advanced ³³³ | The school (school principal, school council, parent association, etc.) has the legal authority to appoint teachers without review by central authorities. |
| Who has the legal authority to appoint and deploy teachers? | Advanced ³³³ | The school (school principal, school council, parent association, etc.) has the legal authority to appoint teachers without review by central authorities. |
| Who has the legal authority to determine teacher salary levels? | Advanced ³³³ | The school (school principal, school council, parent association, etc.) has the legal authority to determine teacher salaries without review by central authorities. |
| Who has the legal authority to dismiss teachers? | Advanced ³³³ | The school (school principal, school council, parent association, etc.) has the legal authority to dismiss teachers without review by central authorities. |
| Who has the legal authority to determine how the curriculum is delivered? | Emerging ³³³ | Schools can determine how the curriculum is delivered, with review by central authorities. |

### C. Policies particular to government-funded private schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item</strong></th>
<th><strong>Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>Justification</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who has the legal authority to set teacher standards?</td>
<td>Emerging ³³³</td>
<td>Schools have the legal authority to set teacher standards, with review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who has the legal authority to appoint and deploy teachers?</td>
<td>Emerging ³³³</td>
<td>Schools have the legal authority to appoint and deploy teachers, with review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who has the legal authority to determine teacher salary levels?</td>
<td>Emerging ³³³</td>
<td>Schools have the legal authority to determine teacher salary levels, with review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who has the legal authority to dismiss teachers?</td>
<td>Emerging ³³³</td>
<td>Schools have the legal authority to dismiss teachers, with review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who has the legal authority to manage school operating budgets?</td>
<td>Latent ³³³</td>
<td>The central government has the legal authority to determine how the curriculum is delivered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the benchmarking results for goal 1, the suggested policy options for Zambia include the following:

- Increase the flexibility of schools to use additional resources and choose curriculum delivery methods that meet the needs of the local community.
- Ensure that community schools are able to make decisions on the appointment and dismissal of teachers, even if those teachers are centrally deployed by the ministry of education.

### Goal 2: Holding schools accountable

As previously noted, students perform better, on average, in schools with higher levels of accountability to
the state (Abdulkadiroğlu et al. 2011; Carnoy and Loeb 2002; Woessmann et al. 2007; Hanushek and Raymond 2005). For non-state providers, when government funding is tied to accountability standards, schools are incentivized to perform more efficiently (Barrera-Osorio and Raju 2010; Patrinos 2002). A strong accountability system requires that the government, parents, and educational professionals work together to raise outcomes. The government must play a role in ensuring that higher education quality is delivered by schools. The SABER-EPS Framework assesses multiple policy indicators to determine the accountability of non-state providers. A list of the key indicators is provided in box 3.

Box 3. International Best Practice—Holding Schools Accountable

- The central government sets standards regarding what students need to learn, including deadlines for meeting these standards.
- Students are required to take standardized examinations; exam results are disaggregated by school, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.
- Schools are required to report on the use of public funds as a condition of continued funding.
- The central government or an external agency performs school inspections as determined by school need.
- Schools produce school improvement plans.
- School performance is tied to sanctions and/or rewards.

**Development level:**

**Private independent schools:**

- Established

**Government-funded private schools:**

- Emerging

In Zambia, policies for holding independent and government-funded private schools accountable are emerging.

The Education Act outlines the programs of study and assessment arrangements at the foundational level of education and each key stage thereafter. National examinations have been conducted annually in grades 7, 9, and 11 since 1997.

The Education Act also specifies that the role of the inspection system is to vet and approve the registration of aided, community, and/or private educational institutions, as well as to ensure that all schools are inspected at least three times a year. The inspection report does not explicitly outline the strengths and weaknesses of a school, but does offer suggestions for improvement. Schools are also required to submit an improvement or operational plan. There are no sanctions based on the results of school inspections or school performance on standardized exams.

Government-funded private schools are required to report to the government on the use of public funds as a condition of continued funding. A public, aided, or community educational institution must submit audited accounts to the minister of education within 90 days of the end of the institution’s financial year.

### Table 6. Goal 2: Holding Schools Accountable

| A. Common policies for independent private schools and government-funded private schools |
|----|----|----|
| Item | Score | Justification |
| Does the government set standards on what students need to learn and by when? | Established | The government does set standards for what students need to learn. It also indicates EITHER by when OR how well they need to be learned. |
| Are students required to take standardized exams, with results disaggregated? | Established | Standardized exams are administered annually. |
| Are school inspections performed as determined by school need? | Established | The government requires schools to undergo standard-term inspections. |
| Does the inspection report outline the strengths and weaknesses of the school? | Emerging | Priorities for improvement are outlined in the inspection report. |
| Are sanctions or rewards administered based on the results of school inspections or school performance on standardized exams? | Latent | Sanctions are not administered based on either the results of school inspections or school performance on standardized exams. |

| B. Policies particular to government-funded private schools |
|----|----|----|
| Item | Score | Justification |

Informed by the benchmarking results for goal 2, the following **suggested policy options** could help Zambia increase the accountability of private schools:

- Ensure that new schools go through a rigorous certification process based on criteria related to student outcomes.
- Use a more needs-based inspection system that gives greater scrutiny to underperforming schools. Follow-up inspection visits can then focus on underperforming schools and their progress against their own school improvement or operational plans.
- Consider administering sanctions and/or rewards for poorly performing and high-performing schools, respectively. These tools could be targeted in rural areas or areas with severe underperformance.

**Goal 3: Empowering all parents, students, and communities**

Empowering parents, students, and communities is one of the foundations for creating quality learning opportunities for all students. Poor and marginalized children, together with youth, disproportionately lack access to quality education services in Zambia. To overcome this obstacle, the government needs to increase providers’ accountability to all clients, particularly underserved groups.

Educational access and the performance of schools and students can be substantially impacted by openly disseminating comparable school performance information (Andrabi, Das, and Khwaja 2009; Pandey, Goyal, and Sundararaman 2009; Björkman 2007; Reinikka and Svensson 2005); increasing parental influence in schools (Skoufias and Shapiro 2006; King and Özler 2005; Jimenez and Sawada 1999; Gertler, Patrinos, and Rubio-Codina 2012; Di Gropello and Marshall 2005); and implementing demand-side interventions—such as scholarships, vouchers, or cash transfers—to help the most vulnerable students (Orazem and King 2007; Filmer and Schady 2008; Lewis and Lockheed 2007; Patrinos 2002; Barrera-Osorio 2006). Effective policy practices for non-state providers include some of the indicators listed in box 4.

**Box 4. International Best Practices—Empowering All Parents, Students, and Communities**

- Information on standardized tests and school inspections is made available by multiple sources.
- Parents and students are included in the inspection and improvement-planning processes.
- Admission processes for entry into publicly funded schools are not based on student background; a lottery is used in cases of oversubscription.
- School choice is not hindered by mandatory financial contributions.
- Tax subsidies, scholarships, and/or cash transfers are available to families whose children attend independent private schools.

**Development level:**

- **Private independent schools:** Latent
- **Government-funded private schools:** Emerging

In Zambia, the policies to empower parents, students, and communities for independent private schools are **latent**, while those for government-funded private schools are **emerging**. Additional policy strategies could increase the client power of parents and better allow them to hold providers accountable for results.

In the case of independent private schools, a law requires publication of the list of registered schools in a daily newspaper, as well as admissions guidelines for those schools. However, it does not require the publication of information on school quality, such as examination results or school inspection reports. For government-funded private schools, parents can request the information from the government directly.

Government-funded private schools are allowed to select students based on both academic performance and geography. This may lead to marginalization of students from lower-income households or disadvantaged backgrounds. The 2011 Education Act mandates that all learners, including poor and vulnerable children, shall have equal access to quality education. It also stipulates that no head of a public, aided, or community educational institution shall refuse to admit...
an applicant to the institution on grounds that the applicant or the applicant’s parent:

(a) is unable to pay, or has not paid, the school fee determined by the educational institution;

(b) is unable to provide the applicant with the items of clothing or other basic necessities determined by the head of institution; or

(c) does not subscribe to the mission of the educational institution or its religious practices.

This policy could be strengthened to ensure that selection criteria are removed.

Table 7. Goal 3: Empowering all Parents, Students, and Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are parents and students interviewed as part of the inspection process?</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Neither students nor parents are surveyed as part of the school inspection process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are standardized exam results and inspection reports provided regularly to parents?</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>No information is provided to parents on the results of standardized exams or inspection reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are schools allowed to charge additional fees or accept contributions from parents?</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>The government does not provide tax subsidies or cash transfers to families whose children attend independent private schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informed by the benchmarking results for goal 3, the following suggested policy options would help Zambia empower parents and students to influence the quality of education services provided by private schools:

- Increase parents’ access to information on school quality, including examination and school inspection reports, to allow them to make informed decisions on their children’s schooling.

- Remove the ability of schools to use selection criteria that may discriminate against marginalized groups.

Goal 4: Promoting Diversity of Supply

By opening education to a more diverse set of providers, governments can increase client power and make providers directly accountable to students and parents for results. Although the public sector will always remain an important (and, in most cases, the predominant) provider of education services, educational choice can be used as part of a package of reforms to improve access and quality in both the public and private education sectors (Hoxby 2003; Levin and Belfield 2003; De la Croix and Doepke 2009; Carnoy and McEwan 2003; Himmler 2007; Angrist et al. 2002; World Bank 2003). In order to facilitate quality improvements through increased school competition and choice, governments can: (i) allow multiple types of providers to operate; (ii) promote clear, open, affordable, and unrestricted certification standards; and (iii) make government funding (and other incentives) available to non-state schools. This policy
goal aims to increase the ability of diverse providers to provide education services. In order to do so, a number of policy indicators are suggested, as outlined in box 5.

**Box 5. International Best Practice—Promoting Diversity of Supply**

- The central government allows different types of providers to operate schools.
- Certification standards do not prohibit market entry.
- Information on market-entry requirements is available from multiple sources.
- Regulatory fees do not prohibit market entry.
- Publicly funded non-state schools and public schools receive equivalent student funding; funding is increased to meet specific student needs.
- The central government provides incentives for market entry, such as access to start-up funding, public land, and public buildings.
- Schools are able to plan budgets six months in advance of the academic year.
- Privately managed schools are not restricted by student numbers, school numbers, or location.
- The central government does not restrict tuition levels at private independent schools.

**Development level:**

- **Private independent schools:**
  - Established
- **Government-funded private schools:**
  - Established

In Zambia, the policies in place to promote diversity of supply for independent and government-funded private schools are **established**—representing systematic good practice.

There are no restrictions on the type of provider who can operate private independent and government-funded private schools in Zambia. Certification standards require schools to provide evidence of land ownership. Standards for registration and certification are available from multiple sources.

For government-funded private schools, academic and additional budgets (e.g., facilities and transport) are equivalent to per-student amounts funded in public schools. For example, grant-aided schools may be entitled to:

(a) a subsidy;

(b) the provision of materials;

(c) operational and capital development costs;

(d) the provision of teachers who are staff members of the ministry of education; and

(e) any other form of aid determined by the minister.

However, schools do not receive funding targeted to specific student needs. Furthermore, no start-up funding is available for government-funded private schools.

Independent private schools are required to pay a registration and renewal fee. Government-funded private schools must pay a fee to apply for aided status.

Government-funded private schools are provided information on the budget allocations to be transferred to them one to three months before the start of the academic year.
### Table 8. Goal 4: Promoting Diversity of Supply

#### A. Common policies for independent private schools and government-funded private schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the government allow multiple types of providers to operate a school?</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>The government allows all of the following types to operate a school: community, not for profit, faith based, and for profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do registration standards for private schools promote rather than inhibit market entry?</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Certification standards that are not linked to education outcomes restrict entry, including one of the three following criteria: 1. land (undulating, distance from public venues, etc.) 2. facilities (separate science labs, weather vanes, etc.) 3. assets (ownership of land or buildings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are guidelines that outline the requirements for school registration clearly publicized by multiple sources?</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Registration and/or certification guidelines are made public by multiple sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. Policies particular to independent private schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are schools able to operate without paying fees?</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Schools are required to pay registration and renewal fees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Policies particular to government-funded private schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are schools able to operate without paying fees?</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>All budgets, academic and additional (e.g., facilities and transport), are equivalent to per-student amounts funded in public schools. Schools do not receive funding targeted to specific student needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do government-funded private schools receive any start-up funding?</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>No start-up funding is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is information on the amount of government funding provided in a timely manner?</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Schools are provided information on the budget allocations to be transferred to them between 1 and 3 months before the start of the academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informed by the benchmarking results for goal 4, the following suggested policy options could help Zambia better promote diversity of supply of independent private schools:

- Review the fees paid by private independent and government-funded private schools to ensure that these fees are not barriers to entry for future providers.
- Consider providing initial funding for government-funded private schools in areas where the number of out-of-school children is high.
- Ensure that government-funded schools are provided information on the budget allocations to be transferred to them at least six months before the start of a new academic year to facilitate planning.
From Analysis to Action: Policy Options for Zambia

Zambia has done much to open educational opportunities to all students over the last 12 years. With the abolition of school fees in 2002, the country substantially increased access to education at the primary level, reaching a primary net enrollment rate of 89 percent in 2015. However, primary schools are hindered by insufficient infrastructure and materials, and access to secondary education remains low. The quality of learning outcomes also requires improvement. The non-state sector plays a significant role in providing education services in Zambia, enrolling approximately 22 percent of primary and secondary students nationally. The majority of non-state schools are community-run institutions, with grant-aided and independent private schools making up a smaller share.

Based on the results of the benchmarking exercise, two suggested policy options are offered to strengthen the government’s engagement with independent and government-funded private schools to ensure learning for all:

1. Strengthen system accountability measures; consider a needs-based inspection system that gives greater scrutiny and support to underperforming schools.
2. Increase the information available to parents on school quality, including via school report cards.

These policy options are supported by international evidence, best practices, and examples of countries that have used innovative interventions to improve from a variety of starting points.

Policy Option 1: Strengthen the inspection system and follow-up actions

Strong accountability systems consist of more than minimum standards; they also require mechanisms that continually improve school performance. A review of quality assurance and school monitoring systems across eight Asian Pacific countries found that a number of countries exceed basic minimum standards and effectively use accountability mechanisms to ensure continual improvement (Mok et al. 2003). The Office for Education Standards in Education (Ofsted) in England, the Education Review Office in New Zealand, and the National Inspectorate in the Netherlands have all moved to a risk-based inspection approach, which allows schools that are performing well and continually improving to have less frequent inspections, while schools performing below standard are inspected more frequently and rigorously (Dutch Inspectorate of Education 2013). This approach reinforces accountability relationships at two levels: it provides autonomy to higher performers and targets monitoring activities to schools in greatest need.

An effective inspection process, including appropriate follow-up, can be an important means of school improvement. Inspection frameworks should outline the strengths and weaknesses of schools and priorities for their improvement. Improvement planning can facilitate positive change as a school strives to deliver better educational outcomes for all students. Incentives such as sanctions and rewards can then be used to reinforce the accountability mechanism.

A. Move to a more needs-based inspection system

To improve the accountability of private schools, Zambia could ensure that inspections are focused on schools that need greater scrutiny. Currently, inspections are scheduled for three times a year. This schedule could be revised so that underperforming schools are visited more frequently and high-performing schools are only inspected on a longer term basis.

Country examples. In Malawi, the inspection framework covers private independent schools, religious schools, and public schools. Schools are inspected once every two

---

4 As previously noted, data collection for this report took place in 2014. The report was updated in January 2017 to reflect available country statistics, as applicable.
years. Malawi also has inspections based on need, using the following criteria:

a) Schools with poor examination results
b) Schools that are poorly managed
c) Schools that have not been inspected for more than two years
d) High-performing schools (to learn good practices).

Malawi also has four different types of inspections (table 9).

Table 9. Malawi: Types of School Inspections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of inspection</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Who carries it out</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full inspection</td>
<td>Evaluation of all aspects of the school: curriculum, organization of teaching and learning, general school administration and documentation, provisions of buildings and grounds, equipment.</td>
<td>Team of inspectors: 3–6 inspectors, depending on size of school.</td>
<td>Full day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up inspection</td>
<td>Evaluation of extent to which recommendations made in the full inspection report have been implemented.</td>
<td>1–2 advisors</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial inspection</td>
<td>Examination and evaluation of one or a limited number of aspects of school life.</td>
<td>1–2 advisors</td>
<td>Depends on gravity of aspect being inspected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block inspection</td>
<td>Improve inspection coverage of schools during a specific period of time.</td>
<td>6–8 supervisors from different districts</td>
<td>1–2 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ rendering based on discussions with the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, Government of Malawi.

The inspection report prepared in Malawi includes the type of school visited, total enrollment, staffing, a rating of school performance in various operational aspects, and general strengths and weaknesses of the school. After the inspection, members of school staff and the head teacher are briefed on its findings. This discussion gives them a chance to start working on the weaknesses identified in the school.

In the Netherlands, a new risk-based inspection framework was introduced in 2007. The new inspection mechanism aims to reduce the burden felt by schools and makes inspections more effective. Schools delivering a good education (i.e., no risks detected) with good results do not require inspection, allowing the Inspectorate to focus on the rapid improvement of schools that are delivering a poorer quality education (i.e., risks detected) and get unsatisfactory results (Dutch Inspectorate of Education 2009). Figure 4 illustrates the Dutch approach.

B. Use school improvement plans to improve quality

Inspection reports outline priorities for improvement. These priorities could be more closely linked to school improvement plans. Additionally, the role of inspectors should be strengthened to ensure that school action and/or improvement plans are submitted and enacted, thus facilitating change at the school level.
School improvement plans have been an important piece of multiple successful education programs in developing countries (Bruns, Filmer, and Patrinos 2011). Their introduction of school improvement plans must be accompanied by the empowerment of school leaders as facilitators of change. That is, school leaders must ensure that improvement plans are meaningful to all stakeholders and that purposeful actions are taken throughout the school (Fullan 2007).

Country examples. Western Cape, South Africa requires schools to submit individual school improvement plans. Particular attention is given to those schools that did not achieve the required pass rate on state examinations. The number of underperforming schools has declined every year since the requirement was instituted, from 85 in 2009 to 26 in 2012 (Western Cape Government 2013). Western Cape is also cited in a study that reviewed how the most improved schools continue to improve (Mourshed, Chijioke, and Barber 2010).

In Brazil, the Ministry’s Plano de Desenvolvimento da Escola (PDE) project required schools to identify their most serious problems and develop their own school improvement plans. PDE also required schools to focus their plans on two or three effectiveness factors (EFs), one of which had to be effective teaching and learning; the other EFs were chosen from a list of general operational areas detailed in the PDE manual. Students in PDE schools saw greater increases in grade passing rates than students in non-PDE schools (Carnoy et al. 2008).

C. Create networks that share best practices to facilitate school improvement

The government of Zambia could create a network of school-to-school learning in order to deliver high-quality education to all students. The country could leverage high-performing schools to mentor low-performing schools. Peer-to-peer learning often benefits both the mentor and the mentored. Many other countries are leveraging school-to-school learning in order to raise educational standards in all schools. These relationships are sometimes facilitated by the government, while in other cases, schools themselves take the initiative to learn from their peers. In still other cases, schools compete against each other.

Country examples. In Mozambique, new non-state schools are mentored by public schools for their first two years of operation. Students in these new schools sit their examinations in the mentor schools until the new schools meet certain criteria, a practice that acts as a quality assurance mechanism (Government of Mozambique 1990).

U.S. charter schools have both direct and indirect influence on their public school counterparts. A recent study found that the presence of charter schools in 8 out of 12 states led to the following actions by public schools:

- Replication of charter practices
- Collaboration with charters
- Piloting new innovations in their own schools
- Increased information to students and families
- Expanded school offerings
- Partnering with charter school operators

Holley, Egalite, and Lueken (2013)

D. Provide incentives and/or sanctions for school improvement

Incentives at the school level can also help strengthen buy-in and improve accountability. As noted earlier, when government funding (in the form of vouchers or subsidies) is tied to accountability standards, it creates an incentive for non-state schools to perform more efficiently (Patrinos 2002). This sort of accountability mechanism could work in Zambia in areas where multiple schools exist or in cases where the government wishes to enter into new funding arrangements with previously independent private schools. Consideration should be given to using such incentives in community schools on a case-by-case basis.

Country example. In Pakistan, the Punjab Education Foundation’s Assisted Schools (FAS) program uses sanctions and rewards to improve student outcomes. The FAS program provides monthly per-student cash subsidies and free textbooks to low-cost private schools. The program grew exponentially, from 8,573 students and 54 schools in 2005 to over 1 million students and 3,000 schools in 2012. Participation in FAS requires that schools achieve a minimum student pass rate on a semi-annual multi-subject exam, the Quality Assurance Test (QAT). At least two-thirds of tested students must score above 40 percent on the QAT. If a school fails to achieve the minimum pass rate on two consecutive QATs, it is permanently disqualified from funding.
A rigorous evaluation of the program found that the threat of program expulsion had a positive causal impact on student learning. Schools threatened with losing access to subsidies were nearly always successful in raising student scores to meet the minimum pass rate on subsequent exams: where only 49 percent of schools in the study met the minimum pass rate in November 2007, nearly 100 percent of these same schools met it in March 2008.

The program also offers two cash bonus benefits. The first is a teacher bonus for high student performance on exams. Once every academic year, a maximum of five teachers in each program school where at least 90 percent of students scored 40 percent or higher on the QAT receive an award of 10,000 rupees (US$ 118) each. The second cash benefit is a competitive school bonus for top exam performance. Once every academic year, the FAS school in each of the seven main program districts with the highest share of students who scored 40 percent or higher on the QAT is awarded 50,000 rupees (US$ 588) (Barrera-Osorio and Raju 2010).

Policy Option 2: Ensure information is easily accessible to parents by using school report cards. Prohibit schools from using inequitable entrance selection criteria for students.

Based on current policies, the government of Zambia could increase the information provided to parents on school quality. Central governments ought not be the only monitors of school performance. Access to comparative information could enable parents and students to influence school quality through increased choice and direct voice to providers. Information on school report cards could include: school demographic data, classroom assessment results, examination results, and inspection reports. Evidence from Pakistan found that school report cards improved learning by 0.1 standard deviations and reduced fees by almost 20 percent. The largest learning gains (0.34 standard deviations) were for initially low-performing (below median baseline test scores) private schools, with the worst of these more likely to close (Andrabi, Das, and Khwaja 2009).

Country example. Parana state in Brazil was an early adopter of school report cards. Between 1999 and 2002, this tool was introduced to inform school communities and stimulate greater involvement in the school improvement process. Report cards were disseminated to a wide range of stakeholders, including all schools, parent teacher associations, municipal education authorities, and all 70,000 state education employees (including 46,000 teachers). Overall results were reported in the state education secretariat’s monthly newsletter, used in teacher and PTA workshops, and disseminated via press releases and press conferences (EQUIP2 2013).

In the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, a USAID-funded program—Civic Engagement For Education Reform in Central America (CERCA)—implemented a school report card that focused on indicators in four areas:

1. **Context:** basic profile information (e.g., number of students in each grade, etc.) and access to services at the school (e.g., sanitation, electricity, etc.)
2. **Inputs:** class size, access to resources (e.g., notebooks, pens, etc.), and access to social services (e.g., school meals, health programs, etc.).
3. **Processes:** student and teacher attendance, school plan implementation, and parent participation.
4. **Results:** coverage and efficiency (repetition and retention rates).

The results of the school report card are used by communities to develop and monitor implementation of school action plans (CERCA 2006).

In Andhra Pradesh, India, the Vidya Chaitanyam intervention used citizens to monitor and advocate for higher-quality service delivery by government and non-government basic education providers. The program was intended to strengthen the oversight function in the state, where local education offices lack the capacity to carry out school inspections. The program included members of women’s self-help groups, who were often illiterate and semi-literate, to assess the quality of basic education provision through the use of school scorecards. The results of the scorecards were shared with district officials, the local school management committee, and local women’s self-help groups at their meetings (Galab et al. 2013).
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Annex I: SABER-Engaging the Private Sector Rubrics

The following tables display the indicators and scales utilized for benchmarking an individual country’s policy on private sector engagement in education. Across the four types of private schools, the indicators pertaining to each goal are largely the same; where a certain indicator pertains only to certain school types, this is noted within the table.

### Table A1.1 Policy Goal: Encouraging Innovation by Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher standards</td>
<td>The central government has the legal authority to set minimum standards for teachers.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority to set minimum standards for teachers, with final review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority to set minimum standards for teachers without final review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Schools have the legal authority to set their own teacher standards without final review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher appointment and deployment</td>
<td>The central government has the legal authority to appoint and deploy teachers.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority to appoint and deploy teachers. Appointments are subject to final review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority to appoint and deploy teachers without review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Schools (i.e., individual school principals, school councils, parent associations, etc.) have the legal authority to appoint teachers without review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher salary</td>
<td>The central government has the legal authority to determine teacher salary levels.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority to determine teacher salary levels, with final review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority to determine teacher salary levels without review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Schools have the legal authority to determine teacher salary levels without review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher dismissal</td>
<td>The central government has the legal authority to dismiss teachers.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority to dismiss teachers, with final review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority to dismiss teachers without review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Schools have the legal authority to dismiss teachers without review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A1.1 Policy Goal: Encouraging Innovation by Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum delivery</strong></td>
<td>The central government has the legal authority over how the curriculum is delivered.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority over how the curriculum is delivered, with final review from central authorities.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority over how the curriculum is delivered without final review from central authorities.</td>
<td>Schools have the legal authority over how the curriculum is delivered without final review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom resourcing</strong></td>
<td>The central government has the legal authority over how resources are allocated to the classroom (e.g., class sizes).</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority over how resources are allocated to classrooms, with final review from central authorities (e.g., class sizes).</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority over how resources are allocated to classrooms without final review by central authorities (e.g., class size).</td>
<td>School have the legal authority over how resources are allocated to classrooms without final review by central authorities (e.g., class sizes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget autonomy</strong> (not applicable to independent private schools)</td>
<td>The central government has the legal authority over the management of school operating budgets.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority over the management of school operating budgets, with final review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Regional or municipal governments have the legal authority over the management of school operating budgets without final review by central authorities.</td>
<td>Schools have the legal authority over the management of school operating budgets without final review by central authorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A1.2 Policy Goal: Holding Schools Accountable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Standards</strong></td>
<td>The national government does not set standards on what students need to learn.</td>
<td>The national government does set standards for what students need to learn, but it does not indicate how well or by when.</td>
<td>The national government does set standards for what students need to learn and also indicates EITHER by when OR how well.</td>
<td>The national government does set standards for what students need to learn, by when, and how well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Students do not take standardized exams.</td>
<td>Standardized exams are administered, but not annually.</td>
<td>Standardized exams are administered annually.</td>
<td>Standardized exams are administered annually and results are disaggregated by school, socioeconomic background, gender, and other criteria of student disadvantage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection</strong></td>
<td>The central government does not require schools to undergo inspections.</td>
<td>The central government requires schools to undergo inspections, but no term is specified.</td>
<td>The central government requires schools to undergo standard term inspections.</td>
<td>The central government requires schools to undergo inspections, with the frequency of inspections depending on the results of the previous inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvement planning</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable if the government does not require schools to take part in inspections.</td>
<td>Inspection reports include strengths and weaknesses of the school.</td>
<td>Inspection reports include the strengths and weaknesses of a school, as well as specific priorities for improvement.</td>
<td>Inspection reports include strengths and weaknesses of the school. Schools are required to submit a school improvement plan with specific priorities for improvement following the inspection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanctions and rewards</strong></td>
<td>Sanctions are not administered based on the results of school inspections or school performance on standardized exams.</td>
<td>Sanctions include additional monitoring and/or warnings; they are administered based on the results of school inspections or school performance on standardized exams.</td>
<td>Sanctions include additional monitoring and/or fines, which are administered based on the results of school inspections or school performance on standardized exams. For government-funded, privately managed, and voucher schools: rewards may also be used.</td>
<td>Sanctions include additional monitoring, fines, and as a final measure, school closures; decisions are made based on the results of school inspections or school performance on standardized exams. For government-funded, privately managed, voucher schools: rewards are also used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial reporting</strong> (not applicable to independent private schools)</td>
<td>The central government does not require schools to report on the use of public funds as a condition for the continuation of funding.</td>
<td>The government requires schools to report on the use of public funds as a condition for continued funding, but on an ad-hoc basis.</td>
<td>The central government requires schools to report on the use of public funds as a condition for continued funding according to a standard term.</td>
<td>The central government requires schools to report on the use of public funds as a condition for continued funding on a standard-term basis, with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>No information is provided to parents on the results of standardized exams or inspection reports.</td>
<td>Ad-hoc information is provided to parents on standardized exam results or inspection reports.</td>
<td>Regular information is provided to parents on standardized exam results or inspection reports.</td>
<td>A variety of sources provide parents regular information provided on standardized exam results (disaggregated by school, socioeconomic background, gender, and other criteria of student disadvantage.) and inspection reports. Policy specifies information on interventions designed to targeted disadvantaged student groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voice</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable if the government does not require schools to take part in inspections.</td>
<td>Neither students nor parents are surveyed as part of the inspection process.</td>
<td>Students and/or parents are interviewed as part of the inspection process.</td>
<td>Student and parents are interviewed as part of the inspection process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection</strong> (not applicable to independent private schools)</td>
<td>Schools are allowed to select students based on both academic performance and geography.</td>
<td>Schools are allowed to select students based on academic performance or geography.</td>
<td>Schools are not allowed to select students but schools are not required to use a lottery if oversubscribed.</td>
<td>Schools are not allowed to select students and are required to conduct a lottery if school if oversubscribed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.1.3. Policy Goal: Empowering All Parents, Students and Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions (not applicable to independent private schools)</td>
<td>Parental choice is restricted by compulsory monetary parent contributions that, if not paid, prohibits a child from attending the school.</td>
<td>Parental choice is restricted by voluntary monetary contributions (i.e., contributions to a school fund).</td>
<td>Parental choice is restricted by voluntary nonmonetary contributions (i.e., in-kind labor or goods) to a school.</td>
<td>Parental choice is not restricted by any type of required parental contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial support (for independent private schools only)</td>
<td>The central government does not provide tax subsidies or cash transfers to families whose children attend private schools.</td>
<td>The central government provides tax subsidies to families whose children attend private schools.</td>
<td>The central government provides tax subsidies and cash transfers to families, which can be used to enable their children to attend private schools.</td>
<td>The central government provides targeted cash transfers that can be used by disadvantaged students attending private schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A.1.4. Policy Goal: Promoting Diversity of Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>The central government allows one of the following types of organizations to operate schools: Community Not-for-profit Faith-based For-profit</td>
<td>The central government allows two of the following types of organizations to operate schools: Community Not-for-profit Faith-based For-profit</td>
<td>The central government allows three of the following types of organizations to operate schools: Community Not-for-profit Faith-based For-profit</td>
<td>The government allows all of the following types of organizations to operate schools: Community Not-for-profit Faith-based For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification standards</td>
<td>Certification standards, which are not linked to education outcomes, restrict market entry. These include all of the following: 1. land (undulating, distance from public venues, etc.) 2. facilities (separate science labs, weather vanes, etc.) 3. assets (ownership of land or buildings)</td>
<td>Certification standards, which are not linked to education outcomes, restrict market entry. These include two of the following criteria: 1. land (undulating, distance from public venues, etc.) or 2. facilities (separate science labs, weather vanes, etc.) or 3. assets (ownership of land or buildings)</td>
<td>Certification standards, which are not linked to education outcomes, restrict market entry. These include one of the following criteria: 1. land (undulating, distance from public venues, etc.) 2. facilities (separate science labs, weather vanes, etc.) or 3. assets (ownership of land or buildings)</td>
<td>Certification standards, which are not linked to education outcomes, do not restrict market entry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.1.4. Policy Goal: Promoting Diversity of Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market entry information</td>
<td>Registration/certification guidelines are not officially outlined.</td>
<td>Registration/certification guidelines are not made public and available only upon request.</td>
<td>Registration/certification guidelines are made public, but by a single source.</td>
<td>Registration/certification guidelines are made public and by multiple sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory fees</td>
<td>Schools are able to operate while paying four or more types of fees.</td>
<td>Schools are able to operate while paying two to three types of fees.</td>
<td>Schools are able to operate while paying one type of fee.</td>
<td>Schools are able to operate without paying fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition fees (for independent private schools only)</td>
<td>The central government sets standardized tuition fees.</td>
<td>The central government does not set standardized tuition fees, but imposes a tuition cap (an overall amount or percentage increase).</td>
<td>Schools set fees, but those fees are subject to review by the central government.</td>
<td>Schools set fees without any review by the central government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding (not applicable to independent private schools)</td>
<td>Academic operating budgets are not equivalent to per-student funding amounts in public schools.</td>
<td>Academic operating budgets are equivalent to per-student funding amounts in public schools.</td>
<td>All budgets — academic and other, such as for facilities and transport — are equivalent to per-student funding amounts in public schools. Schools do not receive targeted funding to meet specific student needs.</td>
<td>All budgets — academic and other, such as for facilities and transport — are equivalent to per-student funding amounts in public school. Schools receive targeted funding to meet specific student needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives (not applicable to independent private schools)</td>
<td>No incentives exist.</td>
<td>Schools are supported by one of the following: 1. start-up funding similar to that provided to public schools</td>
<td>Schools are supported by two of the following 1. Start-up funding similar to that provided to public schools 2. access to government land</td>
<td>Schools are supported by all of the following 1. Start-up funding similar to that provided to public schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.1.4. Policy Goal: Promoting Diversity of Supply

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Latent</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong>&lt;br&gt;(not applicable for independent private schools)</td>
<td>Schools are provided information on the allocations to be transferred to them less than 1 month before the start of the academic year.</td>
<td>Schools are provided information on the allocations to be transferred to them between 1 and 3 months before the start of the academic year.</td>
<td>Schools are provided information on the allocations to be transferred to them between 4 and 6 months before the start of the academic year.</td>
<td>Schools are provided information on the allocations to be transferred to them more than 6 months before the start of the academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage&lt;br&gt;(for privately managed schools only)</td>
<td>Coverage of charters is restricted by three of the following:&lt;br&gt;1. student numbers&lt;br&gt;2. school numbers and location (i.e., certain cities or districts)&lt;br&gt;3. only new or only existing schools are able to become charters</td>
<td>Coverage of charters is restricted by two of the following:&lt;br&gt;1. student numbers&lt;br&gt;2. school numbers and location (i.e., certain cities or districts)</td>
<td>Coverage of charters is restricted by one of the following:&lt;br&gt;1. student numbers&lt;br&gt;2. school numbers and location (i.e., certain cities or districts).</td>
<td>No restrictions. Charters are not restricted by student numbers, school numbers, or location (i.e., certain cities or districts).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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