



1. Project Data:		Date Posted : 06/27/2002	
PROJ ID: P050762		Appraisal	Actual
Project Name: Br- Fundescola I	Project Costs (US\$M)	125	138.72
Country: Brazil	Loan/Credit (US\$M)	62.5	62.5
Sector(s): Board: ED - Primary education (55%), Sub-national government administration (17%), Central government administration (14%), Tertiary education (14%)	Cofinancing (US\$M)		
L/C Number: L4311			
	Board Approval (FY)		99
Partners involved :	Closing Date	06/30/2001	06/30/2001
Prepared by :	Reviewed by :	Group Manager :	Group:
Helen Abadzi	John R. Heath	Alain A. Barbu	OEDST
2. Project Objectives and Components			
a. Objectives			
The development objective of the School Improvement Project --Fundescola I -- was to strengthen primary schools and the public institutions that are responsible for them within a coordinated management framework, in order to increase the participation, promotion and graduation rates, and achievement levels of children in the North and Center-West regions of Brazil, where poverty is particularly high. The project was limited to the biggest cities in each region and neighboring municipalities			
b. Components			
Components were: (a) raising schools to minimum operational standards through educating and certifying teachers, supplying basic furniture and equipment, financing school improvement investments, and financing school-managed rehabilitation of physical facilities; (b) establishing a school development process by designing and supporting school development plans and financing school subprojects; (c) carrying out school microplanning, developing and testing standard architectural plans for additional school places; (d) building management capacity in schools, municipalities, and states through: specialized teaching and learning improvement programs; fostering community participation; strengthening national education information systems and programs; and financing project management.			
c. Comments on Project Cost, Financing and Dates			
The project closed as scheduled. The Bank's loan was disbursed fully, and the government increased its counterpart to cover more schools.			
3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:			
The development objective was largely achieved . Enrollment rates of children attending schools that met minimum operational standards were raised from an initial 10% to an average of 42% in all targeted areas by June 2001. Integrated planning was done in the majority of participating schools . Over 50% of students now attend schools with integrated school development plans, up from 2% in project areas.			
4. Significant Outcomes/Impacts:			
About 10,975 classrooms were equipped, reaching about 558,00 students or 41% of children in targeted areas. Efforts were made to raise the 4164 target schools to minimum operational standards, and the project met its goals for physical improvements. Enrollments in somewhat more advanced grades, where much dropout often takes place, grew significantly between 1996 and 200; by 15.9% for grade 4 and by 33.9% for grade 8. Other grades also showed growth, although many factors besides the project may have been responsible . The project met its goal of offering 25,000 places for a teacher certification program . A total of 1347 teachers had been certified before project completion, and another 26,025 were enrolled in the four-module course at that time. School development plans were created in 1724 schools, and 1513 of them signed agreements and received resources to fund their own school-based development needs.			
5. Significant Shortcomings (including non-compliance with safeguard policies):			
Though the project was to serve regions of Brazil where poverty was particularly high, it included many schools serving lower-middle class students. Few rural schools were supported. The component focused on training of			

Uncertified teachers was initially underfinanced, because teachers needed more support than had been anticipated . Test scores showed a small but significant drop between 1995 and 2000, possibly because more students who might have dropped out stayed in school and took the test . Some municipalities failed to comply with teacher training participation requirements, thus resulting in fewer trained teachers in their areas . Architectural plans for various types of schools were drawn up but not implemented .

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

- Microplanning, i.e. detailed planning focused on small areas that have distinct problems may be more successful in improving quality of education than wider and more diffused targeting of poor schools.
- When working with state and municipal governments, extra care must be made to recognize early on and incorporate in the design the decisionmaking capacity and efficacy of grassroots organizations, such as parents' associations.
- Empowering schools through direct interventions that are designed to generate greater school commitment to the project's development objectives may motivate and train school staff and parents, who might otherwise remain inactive.

8. Assessment Recommended? Yes No

Why? Part of a Country Assistance Evaluation

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

The ICR is comprehensive and satisfactory .