

Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI)

DFID’s support to education in East Africa: a three-country case study

Inception report

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Background.....	2
3. Purpose	5
4. Relationships to other evaluations/studies	5
5. Methodology	6
6. Roles and Responsibilities	17
7. Management and Reporting	18
8. Expected outputs and timeframe	18
9. Risk and mitigation.....	19
10. How will this ICAI Review make a difference?	19

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ICAI) is the independent body responsible for scrutinising UK aid. We focus on maximising the effectiveness of the UK aid budget for intended beneficiaries and on delivering value for money for UK taxpayers. We carry out independent reviews of aid programmes and of issues affecting the delivery of UK aid. We publish transparent, impartial and objective reports to provide evidence and clear recommendations to support UK Government decision-making and to strengthen the accountability of the aid programme. Our reports are written to be accessible to a general readership and we use a simple 'traffic light' system to report our judgement on each programme or topic we review.
- 1.2. We wish to assess UK-funded support for education in three East African countries. The nature and purpose of this review, together with the main themes and questions it will address, were set out in the Terms of Reference. This Inception Report contains more detailed evaluation questions, mapped against the criteria that will be used to answer them. It sets out the methodology in more detail, identifies the team members and their roles and contains an indicative timeline. It is, however, intended that the methodology and work plan be flexible enough to allow the review to explore new issues and questions emerging over the course of the study.

2. Background

- 2.1. The 2000 World Education Forum concluded that education 'is the key to sustainable development and peace and stability within and among countries, and thus an indispensable means for effective participation in the societies and economies of the twenty-first century'.¹ In that same year, the Millennium Development Goals declared the aims of achieving universal primary education and eliminating gender disparity in all levels of education by 2015.
- 2.2. The benefits of education are widespread and include not just better prospects for those receiving the education but also:
 - **Higher economic growth:** 'No country has ever reduced poverty over the medium term without sustained economic growth. Education plays a critical role in producing the learning and skills needed to generate the productivity gains that fuel growth. One recent research exercise draws attention to the importance for economic growth of both years in school and learning outcomes. Modelling the impact of attainment in fifty countries between 1960 and 2000, the study found that an additional year of schooling lifted average annual gross domestic product (GDP) growth by 0.37%.'
 - **Improved health:** 'The links between education and public health are well established. Improved education is associated with lower levels of child mortality and better nutrition and health, even when controlling for factors such as income.'²
- 2.3. The Millennium Development Goals prompted a global drive on primary education. Many countries abolished primary school fees³ and aid to basic education from all sources has almost doubled since 2002.⁴ Whilst the Department for International Development's (DFID's) policies and strategies now address both access and quality, the main focus has been on expanding primary – and increasingly secondary – education.
- 2.4. This donor focus is reflected in education indicators. Efforts to help developing countries progress towards universal enrolment in primary education have enjoyed considerable success. They have raised educational prospects for girls: from fewer than 50% of girls attending primary school in many developing countries in the mid-1990s, the figures now range from 70-90%.⁵ Other indicators, however, look less promising. Pupil drop-out rates remain high and primary completion rates are still

¹ *Education For All: Meeting Our Collective Commitments*, text adopted by the World Education Forum Dakar, Senegal, 26-28 April 2000, http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/fr/ed_for_all/dakfram_eng.shtml.

² *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2009 – Overcoming inequality: why governance matters*, UNESCO, 2009, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0017/001776/177683e.pdf>.

³ Ethiopia abolished primary school fees in 1994, Tanzania in 2001 and Rwanda in 2004.

⁴ *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011-The hidden crisis: Armed Conflict and Education*, UNESCO, 2011, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001907/190743e.pdf>.

⁵ *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011-The hidden crisis: Armed Conflict and Education*, UNESCO, 2011, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001907/190743e.pdf>.

poor. Although pupil attainment is not easy to measure, the indications are that literacy and numeracy among school leavers are low.⁶

- 2.5. DFID has prioritised increasing coverage of education through to 2015 as part of its commitment to meeting the Millennium Development Goals. Across Africa and Asia, DFID is committed to supporting 9 million children in primary school, 2 million in secondary school (700,000 of whom will be girls) and to train more than 190,000 teachers to improve the quality of education and learning.⁷
- 2.6. This review will evaluate DFID's current activities in the East Africa region, comparing achievements in the education programmes in three countries – Tanzania, Rwanda and Ethiopia – and assessing how well DFID is responding to the challenges outlined above. While the review will look at all aspects of DFID's education programmes in these countries, including the link to employability and job readiness, it will pay particular attention to:
 - promoting gender parity in education;
 - improving secondary enrolment and attainment at both primary and secondary levels; and
 - the effectiveness of traditional education financing and a new approach called results-based aid.

Gender parity in education

- 2.7. The third Millennium Development Goal on promoting gender equality and empowering women has, as its first target, eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education by 2005 and at all levels by 2015. According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), gender parity in education 'is a human right, a foundation for equal opportunity and a source of economic growth, employment creation and productivity'.⁸ In sub-Saharan Africa in 2008, however, there were nearly 29 million children of primary school age out of school, of which 54% were girls.
- 2.8. Progress towards gender parity at the primary school level has been good but 52 countries still have a gender parity index (GPI - the ratio of girls to boys in primary school) of 0.95 or less and 26 have a GPI of 0.90 or less. Ethiopia is in the latter group, with the fourth-highest number of girls out of school in the world (1,250,000). Gender disparity is much starker at the secondary school level and, in Sub-Saharan Africa as a whole, has reduced little over the last ten years.⁹
- 2.9. Low income is the greatest source of disparity in the rates of primary school completion and transition to secondary school.¹⁰ Disadvantages associated with income poverty, location, language and other factors magnify gender disparities. While gaps in school attendance between girls and boys from urban middle-class households are usually small, girls from poor and rural households or ethnic minorities are typically more disadvantaged. In sub-Saharan Africa, there is a 55 percentage point difference between the primary completion rates of students from the top and bottom 20% in household income. Overall, almost half of the world's out-of-school girls can be found in sub-Saharan Africa.¹¹

Improving primary attainment and secondary enrolment and attainment

- 2.10. Primary education is not enough to change the livelihood prospects of children. It is increasingly only with secondary education that improvements in an individual's prospects for employment and social

⁶ *Financing Education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Meeting the challenges of Expansion, Equity and Quality*. UNESCO, 2011.

http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/Finance_EN_web.pdf

⁷ *UK Aid: Changing lives, delivering results*, DFID, 2011, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/mar/BAR-MAR-summary-document-web.pdf>.

⁸ *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011-The hidden crisis: Armed Conflict and Education*, UNESCO, 2011, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001907/190743e.pdf>.

⁹ J Klein & E Porta, *Gender and Education: A Global Report*, State of Education Series, September 2011.

¹⁰ The age at which children enter school also matters. Late entry by over-age children is strongly associated with drop-out. This is also linked to household income level.

¹¹ *The Gender Gap and Education around the World* World Bank, August 2011, <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTEDUCATION/0,,contentMDK:22980046~menuPK:282391~pagePK:64020865~piPK:149114~theSitePK:282386,00.html>.

mobility become significant.¹² Successful secondary education depends, however, on the quality of education at primary level. Making good the failures of the primary level at a later stage – with second chance youth education programmes, for example – is a very costly option. It is crucial, therefore, that the continuing challenges to improving attainment at the primary level are tackled if secondary enrolment and attainment are to be achieved.

- 2.11. Boosting primary enrolment is, therefore, only one part of the challenge. Many countries have struggled to convert surges in enrolment into high levels of progression through the early grades. Rapid increases in enrolment (generally following the abolition of user fees) have often led to acute classroom overcrowding and poor education quality. As a result, many children start school but drop out before completing a full primary cycle. In sub-Saharan Africa, around 10 million children drop out of primary school each year.¹³

Results-based aid

- 2.12. Results-based aid is aid given following the achievement of an agreed set of development results, rather than in advance to cover an agreed set of inputs. It is a relatively new innovation in development finance, designed to maximise development results. It is not a substitute for traditional forms of aid but is additional. It is an approach that potentially offers greater flexibility to the recipients to determine how best to achieve results in their particular context, encouraging innovation. It depends upon robust monitoring arrangements to verify the achievement of results. Possible applications of this approach are currently being explored by various development agencies.¹⁴
- 2.13. DFID is increasingly interested in results-based aid as a means of scaling up aid and achieving more demonstrable results. Piloting results-based aid and cash-on-delivery contracts in three developing countries (including in education) is one of the actions in DFID's *Structural Reform Plan*.¹⁵ Pilots are planned in all three of our case study countries.
- 2.14. A small but notable body of successful examples of this approach in education is emerging to suggest that, along with traditional education financing, results-based programmes may be an efficient way of improving education outcomes. For example:
- Bangladesh's female bursary programme increased girls' secondary enrolment to 3.9 million in 2005 from 1.1 million in 1991. Secondary School Certificate pass rates for girls in the project increased from 39% in 2001 to 63% in 2008;¹⁶ and
 - Mexico's *Oportunidades* cash transfer programme provides grants for children attending school from primary level through to high school. The grants increase as children progress to higher grades and, beginning at the secondary level, are slightly higher for girls than for boys due to the higher drop-out rates among girls. Over the life of the programme, secondary enrolment has increased by more than 20% for girls and 10% for boys.¹⁷
- 2.15. There are risks associated with results-based financing. Even its most ardent advocates acknowledge that giving governments greater discretion over the application of funds for specified results may create perverse incentives and encourage manipulation of the results. It may take too long for results to be manifest or prove too difficult to define the right targets and outcome measures. It may also result in less predictable, more variable, aid if a lack of measurable results leads to reduced levels of aid.

¹² The explanation lies in the formal job market - either skills-biased technical change is driving employers to demand at least secondary school education or the competition for a limited number of jobs enables them to do so. See, for instance, Geeta Kingdon, Justin Sandefur and Francis Teal, *Patterns of Labour Demand in sub-Saharan Africa A Review paper*, February 2005, www.gprg.org/pubs/reports/pdfs/2005-11-kingdon-sandefur-teal.pdf. It may also be a consequence of employers' perceptions of poor quality in primary education.

¹³ *Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2011-The hidden crisis: Armed Conflict and Education*, UNESCO, 2011, <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0019/001907/190743e.pdf>.

¹⁴ Nancy Birdsall, Ayah Mahgoub, and William D. Savedoff, *Cash on Delivery: A New Approach to Foreign Aid*, Centre for Global Development, November 2010, www.cgdev.org/files/1424603_file_CashDelivery_FINAL.pdf.

¹⁵ *Structural Reform Plan Monthly Implementation Update*, DFID, September 2011, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/DFID-SRP-Sept2011.pdf>.

¹⁶ *IDA at Work: Bangladesh-Stipends Triple Girls Access to Schools*, <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/IDA/0,,contentMDK:21227882--menuPK:3266877--pagePK:51236175--piPK:437394--theSitePK:73154,00.html>.

¹⁷ *Shanghai Poverty Conference: Case Study Summary*, World Bank, <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/reducingpoverty/case/119/summary/Mexico-Oportunidades%20Summary.pdf>.

- 2.16. Our review will look at DFID plans for results-based financing in our three case study countries and assess the overall prospects for their success.

Case study countries

- 2.17. Our case study countries will be Ethiopia, Tanzania and Rwanda. Ethiopia abolished school fees for both primary and junior secondary¹⁸ levels in 1994 and has supported education as part of a major national push to reduce poverty and move out of food aid dependency. Rwanda has linked its education strategy to a drive for rapid economic growth and transformation: it abolished primary school fees only in 2003, extending this to junior secondary level in 2009 and upper secondary in 2012. Tanzania abolished primary school fees in 2001 and halved secondary fees in 2005, linking the delivery of education to a process of decentralisation. Rwanda and Tanzania are in receipt of both general and education sector budget support. Ethiopia is supported by a major education quality improvement project. We will compare these approaches and identify where lessons can be learnt from each.
- 2.18. We will use selected key metrics for educational efficiency and outcome measures in each country to compare and contrast the performance of the education sectors against each other (and regional benchmarks) and to highlight anomalies and trends. Using only three, very different, examples means that the results of this data analysis cannot be considered as statistically significant but, substantiated by other qualitative analysis, it should contribute to a deeper understanding of the different country sectors.

3. Purpose

- 3.1. To assess and compare the value for money and effectiveness of DFID's education programmes in Tanzania, Rwanda and Ethiopia and to learn lessons for education programmes more generally, if possible.

4. Relationships to other evaluations/studies

- 4.1. There are few relevant recent DFID-specific education evaluations. The two most relevant are the National Audit Office (NAO) report and DFID's own education portfolio review, both noted below.
- 4.2. NAO published a report on DFID's bilateral aid to primary education in 2010. NAO's head said that 'more emphasis now needs to be placed on quality, attainment and cost-effectiveness... [DFID] needs to do more and to take a tougher, clearer, stance on the importance of cost and service performance information, and in particular indicators of education delivery and attainment if it is to make sure that its contributions achieve the maximum good effect.'¹⁹
- 4.3. DFID undertook its own review of its education portfolio as part of an earlier comprehensive bilateral aid review. These reports and the subsequent Public Accounts Committee (PAC) hearing identified a set of priority areas where DFID needs to improve results and value for money in its education programme. They concluded that DFID should base its education investments on clear evidence of what works, improve the measurement of learning outcomes, increase transparency and accountability and develop quantitative benchmarks, especially for the economy and cost-effectiveness in education systems.
- 4.4. In December 2011, NAO reviewed DFID's interim report to PAC, which marks a half-way point through a two-year improvement plan. The overall conclusion is that 'it shows real progress in 2011 and a positive direction of travel for 2012....There is also a greater sense that value for money data is becoming more used by DFID offices, as opposed to merely existing.'
- 4.5. NAO concludes also, however, that a lot of work is still required with serious data gaps remaining and inconsistencies between countries (especially in measuring attainment) and recommends that PAC continues to press DFID to keep its focus on completing and improving the available data.²⁰

¹⁸ Junior secondary, also known as middle school, is usually the first three years of secondary schooling.

¹⁹ Amyas Morse, head of the National Audit Office, 18 June 2010, http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/1011/dfid_support_to_education.aspx.

²⁰ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmpublic/writev/594/m02.htm>

5. Methodology

- 5.1. We will use the ICAI evaluation framework to review each of the country education programmes. Assessments will be made for each of our questions according to the evaluative criteria set out in the framework below. We will then form a view on the appropriate combined scoring across the three countries for each of our guiding criteria (objectives, delivery, impact and learning), which will in turn inform the overall traffic light score for this report.
- 5.2. We will seek to draw conclusions on the value for money and effectiveness of UK education aid in the East Africa region by comparing the aid spending and educational outcomes in the three countries using the most recently available data. We will also examine DFID's plans for education spending in these countries in the coming three years to assess whether its proposed educational targets are feasible, challenging and consistent with sound unit cost²¹ benchmarks. The aid and country context will, of course, be important in informing such comparisons.
- 5.3. The review will focus on outcomes beyond enrolment – through the stages of attendance, progression and completion – to the desired outcome of attainment of learning, as far as it is possible to assess. We will pay particular attention to the most vulnerable and hard-to-reach children in each country. We will examine how the process of delivering education takes into account the particular challenges of reaching out-of-school children and how successfully UK aid encourages these particular challenges to be addressed. We will draw conclusions and determine lessons for each country programme as well as learning wider lessons for education programmes generally where possible.
- 5.4. The study will systematically identify funding, inputs, activity, outputs and (where they are measurable) outcomes for each programme. For example, we will seek to examine the following aspects of education programmes:

Aspect	Area of interest
Pupils	Enrolment, attendance and retention, progression (to the next level), completion, achievement, impact (all split by gender and primary and secondary levels), child protection
Staffing	Pupil/teacher ratios, qualifications and experience, attendance/absenteeism, assessed quality, relevant training, harassment of female teachers
Consumables	Textbooks, stationery, learning aids, uniforms, shoes
Infrastructure	Availability and quality of facilities, water and sanitation
Costs	Unit costs, with teaching/non-teaching split
Local involvement	Parent-teacher associations, support from and engagement with the community
Monitoring	Use of national and local statistics, mobile technology, community involvement, other
Capacity building	Teachers, support staff, planning
Curriculum	Overall relevance, remedial

- 5.5. Due to constraints of time, the study will primarily draw evidence from currently available data, particularly impact monitoring and evaluation information provided as part of programme reporting. It will, wherever possible, seek to validate such monitoring evidence using third party assessments and through testing and challenging on the ground during our case study country visits.
- 5.6. The evaluation will be conducted over a three-month period in late 2011 and early 2012, supported by preparatory review work.

It will consist of the following phases:

²¹ Education unit costs must be treated with care, even before cross-country comparisons are attempted. The major cost in education is teacher salaries, which are administratively determined as part of public sector pay rates and do not reflect quality or effort. Actual costs of consumables can vary hugely depending on economies of scale and availability of low-cost suppliers.

Phase One: Preliminary Assessment

- a) Compile a comprehensive summary of UK bilateral assistance (from British Aid Statistics) to education in each of the three countries.
- b) Undertake initial summary analysis of the education programmes through a review of DFID project documentation and UK-based key informant interviews, including previous DFID advisers.
- c) Undertake a short review of the latest academic literature on what works to raise attainment in primary and secondary education in developing countries.

Phase Two: Field Work

- a) Conduct semi-structured interviews with development partners, civil society organisations, education specialists, non-state education providers, DFID staff and the central and local government authorities associated with education in each of our study countries (Rwanda, Tanzania, Ethiopia).
- b) Assess impacts on intended beneficiaries and collect other community perspectives, including through visiting schools for which UK aid is provided. We will talk to parent-teacher associations and will seek interviews with other informed stakeholders such as women's groups and teachers' unions, where they exist.
- c) Compile summary education sector situation analysis for each country, including achievements to date, financial forecasts, implied unit costs based on data collected from the governments in each of our study countries (Rwanda, Tanzania, Ethiopia), DFID and other sources of analysis.

Phase Three: Final Analysis

- a) Presentation of initial findings to Commissioners.
- b) Follow-up interviews, fact checking and additional data searching.
- c) Draft report on the basis of feedback.
- d) Revisions and preparation for publication.

In view of our emphasis on impact and intended beneficiary perspectives, we aim to include participatory evaluation approaches wherever possible.

Evaluation Framework

5.8 The evaluation framework for this review is set out in the table below. This has as its basis the standard ICAI guiding criteria and evaluation framework, which are focussed on four areas: objectives, delivery, impact and learning. It also incorporates other pertinent questions we want to investigate in this review. The questions which are highlighted in bold are those on which we will focus in particular, including those set out in the Terms of Reference (ToR). As this is a comparative study, all questions will need to be explored in each case study country in order that variations in outcomes between countries and programmes can be explained as far as possible.

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
1. Objectives: what is the programme trying to achieve?			
<p>Does the programme have clear, relevant and realistic objectives that focus on the desired impact? (1.1)</p> <p>Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (1.2)</p>	<p>Is the assistance based on a strategic, realistic and well-evidenced assessment of options? (ToR 6.3.2)</p> <p>Has the education plan/strategy been assessed for its rationale, coherence, affordability and feasibility?</p> <p>Is there a clear and convincing plan, with evidence and assumptions, to show how the programme will work? (ToR 6.3.1)</p> <p>Has DFID considered a range of options for supporting the education process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal/informal commitment by range of stakeholders to the delivery of the plan • Plans demonstrate a logic chain from enrolment through to pupil/student achievement • Means of securing each element in logic chain is documented • Planning process enabled wide participation from Finance Ministry through key stakeholders including donors • Options for support have been documented • Agreement reached on preferred option(s) • Options discussed with Rwanda, Tanzania and Ethiopia • Options for priorities in Rwanda, Tanzania and Ethiopia considered as part of education planning process • Country-based process led by Rwanda, Tanzania and Ethiopia to secure donor co-ordination and coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID interviews • Education policy documents • Plans for each country • Minutes of meetings, memoranda of understanding, contracts • Review documents including initial assessments • Education strategic and operational plans • Monitoring and evaluation reports • Options review reports • Budget guidelines • Donor co-ordination meetings and minutes • Interviews with local experts and civil society organisations (CSOs)

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (1.3)?	<p>Does the programme complement the efforts of government and other aid providers and avoid duplication? (ToR 6.3.3)</p> <p>Has DFID's preferred option for the programme fully taken into account the country government's ambitions and the contributions from other donors?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning process enabled wide participation from country Finance Ministry and key stakeholders including donors • Evidence of donor adaptation to produce more coherent country-focused funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education policy documents • Review documents including initial assessments • Education strategic and operational plans • Interviews with donors, country Finance Ministry
Are the programme's objectives appropriate to the political, economic, social and environmental context? (1.4)	<p>Is DFID confident that the current plans represent the best way forward on the basis of the available evidence?</p> <p>Does DFID's plan effectively take into account the country context, supported by an effective working relationship with the country government?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial assumptions for education plans consistent with Ministry of Finance • Evidence that country context taken into account • Evidence of effective working relationship with the country government • Evidence of donor adaptation to produce more coherent country-focused funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education policy documents • Plans for each country • Interviews with DFID, donors and country Finance Ministry • Interviews with local experts and CSOs

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
2. Delivery: is the delivery chain designed and managed so as to be fit for purpose?			
<p>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (2.1)</p>	<p>Is the choice of funding and delivery options appropriate? (ToR 6.4.1)</p> <p>Specifically, is the balance of budget support and project spending appropriate? Is it a shared decision of DFID and the country government?</p> <p>Does the budget support process fully support the overall budget allocation process and the education planning process?</p> <p>Is general budget support an adequate aid delivery mechanism for promoting the necessary improvements in education quality? (ToR 6.4.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of link between DFID funding and delivery focus and the key levers of education improvement in Rwanda, Ethiopia and Tanzania • Critical success factors linked to general budget support and project options • Evidence of discussion of alternative shares for budget support and projects, with their relative merits being assessed, including with country government • Evidence that DFID (and DFID Rwanda/Ethiopia/Tanzania shared) priorities influenced the allocation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID documents setting up funding arrangement • Rwanda, Ethiopia and Tanzania commitments linked to funding from DFID and other donors • DFID and Government documents covering the rationale of the general budget support and project targets
<p>Does programme design and roll-out take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries? (2.2)</p>	<p>Does this programme take into account the needs of the intended beneficiaries, using available knowledge and appropriate methods? (ToR 6.4.4)</p> <p>Is DFID confident that the Government has taken into account the needs of all children of primary and secondary school age?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of influence of local participation on education priorities and performance • Analysis of variations between boys/girls, schools/regions, rural/urban 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education policy documents • Plans for each country • Discussions with intended beneficiaries and their communities • Review of work in the area by CODESRIA and its partners in the region

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (2.3)	Is there good governance at all levels, with sound financial management and adequate steps being taken to avoid corruption? (2.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of local participation in management of schools and education Evidence of planning and activity to avoid corruption 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information on School Boards, parent-teacher organisations and community score cards Review of Fiduciary Risk Assessments for education sector and budget support Interviews with CSOs ICAI budget support review findings
<p>Are resources being leveraged so as to work best with others and maximise impact? (2.4)</p> <p>Do managers ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery chain? (2.5)</p> <p>Is there a clear view of costs throughout the delivery chain? (2.6)</p>	<p>Are resources being leveraged so as to maximise impact and provide value for money? (ToR 6.4.3)</p> <p>Has DFID been able to influence the level and use of other funding to increase the impact and value for money?</p> <p>How well do DFID education programmes compare with DFID value for money benchmarks?</p> <p>To what extent are variations from the benchmarks understood and explained by context? Are they prompting a programmatic response?</p> <p>How is such value for money analysis being used in the sector dialogue?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that DFID funding has leveraged additional resources and/or redirected other resources to focus on achievement Evidence of DFID definition of value for money in education Assessment of quality and validity of cost data Evidence of use of cost data in planning and management process Comparison of metrics across the three countries and with regional averages Evidence that joint sector review processes tackle value for money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarks for value for money DFID Education Portfolio Review World Bank SABER tools World Bank Edustats Education for All Annual Global Monitoring Reports
Are risks to the achievement of the objectives identified and managed effectively? (2.7)	Is DFID confident that all relevant information has been taken into account by the Government to secure full inclusion and maximum achievement?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of analysis of recent household surveys, demographic surveys and cost and access surveys informing policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National surveys Donor or Government issue-specific surveys Pupil achievement targets by gender, school and region

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<p>Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (2.8)</p> <p>Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)</p>	<p>Is the programme delivering against its agreed objectives? (2.8)</p> <p>Are appropriate amendments to objectives made to take account of changing circumstances? (2.9)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence that there is a link between DFID funding and the key targets related to student achievement • Evidence that DFID targets, advice or modes of support have changed in response to new policy directions from government, key emerging sector issues or new donor context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with other bilateral donors • Review of DFID project documents
3. Impact: what is the impact on intended beneficiaries?			
<p>Is the programme delivering clear, significant and timely benefits for the intended beneficiaries? (3.1)</p>	<p>What does the available evidence tell us about achievements against the output and outcome indicators? (ToR 6.5.1)</p> <p>Are there regular reports on progress towards targets with full coverage of the agreed indicators?</p> <p>What is DFID's role in securing the most appropriate data and analysis?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output/outcome maps (or similar mechanism) available for all key outcomes • Evidence that education priorities driven by focus on student results • Evidence that the education is relevant and improving life options and progress • Any evidence that the education programmes are being distorted to reinforce corrupt regimes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual reports on student performance data • Analytical reports examining coherence of performance across outputs and outcomes • Interviews with parents, teachers and village committees

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)	<p>Is the programme working holistically alongside other programmes? (3.2)</p> <p>Does DFID have a role, along with other donors, in reviewing progress and securing accountability at various levels in the education system?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that sector review process reviews indicators for improvement in accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint sector review monitoring framework and minutes of meetings
Is there a long-term and sustainable impact from the programme? (3.3)	<p>What is the long-term and sustainable impact of the programme? What are the prospects for improvement, including assuring financial sustainability and local ownership? (ToR 6.5.2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable plans for DFID projects post DFID funding in place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer-term finance plans Action plans for improved performance External evaluations and other analyses of DFID
Is there an appropriate exit strategy involving effective transfer of ownership of the programme? (3.4)	<p>Does the Government have clear plans for financial sustainability given the current levels of budget support?</p> <p>What are the future plans for DFID-funded projects?</p> <p>What are the longer-term issues related to budget support in education?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer-term plans for sustainability in place (up to ten years) Education longer-term plans confirmed by Ministry of Finance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Longer-term finance plans and other documents in relation to these plans

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
<p>Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (3.5)</p>	<p>Is there transparency and accountability to intended beneficiaries, donors and UK taxpayers? (ToR 6.5.3)</p> <p>Do the annual reports and other reports for education cover all the essential aspects for local and international accountability?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action plans to improve performance based on reviews • DFID contributing to review process • Coverage of annual reports and other progress review reports, aligned to original targets and scope of plans • Reports distributed to all stakeholders, as appropriate • School and area annual reporting process • Feedback from annual reports influences future decision making • Review process involving donors • Extent of scrutiny or review by national institutions such as parliament, selection committees and audit offices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID documents recording engagement • National public expenditure plans • Annual Reports • Review reports on targets and performance • Reporting process documents for local accountability and feedback • Meetings with donors to review progress and value for money • Parliamentary records • Interviews with intended beneficiaries

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
4. Learning: what works and what needs improvement?			
<p>Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (4.1)</p>	<p>Are there appropriate arrangements for monitoring inputs, processes, outputs, results and impact? (ToR 6.6.1)</p> <p>Does DFID have a comprehensive checklist against which national plans can be examined?</p> <p>Are there arrangements for monitoring and evaluation in relation to outputs, outcomes and impact?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government process for generating monitoring and evaluation information with full coverage and timeliness • Working arrangement for sharing monitoring/evaluation data with all relevant stakeholders? • Feedback mechanism for conclusions from monitoring/evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff with monitoring and evaluation roles • Annual cycle of review meetings for full range of stakeholders • DFID documents and meetings with Government • Government documents
<p>Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (4.2)</p>	<p>Is there evidence of innovation and use of global best practice? (ToR 6.6.2)</p> <p>Is there a feedback mechanism to change plans and actions emanating from the monitoring and review?</p> <p>Do Rwanda, Ethiopia and Tanzania Ministries of Education have processes for identifying/ accessing innovation and best practice, both global and local? And then implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of local best practice and system for access • Source of innovation in education provision • List of global best practice system for access • Evidence of implementation of innovations and best practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of meetings indicating priorities from feedback • Government documents

Relevant ICAI Evaluation Framework Questions	Review Questions	Criteria for Assessment	Sources of Evidence
Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (4.3)	<p>Is there anything currently not being done in respect of the programme that should be undertaken? (ToR 6.6.3)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action list for DFID 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual plans and sources of action • DFID plans • Evidence from different stakeholders • Evidence of required improvements from governments, intended beneficiaries or their communities
Have lessons about the objectives, design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (4.4)	<p>Have lessons about the design and delivery of the programme been learned and shared effectively? (ToR 6.6.4)</p> <p>Are lessons in design and delivery shared with DFID HQ and / or other DFID national offices?</p> <p>Are lessons in design and delivery identified and shared by the ministry of education with other national education ministries?</p> <p>Does DFID have a local arrangement for securing an understanding of the monitoring and evaluation processes for education? Sharing the information and conclusions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learnt identified • Action plans for lessons learnt • Examples of regional networks for learning • Specific examples of lessons adopted • Evidence of improvement in ministerial monitoring and evaluation approaches 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID plans • DFID documents and meetings with Government • Conferences, papers shared

6. Roles and Responsibilities

KPMG will provide oversight of this review under the overall leadership of the ICAI Project Director. Supplementary analysis and peer review will be provided by CEGA and Agulhas Consulting.

The review will use a four-person core team, with selected additional support as follows:

Team member	Role
Team Leader	Team Leader (core team)
Team member 1	Education systems specialist (core team)
Team member 2	Education finance specialist (core team)
Team member 3	Research (core team)
Team member 4	Evaluation Adviser/research supervisor
Team member 5	Peer challenge and support
Team member 6	Analytical support and quality assurance
Team member 7	Tanzania case study support
Team member 8	Rwanda case study support

Team leader

She is an Associate of Agulhas Applied Knowledge. She is an economist specialising in health, education and labour market economics. She has over 20 years' experience in all aspects of international development from strategy development to evaluation.

Team member 1

He has been an independent consultant for 19 years, assisting a wide range of organisations in transition and developing countries to undergo change to produce improved budgeting and value for money and strategic planning. He has been a technical adviser to Ministries of Education, Finance and Labour. He is the team's education systems specialist.

Team member 2

She is a principal consultant at KPMG South Africa. She has worked continuously in the education sector in South Africa for the past five years. This has included analysing financial trends and operational risks and conducting performance audits. She will be the team's education finance specialist.

Team member 3

He is a PhD student and Fulbright Scholar at the University of California, Berkeley. His specialism is advanced applied econometrics and the economics of education. He is experienced in conducting extensive literature reviews, formulating theory, analysing large datasets and identifying statistical relationships. He will assist the team in collating, analysing and interpreting education data.

Team member 4

She is a multidisciplinary international development specialist with significant experience in evaluating global health and education, microfinance and microenterprise development. She has eight years in the NGO sector and three years working in international banking. She is experienced in impact evaluation, programme management, grant-making, foreign investment and translating research into policy outcomes. She will support and supervise the CEGA researcher and provide links to the research and evaluation literature and community in East Africa.

Team member 5

He is the Evaluation Lead for the ICAI consortium. He will provide quality assurance and support to analysis and report drafting.

Team member 6

She is Principal International Consultant at the CfBT Education Trust and a member of the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) Working Group on Education and Fragility. She has extensive experience in research on the financing of large-scale educational reform in fragile and conflict-affected states. She worked for two years as an ODI fellow at the Rwanda Ministry of Education. She will provide analytical support to the team and quality assurance of the final report.

Team member 7

She is a development consultant in Rwanda with over 15 years' experience in Sub-Saharan Africa and Tanzania on major international donor projects, with specific expertise in gender analysis, child development, education in developing countries and the design, monitoring and evaluation of development programmes. She will provide detailed local knowledge and assist with identifying information and contacts in Tanzania.

Team member 8

She is a development consultant in Rwanda with over 15 years' experience in Kigali on major international donor projects, with specific expertise in impact evaluations, the design, monitoring and evaluation of development programmes and gender issues. She will provide detailed local knowledge and assist with identifying information and contacts in Rwanda.

7. Management and Reporting

- 7.1. A first draft report will be produced for review by the Secretariat and Commissioners by the end of January 2012, followed by revision and review prior to completion and sign off by early March 2012.

8. Expected outputs and timeframe

Phase	Timetable
Planning Agreed finalised Inception Report	December 2011
Preliminary Assessment and Fieldwork Rwanda country visit UK-based interviews Detailed description of country programmes, country context, evaluation synthesis and refinement of methodology Ethiopia country visit Tanzania country visit	21 -25 November 2011 By 10 December 2011 By 24 December 2011 9-13 January 2012 16-20 January 2012
Analysis and write-up Presentation of initial findings to Commissioners First draft of report Final report	2 February 2012 By 10 February 2012 By 1 March 2012

9. Risk and mitigation

9.1. The main risks to completing a satisfactory review are:

Risk	Level of risk	Specific Issues	Mitigation
Lack of comparable data on key review questions	Medium/high	<p>Datasets may be available by country but not directly comparable</p> <p>Gender and minority disaggregated data and impact data often lacking</p>	<p>Ensure reasons for non-comparability are fully understood, tested and explained in the report</p> <p>Use proxy datasets</p> <p>Be evidence-based in our conclusions, triangulating with other sources of evidence</p>
Intended beneficiary voices partial or anecdotal	Medium	<p>Inability to meet excluded groups</p> <p>Tendency to hear only service users' views (not non-users)</p>	<p>Ensure field visits cover different regions and groups</p> <p>Contact non-service users, making sure to talk to them during field visits</p>

10. How will this ICAI Review make a difference?

10.1. This review will be a contribution to DFID's key organisational challenge of scaling up aid to education while also shifting its focus to improve educational outcomes rather than just enrolment. We will test current plans in each country against newly gathered data and fresh analysis. We will provide an independent assessment of traditional education financing and a potential new tool (results-based aid) to deliver some long-standing objectives. We will facilitate lesson-learning in particular across the three case study countries and across DFID. Our recommendations may contribute to achieving Millennium Development Goal 3.