**monitoring and evaluation plan**

1. **Introduction**
   1. The overall goal of this multi-phased program is to increase the learning outcomes of students in the education system of Suriname from pre-primary through junior secondary education nationally. The program objective is to improve the internal efficiency and quality of education by implementing a new basic education cycle, and supporting policy changes required to achieve the objective.
   2. The program monitoring and evaluation system will be based on the program’s Results Framework and include the involvement of Ministry of Education and Community Development (MOECD) and Program Management Unit (PMU) staff. The Research and Planning (R&P) Department of the MOECD will be directly involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the program from its inception. While the PMU ultimately is responsible for the M&E and reporting of the program, the R&P Department will be responsible for supporting the PMU in the process. Such support may include: (i) developing M&E instruments for the program; (ii) conducting monitoring visits; (iii) collecting and analyzing data related to program indicators; and (iv) assisting in evaluation of program initiatives. Specific roles of the PMU and R&P Department will be clarified in the Operational Manual.
2. **Monitoring**
   1. **Indicators**

2.1 Based on the complete results matrix of the project, the monitoring will consider the following indicators.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2-1. Monitoring Indicators** | | | |
| **Indicator** | **Formula** | **Frequency of Measurement** | **Source of Verification** |
| **Outcome Level** |  |  |  |
| 1. Dropout rates in grades 3 to 5. | Percentage decrease | Annual | MOECD Yearbook of Statistics. |
| 1. Learning outcomes in grades 3 and 7 in Dutch and mathematics. | Percentage increase | Annual | Exam results are compared to students not using the revised curriculum. The baseline will be the exam scores taken at the end of the 2009-2010 school year. |
| 1. Student repetition rates in grades 3-5. | Percentage decrease | Annual | MOECD Yearbook of Statistics. Baseline per grade: grade 3: 19%; grades 4 and 5: 17%. |
| 1. Promotion rates. | Percentage increase | Annual | MOECD Yearbook of Statistics. Baseline will be taken from R&P Department in 2010-2011 school year. |
| 1. Primary education completion rate. | Percentage increase | Annual | MOECD Yearbook of Statistics. The current completion rate is 50%. |
| 1. Student performance in grades 3 and 7. | Percentage increase | Annual | Data from Testing and Assessment Department on exams.  Exam results are compared to students not using the revised curriculum (Phase II schools). The baseline will be the exam scores taken at the end of the 2009-2010 school year. |
| **Output Level** |  |  |  |
| 1. Curriculum for grades 3 to 6 approved. | Approved curriculum for grades 3 - 6 | Annual | MOECD acceptance and certification of curricula.  Curriculum revision includes completion of curriculum guides, learning lines and teaching materials for grades 3 to 6. |
| 1. Pilot of curriculum for grades 4-8 completed. | Completed pilot of curriculum for grades 4 - 8 | Annual | Consultancy evaluation reports. MOECD certification.  Pilots will be conducted in 30 schools per grade (approximately 10% sample). |
| 1. # of teachers trained in using new teaching methodology. | Number of teachers benefiting from training programs | Annual | Consultancy reports. Research and Planning (R&P) department records. |
| 1. Strategic plan to reform junior secondary grades developed. | Completed Strategic Plan | Year 3 | Plan approved by the MOECD. |
| 1. # of new public schools built and equipped. | Number of schools built | Annual | Report from Supervision consultant. MOECD Technical Department and Bureau of Interior records. |
| 1. # of MOECD staff complete training in relevant topics. | Number of beneficiaries of training programs | Annual | Consultancy reports from the training. MOECD department records. |
| 1. EMIS hardware installed and functional at MOECD R&P Department. | EMIS System installed | Year 3 | Consultancy report, and verified by R&P Department. |
| 1. # of public information campaigns (i.e. newspapers ads, TV, seminars, etc.) regarding program progress. | Public Information campaign launched | Annual | Report from the consultant, R&P Department, Communication. |
| 1. # of selected schools connected to student performance tracking system of EMIS. | Number of schools with functioning and using EMIS system | Year 3 | 30 schools in the Interior  Verified by R&P Department and formative evaluation. |

* 1. **Data collection and instruments**
  2. Sources of information will be the following:
* Data for outcome indicators 1, 3, 4, and 5 will be collected from the annual MOECD Yearbook of Statistics. The new Monitoring and Evaluation system and strengthening
* Data for outcome indicators 1 will be collected from exam results through the administrative reports at the MOECD Examination Bureau.
* Data for outcome indicator 6 will be collected from the Testing and Assessment Department. The results will be compared to that of students not using the revised curriculum.
* Data for output indicators1–9 will be based on MOECD reports and where applicable findings from consultancy reports. In addition the MOECD will provide letters of acceptance for final works from consultancy services for goods and services.
* In addition to the letter of acceptance for all other output indicators (documents delivered and approved, equipment installed, human resources trained), the source of information will be on-site visual inspections with progress reported in the semi-annual progress reports of the Project Executing Unit.

2.3 The PMU will be directly responsible for the monitoring of the program with assistance from R&P.

* 1. **Reporting**
  2. The Second Basic Education Improvement Program (BEIP) – Phase I project unit will prepare and transmit to the Bank a biannual activity progress report that will include the results of the monitoring of all the indicators listed above. The preparation by the PMU and the Bank’s approval of these reports is a contractual condition of the Loan. At the end of the project (Y4), the PMU will prepare a final transition report.
  3. These reports will provide all the required information for the PMR system of the Bank, to be updated on a biannual basis by the specialist in charge, one month after the receipt of the BEIP PMU reports.
  4. The estimated dates for publication of the monitoring results are the following.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 2-2: Publication of monitoring results** | |
| **REPORTING** | **ESTIMATED DATE** |
| PMU report for semester 1 | 28 February, 2013[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| PMU report for year 1 (S1-S2) | 31 August 2013 |
| PMU report for semester 3 | 28 February, 2014 |
| PMU report for year 2 (S3-S4) | 31 August 2014 |
| PMU report for semester 5 | 28 February, 2015 |
| PMU report for year 3 (S5-S6) | 31 August 2015 |
| PMU report for semester 7 | 29 February, 2016 |
| PMU report for year 4 (S7-S8) and final transition report | 30 June 2016 |
| XPMR prepared by IDB | 30 June 2016 |

* 1. **Monitoring Coordination, Work Plan and Budget**
  2. Table 3 provides details on the responsible entities for the implementation of the monitoring plan, monitoring activities, budgetary allocations to each activities and source of funding.
  3. The total cost of the monitoring and evaluation plan is estimated at US$326,000. It will be entirely covered by the loan resources. The costs to FTEs from the PMU are compensated through PCU administration.

**Table 2-3: Monitoring and Evaluation Work Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activities | Year 1 | | | | Year 2 | | | | Year 3 | | | | Year 4 | | | | Responsible | Cost[[2]](#footnote-2) (US$) | Funding |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  |
| Establish M&E Unit within the MOECD R&P. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Consulting firm | 20,000 | SU-L1019 |
| Develop an M&E Plan. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Consulting firm | 20,000 | SU-L1019 |
| Train R&P and PMU staff in Manual use. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Consulting firm | 26,000 | SU-L1019 |
| Develop reporting, monitoring and communication mechanism. Utilize mechanism once developed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PMU |  | SU-L1019 |
| Develop annual work plans and progress reports for all Heads of Department involved in BEIP and the R&P Department of the MOECD. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PMU |  | SU-L1019 |
| Visual observation of outputs. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PMU |  | SU-L1019 |
| Procurement process and contract monitoring of the impact evaluation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PMU | 80,000 | SU-L1019 |
| Procurement process and contract monitoring of the mid-term evaluation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 60,000 |  |
| Procurement process and contract monitoring of the final evaluation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120,000 |  |
| General reporting. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PMU |  | SU-L1019 |

**Total direct cost: US$ 326,000**

1. **Economic Evaluation (Ex-Ante)**
2. **Components 1 and 2. Improve student learning outcomes in basic education and establish bilingual education in the interior**
   1. This program aims to support the MOECD in establishing a Basic Education Cycle and improving its quality and efficiency by developing a new and updated curriculum for pre‑primary, primary and junior secondary education. In Phase I, the program will finance: redesigning the curriculum for grades 5 to 8, including all accompanying textbooks and teaching materials with an emphasis in arithmetic and Dutch; reforming the examination system accordingly; improving teacher performance through education and training, including approaches to teach students of varying abilities and challenges; and designing bilingual education strategies for the interior. By the end of the program, the following are expected: (i) a decrease in the dropout rate from 7% to 5% in grades 3 and 4,[[3]](#footnote-3) and from 8% to 6% in grade 5; (ii) decrease repetition rates from 19% to 15% in grade 3 and from 17% to 13% in grades 4 and 5; and (iii) increase the completion rate in primary school from 50% to 60%; and decrease average class size in 20 selected overcrowded schools from 45 to 30.
   2. **Ex–ante analysis.** The evaluation will consist of establishing a monetary value to the cost efficiency ratio of the program. The costs for the intervention will be compared with the benefit value of reducing repetition and dropout rates and increasing the completion rate. The comparison will take place using the results of a synthetic cohort analysis and comparing different scenarios.
   3. **Results.** Based on the school statistics for public and private schools provided by the MOECD, a synthetic cohort analysis was calculated for grades 3 to 8 (primary education) with the results shown in Table 3-1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 3-1: Analysis of synthetic cohort** | |
| a. Enrollment in grade 3 (grade 1 in the old system) | 1,000 |
| b. Promotion to grade 9. Proxy for primary graduates | 981.78 |
| c. Promotion to grade 9 w/o repeating | 318.42 |
| d. Total drop-outs | 11.15 |
| e. Total student-years | 7,050.86 |
| f. Student-years for students that are promoted to grade 9 | 6,977.84 |
| g. Average # of years needed to complete School for those that finish grade 8 | 7.11 |
| h. Average # of years attended by drop-outs | 6.55 |
| i. Student -years required to produce one student promotion to grade 9 | 7.18 |
| j. Input/output ratio (measure of "wastage") | 1.1970 |
| k. Percent of enrollments that are promoted to 9th grade | 0.98 |

* 1. The measure of wastage, although rather conservative, shows that the system loses around 20% of effort in inefficiencies. The annual value of wastage can be measured in different ways, In this case, the approach taken starts with the estimate of the annual cost to the Government of Suriname (GOS) of a primary student. It is assumed that the GDP per capita for 2009 is US$6,254, and 5% of it goes to primary education giving a cost per year of US$313 per student. Table 1 shows that, on average, a 6 year cycle takes 7.18 years to complete, an extra 1.18 years than necessary. If we consider that the program will conservatively improve the inefficiency by only a quarter, and recognizing that in the public system there are 5,624 students in grade 8, then the benefit will be US$519,564 per year.
  2. The estimated cost refers to the financial cost to the GOS of the intervention in Components 1 and 2. Table 3-2 shows the cost per year in the four years of the program, with interest accrued per year, annual principal payment and outstanding debt by the end of the year, all of this for the first six years of schooling. This was calculated considering a four year grace period, 20 year loan and a nominal interest rate of 1.32% including spread, Libor adjustable every three months.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 3-2: Cost per year** | | | | | | |
|  | **2012** | **2013** | **2014** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** |
| **Costs for curriculum + interior** | **580,000** | **2,723,000** | **2,489,000** | **708,000** | 0 | 0 |
| **Outstanding debt at start of year** | 0 | 580,000 | 3,310,656 | 5,843,357 | 6,628,489 | 6,336,720 |
| **Interest accrued** |  | 7,656 | 43,701 | 77,132 | 87,496 | 83,645 |
| **Annual repayment installment** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 379,265 | 379,265 |
| **Principal repayment** |  |  |  |  | 291,769 | 295,621 |
| **Outstanding debt at end of year** | 580,000 | 3,310,656 | 5,843,357 | 6,628,489 | 6,336,720 | 6,041,099 |
| **Debt financing** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **379,265** | **379,265** |
| **Benefits: wastage reduction** | **0** | **0** | **129,891** | **259,782** | **389,673** | **519,564** |
| **Stream** | **0** | **0** | **129,891** | **259,782** | **10,408** | **140,299** |

* 1. **Conclusion**. Based on the analysis, the Net Present Value (NPV) for the stream of income after the program is US$2,677,544. The present value of costs is lower than the Present value of benefits, with a Cost/Benefit ratio of 1.37. It will take almost 12.5 years to recuperate the principal (US$6.5 million) with the stream of savings of US$519,564 per year.

1. **Component 3. Increase access to education and improve MOECD facilities**
   1. This component will focus on the construction of four (4) new schools, primarily to include grades 1-2, 9-11 and to decrease school over crowdedness in the surrounding area. Multimedia Centers will be constructed in each of the new schools to contribute to the continued professional development of teachers and modernize students learning with the use of Information Communication Technology (ICT). By the end of the program an increase in access to junior secondary grades of 12%, and an increase of the completion rate through grade 8 by 10% are expected.
   2. **Ex–ante methodology.** The methodology will focus on the schools selected to be beneficiaries of the Program, and the location and size of the new schools, considering the national standard for the student/teacher ratio per classroom ratio. Calculations made include the construction cost for the new schools to be built in the interior (including the cost of a multimedia center) and the number of student beneficiaries of the new construction considering a student/teacher ratio of 35. Given that all of these schools will be in the interior, proper accommodations for teachers and principals will be built. All of them will also have principal office, and a basketball court. The larger schools will have a teacher’s lounge. With a total investment of US$4.23 million there will be an increase in 1,330 slots for students in schools in the interior.
   3. According to the literature, a cohort of young people who leave secondary school early will have lower earning and productivity over their lifetimes than they would have if they had finished their secondary education.[[4]](#footnote-4) This lower productivity translates to lower output, and the value of this foregone output over the cohort’s lifetime is equal to 12.7% of the value of GDP for a given year for Trinidad and Tobago (Suriname is not in the list of countries studied). This means a reduction in annual GDP of 0.36 percentage points per year for the next 35 years. For Suriname, we conservatively took half of this amount or 0.18 percentage points. According to WB/WDI,[[5]](#footnote-5) Suriname had a GDP of US$3,251 million in 2009. Considering that the Total Gross Enrollment rate in 2009 (the last year where information is available) was 90%,[[6]](#footnote-6) and that the number of students enrolled in Lower Secondary education for the same year was 34,707, the dropout rate would be 10% conservatively, or 3,471 drop outs from Junior Secondary School (OJS). Using these numbers, we can calculate the loss to Society (LTS) per dropout per year:

*LTS* = GDP\*0.18%/OJS

* 1. The loss to society is US$1,700 per dropout. That, number is then multiplied by the number of students Saved from being Dropouts (SFD) because of the new schools (7% of the enrollment in those schools) to determine the Gain to Society (GTS) per year for having the students stay in school. The GTS for these four schools in Suriname is US$141,579 per year.

*GTS* = LTS\*1330\*SFD

* 1. As a result of the new schools, transportation costs will decrease adding another savings to the MOECD. In the interior, a conservative measure for transportation costs is 50 US cents per day round trip per student. Based on a school year of 180 days, the cost per student per year for transportation is US$90. This amount times the number of students attending the new schools equals an annual savings of US$119,700.
  2. Dividing the amount of the principal (US$4,230,000) by the sum of the annual benefits results in a ratio of 12.5 years; the time necessary to recover the principal.
  3. Considering a loan for the total amount given with a nominal interest rate of 1.32% Libor adjustable every three months, repayable in 20 years with a grace period of four years, the debt financing would be US$248,984 per year.
  4. **Conclusion.** Considering the stream of benefits minus costs, with an end of period salvage value for the construction of 31.28% (12.5 years of the 40 year life expectancy of the construction), the NPV equals US$2,397,790. The cost/benefit analysis ratio equals 1.12, which is a good return on the investment.

1. **Impact Evaluation (Ex-Post)**
   1. The goal of this evaluation is to analyze if changes in efficiency and in academic results are positive, continuous and sustainable, using econometrics as a tool.

**1 Component 1 and Component 2**

* 1. These two components will utilize the same evaluation methodology. The Program will perform two complementary evaluations, one is qualitative and the other quantitative. The **qualitative** evaluation will include interviews, focus groups and classroom observations and focus on determining the link between the outputs (especially in the classroom) and the related expected outcomes. Specifically, the evaluation will focus on: (i) determining if teaching approaches mirror the methodologies covered during training; (ii) assess the effectiveness of follow up support offered to teachers; and (iii) establish if textbooks and teaching and learning materials have been distributed to students and teachers.
  2. Two **quantitative** evaluations of these components will be conducted. The first evaluation for Phase I will be measured using the internal efficiency indicators for grades 3 – 5; in Phase II grades 7 – 9 will be included. Key variables to be measured include enrollment, repetition and promotion rates, measured at the end of each school year and the beginning of the following one.
  3. Secondly, a random, stratified (three regions) representative sample will be used to evaluate a pilot for the **curriculum** per grade. Education quality will be evaluated based on the new examination system applied to students in 30 schools each following the schedule of the table below. In the Table 4-1, the numbers are the correspondent grades; and the letters mean C = Comparison; E = Experimental; N = National expansion to all schools.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4-1:Timeline for the curriculum pilot** | | | | | | | |
| Group 1 | Year 2 | 3 E | 4 E |  |  |  |  |
| Year 3 | 3 N | 4 N | 5 E | 6 E |  |  |
| Year 4 | 3 N | 4 N | 5 N | 6 N | 7 E | 8 E |
| Group 2 | Year 2 | **3 C** | **4 C** |  |  |  |  |
| Year 3 | 3 N | 4 N | **5 C** | **6 C** |  |  |
| Year 4 | 3 N | 4 N | 5 N | 6 N | 7 C | 8 C |

* 1. The number of 30 schools represents approximately 10% of the 328 primary schools in the country. Each stratum will have a number of schools that will be proportional to the total quantity of primary schools in the region. The schools will be selected randomly within each stratum. For example, the 30 schools in Group 1 will be divided proportionally to the number of schools in the three regions. Assuming that 12 schools are selected in Paramaribo, 10 in the Coastal Area and eight in the interior, each subset will be chosen randomly. The same procedure will be applied for Group 2. The schools will be assigned to the experimental and control groups during the first year of the program.
  2. The evaluation will concentrate on learning achievements in the core courses, namely arithmetic and Dutch. The first pilot, which will focus only on grades 3 and 4will start in the second year of the Program (2013-2014) and expand to all primary schools in the 2014-2015 school year. For grades 5 and 6 the pilot will be conducted in year three of the program (2014-2015) and will be expanded nationally in the following year, which is the last year of Phase I. Simultaneously, during the last year of Phase I (2015-2016) the program will run the pilot for the curriculum for grades 7 and 8, which will be expanded under Phase II of BEIP. Students in all grades included in the pilot as experimental or comparison groups will take the correspondent exam for their grade at the beginning and end of the school year. For example, for grades 3 and 4, the exams prepared will be administered in October 2013 and again,
  3. to the same students (experimental and comparison groups), at the end of the school year, June 2014. This methodology has the dual purpose of gauging the grade level contents students know at the beginning of the school year compared to the end of the year. Doing so will facilitate the calibration of the results of those subject to the experimental group compared to those in the comparison group.
  4. The analysis will also control for students’ socioeconomic characteristics, regions, and the academic proficiency of school teachers and principals and/or hours of training received. The socioeconomic characteristics will be gathered through a simplified form that will be developed during the first year of the program, distributed by the schools, completed by parents/guardians and returned to schools. Teachers’ characteristics will be collected by professionals contracted for this purpose. All the information will be stored in a database and will include all the students participating in the pilot, whether in the experimental or comparison groups, identified by name, school, grade, and teacher to facilitate the analysis.
  5. The ICT education model will be a separate analysis from the curriculum design. The design will be finalized after the first year, when the study shows the different modalities that will be experimented.

**2 Component 3**

* 1. The evaluation of this component will: (i) verify the completion of school construction, including the delivery of furniture, equipment and materials; (ii) verify that appropriate building material are utilized for the interior, and environmental and social issues addressed; and (iii) assess the involvement of local stakeholders in the process. A quantitative evaluation will be conducted to evaluate: (i) decrease in overcrowded schools where new facilities are built; and (ii) increase in access to schooling.

**3 Component 4**

* 1. A qualitative evaluation for this component will be utilized. The program will have a baseline and annual measurements in at least 30 schools regarding the number of hours that: (i) students and teachers are at school in that day; (ii) students and teachers are in the classroom per day; (iii) the teachers spend on teaching; and (iv) percent of teachers using the EMIS to track student progress and develop student work plans. Also the number of MOECD departments that incorporate monitoring and evaluation functions into their work will be assessed.
  2. The power calculations will be performed in semester 1 of the program based on data collected from the R&P and where not available from field work.
  3. **Midterm.** MOECD will receive technical assistance to develop a monitoring and evaluation strategy for the program to guide implementation and for developing program details for Phase II.
  4. Loan resources will finance an external midterm formative evaluation. The formative evaluation, in addition to analyzing progress towards achieving planned outputs, will analyze bottlenecks in the implementation process, suggest solutions to these challenges and recommend program modifications based on lessons learned during the review period.
  5. MOECD will receive technical assistance to develop comprehensive evaluations to inform Phase II of the Program. Among the innovative features included in this operation are: (i) curriculum evaluation of the previous grade; (ii) evaluation and documentation of experiences and lessons learned on the TRC use; and (iii) monitoring and evaluation of improvement projects offered to schools.
  6. **Final Evaluation.** A final program evaluation will be conducted at the end of Phase I and Phase II of the program using loan resources. An ex-post evaluation will be conducted 12 to 18 months after the end of Phase II using counterpart resources.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4-2: Chronogram of evaluation activities** | | | | |
| **Study/evaluation** | **Start date** | **End date** | **Responsible** | **Comments** |
| **Components 1 and 2** | | | | |
| Design of curriculum and exams for Grades 3 and 4 | June 2012 | June 2013 | MOECD/PMU, Consultants and R&P Department |  |
| Design/Preparation of random stratified sample for Grades 3, 4, 5 and 6 | June 2012 | June 2013 | MOECD/PMU, R&P Dept, Bureau of interior | Preparation is for curriculum and Bilingual Education. Sample is for experimental and comparison groups |
| Quantitative assessment of sample for Curriculum Grades 3 and 4 | Oct 2014 Jun 2015 | Nov 2014 Jul 2015 | PMU, Curriculum Dept, Bureau of interior, R&P Dept. | Assessment at the beginning and at the end of the school year |
| Qualitative Evaluation for curriculum Grades 3 and 4 | Oct 2013 | Jun 2014 | MOECD/PMU, R&P Dept. |  |
| Design of curriculum and exams for Grades 5 and 6 | March 2013 | March 2014 | MOECD/PMU, Consultants and R&P Department |  |
| Quantitative assessment of sample for Curriculum Grades 5 and 6 | Oct 2015 Jun 2016 | Nov 2015 Jul 2016 | PMU, Curriculum Dept, Bureau of interior, R&P Dept. | Assessment at the beginning and at the end of the school year |
| Qualitative Evaluation for curriculum Grades 5 and 6 | Oct 2014 | Jun 2015 | MOECD/PMU, R&P Dept. |  |
| Design of curriculum and exams for Grades 7 and 8 | March 2014 | March 2015 | MOECD/PMU, Consultants and R&P Department |  |
| Qualitative Evaluation for curriculum Grades 7 and 8 | Oct 2015 | Apr 2016 | MOECD/PMU, R&P Dept. |  |
| Qualitative Evaluation for ICT in Education for selected grades with pilot | Oct 2014 | Jun 2015 | MOECD/PMU, R&P Dept. |  |
| Internal Efficiency study | Jan 2016 | Jun 2016 | MOECD/PMU, R&P Dept. | Data from end cycle 2013 and beginning 2014 |
| **Component 3** | | | | |
| Infrastructure baseline | July 2012 | Dec 2012 | MOECD/PMU, Bureau of Interior, R&P Dept. |  |
| New construction Interior | Oct 2015 | Dec 2015 | MOECD/PMU, Bureau of interior, R&P Dept. |  |
| **Component 4** | | | | |
| Qualitative Evaluation | Annually Jan 2013 | Jan 2016 | MOECD/PMU, Bureau of interior, R&P Dept. |  |
| Mid-term evaluation | Apr 2014 | Aug 2014 | R&P Dept. |  |
| Final evaluation Phase I | Jan 2016 | Apr 2016 | R&P Dept. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 4-3: Chronogram of main activities** | | | | |
| **Study/evaluation** | **Start date** | **End date** | **Responsible** | **Comments** |
| Bilingual education models | Dec 2012 | Aug 2014 | Bureau of interior MOECD/PMU |  |
| Pilot study for bilingual education | Oct 2013 | Jun 2014 | PMU, Curriculum Dept, Bureau of interior, R&P Dept. |  |
| Pilot studies of curriculum (grades 3-4) | Oct 2013 | Jun 2014 | PMU, Curriculum Dept, R&P Dept. |  |
| Pilot studies of curriculum (grades 5-6) | Oct 2014 | Jun 2015 | PMU, Curriculum Dept, R&P Dept. |  |
| Pilot studies of curriculum (grades 7-8) | Oct 2015 | Jun 2016 | PMU, Curriculum Dept, R&P Dept. |  |
| Feasibility of construction in interior (environmental and social assessment) | April 2012 | Jun 2012 | MOECD/PMU, Bureau of interior |  |
| New school construction | June 2012 | June 2015 | MOECD/PMU, Bureau of interior |  |
| Assessment of ICT options for the interior | Dec 2012 | Aug 2014 | MOECD/PMU, R&P Dept. |  |
| Assessment of junior secondary education | Dec 2013 | Mar 2013 | R&P Dept. |  |
| EMIS implementation, expansion | Feb 2013 | May 2014 | PMU, R&P Dept. |  |
| Capacity development of MOECD staff | Dec 2012 | Feb 2016 | PMU, MOECD Departments |  |
| Mid-term evaluation | Mar 2014 | Oct 2014 | R&P Dept. |  |
| Final evaluation Phase I | Sep 2015 | May 2016 | R&P Dept. |  |

1. **Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements**

5.1 The program monitoring and evaluation system will be based on the program’s Results Framework and include the involvement of MOECD and PMU staff. In order to strengthen MOECD’s ability to monitor and evaluate education initiatives, the program will: (i) establish an M&E Unit within the MOECD R&P Department; (ii) develop an M&E manual for the program; (iii) train MOECD and PMU staff in using the manual; (iv) develop a reporting, monitoring and communication mechanism;[[7]](#footnote-7) (v) integrate M&E functions into MOECD departments directly responsible for the delivery of the education program; and (vi) develop annual work plans and progress reports for all Heads of Departments involved in the program and the Planning Section of MOECD. In Phase II, M&E functions will be expanded to the remaining MOECD departments.

5.2 The PMU will be responsible for monitoring, evaluation and reporting. Specific tasks include: (i) preparing semi-annual progress reports documenting project outputs and outcomes; (ii) preparing and administering the program budget; (iii) documenting bidding and contract administration processes; (iv) in collaboration with the R&P Department, monitoring program indicators and performance targets and analyzing data collected; (v) monitoring budgetary allocations; and (vi) regularly updating the Ministers of Education and Finance.

5.3 The R&P Department will be directly involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the program from its inception. While the PMU ultimately is responsible for the M&E and reporting of the program, the R&P Department will be responsible for supporting the PMU in the process. Such support may include: (i) developing M&E instruments for the program; (ii) conducting monitoring visits; (iii) collecting and analyzing data related to program indicators; and (iv) assisting in evaluation of program initiatives. Specific roles of the PMU and R&P Department will be clarified in the Operational Manual.

**FIGURE 1: Reporting, Monitoring and Communicating Mechanism**

**Semi-Annual Program Planning Meeting**

**In attendance:** Project Manager (Chair); Sub-Component Leaders (SCL); Consultant and MOECD Technical Coordinator.

**Purpose:** To (i) discuss and establish annual work plans for the program; (ii) discuss the development of ongoing work plans; and (iii) share completed work plans for each component and sub-component and / or adopt strategies to address bottlenecks.

**Direction Outcomes**

**Monthly Sub-Component Meetings**

**In attendance:** MOECD Technical Coordinator (Chair); SCL; MOECD Technical Officers; and PIU Consultant

**Purpose:** To review implementation, propose follow-up action and develop monthly implementation plans for the sub-component.

**Feedback** **Outcomes**

**Quarterly Program Meeting**

**In attendance:** Project Manager (Chair); MOECD Technical Coordinator; SCL; designated MOECD Monitoring Dept, and PMU Consultants.

**Purpose:** To review implementation, propose follow-up action, recommend courses of action for the PMSC’s consideration and review quarterly plans for the sub-components.

**Monthly Meeting Monitoring and Evaluation Team \***

The M&E Team has the responsibility for collecting, analyzing and reporting on the components and sub-components’ performance and outputs.

**Feedback**

**PMSC Quarterly Meeting**

**In attendance:** Education PS (Chair), MOECD Executives, other education stakeholders, MOECD Technical Coordinator and Project Manager.

**Purpose:** To review the program’s implementation, consider recommended courses of action, take policy decisions and provide general direction to the program.

**Feedback Outcomes**

**Outcomes**

**Monitoring and Evaluation Team** formed by Financial Manager from PIU, designated Department from MOECD and designated person from Ministry of Finance. Chair to be designated.

**PMSC:** Project Management Steering Committee

**Feedback** **Outcomes**

Office of the Permanent Secretary Information Office

**Feedback Outcomes**

**Stakeholders**

MOECD Staff, IDB, Cabinet, Parliament, Teachers, Private Sector and General Public

**Purpose:** To inform all stakeholders on the process of the program and provide stakeholders with the opportunity to offer feedback.

1. Based on the hypothesis of a partial eligibility to disbursements no earlier than June, 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Costs estimates include the cost of the labor, inputs and contracts linked with the activity. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In the new basic education cycle, grades 3 and 4 are equivalent to grades 1 and 2 in the current primary education. In this document, references to grades follow the new basic education cycle. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Cunningham, Wendy, Linda McGinnis, et all. “Youth at Risk in Latin America and the Caribbean: understanding the causes, realizing the potential.” Directions in Development. Human Development. The World Bank. 2008. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. World Bank, World Development Indicators, October 2011. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. MOECD Research and Planning. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See Figure 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)