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Executive Summary

Purpose
The School Improvement Grant (SIG) programme aims “to provide financially constrained schools with enough resources to address their most basic needs and to meet a minimum set of school functionality criteria with the aim of improving the quality of teaching and learning at the school level and reducing user fee costs for vulnerable children”\(^1\).

The SIG is a component of the Education Development Fund (EDF). The EDF is a multi-donor trust fund which enables donors to jointly support the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education\(^2\) (MoPSE) in its activities, with UNICEF managing the funds and providing technical support.

The SIG programme has four proposed phases (only the pilot and rollout phases are funded under the EDF): a pilot phase, a rollout phase, an expansion phase and an integration phase\(^3\). Only the pilot phase and the rollout phase are funded under the EDF. This current report is the evaluation of the pilot.

The aim of this current report is to present an analysis of the School Improvement Grant pilot in 132 schools (100 schools in Goromonzi District and 32 special schools in seven provinces from around Zimbabwe – see Figures 1.1 and 1.2) which will inform the rollout of the SIG to 7,000 target schools comprising special, satellite, P3 and S3 schools (P3 and S3 are rural primary and rural secondary schools respectively). The questions answered by this report include whether the grant reached all of the pilot schools and what is the impact of the grant on these schools.

Research Approach
The analysis is derived from a desk study of the relevant documentation as well as interviews with key informants in MoPSE, stakeholders at school level (school heads, school development committee members, teachers, learners and parents), relevant education partners and UNICEF, as well as the reported findings from the baseline, process review and visits to pilot schools.

Main findings
The pilot was a success. The pilot schools all received training on school development and financial management, all of the SDPs are adequate (they were approved by MoPSE as adequate for funding), most of the schools have received all of their disbursements and most schools have spent their grants. There were signs that the grants are leading to improvements in the teaching and learning environments, which is the first part of the objective statement for the School Grants programme.

The approach through the development of SDPs and financial management training has taken a whole school approach which includes the involvement of all the relevant stakeholders. It has respected the opinions of those who know what is needed for a school, dealt with the unique situation of each school and created a programme owned by the people. This has increased the community involvement in the schools and re-energized the schools.

Due to only the base-line being carried out there was no opportunity to observe reductions in fees and levies, which was the latter part of the objective statement for the School Grants

---

\(^2\) The MoPSE was previously known as the Ministry of Education, Sport, Art and Culture (MoESAC).
programme. This could be due to the length of time that the programme has been running being insufficient for changes to be observed (there was also no before and after data concerning this) or it could be that in the current economic environment that makes this is not a possibility. For there to be a fee reduction or abolition there must be sustained and increased funding from Government. To avoid the programme being a “failure” it is proposed that the aim of the School Improvement Grant programme be changed to: “Improved learning outcomes through improved planning, better learning outcomes and increased parental involvement”. Donors’ views on this have not been sought and will need to be taken into account if the aim is to be changed.

The design framework for the school grants emphasized that for the grant to work, that planning, management and monitoring, and financial management systems must be improved. The whole school development process and financial management training have been accomplished. However, the Grants Management Team (GMT), which plays key roles in the planning and management of the grants, is still not operational. There is no evidence of monitoring and evaluation systems having been developed and established. Although there were provincial links set up for Goromonzi, there was no evidence of this being done for the Special Needs schools, as the Provincial Education Department for Harare, which had the most special needs schools, only played a monitoring role in the training and was not aware of whether their schools had received the grants.

**Recommendations**

*It is recommended that payments continue to the pilot schools as scheduled. For the initiation of the rollout the GMT should be established with dedicated staff, the monitoring and evaluation framework for all levels of MoPSE should be designed, established and the relevant training done on the implementation of the framework, issues of bank accounts should be resolved and the GMT database populated with school data. A delay in the first disbursement is thus recommended until these critical prerequisites are met.*

Other recommendations are as follows (see Annex L for more detail on these recommendations):

**Recommendation 1. Manuals**
The Grants Management Team Operational manual should be updated to take into account the revised manuals and changes in the programme. The manual needs to be approved to empower the GMT. The process of approving the grant manuals (School Development Plan Manual, School Minimum (Functionality) Standards, and the GMT Operational Manual) needs to be completed. The School Development Manual needs to be distributed to all schools.

**Recommendation 2. Grants Management Team (GMT)**
The GMT needs to be restructured slightly. A SIG management team with formal fortnightly meetings and additional meetings when required is needed to reduce delays in implementation. For the GMT to be able to fulfill its role of planning, monitoring and management of the programme, all positions in the GMT need to be filled with full-time personnel.

**Recommendation 3. Bank Accounts**
Schools should be allowed to open bank accounts for SIG funds with banks of their own choice. MoPSE should negotiate with the relevant banks to allow the schools to operate these bank accounts free of bank charges (except for replacement cheque books). School Development Committees should be included as signatories on the bank accounts.
Recommendation 4. Finance

MoPSE needs to match the funding provided by the donors to help meet the funding gap and to move the programme to the next phase.

Recommendation 5. Monitoring and Evaluation

A monitoring and evaluation framework needs to be developed for the Grants programme. Monitoring and evaluation systems must be set up at all levels (head office, province, district and school). Data collection forms, data entry formats, analysis formats and reporting formats need to be developed for each level, timeframes for activities and the relevant training done in the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation framework before the SIG can be rolled out to the satellite primary and P3 schools in 2014. The monitoring and evaluation needs to be built into the annual work planning of district offices across the country.

Recommendation 6. Monitoring

For the rollout the schools cannot receive the same level of attention and assistance that the pilot schools have received due to the resources that would be needed. District offices will need resources for monitoring and support to the SIG, however the monitoring and support to the SIG should be part of the regular monitoring of the schools that the districts carry out. This should be built into the annual work plans of the districts. There will be a need to ensure that district accountants visit every school at least once a year. It is recommended that a monitoring plan is set up where every school is visited at least once a year and data are collected with standardised templates.

Recommendation 7. The Baseline Indicators

Due to the timing of the baseline, which was after SIG implementation had already commenced, it is recommended that the data from the baseline should not be used to set the baseline for the whole country or the targets that the SIG programme is aiming to reach. It is recommended that the core indicator framework be amended based on the lessons learnt from the baseline (see Annex F for a revision) and that the questionnaires used for the pilot baseline be amended to collect ‘need to know’ information and remove the ‘nice to know’ information. The baseline next year for the rollout to the 4,500 schools can then be used to set the baseline values for the indicators and the target values for the indicators.

Recommendation 8. Training

Follow up on the training that has been carried out should include continual training at cluster level for schools and their stakeholders, a strategy developed to deal with the school heads that failed the post-training financial management test, retesting of school heads on financial management at the end of the first term of 2014 to verify the efficacy of the training and a post-workshop survey of participants of the financial management training at the end of 2014.

Recommendation 9. School Development Plans

There is a need for annual reviews of the SDP with respect to the whole SDP and the items that the SIG can be spent on as situations do change in schools.

Recommendation 10. Design

The definition of P3 and S3 has caused confusion in the selection of the schools for the pilot. Initially it was thought that the classification was to do with the financial status of the school however it has now been indicated that it is to do with the rural / urban situations of the schools. For the rollout there is a need to review the targeting and SIG amounts to better respond to the needs of the most disadvantaged.
1. Background and rationale

The School Improvement Grant (SIG) programme aims “to provide financially constrained schools with enough resources to address their most basic needs and to meet a minimum set of school functionality criteria with the aim of improving the quality of teaching and learning at the school level and reducing user fee costs for vulnerable children”\(^4\).

The SIG is a component of the second phase of the Education Development Fund (EDF). The EDF is a multi-donor trust fund which enables donors to jointly support the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education\(^5\) (MoPSE) in its activities, with UNICEF managing the funds and providing technical support.

The SIG programme has four proposed phases (only the pilot and rollout phases are funded under the EDF):

- **A pilot phase** during which staff will be trained, systems will be developed and established, implementation will take place in a small number of schools and the systems tested and reviewed. This will take place in 2013.
- **A roll-out phase** during which grants will be distributed to satellite, P3 and S3 schools with a scaling up over two years. In the first year (2014) the programme will be extended to primary satellite and P3 schools and in the second year (2015) the programme will be further extended to secondary satellite and S3 schools.
- **An expansion phase** (if funding permits) during which the range of eligibility criteria will be expanded and the types of schools may be expanded.
- **An integration phase** during which the programme will become an integration of all the different types of school grants.

The success of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) is dependent on strong project management at the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (MoPSE), reliable disbursement modalities, accountability, strong monitoring and evaluation systems, strengthened overall institutional capacity of MoPSE, well trained and informed schools on the SIG, active School Development Committees (SDC) and quality School Development Plans (SDP).


\(^5\)The MoPSE was previously known as the Ministry of Education, Sport, Art and Culture (MoESAC).
The aim of this current report is to present a critical analysis of the School Improvement Grant pilot in 132 schools (100 schools in Goromonzi District and 32 special schools in seven provinces from around Zimbabwe – see Figure 1.1 and Table 1.1) which will inform the rollout of the SIG to 7,000 target schools comprising special, satellite, P3 and S3 schools (P3 and S3 are rural primary and rural secondary schools respectively). The analysis is derived from a desk study of the relevant documentation as well as interviews with key informants in MoPSE, stakeholders at school level (school heads, school development committee members, teachers, learners and parents), relevant education partners and UNICEF, as well as the reported findings from the baseline, process review and visits to pilot schools.
Figure 1.1 Map of the schools in the pilot of the SIG in Goromonzi District
Table 1.1 Location of the special schools in the pilot of the SIG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School name</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batsirai Special</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>Warren Park Mabelreign</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chengetai</td>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>Mutare</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Hill School for The Deaf</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Murray</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jairos Jiri Special</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>High Glen</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jairos Jiri</td>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>Sanyati</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jairos Jiri Centre</td>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>Gweru</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Slaven</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Bulawayo Central</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George VI</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Bulawayo Central</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makwasa</td>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>Mutasa</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaretha Hugo School for the Blind</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudavanhu</td>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>Gweru</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratidzo</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Stimulation Centre</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Imbizo</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubatsiro</td>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>Sanyati</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruvimbo Special</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>High Glen</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Cohen Special</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>Chitungwiza</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibantubanye</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Mzilikazi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simanyane</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Bulawayo Central</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Humphrey Gibbs</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Bulawayo Central</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis RC</td>
<td>Mashonaland West</td>
<td>Chegutu</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Giles</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catherine Special</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinokwirira Special</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>Mabvuku Tafara</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danhiko</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>Mabvuku Tafara</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerald Hill School For The Deaf</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George VI</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Bulawayo Central</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahuwe</td>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>Mbire</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaretha Hugo School for the Blind</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>Masvingo</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munyoro</td>
<td>Manicaland</td>
<td>Mutare</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushumbi</td>
<td>Mashonaland Central</td>
<td>Mbire</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Secondary</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>Imbizo</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 The Design Process

The original situational analysis for this school grants programme\(^6\) identified that high user fees in Zimbabwe present a barrier for education for all, that P3 and satellite schools have benefited least from school grant programmes, that characteristics of the schools may need to be considered, and that the strengthening of school finance management and accountability, and uniform school development plans are needed.

A School Grants Concept Design paper (2012) was produced for discussion in August 2012\(^7\). The concept design paper was informed by the School Improvement Grants paper\(^8\).

---


\(^7\) CfBT and SNV (2012) School Grant Design Concept Paper, 22 August 2012.
produced by the Ministry of Education, Sports, Art and Culture (MoESAC)\(^8\), a situational analysis (a separate paper produced concurrently) and a brief field survey. The purpose of the concept design paper was to present a series of possible options which could be considered for the design of the School Improvement Grant.

The School Grants Concept Design paper identified the following as priorities for the education sector to improve the access and quality of education: investment in continuous professional development for teachers, the need for teaching and learning materials, issues concerning the inclusion of children with disabilities, WASH, renovation and construction of school facilities, and the reduction/abolition of school fees/levies. In addition, the concept design paper identified the need for a 'Whole School Approach' which accepts that the local communities are key to the school development process but that they will need training, guidance and support for them to fulfil their role in this process. It was concluded that the "core purpose of a well-designed school grants programme is therefore to provide adequate and well-targeted levels of grant funding to cover non-personnel and non-salary resource demands of the school".

The School Grants Concept Design proposed two alternative approaches for 2013 to 2015:
- A pilot of 100 schools in 3 provinces and 5 districts during 2013. Then a rollout to 20 districts with 400 schools in 2014, and 30 districts and 600 schools in 2015.
- A pilot of 100 schools in 3 provinces and 5 districts during 2013. Then a rollout from 100 schools in the pilot to 1,200 schools in 2014 and 2,500 schools in 2015. This was considered to be ‘too taxing’ on MoPSE systems.

A further document, the School Grants Design Framework\(^10\), was produced as a result of informed discussions based on the School Grants Concept Paper (August 2012) and the Situation Analysis (October 2012) between MoPSE, the Education Coordination Group (ECG) and the Education Development Fund (EDF) Steering Committee as well as discussions and recommendations of MoPSE senior management at a workshop in October 2012. This document narrowed down the approach given in the School Grants Concept Paper which resulted in the current design with a ‘Whole School Approach’. This approach emphasizes an approach which empowers the school staff, parents and community to identify the needs and development of their schools and it will have a progressive and phased approach. The progressive part of the approach will be through the development of the grant from a simple grant covering the highest priority education resource items in a few schools to a comprehensive grant system covering all school needs in all schools. The approach has four phases (pilot, rollout, expansion and integration), however under the EDF only the pilot and the rollout phases are funded. The following key issues were still to be finalized at the time of compiling this report:
- MoPSE need to agree on and finalize the composition of the Grants Management Team (GMT). Staff will then need to be appointed to the positions.
- The training and support programme for the necessary structures and systems within MoPSE need to be planned in detail.
- The training and support programme for the schools need to be finalized; with a focus on school development planning and financial management for non-finance managers.
- UNICEF procedures for the disbursement of funds and liquidation of these funds need to be finalized and included in the training programmes for both schools and MoPSE structures.
- Terms of reference for the external verification agency need to be agreed upon and the agency appointed by MoPSE and UNICEF.

---


\(^9\) Now renamed to the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education (MoPSE)

The School Grants Design Framework proposed the following activities for 2013 to 2015:

- A pilot of 100 schools in one district (satellite primary, P3\textsuperscript{11}, satellite secondary and S3 schools) and 36 special schools around the country in 2013. At the same time staff would be trained, structures and procedures established, and systems as well as processes tested.
- A rollout phase to special schools, primary satellite, P3, secondary satellite and S3 schools in 2014 and 2015.

Goromonzi District was chosen as the pilot district through a series of technical discussions at MoPSE and approved by the Education Coordination Group (ECG). The choices of Goromonzi was made as it is considered rural and close to the centre (Harare City and the Head Office of MoPSE) while the number and types of schools are representative enough to take lessons learnt to the rest of the country. This also allows effective monitoring from Head Office and for quick responses and changes to the pilot may also be needed.

1.2 Approach

1.2.1 Requirements for a successful programme

An efficient and effective school grants programme requires strong support and monitoring from the higher levels of the education system. As indicated in the design framework document\textsuperscript{12} and other reports, a school grants system must cover a number of crucial areas for it to be managed effectively:

- Strengthened administration systems at all levels of the Ministry.
- Strong controls on financial management, disbursements and expenditure.
- Monitoring and reporting systems to track the disbursements and use of the school grant.
- Enhanced capacity of provincial and district education offices for oversight and support to the schools.
- Criteria for eligible and non-eligible expenditure.
- Parallel action to control and reduce the high levels of school fees and levies.

Therefore, for the current school grants to be successful there is a need to improve systems and processes, and to ensure the highest standards of planning, management, financial management and expenditure control for the programme. These are needed to ensure the success of the programme as well as supporting the sustainable integration of the SIG into MoPSE. The following areas were identified in the design framework as needing to be addressed at all levels for the success of SIG:

1. Planning, management and monitoring
   a. Policy and planning
   b. Regulatory framework
   c. Monitoring and auditing
   d. Province and district systems
   e. Whole school development and integrated school planning

2. Financial management systems
   a. Financial management systems at district and provincial level
   b. School financial management
   c. Auditing

The issues 1a to 1d are to be addressed directly through the setup of a Grants Management Team (GMT) and issues 1e and 2a to 2c are to be addressed through training on financial

\textsuperscript{11} Schools in Zimbabwe are classified using a system of P1-P3 and S1-S3. This is primarily a geographical category differentiating urban low-density (Level 1), urban high-density (Level 2) and rural (Level 3) schools with the P indicating primary schools and the S indicating secondary schools. This classification also has a wealth categorization aspect in that the low-density schools are located in wealthier areas than the P2 schools which in turn are considered to be wealthier than the P3 rural schools.

management and school development planning. It is however important to note that all factors listed above need to be led, managed, coordinated and monitored closely by the GMT.

The MoPSE operates at four administrative levels (see Figure 1.2). These four levels are head office (policy), provincial (policy implementation level), district (functional) and school (operational level). All of these levels are involved in the school improvement grant. The Grants Management Team (GMT) was set up at the Head Office (policy level). The provincial and district offices are involved in the management of the grant programme and the schools are involved in the day to day implementation of the programme at the Head Office. The provincial and district offices are involved in the management of the grant programme and the schools are involved in the day to day implementation of the programme.

1.2.2 Pre piloting phases
The pre-piloting stages needed to concentrate on the establishment of the GMT, the development of required manuals and training materials, and the orientation and training within the administrative system (head office, provincial, and district offices and schools). In this phase the selection of districts and schools for the pilot needed to be done and this communicated to the schools. It was originally intended that the pilot schools be selected through a “stratified sampling basis based on the characteristics most likely to divide the performance of schools during the pilot and which reflect the relative breakdown of schools or school populations in the full rollout of the programme”. However, it was decided that the pilot schools be the 32 special schools and 100 schools in Goromonzi District.
Figure 1.2 Administration Levels of the Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education with the path to the pilot schools in Goromonzi shown

Note. Special schools were included in the following provinces: Bulawayo (8), Harare (10), Manicaland (3), Mashonaland Central (2), Mashonaland West (3), Masvingo (4) and Midlands (2).
In April 2013 a stock take and proposed way forward was done of the SIG\textsuperscript{13}. In this document it was suggested that the implementation of the programme for 2013 be considered through five work streams or pillars:

- Grants Management Team and office set-up
- Payment and IT systems
- Systems assessment and verification
- School development plans
- Financial management training

Some of the components of these activities are not directly related to the pilot, rather, they ran parallel to the pilot to prepare the systems for the rollout to 4,500 primary schools in 2014.

Once the work streams related to the pilot schools were completed, it was possible to start making payment of the grants to the pilot schools. This report consider only those activities directly related to the pilot.

The proposed time frames given for the activities related to the pilot in the stock take in April 2013 are given in Annex H\textsuperscript{14}.

The Grants Management Team is the team within the Head Office of MoPSE which is responsible for the planning, management and monitoring of the programme. The payments and IT systems involve the completion of information sheets by the schools, the opening of bank accounts and the development of the IT database for the management of all this information. The systems assessments and verification includes the UNICEF micro-assessments prior to disbursement, the bi-annual spot checks and the verification agency. The school development plans activity covers more than the development of the school development plans. It also involves the development of materials, the training of the schools, piloting in the 132 schools, the review of the pilot SDPs, and the refinement and training of the remaining 7,000 schools. The financial management training includes the design and development of materials, the piloting and rollout to the 7,000 schools.

Training in the pilot schools was to start at the beginning of Term 1 in January 2013 with schools clustered for the purpose of training. Two areas of training were to be done:

- \textit{Whole school development}: training on school development plans (SDP), school vision and managements, roles and responsibilities.
- \textit{Financial management}: training of the schools on grant disbursement, expenditure, monitoring, reporting, financial procedures and controls, and good financial management.

It was intended that the GMT was to visit schools, reinforcing the work of the training teams through regular visits.

1.2.3 School deliverables

A well designed school grants programme can increase community ownership and interest in the school\textsuperscript{15} by providing the grant directly to the school as this allows for local level control and accountability by the school and its community. The general rule in most countries is that schools must satisfy some requirements before receiving the grant i.e. provide documents, although the actual documents required varies from country to country. For the SIG the schools had to produce a school development plan (SDP). All schools received training on how to develop SDPs. All school heads also received training on financial management for non-finance managers.

\textsuperscript{13} CfBT (2013) School Improvement Grant Programme. Stock take and way forward. 14 April 2013.
\textsuperscript{14} CfBT (2013) School Improvement Grant Programme. Stock take and way forward. 14 April 2013.
1.2.4 The grant transfer and amount
Funds as grants can be transferred to schools using a number of different routes: direct to the school or through a series of transfers down the administrative structure. However this can incur administration costs with each transfer. Grants can also be transferred every term or in one lump sum for the year to the school. All countries reviewed in the situational analysis for the school grants programme\(^{16}\) clearly demarcate the roles and responsibilities of all involved levels of the administration. In the SIG the funds are transferred every term direct into dedicated school bank accounts (operational level) by UNICEF (fund manager) on receipt of the pay sheet from the MoPSE. The decision to transfer the funds directly to the schools was made after consideration of legitimate donor concerns over financial accountability within the Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) budget and financial management system\(^{17}\), off-vote GoZ channels like the Better Schools Programme Zimbabwe (BSPZ), and the high United Nations fiduciary risk assessment of MoPSE. Acknowledgement of receipt of funds is done by the district office on behalf of the schools in receipt of grants. Reporting of school grant disbursement and expenditure is done using the Funding Authorization and Certificate of Expenditures (FACE) form – see Annex E.

The calculation of the grant amount was done using a formula (average enrolment * per capita allocation * OVC % of enrolment). The per capita allocation and percentage of OVC in each school type is derived from the practice and experience\(^{18}\) from the Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM). For example, satellite primary schools receive $4,312 (308*35*0.4). The amounts for the different school types are given in Table 1.2.

### Table 1.2 Lump sum grant amount by school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>No. schools</th>
<th>Average enrolment</th>
<th>Per capita allocation*</th>
<th>OVC % of enrolment</th>
<th>Total grant per school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satellite (P)</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$4,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>4,154</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$4,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite (S)</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$6,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Per capita allocation is derived from the amounts indicated by BEAM practice and experience.

1.2.5 Eligible items
The SIG is targeted at school recurrent funding needs. Schools are only allowed to spend their SIG funds on eligible items. These items are given in Annex D. Annex D also gives the eligible items allowed in each phase of the SIG (pilot, rollout, expansion and integration phases). The inclusion of Continuous Professional Development (CPD) is given as one of the eligible items under the expansion and integration phases. At this stage it is recommended that this is kept in these phases as the Global Partnership in Education will be funding the CPD for the next few years.

1.2.6 The final design of the pilot
In the final design of the SIG it was decided that the programme would run from 2013 to 2015. The first year (2013), the pilot phase, has 132 schools which have received grants. These consist of 100 schools in Goromonzi (4 primary satellite, 69 registered primary (P3), 4

---

secondary satellite and 23 registered secondary (S3) schools). A further 32 schools were selected which are special schools. The schools were all required to produce a School Development Plan which had to be reviewed and approved by the relevant District Office (functional level). The lists of schools with approved SDPs were submitted to the Grants Management Team (GMT) at MoPSE Head Office through the Provincial Offices (policy implementation level). On receipt of these lists of schools, the GMT produced a pay sheet with bank details. One bank, the Metropolitan Bank, was approved to be used for the pilot by the Ministry of Finance. Accounts were opened for all the pilot schools with two signatories (both school administrative staff) from each school. The pay sheet with the bank details for each school was submitted to UNICEF, the fund manager, for disbursement of funds to the schools. Disbursement for 2013 took place in two tranches (the first and second term tranches were combined as one and disbursed in early July 2013 and the third tranche was disbursed in early September).

In the running of the School Improvement Grants programme, MoPSE is responsible for the planning, management, monitoring and auditing of the programme and UNICEF will be responsible for the fund disbursement and external verification.
2. The Pilot Implementation

The following section discusses the progress on each of the components identified as key to the success of the implementation of the SIG.

2.1 Programme management

2.1.1 Grants Management Team (GMT) and office set-up

Responsibilities

A strong and full-time dedicated team is needed to implement the School Improvement Grant. The structure that has been developed to carry this out is the Grants Management Team (GMT). The principal behind establishing this team at Head Office is that it is to work within MoPSE structures and support existing departments of MoPSE. It does this through the MoPSE structures and units down to school level including the monitoring of UNICEF disbursements. It is supposed to support the Provincial Offices with grant related administrative and operational functions including vehicles for school support. At a policy level it is supposed to drive the consolidation of funding for the different existing grants into a single grants system, the complementary interventions in public sector and financial management reform and the rationalisation of the system of school fees and levies.

The structure of the Grants Management Team

It was indicated in the stock take\textsuperscript{19} of April 2013 that the GMT was envisaged to have 14 staff exclusively appointed against the posts. It was also intended that UNICEF would hire some of the technical assistance who play key roles in the GMT functioning (IT specialist, a planning specialist, and a monitoring and supervision specialist to support the GMT Coordinator). The IT specialist was recruited however the appointment of the other two specialists was postponed by MoPSE who wanted internal MoPSE people to fill these posts. In addition, UNICEF recruited a number of consultants to assist during the take off period of the SIG programme. These were a financial management consultant to provide support to the financial management training and a consultant to assist with the development and review process of the SDPs.

Figure 2.1 Structure of the Grants Management Team (October 2013)

The setup of the GMT has taken longer than expected due to the operating environment with the elections on 31\textsuperscript{st} July 2013, changes in ministerial and senior management and the issues with the lack of human resources in MoPSE. In March 2013, seven members were seconded to the GMT by MoPSE out of a total of 14 positions. Their GMT duties were in addition to their existing full-time duties. The most recently proposed structure has 16 positions (Figure 2.1). In October 2013 the proposed names against each position and the slightly modified GMT structure were communicated with the directors at MoPSE for

approval. All of the proposed appointments will essentially be part-time as these personnel still have full-time posts in under-staffed departments. Discussions with some of the proposed members of the GMT has indicated that the time that they have available to devote to the GMT is not sufficient to fulfil the functions expected of them. The formation of a strong and fully functional GMT is critical for the success of the programme. The planning function is key to making the programme a success and once the rollout is commences there will be a need to review 4,500 SDPs. Current discussions support the actual review of SDPs at the district level with some verification at provincial level. This would reduce the workload of the GMT. The staffing of the Planning Division at MoPSE is inadequate with only three posts filled in the department while over 10 posts are frozen. This makes the additional activities on the GMT functions difficult to carry out. Once the SDPs have been reviewed, the collection and entry of data for each of the schools which is required to develop the pay sheets for payment will need to be done.

The importance of a fully dedicated and complete GMT is highlighted by the following statement: “The process of reviewing those 132 SDPs by Grants Management Team (GMT, MoPSE) for final approval for the disbursement of the first grants (1st and 2nd term grants) experienced some delay mainly due to the efforts of MoPSE in streamlining the SIG payment approval procedures and protocol with the ministry’s existing approval procedures and delays in forming the Grant Management Team (GMT).” 20 If these delays were experienced with 132 schools, the delays with 4,500 schools will be magnified. The 132 school’s SDPs were reviewed at Head Office by the Planning Division after being reviewed and corrected at District Level, and then at Provincial Level. The proposed time line for the roll out of the 4,500 schools in 2014 is already delayed as the GMT is not in place, the notification for the approval and onward transmission to the GMT of the SDPs has not been given, there are bank related issues and the information sheets for each school that still need to be completed and sent onto the GMT for data entry until the bank accounts for the schools have been opened. In a similar programme, the Education Transition and Reform Programme (ETRP), a previous school grants programme, roll out was slow. The delays were attributed to the lack of both human and physical resources to monitor and supervise the school authorities.

The original reporting structure of the GMT has meant that the School Grants Programme Coordinator has reported to one of two division heads depending on the issue to be dealt with. The experience and advice from the two division heads is an advantage, however, there have been delays in implementation due to the involvement of this two divisions. This has been due to a lack of communication and a lack of a common understanding of roles and responsibilities from both departments. It is proposed that the management of the GMT is changed slightly with the introduction of a senior management team (SIG Management Team) – see Figure 2.2. This team would consist of the Director of Planning, the Director of Finance and the School Grants Programme Coordinator. This team would meet every two weeks and have additional meetings when required. The team would report to the Permanent Secretary.

Figure 2.2 Proposed adjustments to reporting structure of the GMT

Activities of the Grants Management Team
The activities for the GMT for 2013 can be summarized as follows:

1. Development of training materials and the training on school development plans. This is complete. This was done with the assistance of SNV and technical assistance from UNICEF.

2. Development of training materials and the training on financial management for finance and non-finance managers. This will be complete by the end of January 2014. This has been done in collaboration with the Ministry of Public Services (MoPSE) and UNICEF.

3. Establishment of the GMT offices complete with furniture and computers. This is complete.

4. The development of a database to store all the information on schools and payments made, and to facilitate the management and analysis of these data was needed. This database will also enable the GMT to make queries and generate reports in schools that have been paid/not paid, have acknowledged receipt of payment and will be compatible with the Education Management Information System (EMIS). The database has been developed by a contracted IT specialist (sub-contracted by CfBT). The development of this database is now complete. Training of the GMT on the use of this database was done in December 2013. This database was discussed during the pilot, but for the sake of time, the Education Coordination Group agreed to go ahead with an Excel pay sheet for the pilot only.

5. Disbursement of funds to the pilot schools. This is complete for 2013. A pay sheet was produced by the GMT in Excel, and signed by the Permanent Secretary. This was then handed to UNICEF. UNICEF, as fund managers, made the payments for the pilot schools for 2013 directly into the school bank accounts.

In conclusion, it can be seen that all the tasks that were completed by the Grants Management Team were done with the assistance of partners. This has been good as much needed technical assistance has been provided and there has been capacity building of MoPSE, however it does highlight the lack of capacity in the GMT.
Discussion with MoPSE personnel has shown that there is emphasis on the appropriate channels for communication of information either from Head Office or from the schools. The information flow from the schools to the GMT is given in Figure 2.3. It is important that the flow of information comes along these structures so that there is order and things don't get overlooked. However this can delay information. The consultant who was developing the database developed a series of flow charts which give the flow of information necessary for requests or acquittals (Annex G). However for these systems to be effective there is a need to have the systems established for each type of information and the relevant training done. For example, one of the schools in the pilot changed its registration status on the 1st May 2013, but the payment it received was for a satellite school. A monthly reporting system needs to be established whereby changes in information on the schools and issues from the schools can be communicated to the GMT as well as a system to communicate vital information quickly. This should be covered in the monitoring and evaluation framework and plan for the GMT which is yet to be developed.

**Figure 2.3 Submission of returns / information**

The monitoring carried out by the GMT at school level in the pilot has been when members of the GMT have joined the base-line data collection teams, the monitoring of the financial management training at the Ministry of Public Service institutes and the first ten school visits with the Ernst and Young verification visits. The GMT has felt that the only monitoring that they could carry out was based on reports from the provinces as they have to have substantive justification to go into the field. It is suggested that the monitoring plan include regular monitoring of provincial offices, district offices and schools as well as building in an ad hoc monitoring that allows the monitoring of schools based on issues and reports (both verbal and written).

**Challenges**

There has been no development of monitoring tools for province offices, district offices or schools by the GMT and no development of a monitoring and evaluation plan for either the pilot schools for 2013 or the rollout schools for 2014.

The GMT needs to be a dedicated full-time team and the current arrangement is not going to be able to cope with the rollout. No planning has been done for monitoring and evaluation, and no data have been collected and entered on the rollout schools.

Although the GMT feels that the advent of the SIG has helped synergize the departments and divisions of MoPSE it is felt that without the Operation Manual being approved that there is no mandate to carry out their activities.

**2.1.2 Set-up of payments and IT system**

*School Information Form / Fact Sheet*

A sample template was developed for information needed for the payments and sent to the pilot schools via the District Education Officer (DEO). This was completed and returned to the GMT.
Bank accounts
All schools need a dedicated bank account into which the SIG funds will be paid. For the pilot, the Ministry of Finance instructed that the Metropolitan Bank (Metbank) be used by all the schools. The GMT requested information from all the pilot schools to open these bank accounts using the school information sheet (e.g. name of school, contact names and the names of the signatories). This information was then given to Metbank. Bank accounts for all schools were opened by Metbank and this information passed back to the GMT. The information was consolidated into an Excel spreadsheet. This information was used to generate the pay sheet which was presented to UNICEF for disbursement of funds to schools. School heads were informed of the opening of their accounts and they collected and signed for their cheque books from the GMT. There were mistakes made on the opening of four of the 100 Goromonzi schools.

The bank accounts with Metbank have the following operating conditions:
- The cheque limit was $500.
- Only one cheque could be made out for each working day.
- Some school heads spoken to were under the impression that no electronic/bank transfers were allowed for these account types (2) or they were not sure if they were allowed (1).
- No cash withdrawals were allowed.
- No bank charges were incurred on transactions. The only charges concerned the issuing of new cheque books.

The choice of Metbank as the main bank for the SIG rollout is causing some concern due to the limited number of branches (20) with only a small percentage of schools within a reasonable distance of the branches, high transport costs to get to the branches, and a lack of competitive processes as other banks were not allowed. A mapping exercise\(^\text{21}\) of the Metbank branches took place (Figure 2.4) with the numbers of schools within 10, 20, 50 and 70km radii of the branches counted. Within a 0-20km radius of the Metbank branches there are 856 schools (11%), within 0-50km there are 2,468 schools and within 0-70km there are 3,082 schools. Three provinces, Matabeleland North, Mashonaland Central and Mashonaland West have no branches within the province, and there are 52 districts with no branches. There are insufficient branches for this bank to be considered the only bank for the SIG programme. There is an urgent need for schools in the rollout to be allowed to open accounts with banks of their own choice. The only advantage that Metbank has over other banks has been the lack of bank charges on the accounts opened for the SIG programme. There are concerns about the capacity of Metbank to cope with the number of schools in the rollout and these were confirmed with the recent incident of the branch in Mutare being unable to meet its commitments (Annex J).

\(^{21}\) UNICEF (2013) Metbank branches and school coverage summary. Presentation to the ECG.
2.1.3 Systems assessment and verification

UNICEF is the SIG fund manager. All organizations receiving funds from UNICEF are required to follow HACT guidelines and to undergo a micro assessment of their financial systems. The micro assessment of MoPSE Head Office was carried out in 2012 with the recommendations from this micro assessment being addressed through the capacity building on financial management. Micro assessments of the 72 district offices and the 13 training institutes (MoPS) have taken place. UNICEF and MoPSE also visited all the training institutes to assess their capacity for training in March 2013 in preparation for the rollout of the financial management training. As part of the HACT guidelines and procedures, UNICEF is required to carry out spot checks of the provincial and district offices at least twice a year. UNICEF spot checks at provincial and district level are scheduled to start taking place in 2014 using Baker and Tiley.

An independent agency is required to verify the proper use of school grant programme funds in the schools and districts through a system of periodic random visits and financial checks. This agency carries out the following checks:

- All financial procedures for disbursement and expenditures of funds are being followed;
- Funds are only being spent on eligible items;
- All financial monitoring and reporting requirements are being met accurately and in good time; and
- There is no evidence of the misuse or misappropriation of funds.
All schools and districts have been made aware from the start that there is a prospect of being visited at any time regardless of how remote the schools are. It was recommended that this be done on a 10% random sample monthly for the rollout. All schools in the pilot were to be visited in 2013.

The verification agency contracted to carry out verifications of the pilot schools is Ernst and Young. These trips were completed by the end of 2013. The first verifications of the pilot schools were done as joint trips between Ernst and Young, MoPSE and UNICEF in October 2013 to ‘fine-tune’ the methodology. It was realized that the auditors had not been trained or briefed in SDPs and eligible items and were not experienced with public sector accounting and HACT procedures. This was addressed by providing them with the relevant manuals and training them on financial management and HACT procedures. The results of the verification visits are presented under Section 2.4.4.

2.1.4 The monitoring of the programme
The monitoring processes for the SIG are complex due to the different work streams of the programme and the implementation in the schools. The GMT is tasked with developing a monitoring and evaluation plan for the SIG programme. However such a plan does not exist due to the lack of full-time capacity at the GMT.

The main monitoring and assessment mentioned in the GMT operational manual is the School Grants Utilization Survey which is to be done in a representative sample of primary and secondary schools at the end of the school year. It does not specify if this was to be done in the pilot or in the rollout. This assessment also has to collect baseline data which can be used to assess the impact of the SIG. In this operational manual there is also mention of regular monitoring at each level of MoPSE (GMT, Province, District and School). None of this monitoring has been formalized or incorporated into any annual work planning by the GMT.

In the School Grants Design Framework there is an indicative monitoring framework, which has been reviewed in the Baseline Survey of the Pilot Schools (draft report). This framework is the proposed basis for the indicators to measure the impact of the SIG programme. In the Stock Take conducted in April 2013 there were a number of evaluation activities given. These all consisted of activities being carried out by contracted organizations external to MoPSE (see Annex F for the proposed time frame). The three main activities were the evaluation of the capacity building activities (SDPs), the evaluation of the SIG pilot (this current report) and the impact evaluations of the grants (the baseline). In addition to these activities there are activities which were not given in Annex F: the process review and case studies, which were done at the same time as the baseline, and the evaluation of the financial management activities. All of these activities have been summarized in the relevant sections of this current report.

The template of the school development plan included an implementation plan and a monitoring and evaluation framework to assist the schools in the monitoring of the activities in the SDP. A brief review of SDPs has shown that not all schools included the implementation plan and a monitoring and evaluation framework in their SDPs.

2.2 Training and support programme

2.2.1 School Development Plans (SDP)
Support to the development of the school development plans was given in the form of training to all pilot schools (and all other schools to be included in the rollout).
MoPSE, together with UNICEF through SNV, designed materials and training programmes following Government policy and guidelines to assist schools with the development of their SDPs. This was done in January and February of 2013.

In January 2013, SNV delivered the induction to the local capacity builders (LCB). The first activity carried out by the LCBs was to capacity build key national and provincial staff in SDP development. This took place in February 2013 and consisted of five personnel from Head Office and four staff from each provincial office (Provincial Education Director or Deputy Director, Provincial Accountant, Provincial Planning Officer and one Administrator). In total there were 45 staff trained.

The pilot schools were trained in March 2013 in clusters (17 clusters for Goromonzi). The 32 special schools were trained at separate trainings to the 100 Goromonzi schools. The target participants from each school included: the school head, one deputy and one member of senior staff, two members of the school development committee, two student representatives and one member of the responsible authority. The provincial education psychologist and a chaperon from each school were included in the SDP training for special school. During the training the schools drafted the SDPs, however, they could not finalize these until they had consulted with the relevant stakeholders at school level. School heads were expected to cascade the SDP training and process to the other school stakeholders. Training also included information on the completion of FACE forms and the schools were given copies of the draft Minimum School (Functionality) Standards document. Schools were not given an SDP manual. An SDP manual is currently in draft form but has not been distributed to pilot schools. The presence of monitors from other organizations (including MoPSE) at each of the trainings emphasized the importance that was being placed on these trainings and helped to deal with any misconceptions.

The deadline for the submission of the pilot schools’ SDPs to the District Education Officer’s (DEO) Office was 15th April 2013. The approval purpose of the SDPs was facilitated by the development a checklist of items to assess the suitability of the SDPs. As this checklist was developed at the workshop on the review of the SDP pilot school training (9-10 April 2013), the checklist and the SDPs had to be sent back to the schools so that the schools could amend the SDPs with respect to the checklist. The schools only submitted two copies of the SDPs which has resulted in some problems as an approved stamped versions of the SDPs have not been sent back to the schools. One copy of the SDP was kept by the DEO’s office and the other was sent, with the completed checklist, to the GMT. This has complicated issues when verification and monitoring teams visited the schools as there are no approved SDPs at school level in Goromonzi.

In the roll out of the SDP training to non-pilot schools a few key observations were made. Some schools attended the SDP training with their village head or chief. The involvement of these stakeholders has led to the traditional leaders mobilizing their communities to assist their schools. Most schools did not know the importance of long-term planning and this has made a difference to the schools and the communities. Where schools which were not to receive SIG funds wanted to attend the training this was allowed. The District Education Officer (DEO) of Goromonzi also felt that he would have liked the non-pilot schools in Goromonzi to attend the training.

During the baseline data collection a series of questions were asked of the stakeholders (school heads, school development committees, teachers, learners and parents) about the development of the SDPs. The level of knowledge by a stakeholder reduces from the head (100%) to the SDC (90%) to the teacher (64%) to the learner (51%) to the parents.  

---

(49%) which may indicate that the heads are not cascading the training information on SDPs to other stakeholders. As the stakeholder group size increases and the ‘distance’ from the top of the hierarchy (the school head) is increased, the percentage of people with knowledge is reduced (Figure 2.5). This could be due to some heads not wanting to cascade information or some stakeholders (parents) not wanting to commit their time on how the school is being run. Misconceptions of stakeholders on the SDP may also have been due to confusion as to where the SIG fits into the SDPs. There may be issues with knowledge being lost due to the changes in SDCs on an annual basis and the appointment of substantive school heads where school heads were acting.

Figure 2.5 Level of information on School Development Plans

Consultations with stakeholders during the development of the SDPs were not as good as it could have been. The numbers of stakeholders interviewed that had knowledge of the current SDPs were 80% of SDC members, 49% teachers, 15% of learners and 17% of parents interviewed. The few respondents who were familiar with the current SDPs were happy with it (79% and over) – see Figure 2.6. The most noted recommendation for improving the SDP planning process was that there should be more consultations with all stakeholders groups (teachers, learners and parents). School heads recommended that there should be more time for the process. Almost all stakeholders wanted more information on SDPs. More parents knew about the SIG than the SDP – possibly due to the money component or the actual purchased items. Most respondents want further information on the SIG.

The SDP training (orientation) was evaluated at a workshop on the 9th and 10th April 2013. A final evaluation report of all the trainings (i.e. of the 7,004 schools) was produced in September 2013. Some of the findings from this workshop included:

- Some of the people with special needs could not read the materials (e.g. if they are blind).
- More time should be spent understanding the minimum functionality standards.
- SDPs should include a more detailed summary of the finances of the school.
- In general, facilitators were confident but some of the first timers needed support.
- The FACE form from UNICEF appears to be user friendly so it can be filled in intuitively.
- Material should be rationalized and an overload of information should be avoided.
- The SDPs should include the reasons for the high drop-out rates and low pass rates so that the reasons can be targeted in the SDP.
- The explanation of the SIG programme should come at the end of the programme so that the whole programme and SDP does not end up focusing on the SIG.
- Facilitators should have the ability to anchor debates so that participants remain focused.
- The participations of children might be necessary only for day 1 when priorities for the SDPs are identified.

The evaluation of the training of all schools showed that there was a major positive change in the capacity of the participants to develop viable SDPs. Participants were happy with the content and quality of the training, knowledge gained from the training and the conduct of the facilitators. The respondents indicated that there had been an improvement in the quality of planning at school level although they were worried about skills retention as SDCs change every year. The participants recommended that the terms of the SDCs be extended (DEOs indicated that if an SDC committee is effective, the committee can be voted back in the next

---

year), they were also concerned about the restrictions in terms of eligible items which can be purchased with SIG funds and they thought the training period was too short. Positive outcomes of the SDP trainings include the inclusion of children more in the running of schools, better communications between the heads and the SDCs, increased transparency of the school management, improved planning at District Office level, increased involvement of children and parents in the schools, interactions with peers in other schools and increasing personal capacities of children to plan their own lives.

A review of some of the pilot SDPs has shown that for some of the schools there is a problem with:

- The time frame which has been planned for the SDPs covers between three and five years. The SIG budgets usually cover only one year this could be because the schools were not sure if they were going to receive funds for 2014 and 2015. School heads frequently asked the enumerators for the baseline survey about whether their schools were going to receive SIG funds in 2014.
- Some of the monitoring and evaluation time frames and frameworks in the SDPs need to be revised.
- There are ranges in the quality of the SDPs with some lacking depth and others being very comprehensive. This in some cases is due to the facilitator in the training. In other cases it is due to the existing knowledge at the school concerned. SDPs were originally introduced in 1992. At that time, the extent of the take-up and development of SDPs was dependent on the Provincial Education Director (Mr Bowora, personal communication). Some schools brought existing SDPs to the current training as well as school profiles and statistics. This gave these schools a distinct advantage in developing their SDPs at the workshops.
- Some schools felt that the SDPs were developed at the workshop and that there was not enough time to consult with stakeholders at school level.
- In some cases it was felt that the SDPs were limited and did not address issues that the school needed (e.g. construction).

From the end of project report by SNV27 the following final statement was made: “The direct involvement of Ministry Head Office from the Minister, the Permanent Secretary and the Co-Directors and all their staff involved made the design and implementation of the project easy as there was a high level of ownership at the top which was transferred down to the lower levels of the Ministry. This is encouraging for future institutionalization of projects of a similar nature”.

### 2.2.2 Financial management training

The results of the micro assessment of Head Office of MoPSE, the numerous cases of discharges of school heads because of the misuse of funds and a baseline survey on knowledge of financial management issues within the education sector showed that there is a need to strengthen the financial management capacity of all levels of MoPSE. Issues which led to this included the need for financial management of two donor-funded programmes (EDF II and Global Partnership in Education (GPE), MoPSE was rated as ‘high risk’ under UNICEF’s Micro Assessment, inadequate financial management skills by school heads and the large number of new recruits of finance and non-finance personnel who have not been trained. MoPSE requested assistance for the training of finance and non-finance personnel. A national training programme on financial management for the education sector was designed in January 2013 for head office, provincial offices, district offices, and all school heads. This training programme was subsequently agreed upon28. The training was to be carried out jointly by MoPSE, Ministry of Public Services (MoPS) and UNICEF. MoPSE knows their training needs, the required training content and is ultimately responsible for the

---


programme, MoPS has the facilitation and training skills (and the mandate) and UNICEF has the specialised expertise and the funding.

The proposed training programme is taking place in stages in line with those proposed except for some slight variations. The training materials were developed in February and March 2013 as planned. A manual on basic accounting procedures was developed and approved. This manual and the related training were based on existing MoPSE documents and systems. The manual is based on the Manual on Financial Administration in Non-Government Schools as well as other existing regulations.

The training was divided into three groups: finance personnel, non-finance personnel at provincial and district level, and school heads. The financial management training at provincial and district level took place for finance personnel in April 2013 as planned. Preparation for the training of trainers (ToT) rollout with key facilitators and coordinators in August 2013 was an additional activity. The roll out of ToT took place in August 2013 (originally scheduled for June/July 2013), pilot training of the school heads took place in September 2013 (originally planned for July 2013), financial management training at provincial and district level for management personnel took place in October 2013 (originally planned for May 2013), and roll out of financial management training for school heads starting in October 2013 as planned. The training for the school heads was originally scheduled to be 3 days but has been reduced to 2.5 days.

The financial management training for the SIG programme, including the training of the pilot schools, was reviewed and a way forward proposed in October 2013. The financial management training has had positive ‘spill-over’ effects including the enhancement of the reputation of the Head Office in their support and oversight issues, empowering the MoPS and its training institutes, and empowering the finance officers who were selected to be trainers.

Two lessons came out of the training for the pilot and the rollout to date. The ToT should happen after the training of the pilot personnel so that the ToT can take into account the lessons learnt in the pilot and, the financial management manual and the trainer’s manual should have been finalized and printed ahead of the ToT. There is also a need for ongoing training in financial management.

The monitoring and evaluation of the trainings has been carried out at every training. The monitoring activities have included a pre and post workshop test for every participant, direct attendance and supervision by all members of the core team (national coordinators, regional coordinators, the UNICEF support team and selected team leaders), completion of feedback forms by participants at the end of each day and reports on each workshop by the coordinators on the return to the office.

For the training of the pilot schools, 130 schools (86 males and 44 females) out of the invited 132 took part. In the pre-test 109 participants failed however in the post-test 113 passed. The training of the pilot school heads had multiple purposes. The first was to enhance financial management capacity of school heads and ensure effective management of schools to meet the school functionality criteria. The second was to test the training instruments including the finance and administration manual’s content, trainers and training methodology before rolling out the training to the rest of the country.

---

It was decided at the review workshop of the pilot school head training that the content of the manual hardly needed to be changed based on the feedback from the training and that the school heads in the pilot would not need retraining. However, some of the school heads in the pilot schools felt that they needed retraining as the participants in the different sessions received different information and there was no manual available for their training. They did receive the revised manual later. It is noted from the list of attendees that there was no representation from Special Needs within MoPSE.

The analysis of the evaluation forms for the workshop on the training of pilot school heads showed that participants greatly appreciated the training programme as they felt that it equipped them with the relevant knowledge and skills needed for their day to day operations. Almost 60% of the staff members who attended the workshop were fairly new to their appointments as school heads with most of them only having been in post for less than 2 years. None of them had received any inductions. There were topics on the course which offered new insights (asset management, budgeting, transport, security, internal checks and controls, stores management and bank reconciliations). Participants wanted more practice on bank reconciliations and budgeting at school level. The school heads indicated that internal checks and controls need to be improved at school level. Participants felt that they could apply the knowledge learnt especially in the areas of record keeping, preparing more informative budgets, managing transport in a better way, sourcing circulars and checking bank reconciliations properly.

Participants indicated that they had no reference material such as the acts (e.g. Public Finance Management Act) and circulars. It was recommended that a post-workshop survey of participants be done at the end of the year, that all new staff should receive induction on finance and administration before taking up their posts, the current training should have more days, and there should be regular on the job training for non-finance managers. Heads wanted more practice and wanted a partner to come and coach them. It is suggested that the District Accountant consolidate the training by running further trainings at cluster level. In the stock take and way forward of the financial management training this was corroborated as it was recommended that there be a “more systematic capacity building effort of finance offices and managers as part of MoPSE’s mandate to ensure compliance with regulations and instructions. Refreshment of content and induction for new appointees should be taken into account as part of an institutionalized capacity building programme.”

With regards specifically to the pilot training, the Finance Consultant from UNICEF and key informant interviews with stakeholders from the schools indicated that there were some issues which need to be dealt with. The groups being trained were too big. The trainings were mixed by school types (satellite, P3, S3, Special) with different systems and requirements in terms of the funds handled and the methods of handling money (some schools have computerized systems). The mixing of the different school types in the pilot meant that some aspects were missed and it was difficult to get the training pitched at the right level. The assimilation of knowledge from the training depended on the background and school of the person being trained. There were a number of school heads who failed the post-training test. A strategy needs to be developed on how to address this; however the first step is the need to analyze the background information of these heads to find out if there is any common factor which can be addressed. Suggestions on strategies include support visits from the district accountants, cluster level training and the internal auditors of MoPSE could carry out verification exercises for these schools. It is also recommended that school heads be retested at the end of the first term in 2014 to check on the impact of the training.

The issues of staff turnover require careful attention. Based on the information from MoPSE, a total of 47 new District Education Officers (out of a total of 72) were selected in late 2013 and officially appointed in early 2014, which would indicate that many of them may have missed the training opportunities.

2.3 The implementation

The following section presents the duties of each level of MoPSE (Figure 1.3) for the SIG. It then summarizes what has been done, lessons learnt, successes and challenges for each level of MoPSE.

2.3.1 Province

Responsibilities

The Provincial Offices are supported by the GMT for SIG related activities. The functions of the Provincial Offices in the SIG programme are as follows: coordinate support to schools receiving grants in their districts, monitor training programmes in their districts, provide a central provincial information desk on grant funding, confirm the funds to be allocated to each district and school, monitor receipt of the grant funds in schools through their district offices, monitor the collection of grant acquittal reports from schools by districts, monitor district visits to schools, ensure that the proper liquidation processes and systems are in place and that liquidations take place within the stated time period, coordinate provincial level audit staff to ensure proper financial management at schools, act as a provincial point of contact for the School Grants Utilization Survey and hold a School Grants Review Workshop on assessment findings.

Activities

The involvement of the Mashonaland East Provincial Office with the pilot in Goromonzi was mainly through the monitoring of training (school development plans and financial management). The Provincial Education Director (PED) felt these trainings were essential for the general administration of schools. Staff were trained on SDPs through their monitoring of the trainings. No school visits were carried out by his office and there were no monitoring and evaluation activities specific to the SIG, although when school visits did take place the education officer would include the SIG in the general monitoring.

Lessons learnt, successes and challenges

It is felt that monitoring will be needed to help get the systems sorted in the schools and make them self-sufficient; however the Mashonaland East Provincial Office has problems with resources and motivation.

With respect to the financial management training, it is felt that more practice would benefit the school heads. Continuous training on the SDPs will create a better understanding of them. The BSPZ must put emphasis on training.

The Mashonaland East Provincial Office has received some feedback on the SIG programme. The parents are unhappy about not having signing powers on the SIG accounts. The choice of Metbank has been queried by some districts due to their lack of access of its branches. There is a feeling that other banks should be used. Metbank does not have a known profile so people are wary of it. It was felt the focus of the SIG should be on the extremely poor schools and that construction should be allowed in the satellite schools. The impression from the activities of the SIG programme is that things are changing for the better with funds being wisely spent and that there should be no change in the programme as the framework gives a lot of room to manoeuvre. The programme has made people think that they can change their situations by looking introspectively.
The Provincial Office for Harare was not aware if their special schools had received their funds. There is a need for reporting structures and knowledge of their roles and responsibilities.

The Provincial Education Director (PED) for Special Needs felt that special needs are often overlooked and that School Psychological Services must be involved at all levels e.g. in the development of questionnaires, forms and visits. She felt that primary schools may overlook their resource units due to the limited grants that they are getting.

2.3.2 District Responsibilities

The District Education Office is responsible for the day to day administration of the grant at district and school level. The District Education Officer (DEO) and the District Accountant are the key officers responsible for activities in the district and schools. Their roles include the arranging of the SDP training for school clusters, ensuring that the schools receive the relevant information needed for the SIG programme (Annex G), acknowledging receipt of funds in the schools, ensuring that schools liquidate on time and following up when acquittal reports are outstanding or incomplete, checking that all bank records, school expenditure documents and files are in order, ensuring that SIG fund expenditure is on eligible items, dealing with queries on the SIG, monitoring of at least 10% of schools, facilitating the external verification process, onward transmission of information to the Provincial Office and dealing with duties communicated by the province office (from the GMT).

Activities

In early 2013 Ministry officials were asked to attend a workshop at the Crowne Plaza. DEOs were sensitized on the programme, its expectations, what the pilot district was expected to do and on the targets set. It was noted at the time that the programme was already running behind according to the original Concept Design.

The programme then took off for the pilot schools with workshops being held to sensitize the school heads of the pilot schools. Training of the pilot schools on the SDPs then took place. These trainings were 2.5 days and involved school staff, the SDCs and two children (a boy and a girl) per school. The trainings took place using approximately four clusters at a time (an average of 24 schools per cluster). The schools were expected to produce their SDPs before the beginning of the second term. Originally the criteria by which the SDPs were to be judged were not available. When they became available they were distributed by the District Office to the school heads who then revisited their SDPs and brought them into line with the required criteria. The only resource available to the schools was the list of criteria. Some sections of the schools’ SDP were still too long or too short, however they were much improved by the introduction of the criteria list. The SDPs were then evaluated and approved (where relevant) by the District Office. The District Office worked as a team using the criteria to evaluate the SDPs and the submissions list to keep track of the SDPs. The submissions list also included the school name, type (e.g. P3 or S3) and registration number. Only a few of the SDPs were returned to the schools to be redone. Once all the SDPs were approved, the SDPs, the list of schools and their details were sent to the GMT. However this had skipped the Provincial Office so they were sent back to the District Office. They were then sent to the Provincial Office. The Provincial Office reviewed the District Office submission and then forwarded this to the GMT. It is assumed by the District Office that the SDPs were reviewed and approved by Head Office but no feedback was given to the District Office. Bank accounts were opened for each school by the GMT. The GMT produced a paysheet with school details which was passed onto UNICEF and the money was then disbursed by UNICEF. The first and second disbursements were reflected in the school bank accounts on the 10th July 2013. The schools then spent the money using the standardised procurement process. It was later realised that there was a need to train the school heads in financial management as they had no training in this area. The pre-test for the financial management
showed that the school heads had little or no financial management knowledge. Since the financial training there has been a noticeable change in the way that things are run with policies and regulations being followed (Goromonzi District Accountant, pers. comm.). The original implementation of the SIG was slow and not good, however, since the training, things have progressed much better.

The District Office is currently compiling (December 2013) a report for the SIG. The office has asked the schools for a narrative report. The structure specified by the District Office included the use of SIG funds, achievements to date (teaching achievements), activities, challenges faced by the school, bank statements and a FACE form. Deadlines were given to the schools as follows: 29th November 2013 for the reports on the first and second term disbursements, 12th December for the reports on the third term disbursement and the 13th December for the requests (FACE form) for next year. A review of the already received reports showed the following:

1. Achievements were misread by the schools as meaning the items bought when it should have been the changes in the schools.
2. Where the bank statements went back far enough (seven schools) it was seen that the deposit of the third tranche came through on two different days – for five schools they received it on the 10th September 2013 and two schools they received it on the 4th October 2013.

Schools need to be prepared psychologically for the next step in the New Year. The SDPs need to be revisited to develop the additional annual plan for 2014 and the schools need to be informed of this. It was thought that schools realized from the SDP training that they were part of the pilot and would be receiving money every year until 2015. As schools were asking the data collection teams for the baseline survey about receiving the SIG grant in 2014 it is thought that the confusion could be due to the fact that at the training it was not clear if the non-primary satellite and P3 schools would be receiving funds. (It may also be that as the rollout is to primary schools in 2014 this would be interpreted to mean the secondary schools would not receive funds – a decision was taken at an ECG meeting that all schools in the pilot would receive money for the duration of the SIG).

Schools can make cases with the District Office to change the items to be purchased from those given in the SDP. It is assumed that schools will follow the SDP however if they are not going to they need to consult and get permission from the District Office. This must be done in writing with strong reasons for the changes.

Lessons learnt, success and challenges
The following section highlights the main discussion points with district officials.

Adjacent schools were trained in the same clusters for the pilot schools on the development of SDPs. It would be expected that they would collaborate on projects that would affect adjacent schools; however, personal issues between individuals can cause problems. There was one school visited that indicated that there were some issues concerning water with its neighbouring high school which have since been resolved with the assistance of the Counsellor for the ward. Sometimes there are issues between the SDCs and the school heads as the SDCs try to run the schools. Again this is often due to personal issues between individuals.

The trainers in the SDP trainings tried to impart the idea that SDPs are to develop the long-term vision of the school and that the SIG is just one of the funding partners however the SIG was often seen as the focus of the SDP when it was introduced early on in the training.

The DEO felt that the nine Goromonzi schools which were not included in the pilot should have been included in the SDP training. He felt that every school in the district should be
trained regardless of whether they qualified for SIG. The schools which were not trained were Ariel, Old Windsor, Ralph, Windview, Glen Forest, Goromonzi High, St Dominics Chishawasha, St Ignatius College, and St John’s.

There was a need for more time and resources for the Goromonzi District Office so that it could monitor more and confirm what was happening in the schools. No resources for monitoring were available. The office had to use its own resources for monitoring from the BSPZ and will have to claim these back. This was felt by the District Office not to be satisfactory as the monitoring could not be planned properly.

Staff turnover and changes in SDC committees will be a problem as knowledge will be lost. There must be inductions for new SDC committees.

Report backs to school stakeholders, including teachers, on the SDP and financial management training would have benefited the whole school and made implementation easier and outcomes better. Only a few school heads are doing the right thing concerning cascading the training on SDPs and the involvement of all stakeholders. Parents and teachers needed to be given more information so that they took ownership. The training was not feeding back to school level even to teachers.

The SDP training has benefited the schools in giving them focus and the ability to do long term planning. It has reactivated education. The SDP is an informative document that can be used for other purposes and as an information source on the school. The prioritization of the activities for the SIG funds in an SDP may not be appropriate as the wrong things are prioritized. Aspects of teaching should receive prioritisation whereas some schools may be prioritizing more fancy assets e.g. a bus when desks are needed.

The Goromonzi District Office has a SIG District Committee comprising the DEO, the District Accountant, the Education Officer and the Remedial Tutor. This committee meets every fortnight. This committee has contributed to the success of the SIG in Goromonzi.

Some schools did not receive their cheque books and were only able to start the SIG activities once these were made available.

The extent to which the training on SDPs has impacted on the schools should not be underestimated. The training has triggered a desire in the schools for improvement. This has been shown by self-help projects that have been submitted to the DEOs office for approval. People are getting more professional, working as teams and wanting to improve their schools. People are respecting each other’s roles and seeing that children can contribute.

The District Accountant felt that the practice in the financial management training was not adequate e.g. for writing up cash books and doing bank reconciliations. The District Accountant wants to address this through cluster training of the school heads, deputy heads, senior teacher, clerks, bursar and one representative of the SDC (treasurer) on a regular basis (termly) with the school bringing their own books to work on. The baseline of the pilot showed that continuous training is needed on all aspects of school management (SDCs, SPDs, and financial management).

The needs of the implementation process of the SIG have compromised the other work of the Goromonzi District office. Staff have worked overtime. The activities of the SIG were not built into the work plan for 2013 which has created pressure on the staff but they have not wanted to let down the Nation and have put in extra time. The office feels honoured to have been chosen for the pilot and the district has received benefits which the other districts in the roll out will not receive.
The staff of the Goromonzi District Office were not trained separately on the SIG requirements. However they acted as facilitators for the trainings for the schools and hence received training on the core activities of the programme.

Being the ‘guinea pigs’ has meant that the district has made mistakes and the district will not benefit from the refined trainings of the rollout. The SDPs for Goromonzi may not be as good as those of other districts however they will have benefited in having assistance which it will not be possible to give in the roll out.

Other national programmes have also impacted on the pilot of the SIG (referendum and the elections) as district office staff was involved in these activities.

The district office carries out regular supervision visits to schools in the districts. There is a template available for lesson observations however for other types of observations there are no standardized templates. For example, visits may include assessments of financial records. For visits such as these a general examination is made of the relevant records. SIG has also been examined in the same way in the usual monitoring visits. The District Office commenced monitoring in November 2013 of the SIG programme using BSPZ funds. A monitoring and evaluation form was developed by the DEOs office for this purpose (Annex K) which collects information on SIG financial records, items funded by SIG (plus physical inspection), challenges and comments. This is a good starting point for a standardized form for all district offices, however, it may need to be revised so that it is easier to analyze the data for large number of schools.

Additional activities at the Goromonzi District Office to support the SIG included cluster workshops on the best way to open bank accounts, checking that schools had received their money after each disbursement and following up if there were problems and dealing with queries on procedures and procurement.

Challenges at District level included mobility (for monitoring), monitoring and evaluation funding (having to use BSPZ funds), the lack of a dedicated office and office equipment for the SIG activities and the need for continuous monitoring and evaluation trips (which could not be undertaken due to transport issues).

There is a worry that schools may deliberately add extra OVC fees to the use of the SIG funds (Goromonzi District Accountant, pers. comm.). Schools are allowed to use 10% of the fees they charge learners as incentives for teachers. To manage this there must be strict monitoring of SDPs to make sure that the numbers of OVC are not increased. A limit could be set on the percentage of the SIG grant that can be used for OVC fees. It was suggested that schools set up income generating activities for OVC (using other funds) and the OVC fees can be paid from this.

One key informant felt that although construction is not one of the eligible items for the SIG, it should be reconsidered for each individual case e.g. satellite schools have no classrooms and no accommodation for the teachers. Teaching and teachers happiness is dependent on these. The focus of the SIG and the EDF has been on the child. Teachers have not been considered. If the issues of the teachers are not addressed the schools cannot become child friendly places. Teachers need to be respected and happy. To address this within the SIG, the accommodation of the teachers, and teaching and learning materials could be targeted. However this must be done responsibly.

It is hoped in the next year that the schools will be more experienced in the SIG and the time needs of the schools on SIG issues will be reduced. The monitoring of the SIG by the District Office will continue next year. Apart from the SIG, the DEO hopes that monitoring will be
expanded to include the whole SDP. He wants to encourage the schools to address their whole SDP and that they follow work plans.

Lessons learnt and recommendations by the District Office include:

1. The DEO is particularly not happy that teachers show a lack of information about the SIG. All stakeholders need to be involved and have ownership of the SDPs.
2. If the schools stick to the SDPs they can achieve the objectives of the programme.
3. The schools need to revisit the plans to check on where they have come from, where they are and where they are going. They need to check their action plans. This will encourage them to do better.
4. The Ministry needs to put aside funds which will encourage schools to do their own self help. Schools need to be equipped to help themselves. Schools should be encouraged to generate their own incomes. They could use practical subjects to do this but the use of the funds should be transparent and maybe built into their SDPs.

2.3.3 Schools Responsibilities

The school head’s function within the SIG programme is to work with the School Development Committees (SDC), the DEO, and, where applicable, with the responsible authority to develop SDPs, submit the SDPs to the DEOs, prepare the school’s annual budgets and reporting, promote flows of information on the SIG to all relevant stakeholders, implement the SDP, prepare summary reports as required by the GMT and DEO, open a dedicated SIG bank account, prepare and submit request forms (FACE forms) to the DEO, monitor and report on the fiscal probity of the school, and submit financial reports and documents to the DEO.

The schools monitor themselves using the work plans in their SDPs. These documents have deadlines that the school sets for themselves. They have to follow Government regulations and procedures for the expenditure of SIG funds.

Activities

The SDP training took place in March 2013 for the pilot schools. This was followed by the finalization and submission of the SDPs to the District Offices in April 2013. Bank accounts were opened for the schools by the GMT. The first and second disbursements of the grant were received by the schools as one payment into their bank accounts on 10 July 2013. The schools then started the process of procuring the items identified in their SDPs for the SIG funds. The third tranche was received for most schools on the 10 October 2013 with some schools receiving the tranche on the 4 October 2013. The schools were then required to submit reports for the first and second disbursements on the 29th November 2013, reports for the third disbursement on the 12th December 2013 and the request for the first disbursement of 2014 on the 13th December 2013.

Lessons learnt, challenges and successes

This section briefly describes some the lessons learnt, challenges and successes which were at school level. The pilot monitoring and verification gives more information and detail under the relevant studies that identified the lessons learnt, challenges and successes.

This excerpt from an SNV evaluation report on the SDP trained gives early feedback on the impact of the SIG funds:

“Some participating schools reported having utilized the money on the following among others:

- Furniture (including teachers’ chairs and desks)
- Stationery

At one school it is reported a Wi-Fi has been installed, allowing children to access Internet!

The reported outcomes in schools include a general improvement in the learning environment and physical outlook of the schools. Children now generally like associating with the now more friendly school environment as a result. Attendance has also improved as those who would come to school and spend the day sitting on the floor and would therefore sometimes dread coming to school on some chilly winter days, now have their own desks. The individually issued desks have even resulted in increased care from the children as they are now accountable for any damages on their desks. Besides increased attendance, there is increased enrolment also as those disadvantaged children who used to stay home due to their inability to pay fees are now able to come to school as their fees are being catered for by the SIG fund. In some schools, children no longer have any fears of copying each other, especially the examination classes i.e. Grade 7 and ‘O/A’ Levels as the individual desks bought using the fund are now making this difficult.”

Two reported challenges at school level reported by the District Office with SIG activities included the refusal of suppliers to accept cheques or accept MetBank cheques, difficulties in finding quotations, difficulties in finding experts, shortages of supplies on the market e.g. textbooks, suppliers wanting payment first, not being able to draw cash for transport and subsistence, photocopying and stationery and the need to develop a suppliers list.

The reported outcomes at school level by the District Office included that the schools all appreciated the money and one school reported outcomes in the reduction in children sharing textbooks and improved reading skills.

2.4 The pilot monitoring and verification

2.4.1 The baseline
It was originally envisaged that there would be two data collection exercises concerning the 132 schools in the pilot – the baseline in July and then the evaluation in October. However this did not happen and the data collection only took place once in October 2013, three months after the first disbursement of two tranches.

A core indicator framework was proposed in the initial design framework with the following outputs:
- Output 1. Improved learning outcomes for grant schools
- Output 2. Improved quality and professional development of teaching staff
- Output 3. Improved access to education for mainstream learners and improved access for OVC
- Output 4. Improved capacity to plan school development and manage school budgets
- Output 5. An improved physical learning environment that is safe and secure
- Output 6. Increased number of registered schools

The aim of the baseline was to establish the status in the pilot schools with respect to the six outputs given above, to test the baseline questionnaires in preparation for the rollout and to

---

revise the core indicator framework. Due to the timing of the baseline, which was after SIG implementation had already commenced, it is recommended that the data from the baseline should not be used to set the baseline for the whole country or the targets that the SIG programme is aiming to reach. In addition to this, the baseline was conducted after implementation had commenced and hence the values obtained in the survey are not baseline figures. It is recommended that the core indicator framework be amended based on the lessons learnt from the baseline (see Annex F for a first revision) and that the questionnaires used for the pilot baseline be amended to collect ‘need to know’ information and remove the ‘nice to know’ information questions. The baseline next year for the rollout to the 4,500 schools can then be used to set the baseline values for the indicators and the target values for the indicators.

All schools in the pilot of the School Improvement Grant were visited and data collected using 3 baseline questionnaires in October 2013. Two of the questionnaires were similar (one for primary schools and one for secondary schools) and collected data concerning the people and resources of each school. The third questionnaire collected information from the School Development Committee concerning the activities of the committee and the local communities’ involvement in the school. The data were collected by combined teams of the MoPSE and the Education Partners (Farm Orphan Support Trust, Mavambo Trust, Plan International, Save the Children and World Vision International).

Figure 2.7 Interviewing the school head for Nyakudya Secondary School, Goromonzi

The results of the baseline are as follows. They have been put into logical groupings with reference to learners, special needs, teachers, school development committees and school development plans, and schools.
Learners
There were 67,789 learners in 131 schools. Goromonzi schools had 64,256 learners in 100 schools and the special schools had 3,533 learners in 31 schools (Table 2.1). The statistical data for one special school was missing.

Table 2.1 Total learners enrolled in the pilot schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Registered</th>
<th>Satellite</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male learners</td>
<td>Female learners</td>
<td>No. Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goromonzi Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (ECD only)</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>2,629</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (without ECD)</td>
<td>21,800</td>
<td>21,689</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7,171</td>
<td>6,706</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (ECD only)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (without ECD)</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>33,660</td>
<td>32,760</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1. The enrolments are broken down for primary schools by ECD and Primary (without ECD). Not all primary schools have ECD.
2. The numbers for the special schools where money was given to the Special Units only do not include the total enrolment of the school.

Approximately 2% of learners repeated in 2013 in both primary and secondary schools in Goromonzi. The number of repeaters was higher (approximately 7%) in the special schools. The number of repeaters was greater in the lower grades in primary school than the higher grades. The number of repeaters was greater in the higher forms (Form 3 and 4) than in the lower forms (Form 1 and 2).

The number of dropouts was approximately 1% in primary school, approximately 3% in registered secondary schools and 10% in secondary satellite schools. The percentage of learners who dropout in special schools (18.0%) was higher than in the Goromonzi Schools (1.3%).

The average pass rates are higher in special schools than Goromonzi schools for Grade 7 (Table 2.2a). Special schools do not put all their learners into the examinations. The pass rate pattern is reversed for ‘O’ Level (Table 2.2b). Satellite schools have a lower pass rate than registered schools for all exam types.
The number of learners with special needs in primary school in Goromonzi is 1,952 learners and 2,482 learners in special schools. There are 69 out of 73 primary schools in Goromonzi with learners with special needs. The number of learners with special needs in secondary schools in Goromonzi is 454 learners and 2,482 learners in special schools. There are 24 out of 27 secondary schools in Goromonzi with learners with special needs. Only 12 primary schools in Goromonzi have either Resource Units and/or Authorised Special Classes. There are no secondary schools in Goromonzi with these units or classes.

The primary school heads in Goromonzi indicated that 13,396 learners are OVC (27% of learners). The definition of OVC in the questionnaires used the BEAM definitions for OVC. In the primary special schools the school heads indicated that 1,754 learners are OVC (62% of learners). The secondary schools in Goromonzi had 3,936 learners (27% of learners) that were reported as OVC and the special secondary schools have 480 learners (66% of learners) that were reported as OVC.

SIG was used to pay school fees/levies for 1,098 learners, mainly in the registered primary schools – see Table 2.3. Few fees have been paid by BEAM compared to those outstanding in the primary and secondary schools in Goromonzi (Table 2.3). In Goromonzi, fees or levies have been paid for 9,628 learners (6,639 by BEAM, 1,003 by SIG and 1,986 by others) and in special schools fees and/or levies have been paid for 1,876 learners (1,590 by BEAM, 95 by SIG and 191 by others). If an average payment of $35 was taken per learner fees/levies, the amount used for OVCs in the SIG would be approximately $38,430 (around 3% of the 1.2 million disbursed to pilot schools of the SIG).
Table 2.3 Learners assisted with fees/levies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School level</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Paid by BEAM</th>
<th>BEAM claim still outstanding</th>
<th>Paid by SIG</th>
<th>Paid by others</th>
<th>Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goromonzi Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>2,878</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>2,033</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td>3,663</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Schools</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>3,955</td>
<td>7,889</td>
<td>6,334</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total excludes the BEAM outstanding learners.

Special needs
Eighteen selected resources were identified to reflect evidence of inclusive policies on which data were collected. The most common resource that schools have is trained remedial teachers (46, 39%) followed by trained school counsellors (44, 37%) and special needs teachers (39, 33%).

Special schools have provided hearing aids for 132 learners but a further 249 learners are in need of hearing aids. Two special schools used SIG funds to provide hearing aids for their learners. Schools have provided prescription glasses for 26 learners and a further 77 learners are in need of prescription glasses.

Teachers
There are 1,713 teachers in 95 Goromonzi schools and 511 teachers in the 32 special schools. There are more female teachers than male teachers. For the data available, the most common qualification of teachers was a diploma (65%) with 7% of the teachers unqualified in the schools. Teachers were generally well prepared for lessons with 99% of teachers having schemes for subjects taught and lesson plans, however only approximately 70% of teachers had records of the learner’s progress. Only 16% of teachers received in-service teaching in the year previous to the survey.

School Development Committees and School Development Plans
Not all schools had a budget in their SDPs (88%). Satellite schools have less committees, management information records and finance items than their registered counterparts. Not all schools had a finance committee and a procurement committee (85% and 86% respectively). The least common management information record was the finance diary (51%), the special needs (32%) and file index book (27%). The least common finance item was a vote book (21%) and independently audited accounts with the District Office for June (23%).

When a list of 12 possible activities that could be considered in the SDPs were considered by the community, it was found that registered schools have more active communities than satellite schools. Primary schools, both Goromonzi and special schools, have more active communities than secondary schools of the same type. The most common activity that communities undertake is the repair of damaged buildings or facilities (73 schools) followed by ensuring the safety of children and teachers (52 schools) and replacing school materials (52 schools).
School facilities
Only 58% of classrooms have usable writing boards. Learner to desk ratios and learner to seat ratios are variable with ratios ranging from 1 to 4.1 for desks and 1 to 2.2 for sitting places depending on the type of school.

More than half of the schools (76, 62%) had ratios of girls to toilets which were higher than the recommended standard of 1:20. Less than half of the schools (55, 45%) had ratios of boys to toilets that were higher than the recommended standard of 1:25. Almost half of the schools (56, 49%) had safe adequate water within 500m of the school.

2.4.2 The process review
At the same time as the data for the baseline were collected, data were collected using key informant interview guides. For the roll-out of the School Improvement Grant to be a success it is necessary to review the processes of the pilot which have taken place at school level. The specific objectives of the process evaluation of the pilot schools were to establish the situation in the schools in the pilot with respect to the following:
- The current understanding of the School Improvement Grant within the school by each of the stakeholders (school head, SDC, teachers, learners and parents).
- To understand the current status of the School Development Plan (SDP) and the activities that led to its development.
- To understand what is going to be done with the School Improvement Grant.
- To understand the activities that the stakeholders think that the School Improvement Grant will support.
The process review of the pilot of the School Improvement Grant covers every school in the pilot. That is, 100 schools in Goromonzi in Mashonaland East Province and 32 special schools in seven provinces. The data were collected in October 2013 by combined teams of the MoPSE and the Education Partners (Farm Orphan Support Trust, Mavambo Trust, Plan International, Save the Children and World Vision International). In each school, the following were the intended target groups to be interviewed using the Key Informant Interview guides:

- The school head,
- Two members of the School Development Committee,
- One teacher from each grade or form,
- Four learners each from Grade 5 and 6 in primary schools and Forms 1, 2, 3 and Lower 6 in secondary schools.
- One parent from each grade or form, whichever is relevant.

In addition, Focus Group Discussions were carried out, where possible, with parents (two discussions, one with each gender) and learners (two discussions, one with each gender, using children in Grade 7 in primary schools, and Form 4 and Form 6 in secondary schools) in the twelve case study schools.

The following are the highlights of the process review and the recommendations resulting from the review. At the time of the review the programme is well established in most schools with the spending of the money well under way.

**Establishment of the programme**

Staff meetings were the main method used to disseminate information about the SIG to the teachers. Four school heads indicated that they did nothing to inform the teachers about the SIG. Issues of SIG in the schools are dealt with as they arise. This mainly concerns the meetings by the procurement and finance committees and these meetings are usually minuted. Monitoring measures that school heads have introduced to monitor SIG include separate committees to monitor SIG, monitoring SIG progress through meeting minutes (procurement and finance committees) and introducing inventories. Some of the inventories specifically monitor items purchased with SIG funds. Results show that the implementation of the SIG at school level has been successful and, in most cases, the money has been spent.

School heads said that the banks should allow withdrawal of cash and RTGS, and schools should be allowed to use banks of their own choice which are convenient. There are issues concerning the use of the current bank which need to be addressed to facilitate payments of suppliers. School heads and SDCs indicated that the procurement system, the use of cheques (some service providers do not accept cheques), and the cheque limitation of $500 has made the implementation of the SIG difficult. School heads and SDCs would like the amount received under SIG increased and the restrictions to be removed.

There are issues with the knowledge of different stakeholder groups of SDCs, SDPs, and SIG due to the lack of information cascading to the other stakeholders by the schools heads. More time was needed for the development of the SDPs. The school heads would like more and continuous training in all issues including financial management. There was no standard set of information in the SDP trainings and the financial management trainings.

**Expectations**

The expectation of the different stakeholder groups of SIG were construction and purchase of teaching and learning materials. The expectations of how SIG money was to be spent was not met due to the list of items on which money could not be spent. The most common use
of the SIG money was for furniture and minor repairs. The impact of the use of the money was not evaluated in this study. The immediate impact of the SIG money is given in the 12 case studies. All stakeholders indicated that if they were given money they would use it for major construction while the learners prioritised reading materials and textbooks. This matches their expectations of what the SIG would be spent on.

Figure 2.10 Desks purchased using SIG funds and minor repairs of classrooms at Margaretho Hugo

**Learning environment and outcomes**

More than half of all stakeholder groups (school heads 58%, SDC members 61%, teachers 63%, learners 72% and parents 63%) were happy with the learning environment in their schools however they thought that if the school could prioritise major construction and reading materials that the learning environment would improve. More than half the stakeholders (schools heads 53%, SDC members 67%, teachers 55%, learners 76% and parents 66%) were happy with the learning outcomes but felt that the provision of textbooks and teacher incentives were needed. Accommodation and teacher incentives would improve the dedication and motivation of the teachers.

The main recommendations from this study concerning are as follows:

**Training**

It was recommended that training on SDCs, SDPs and financial management at cluster level is done on a regular basis or, in the case of SDCs, on an annual basis. The stakeholders attending the cluster level training would then be required to cascade the training to school level. This should be monitored by the cluster and supported by MoPSE. Perhaps one person in each cluster could be trained as a local monitor and given a standardised set of tools to monitor the schools.

**Finance**

The partners collecting the data for the process review recommended that SDCs should be included as signatories on the bank accounts. This recommendation was made due to the issues concerning the signatories on the bank accounts that were being expressed by school heads and SDC members to the data collection teams.

Schools complained that the bank’s branches are only based centrally and they are having travel long distances to the banks. Hence schools would like to use banks of their own choice. Government would need to support their choice by negotiating with the banks for the removal of bank charges. The limit ($500) on cheques should be increased. School heads were making out multiple cheques to the same supplier with different dates. In rural areas local suppliers do not have bank accounts and the schools are having problems paying
The schools need to be able to draw cash from the banks to pay these suppliers and for travel and subsistence. The perception of some school heads was that they were not allowed to use bank transfers. There is a need for school heads to be provided with the right information concerning the management and use of their bank accounts.

The procurement system needs to be in place to keep the process transparent.

**School Development Plans**

A manual should be provided on SDPs to all schools. A list of priorities for schools based on the items necessary to improve teaching and learning, and the minimum functionality standards should be drawn up to assist schools to prioritize the items in their SDPs and to be purchased by SIG.

The results of the study has shown that the SIG funds have been used for items identified by the stakeholders as necessary to improve teaching and learning (the stakeholder responses showed that the use of SIG funds matched the items identified as necessary to improve teaching and learning). **However, each school is unique and needs to be considered separately with respect to priorities. The school should be allowed to make a case for this and the case considered.**

### 2.4.3 School visits and case studies

A series of supervision visits were made to schools during the testing of the questionnaires for the SIG baseline and the data collection for the SIG baseline. A total of 18 schools were visited. Different stakeholders (mainly school heads) and data collection teams were interviewed during these visits. In addition, the supervision sat in on a series of interviews (with different types of stakeholders). Annex C gives the list of schools and their characteristics. In addition to the visits to the schools, a series of case studies were compiled on 12 pilot schools (four special schools and eight Goromonzi schools).

![Figure 2.11 The District Accountant for Goromonzi (Mr. Mahoya) examining one of the purchased combination desks](image)
stakeholders and the data collection teams. Some of the results have already been presented in previous sections where relevant.

**School head**
School heads were ‘surprised’ (and very happy) to receive the SIG money indicating that it came ‘just in time’. However school heads are surprised by the limitations on the money. Many of the school heads want to be able to spend the money on construction and felt that the programme’s activities had been ‘imposed from above’ (although the activities were what the school needed). Reasons given for this included the need to provide teachers with housing and to construct more classrooms to avoid hot seating. One school head indicated that they could have built two teachers’ houses with the SIG fund ($5,000 each). Some school heads wanted to pool the money with other money to be able to carry out larger projects.

School heads found the financial management training extremely useful indicating that this was the first time they had received this sort of training and would have liked to have a longer training. It was suggested that this could be extended to other staff e.g. deputy head and bursar so that all concerned with the school finances could have a common understanding and to avoid arguments.

**Purchases**
Some schools negotiated with suppliers to increase the number of items that they could buy with the money e.g. one school negotiated with a South African supplier for hearing aids, other schools negotiated for desks. Two of the schools visited had spent SIG money on items which were not allowed (laptops for the teachers and toilet construction for the staff).

The procurement committee does not include the head so that the head cannot unduly influence the outcome. However in one school the school head felt that he should be included as he has to ultimately sign off on purchases.

The most common item purchased by the schools visited using SIG money is furniture for the children (desks/combination benches and chairs). The type of, cost of and quality of the desks purchased varies by school with the best quality and price being that of the desks purchased by Musirikwe Primary which purchased combination desks seating two learners at a cost of $60. Impacts of the purchase of desks which had been observed by school heads included an improved attendance by learners at school and fewer disruptions to teaching time. Most schools had spent most of both tranches of money by the time they were visited in October 2013.

**Teachers**
ECD teachers were being left out of the SDP and SIG consultation and information processes. Teachers in one school felt that the SIG was concentrating on children and that they were being left out. They want incentives and housing. ‘SIG is a noble idea……..maybe if teachers were helped somehow’.

**School Development Plans**
Heads felt that the SDP had to be completed in the training and that the process was rushed with not enough time for consultation. Some stakeholders felt that little or no consultation had been done on the SDPs and that they did not receive sufficient information on the SIG. The process was often rushed and the time given too short. In some schools there were groups of stakeholders who did not know anything about the SIG and/or the SDP. Generally, where children were consulted about the SDP, they did not link the consultations to the SDP and the SIG. In some schools it was the children that decided how the SIG money should be spent. The development of the SDC in one school involved the following steps: Listing of
ideas by children. Children discussed what they wanted and were excited. Then priorities set by teachers from the children’s ideas and the SDC helped draw up the plan.

When schools discussed issues concerning SDPs and the training, they felt that they had received conflicting messages from schools that had attended other training. They should have received a manual on SDPs.

The SDP training was useful and informative. In some cases it formalized and improved existing SDPs. There is now a need for continual (at least once a term) sensitization of all stakeholders and a need for the financial records to be displayed e.g. printout put on a window of the school office. There is a need for annual reviews of the SDP with respect to the whole SDP and the items that the SIG can be spent on as situations do change in schools.

Adjacent schools should consult each other when developing their SDPs. It was suggested that clusters of schools should meet for extra support and discussion.

Schools often asked if the SIG money was a one-off (for this year only) or whether they were to continue to receive the money and for how long. There appeared to be some confusion possibly due to the rollout phase being for satellite and P3 schools which could confuse the secondary schools into thinking that they will not receive the SIG in 2014.

Finance
One school asked if the money could be received in one tranche so that the benefits could accrue earlier and so that one activity could be completed at a time.

There were multiple banking issues raised by the schools:
- Multiple checks of $500 had to be issued to suppliers for amounts of more than $500. These checks had to have different dates and be presented to the bank on different days. Some schools indicated that they will run out of checks quickly.
- Some suppliers faced challenges in getting the money from the bank.
- Some suppliers do not have bank accounts, for example members of the local community who have provided paid labour.
- For travel and subsistence it would be necessary for the school to cash checks.
- No information has been given to the schools on the different bank charges and their amounts on their accounts.
- Some schools want to be able to use RTGS. They were under the impression that they could not use RTGS. This indicated that the schools were not aware of the conditions for operating the SIG bank accounts.

Schools indicated that the signing powers being allocated to only school staff has been causing issues between the school authorities and the SDCs. SDCs normally have signing rights on all school accounts for development purposes. One head felt that giving the SDC or parents signing powers would give them ownership of the programme and reduce issues at meetings concerning how the money was spent. Parents currently do not feel that they have ownership of the programme. A letter to guide heads on how to use the funds which was received from the Finance Director (the Colonel) had two conflicting paragraphs. The second last paragraph indicated that only civil servants could be signatories on the SIG bank accounts but the last paragraph said that the SDC should guide on the use of the funds. This was being interpreted to mean that the SDCs were responsible for the use of the SIG funds but they felt that as they did not have signing powers that they were powerless in this process.
Anomalies
Grace Covenant primary school became a registered school on 1st May 2013. This school received $4,335 for the SIG grant, the amount to which a satellite school is entitled. A set of procedures needs to be put in place so that information on changes in school details can be communicated to the GMT to allow for that adjustments to be made.

Approach
One of the data collection team leaders felt that the approach of the SIG has been correct. It allows the testing of the system, testing and learning for the suppliers and capacity building. The speed of the notification and implementation was good and indicated the seriousness of intentions (building good faith). This has helped to build the confidence of the communities in SIG and will allow schools to mobilize communities as this is building the trust of the communities in the grant.

It was suggested that small amounts of SIG funding could be used by the school to train the stakeholders at school level.

It was suggested that satellite schools should get more money and that enrolment should be considered when calculating amounts for schools.

Qualitative outcomes observed by the school heads of case study schools
Case studies were carried out on 12 schools (four special schools and eight Goromonzi schools). The special schools were Chengetai (primary, Mutare), Emerald Hill School for the Deaf (secondary, Harare), King George VI (primary, Bulawayo), and Margaretha Hugo (primary, Masvingo). The four primary schools in Goromonzi were Chiremba, St. Dominic Nora, Nyambanje, and Sally Mugabe Heights. The four secondary schools in Goromonzi were Melfort, Nyakudya, Rusununguko and St Michaels. The following list of immediate outcomes were observed by the school heads. Some school heads felt that they could not yet comment due to the short time that the programme had been operating:

- **Chengetai**
  - Cookery has been introduced.
- **Emerald Hill School for the Deaf**
  - Children have been able to listen better once fitted with hearing aids.
  - The attitude of the teachers has improved and made them improve their way of looking at the children.
  - The purchase of some computer accessories has made it possible for learners to sit for their exams.
- **Margaretha Hugo Capota Primary**
  - Improved materials for use in teaching e.g. Braille papers.
  - Children can identify with new gadgets e.g. fridge, toaster.
  - The installation of lights in classes has improved the quality of learning.
- **Chiremba Primary**
  - The children are more comfortable (furniture was purchased) and they are happy that they no longer have to sit on the floor.
- **Sally Mugabe Heights**
  - Improved attendance (due to purchase of ECD furniture).
  - Improved access to learning materials.
  - Children for whom fees were paid passed.
- **Melfort Secondary**
  - Children have access to a variety of books.
  - School attendance has improved.
  - Seating arrangement is now conducive to learning.
  - Positive comments on the learners performance.
- **Rusununguko High**
• Created a conducive learning environment.
• No time is wasted looking for furniture on lesson change over.
• Learners performance has greatly improved.

• St Michaels Secondary
  • Teaching is now no longer teacher centred and learners are now able to work freely and can now exchange ideas, skills and knowledge
  • The quality of work of learners has improved.

2.4.4 Verification
The verification process for the pilot started with a testing of the tools in randomly selected schools by Ernst and Young (Verification Agency) and the UNICEF finance team. The tools were modified based on the visits and the actual verification activities started in October 2013 using the refined tools. The testing of the tools in the schools also highlighted the lack of knowledge of the Verification Agency on Government accounting, SDPs, SIG and HACT procedures. They were provided with the finance manual, SIG documentation, an SDP manual and HACT training to address this.

By the end of December 2013 the verification agency, Ernst and Young, had visited all of the 132 pilot schools. The schools for which the verification was being undertaken had only received their financial management training in September and had not had a chance to implement what they had learnt by the time of the baseline survey and the verification exercise. This should be taken into account when considering the results of the verification and the baseline. The purpose of the verifications was as follows:

• To check whether the use of the SIG funds complies with the GoZ financial procedure requirements.
• To check whether the internal controls at each school are sound and that financial records are kept and that they are accurate.
• To check whether the funds are being spent on eligible items and as indicated in the school’s SDP.
• To check whether the school’s financial information is shared with the SDCs.
• To check whether all the SIG funds are accounted for.
• To check whether the schools need any further assistance to strengthen their financial management skills.

The SIG verification approach adapted by the Verification Agency was standardised using four stages:
1. The school was selected in consultation with UNICEF and the verification team commenced the verification exercise planning.
2. The verification team was provided with a schedule of the disbursement for the school to be visited, details of the school’s bank account and a brief description of the SIG programme as a whole.
3. The verification team visited the school and commenced work at the school with a meeting with the head. This was done to give the verification team an overall picture of the school’s operating and control environment concerning the funds to be verified. The verification team then carried out the verification.
4. The final report was discussed with the school head. The school head endorsed the report and kept a copy of it. The report was then submitted to UNICEF by the verification team.

In addition, the visits by the Verification Agency also served as further capacity building on financial management for the schools. The Verification Agency provided instant feedback and in some cases assisted the school heads to do bank reconciliations. The feedback to the school head is presented on an adapted Spot Check form (from the standard UNICEF Spot Check form). This is initialled by the school head to show that s/he has read and
agreed with the observations. The school head remains with one copy of this report and actions the areas suggested for improvement.

The Ernst and Young team presented a draft report on the summary of their findings from 132 schools in early January 2014. In this report they indicated that 95% of the funds were used as per the SDP; 3% of the schools did not use the funds as per the SDP and 2% of the schools had not utilised the funds on the date of the assessment (assessments were carried out between October and December 2013). The percentage of schools which had no activity deviation was 89%. (A 5% deviation was allowed). Deviations were seen where schools used the money for replacing fees for OVC and administration costs, or carrying out activities related to water and sanitation. Only one of the schools concerned sought approval from the UNICEF and MoPSE prior to the activity. Two schools used RTGS instead of cheques. None of the schools had petty cash on site. FACE forms were used correctly (completed, signed by the correct people and submitted on time) in 69% of schools. There were issues in the remaining schools as the school had not kept a copy of the FACE form on site or they were not due for acquittal yet (some verification visits were made before the school had a chance to spend the money). All schools had SIG funds deposited and managed using their Metbank accounts.

The findings for the 132 schools indicate that schools are using the grants for purchasing teaching and learning materials (82% of schools), furniture (68%), small maintenance (55%), OVC levies/fees (37%) and school running costs (32%) and special needs provision (8%) – see Figure 2.12.

![Figure 2.12 Nature of expenditure of SIG funds by the pilot schools (N = 132)](image)

The Verification Agency noted the following capacity building needs for the schools:
- Not enforcing PAID stamping or cancelling vouchers.
- No bank reconciliations or there was not adequate segregation of duties related to the process.
- Absence of an approved suppliers list. Some schools did not know how to go about setting this up.

---

There were no progress reports as the schools were not aware of the standard to be met and there was no standard template for them to complete.

Delays in implementation of the SIG at school level varied from school to school with 31% with all activities implemented and completed and 61% with satisfactory implementation when the Verification Agency visited the schools (this took into account the time of the visit). Delays were caused by year end examinations and hence shortage of personnel, delays in sourcing quotations, difficulties in getting a quorum for committee meetings and, for schools outside of Goromonzi, delays caused by the bank. Schools outside of Goromonzi were facing challenges on completing FACE forms.

Other issues which were raised by the Verification Agency which were also indicated in key informant interviews were that the suppliers are demanding payment before delivery but that the schools are supposed to take receipt of the items before payment, that there should be a signatory on the SIG account from the SDC and that the budget in the SDPs for SIG or for the whole SDP do not cover the entire 2013-2015 period. Delays in the programme implementation were noticed by the verification agency to be mainly due to delays caused by the bank. In some instances this involved the lack of availability of cheque books (these sometimes took up 5-6 weeks) and the liquidity challenges faced by the bank (see Annex J). In addition it was noticed that the bank had difficulties with transferring funds to international suppliers and that cheques were sometimes taking 5-7 days to clear.

The Verification Agency classified the schools according to good internal controls. They classified 12% of the schools as being “Model schools” and 7% of schools as “Need Assistance”. The Verification Agency interviewed stakeholders. Stakeholders expressed their gratitude regarding the SIG funding. Issues raised included that the amounts disbursed did not take into account the enrolled numbers of learners, and whether SIG will fund capital projects.

The Verification Agency observed that the schools exercised good accounting and internal control procedures which resulted in no cases where a school failed to account for the use of funds.

Of major worry for the rollout is that the rollout schools will not be receiving this level of attention and assistance. There will be a real need to make sure that district accountants visit every school during every term in their districts to provide the schools with the same level of attention that the pilot schools have received. It is recommended that a monitoring plan is set up to guide scheduling of school visits and to guide data collection with a standardized template and that the district accountants provide the assistance needed to the schools.
Figure 2.13 Textbooks purchased using SIG funds at Grace Covenant (Runyararo) Primary
3. Observations from Implementation

3.1 Time line
Although the programme has not kept to the time schedule (Annex H), all of the activities related to the pilot have been completed this year. Although out of the scope of this report it should be noted that the roll-out is already running behind. A revised time line for 2014 is proposed (Annex I).

3.2 Did the Pilot Work?
Yes – The pilot schools all received training on school development and financial management, the SDPs are adequate, the schools have received all of their disbursements and most schools have spent their grants. There were signs that the grants are leading to improvements in the teaching and learning environments.

The approach through the development of SDPs and financial management training has taken a whole school approach which includes all the relevant stakeholders. It has respected the opinions of those who know what is needed for a school, dealt with the unique situation of each school and created a programme owned by the people. This has increased the community involvement in the schools and re-energised the schools.

It was not possible to examine the differences in implementation and outcomes between registered and satellite schools due to the small number of satellite schools in the pilot (four satellite primary schools out of 73 primary schools and four satellite secondary schools out of 27 secondary schools).

There were no observed reductions in fees and levies due to the data not being collected: only a base-line took place in October 2013 instead of the planned base-line before the first disbursement and the evaluation at the end of the pilot. Calculations based on the baseline data indicate that approximately 5% of the SIG funds received by the schools were spent on fees/levies for OVC. The baseline data indicated that there were 19,566 OVCs in the 131 schools for which there were data (17,332 in Goromonzi schools and 2,234 in the special schools). BEAM paid for fees/levies for 9,628 learners, SIG paid for 1,098 learners and others paid for 2,177 learners. Therefore SIG paid for 6% of the total number of OVCs given by the school heads.

For there to be a fee reduction or abolition there must be sustained and increased funding from Government. The current SIG grant amount is approximately 32% of the average total expenditure in primary schools (P3) and 16% of the average total expenditure in secondary schools (S3) – see Table 3.1. In one school parents did resist fee increases by the SDC saying that with the school receiving the SIG money the SDC could not justify an increase in the fees/levies. The EMIS (2012) indicated that 86% of the income in primary schools and 93% of the income in secondary schools comes from the parents through a variety of fees and levies. Only 6% of the funding sources in schools comes from Public Funding with the remaining funding coming from external sources (BEAM and external aid). The current Government expenditure on education is mainly spent on salaries (92%). Therefore, for there to be a reduction in fees/levies, not just a resistance to fee/levies increases, the Government needs to start putting in more money on a sustained and reliable basis for the schools to start considering a reduction in fees/levies. For the programme to be sustainable after 2015 the Government has to start contributing to the grant and eventually take over the funding of the grant.
Table 3.1 Comparison of SIG amount to average expenditure in different school types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Total expenditure*</th>
<th>No of schools*</th>
<th>Average expenditure per school</th>
<th>Average payment**</th>
<th>SIG</th>
<th>SIG percentage of total expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>$68,678,170</td>
<td>5006</td>
<td>$13,719.17</td>
<td>$4,339.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>$99,302,468</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>$52,264.46</td>
<td>$8,140.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculated by taking the SIG amounts for registered and satellite schools and taking an average.

The design framework for the school grants emphasised that for the grant to work that planning, management and monitoring, and financial management systems must be improved. The whole school development process and financial management training have been accomplished. However, the GMT is still not operational, there is no evidence of monitoring and evaluation systems having been developed and established, and although there were provincial links set up for Goromonzi, there was no evidence of this being done for the Special Needs schools. Special needs schools were facing challenges in completing FACE forms showing a lack of capacity development that was experienced by the Goromonzi schools through the support of their District Office.

### 3.3 Successes

Positive outcomes of the SDP trainings include the inclusion of children more in the running of schools, better communications between the heads and the SDCs, increased transparency of the school management, improved planning at school and District Office level, increased involvement of children and parents in the schools, interactions with peers in other schools and increasing personal capacities of children to plan their own lives.

The evaluation of the training of all schools\(^\text{37}\) on SDP development showed that there was a major positive change in the capacity of the participants to develop viable SDPs. The respondents indicated that there had been an improvement in the quality of planning at school level although they were worried about skills retention as SDCs change every year.

From the end of project report by SNV\(^\text{38}\) the following final statement was made: “The direct involvement of Ministry Head Office from the Minister, the Permanent Secretary and the Co-Directors and all their staff involved made the design and implementation of the project easy as there was a high level of ownership at the top which was transferred down to the lower levels of the Ministry. This is encouraging for future institutionalization of projects of a similar nature”.

The financial management training has had positive ‘spill-over’ effects including the enhancement of the reputation of the Head Office in their support and oversight issues, empowering the MoPS and its training institutes, and empowering the finance officers who were selected to be trainers.

Since the financial management training there has been a noticeable change in the way that things are run at school level with policies and regulations being followed.

The combined E&Y/MoPSE/UNICEF audit team that made a preparatory visit to the pilot schools for the forthcoming verification found that the material from the training was proving helpful to the heads however there are still some issues.

The District Office has a SIG District Committee comprising the DEO, the District Accountant, the Education Officer and the Remedial Tutor. This committee meets every fortnight. This could account for the success of the programme in Goromonzi District.

The extent to which the training on SDPs has impacted on the schools should not be underestimated. The training has triggered a desire in the schools for improvement. This has been shown by self-help projects that have been submitted to the DEOs office for approval. People are getting more professional, working as teams and wanting to improve their schools. People are respecting each other’s roles and seeing that children can contribute.

The District Accountant felt that the practice time built into the financial management training was not adequate e.g. for writing up cash books and doing bank reconciliations. The District Accountant wants to address this through cluster training of the school heads, deputy heads, senior teacher, clerks, bursar and one representative of the SDC (treasurer) on a regular basis (termly) with the school bringing their own books to work on. The baseline of the pilot showed that continuous training is needed on all aspects of school management (SDCs, SPDs, and financial management).

In addition, the visits by the verification agency also served as further capacity building on financial management for the schools. The verification agency provided instant feedback and in some cases assisted the school heads to do bank reconciliations. The feedback to the school head is presented on an adapted Spot Check form (from the standard UNICEF Spot Check form).

One of the Education Partner data collection team leaders felt that the approach of the SIG has been correct. It allows the testing of the system, testing and learning for the suppliers and capacity building. The speed of the notification and implementation was good and indicated the seriousness of intentions (building good faith). This has helped to build the confidence of the communities in SIG and will allow schools to mobilize communities as this is building the trust of the communities in the grant.

3.4 Lessons learnt

The lessons learnt due to the pilot are discussed in this section.

The time given for the development of the SDPs was not sufficient to allow enough consultation with all stakeholders. The timing of the process for consultation needs to take into the availability of stakeholders, i.e. it should not be done during the school holidays. The development of the SDPs would have been assisted if the schools had an SDP manual. The manuals are important at all levels of the SIG as they standardize and direct the operations and processes across diverse schools.

The number of copies of SDPs which should be submitted to the district offices should be four: one to be stamped when approved and sent back to the school, and one each for the district, province and head offices this will allow the school to retain a copy for referral by the school and any other stakeholder e.g. the verification teams, auditors and education officers.

SDPs have rejuvenated the schools and the involvement of communities in the schools. However due to the changing of people on committees and positions of authority in schools there is a need for continual training on this and all aspects of school administration (SDCs, SPDs and financial management).

The ToT of the financial management training should happen after the training of the pilot personnel so that the ToT can take into account the lessons learnt in the ToT and, the financial management manual and the trainer’s manual should have been finalized and
The trainings were mixed by school types (satellite, P3, S3, Special) with different systems and requirements in terms of the funds handled and the methods of handling money (some schools have computerised systems). The mixing of the different school types in the pilot meant that some aspects were missed and it was difficult to get the training pitched at the right level.

The Verification Agency needs to be familiar with government accounting procedures, SIG, SDPs and HACT.

The District Office has a SIG District Committee comprising the DEO, the District Accountant, the Education Officer and the Remedial Tutor. This committee meets every fortnight. This committee is key in the success of the pilot.

There is concern that schools may deliberately add extra OVC fees to the use of the SIG funds. Schools are allowed to use 10% of school fees from learners as incentives for teachers. To manage this there must be strict monitoring of SDPs to make sure that the numbers of OVC are not increased as a strategy to obtain more funding. A limit could be set on the percentage of the SIG grant that can be used for OVC fees. It was suggested that schools set up income generating activities for OVC (using other funds) and the OVC fees can be paid from this.

The use of Metbank for the pilot, whilst allowing control over the opening of the accounts, control of how the money was handled, negotiated reduction of bank charges, has on the other hand created problems for the schools and in some cases delayed the implementation of activities by schools. This will need to be revisited to ensure efficiencies in the roll out.

Schools indicated that the signing powers being allocated to only school staff has been causing issues between the school authorities and the SDCs. SDCs normally have signing rights on all school accounts for development purposes. One head felt that giving the SDC or parents signing powers would give them ownership of the programme and reduce issues at meetings concerning how the money was spent. Parents currently do not feel that they have ownership of the programme.

3.5 Recommendations
It is recommended that payments continue to the pilot schools as scheduled. For the initiation of the rollout the GMT should be established with dedicated staff, the monitoring and evaluation framework for all levels of MoPSE should be designed, established and the relevant training done on the implementation of the framework, issues of bank accounts should be resolved and the GMT database populated with school data. A delay in the first disbursement is thus recommended until these critical prerequisites are met.

As the SIG was operating effectively in the pilot schools with the receipt of funds, the use of the funds and the reporting by the schools in the pilot there is no reason to delay payments to these schools.

It was initially stated in Section 1, that the success of a school improvement grant is dependent on strong project management, reliable disbursement modalities, accountability, and strong monitoring and evaluation systems. The GMT is currently not functioning at the level required for the roll out to 4,500 schools. The staff in post in December when the interviews for this report were carried out was not adequate to provide the strong management needed, process the payments and to carry out the required monitoring to ensure that funds are reaching the schools. The need for a fully staffed and functional GMT was also emphasized by the donors.
There is no existing monitoring and evaluation framework for the GMT. This should have been developed and put in place (people identified, processes designed, forms developed and training on these processes and forms) during 2013. Provincial links and district systems are yet to be established in the rollout districts.

The current issues with bank accounts are of concern. The bank used in the pilot has had liquidity problems and does not have sufficient national coverage to service the schools in the rollout. The pilot schools are unhappy with the current arrangement as seen in the Process Review and school visits. The banking issues need to be resolved to allow the rollout to proceed as each school in the rollout will need to open a dedicated bank account.

To be able to disburse the grant to the rollout schools the SDPs for the rollout schools will need to approved, the schools will have to open dedicated bank accounts and the schools will have to provide their details to the GMT. These details will have to be entered into the database at the GMT to generate the pay sheet data for onward transmission to UNICEF for payment. While some of the donors emphasized the importance of keeping to the initial rollout schedule for the satellite and primary schools (P3) so that there was sufficient time to see results from the grants, one of the donors expressed concern that there should be time to take into account the lessons from the pilot and to set up the systems needed for the rollout. This particular donor recommended that the first payment for the rollout schools should take place at the end of Term 1.

Other recommendations are as follows (please see Annex L for more detail on each of these recommendations):

*It is recommended that payments continue to the pilot schools as scheduled. For the initiation of the rollout the GMT should be established with dedicated staff, the monitoring and evaluation framework for all levels of MoPSE should be designed, established and the relevant training done on the implementation of the framework, issues of bank accounts should be resolved and the GMT database populated with school data. A delay in the first disbursement is thus recommended until these critical prerequisites are met.*

Other recommendations are as follows (see Annex L for more detail on these recommendations):

*Recommendation 1. Manuals*
The Grants Management Team Operational manual should be updated to take into account the revised manuals and changes in the programme. The manual needs to be approved to empower the GMT. The process of approving the grant manuals (School Development Plan Manual, School Minimum (Functionality) Standards, and the GMT Operational Manual) needs to be completed. The School Development Manual needs to be distributed to all schools.

*Recommendation 2. Grants Management Team (GMT)*
The GMT needs to be restructured slightly. A SIG management team with formal fortnightly meetings and additional meetings when required is needed to reduce delays in implementation. All positions in the GMT need to be filled with full-time personnel to be effective in its role of planning, monitoring and management of the programme.

*Recommendation 3. Bank Accounts*
Schools should be allowed to open bank accounts for SIG funds with banks of their own choice. MoPSE should negotiate with the relevant banks to allow the schools to operate
these bank accounts free of bank charges (except for replacement cheque books). School Development Committees should be included as signatories on the bank accounts.

Recommendation 4. Finance
MoPSE needs to match the funding provided by the donors to help meet the funding gap and to move the programme to the next phase.

Recommendation 5. Monitoring and Evaluation
A monitoring and evaluation framework needs to be developed for the Grants programme. Monitoring and evaluation systems must be set up at all levels (head office, province, district and school). Data collection forms, data entry formats, analysis formats and reporting formats need to be developed for each level, time frames for activities and the relevant training done in the implementation of the monitoring and evaluation framework before the SIG can be rolled out to the satellite primary and P3 schools in 2014. The monitoring and evaluation needs to be built into the annual work planning of district offices across the country.

Recommendation 6. Monitoring
For the rollout the schools cannot receive the same level of attention and assistance that the pilot schools have received due to the resources that would be needed. District offices will need resources for monitoring and support to the SIG, however the monitoring and support to the SIG should be part of the regular monitoring of the schools that the districts carry out. This should be built into the annual work plans of the districts. There will be a need to ensure that district accountants visit every school at least once a year. It is recommended that a monitoring plan is set up where every school is visited at least once a year and data are collected with standardised templates.

Recommendation 7. The Baseline Indicators
Due to the timing of the baseline, which was after SIG implementation had already commenced, it is recommended that the data from the baseline should not be used to set the baseline for the whole country or the targets that the SIG programme is aiming to reach. It is recommended that the core indicator framework be amended based on the lessons learnt from the baseline (see Annex F for a revision) and that the questionnaires used for the pilot baseline be amended to collect ‘need to know’ information and remove the ‘nice to know’ information. The baseline next year for the rollout to the 4,500 schools can then be used to set the baseline values for the indicators and the target values for the indicators.

Recommendation 8. Training
Follow up on the trainings that have been carried out should include continual training at cluster level for schools and their stakeholders, a strategy developed to deal with the school heads that failed the post-training financial management test, retesting of school heads on financial management at the end of the first term of 2014 to verify the efficacy of the training and a post-workshop survey of participants of the financial management training at the end of 2014.

Recommendation 9. School Development Plans
There is a need for annual reviews of the SDP with respect to the whole SDP and the items that the SIG can be spent on as situations do change in schools.

Recommendation 10. Design
The definition of P3 and S3 has caused confusion in the selection of the schools for the pilot. For the rollout there is a need to review the targeting and SIG amounts to better respond to the needs of the most disadvantaged.
3.6 What happens after SIG?
Funding for the SIG from development partners is secured until the end of 2015. All the donors that were consulted were concerned with what will happen after the funding comes to an end. The donors emphasized the need for the partners to start designing the programming that is to take place at the end of the EDF. For a continuation of the SIG into the integration and expansion phases MoPSE needs to match the funding provided by the donors to help meet the funding gap and move the programme into the next phase. To attract funds from the donors MoPSE needs to take ownership of the programme (by the establishment of the GMT) and to show capacity to manage programmes. It is unlikely that donor funding will be available for large construction projects however small construction projects may be considered. Surrounding countries are also implementing grants programmes and it is recommended that these be examined to help inform the design of the next programme.
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## Annex C. List of Schools Visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chinamhora</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Emerald Hill</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>Secondary /Special</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kadymadare</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Maturi Dehwe</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Melfort</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Satellite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Musirikwi</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mutake</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nyakudyya</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Parirewa</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Resthaven</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Runyararo (Grace Covenant)</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered (was satellite at start third term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rusike</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Rusike</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Rusununguko</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sally Mugabe</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. St Catherine’s</td>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>Primary / Special</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Thornicroft</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ZIMRE</td>
<td>Goromonzi</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex D. Recommended Eligibility Criteria

This table applies to the roll-out, expansion and integration phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE ITEMS</th>
<th>INELIGIBLE ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacing fees or levies for OVC</td>
<td>• Pupils identified and approved as OVC as defined by BEAM by community committees and the school head teacher but not covered by BEAM.</td>
<td>• Pupils that have not been identified and approved as OVC as defined by BEAM by community committees and the school head teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Materials (TLM)</td>
<td>• Exercise books and workbooks approved by MoESAC.</td>
<td>• All textbooks, exercise books and workbooks, teaching guides and facilitation materials, not approved by MoESAC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Teaching guides and facilitation materials approved by MoESAC.</td>
<td>• All teaching and learning material and small equipment not used in the classroom, such as school office supplies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pens, pencils and markers.</td>
<td>• Office equipment, including photocopiers and computers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Blackboard chalk.</td>
<td>• All teaching and learning material and equipment for use outside the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Readers and ‘big books’ approved by MoESAC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Library books.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Science kits and laboratory supplies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Software for teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small teaching and learning equipment, such as compasses, protractors, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs provisions</td>
<td>• Adapted TLM and small equipment, such as hearing aids, to support the mainstreaming of special needs pupils in schools.</td>
<td>• Major adaptations to infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School running costs</td>
<td>• Electricity and water bills</td>
<td>• Purchase of vehicles and vehicle running costs and maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Office supplies, including stationery, pens, pencils and other small items</td>
<td>• Office equipment, including photocopiers and computers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Travel and subsistence for legitimate school administrative purposes approved by the finance committee.</td>
<td>• Office furniture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small maintenance</td>
<td>• Minor repair of broken items and areas of school infrastructure, including windows, doors, ceilings, classroom fittings.</td>
<td>• Travel and subsistence for non-school purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Professional Development (CPD)</td>
<td>• Travel and integration phases:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Travel and subsistence to attend training events and workshops approved by the district office up to the level set by MoESAC.</td>
<td>• Travel and subsistence for any training events and workshops not approved by the district office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training and workshop materials, including manuals, notepads, pens and pencils for use at approved training events or for CPD workshops organised within the school.</td>
<td>• Travel and subsistence for any purposes other than approved training events and workshops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>ELIGIBLE ITEMS</th>
<th>INELIGIBLE ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td>Roll out, Expansion and integration phases:</td>
<td>Expansion and integration phases:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Purchase of school desks and chairs for use in the classroom by pupils and</td>
<td>• Purchase and repair of all furniture for use outside the classroom or the school,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers.</td>
<td>including office furniture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Repair of school desks and chairs for use in the classroom by pupils and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adapted desks and other school furniture to support the mainstreaming of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>special needs pupils in schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td><strong>Expansion and integration phases:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Roll-out phase:</strong> no expenditure eligible, other than minor maintenance and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction and rehabilitation of water and sanitation infrastructure for</td>
<td>repairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which funds have been approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Toilets and toilet blocks, boreholes, water supply pipes, hygiene equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>such as wash basins and other hand washing structures based on school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adapted toilets and hand washing units or basins to support the mainstreaming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of special needs pupils in schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure construction and rehabilitation</td>
<td><strong>Expansion and integration phases:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Expansion and integration phases:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction and rehabilitation of school buildings for which funds have</td>
<td>• Construction and rehabilitation of water and sanitation infrastructure for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>been approved.</td>
<td>which funds have not been approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classrooms, teacher’s houses, administration blocks, libraries, laboratories,</td>
<td>• Construction and rehabilitation of water and sanitation infrastructure in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>computer centres based on school priorities.</td>
<td>schools and buildings that are not owned by the school authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rehabilitation of major items of degraded infrastructure, including the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>replacement of damaged or sub-standard infrastructure, such as damaged roofs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and walls of buildings for which funds have been approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ramps, paths, rails and other structures to support the mainstreaming of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>special needs pupils in schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel: salaries and allowances</td>
<td>• None.</td>
<td>• All types of personnel salaries and benefits, including salary supplements and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘teacher incentives’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex E. FACE Reporting

Based on the grant disbursement schedule set out in the table and figure below it will be possible to ensure that school grant funds are disbursed early in each term and that UNICEF financial reporting requirements will be met. These strong financial reporting requirements and tight time frames give even stronger emphasis to the building of strong financial management and reporting capacity in the districts and the schools under the school grants programme. Financial reporting must be provided using the FACE format accurately and in good time to provide strong evidence of both authorization and full liquidation of funds and reduce the risk of school grant disbursement in the district being frozen due to failure to meet these requirements.

Table E.1 Recommended FACE reporting requirements and responsibilities within the school year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>TERM 1</th>
<th>TERM 2</th>
<th>TERM 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>• Term 1 grant disbursed to each school by the end of February.</td>
<td>• Approval of FACE form with acknowledgement of receipt of funds for Term 1 grant by the end of May.</td>
<td>• Approval of FACE form with authorisation of full liquidation of funds for Term 1 grant by end of August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Term 2 grant disbursed to each school by the end of June.</td>
<td>• Approval of FACE form with acknowledgement of receipt of funds for Term 2 grant by end of September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Term 3 grant disbursed to each school by end of October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>• Monitoring of Term 1 grant disbursement with evidence of disbursement to each school by the end of March.</td>
<td>• Monitoring of Term 1 expenditure with evidence of expenditure of funds by each school by the end of June.</td>
<td>• Monitoring of Term 2 expenditure with evidence of expenditure of funds by each school by the end of October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completion of the FACE form and submission of acknowledgement of receipt of funds for Term 1 grant to UNICEF by the end of April.</td>
<td>• Completion of the FACE form and submission of authorisation of full liquidation of funds for Term 1 grant to UNICEF by the end of July.</td>
<td>• Completion of the FACE form and submission of authorisation of full liquidation of funds for Term 2 grant to UNICEF by end of November.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring of Term 2 grant disbursement with evidence of disbursement to each school by the end of July.</td>
<td>• Monitoring of Term 3 grant disbursement with evidence of disbursement to each school by the end of November.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Completion of the FACE form and submission of acknowledgement of receipt of funds for Term 2 grant to UNICEF by the end of August.</td>
<td>• Completion of the FACE form and submission of acknowledgement of receipt of funds for Term 3 grant to UNICEF by end of December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>• Submission of evidence of receipt of Term 1 grant to the district by the end of March.</td>
<td>• Submission of evidence of full liquidation of Term 1 grant to the district by the end of June.</td>
<td>• Submission of evidence of full liquidation of Term 2 grant to the district by the end of October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submission of evidence of receipt of Term 2 grant to the district by the end of July.</td>
<td>• Submission of evidence of receipt of Term 3 grant to the district by the end of November.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure D.1 Reporting and monitoring lines each term for the school grants programme
## Annex F. Revised Core Indicator Framework

### DRAFT 2 of Framework for Core Indicator to measure school Grant performance for Primary and Lower Secondary Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Level</th>
<th>School Performance Indicators in a Given Year</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>ESP and National Target</th>
<th>School Baseline</th>
<th>School Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUALITY EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1</strong></td>
<td>Improved learning outcomes for grant schools</td>
<td>Efficiency Rates</td>
<td>EMIS School baseline questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of learners repeat each year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of learners who enrolled at each level who exit before completing the cycle (Dropout)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completion Rate at the end of the Cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of learners enrolled in the last year of a cycle (e.g. Primary) that successfully pass the final examinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two consecutive years of EMIS for start and end of programme for all grant schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of learners in initial cohort who completed the final level of the cycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction by stakeholders of SIG outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key Informant Interviews (school heads, SDC members, teachers, learners, parents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Level: ACCESS</td>
<td>School Performance Indicators in a Given Year</td>
<td>Method of Verification</td>
<td>ESP and National Target</td>
<td>School Baseline</td>
<td>School Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2</td>
<td>Improved access for general learners</td>
<td>EMIS, Base-line Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% increase in intake enrolments for the first year of the school cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of learners present on day x (attendance rate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of schools with reduction in school fees and levies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access for OVC</td>
<td>□ X% intake enrolments of OVC by sex</td>
<td>EMIS, Base-line Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% increase in intake enrolments of OVC by sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of OVC/ children with special needs enrolled into school by sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of OVC provided with school related assistance by sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of children with disabilities by sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of children beneficiaries of special policies by sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of schools with evidence of inclusive policies and or culture of accommodating children with disabilities being implemented– this is measured by counting how many selected resources (out of a list of 18) are available at the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of school with evidence of extension work or remediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% schools with evidence of psycho-social support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of schools with sensitive curriculum to diversity of abilities/aptitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Level:</td>
<td>School Performance Indicators in a Given Year</td>
<td>Method of Verification</td>
<td>ESP and National Target</td>
<td>School Baseline</td>
<td>School Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANAGEMENT &amp; FINANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Improved school planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output3 Improved capacity to plan school development and manage school budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of schools have credible school3 to5 year school development plan that in line with national strategic plans and goals and approved by DEO</td>
<td>SDC Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Level:</td>
<td>School Performance Indicators in a Given Year</td>
<td>Method of Verification</td>
<td>ESP and National Target</td>
<td>School Baseline</td>
<td>School Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT &amp; FINANCE CONTINUED</td>
<td>Improved management of school budgets and expenditure</td>
<td>Monthly financial reporting and monitoring reports from the schools to the district FACE financial reporting to UNICEF District reports on audited accounts SIGNATORIES on expenditure vouchers, bank withdrawal slips</td>
<td>No national targets set but all Schools are required by regulation to submit independent audited accounts, either conducted by provincial internal audit in the case of government schools or by independent auditors in the case of non-government schools. To be collected by independent verification agency on a regular basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRAFT2 of Framework for Core Indicator to measure school Grant performance for Primary and Lower Secondary Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Level:</th>
<th>School Performance Indicators in a Given Year</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>ESP and National Target</th>
<th>School Baseline</th>
<th>School Targets Years 1 2 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Support and Participation in planning</td>
<td>SDC Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of schools where the PTA(SDC) has reviewed and approved(signed off on) the school development plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of schools with evidence of community participation in plan and budget preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of schools with community own contributions in labour, building materials, school property maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ X% of schools with specified community activities (N = 12). Communities are classified as: No activity (0), Little activity (1-3), Some activity (4-6), Active (7-9), Very active (10-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Output Level: School Performance Indicators in a Given Year

### Method of Verification

### ESP and National Target

### School Baseline

### School Targets

## INFRASTRUCTURE

### Output4

An improved physical learning environment that is safe and secure.

#### Safe Buildings and Classroom

- X% of classrooms in use
- X% of classrooms need of repair;
- X% of classrooms dangerous and not in use
- X% of schoolshavefacilitiesandadaptations(e.g.ramps)forchildrenwithspecial needs available and in good condition(adequate, inadequate, not applicable)
- X% of schools giving children hearing aids
- X% of schools giving children prescriptive glasses
- X% of schools giving children Braille devices
- X% of schools giving children mobility devices

#### Blackboards, Furniture

- X% of classrooms with good blackboards
- Learner to desk ratio is 1:1
- Learner to chair ratio is 1:1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe Buildings and Classroom</th>
<th>EMIS</th>
<th>Base-line Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackboards, Furniture</td>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Base-line Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Level:</td>
<td>School Performance Indicators in a Given Year</td>
<td>Method of Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFR Structure Continued</strong></td>
<td><strong>Latrines and Portable Water</strong></td>
<td><strong>Availabilty of Space for Learner Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X% of schools with Learner to toilet ratio of 20:1 for girls (summarise as &lt;11, 11-20, 21-50, &gt;50)</td>
<td>X% of schools with Learner to toilet ratio of 25:1 for boys (summarise as &lt;11, 11-25, 26-50, &gt;50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration and expansions phases</td>
<td>X% of latrines constructed</td>
<td>X% of water points constructed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DRAFT2 of Framework for Core Indicator to measure school Grant performance for Primary and Lower Secondary Cycle

**Output Level:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Performance Indicators in a Given Year</th>
<th>Method of Verification</th>
<th>ESP and National Target</th>
<th>School Baseline</th>
<th>School Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REGISTERED SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 5 Increased number of Registered schools</td>
<td>X% of satellite schools are upgraded to fully registered schools</td>
<td>Provincial and district Authorities EMIS Baseline Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDITIONAL QUALITATIVE INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 6 Happiness with the SIG programme</td>
<td>Happiness with learning environment (Very happy, happy, undecided/neutral, unhappy, very unhappy)</td>
<td>Key informant interviews of stakeholders (school heads, school development committees. Teachers, learners and parents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happiness with learning outcomes (Very happy, happy, undecided/neutral, unhappy, very unhappy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For evaluation ask questions concerning effects of the SIG using a Lickert Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following changes were made to the core indicator framework:

1. Six indicators were moved from Output 1 to the Output “Improve access to education for mainstream learners and improved access for OVC”.
2. Output 2 was removed. This output concerns teacher continuous professional development which is not covered under the pilot and rollout of the SIG. Measuring this output would not be relevant for the current SIG programme. It would also be complicated by the GPE (Global Partnership in Education) activities which are continuous professional development of teachers.
3. The indicator for the inclusive policies has been changed to measure specific activities that the school could be undertaking on inclusion.
4. Additional indicators have been added concerning school’s abilities to manage finances.
5. Safe buildings and classrooms have been adjusted to make them easier to measure.
6. The actual assistive devices which are being provided to children by schools is being measured instead of a generic ‘provision of assistive devices’
7. The indicators on latrines and potable water have been reworded to make them easier to measure.
8. The space for learner learning and recreation has been reworded so that average areas are being measured.
9. Additional qualitative indicators have been added (Output 1 Satisfaction of stakeholders of SIG outcomes, Output 6 Happiness with SIG programme)
Annex G. Basic Information Flow in the SIG

1. Request Initiation Up To Payment

Adapted from Victor Ngulube (2013) Personal Communication.
2. Submission of Acquittals

- DEO Checks, Compiles, and submits to GMT via PED
- PED Authorises
- GMT Supervisor
- Captures Acquittal
- System Analyses Acquittal vs Request noting the compliant and those not
- Clerk Captures Acquittal
- SDC compiles Acquittal returns
- Acquittal Report is analysed by Program Manager
- Notifications Are Made to Non Compliant Schools and DEOs
Annex H. Pilot Implementation Workplan: Activities in 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity - 2013</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Management Team and office set-up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap assessment and GMT take-off requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of take-off interim support team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set-up of Payments and IT systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools information factsheet / form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of template</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of template by schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>GMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance from MoF to open bank accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening bank accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of school details (including bank account)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>GMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microsoft Access Database</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of IT developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMT training and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems assessment and Verification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Deloitte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Assessment of HO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>KPMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Assessment of district offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>KPMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro Assessment of training colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>KPMG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: 1) CfBT (2013) School Improvement Grant Programme. Stock take and way forward. 14 April 2013; and 2) CfBT (2013) National Training Programme on Financial Management for Education. Stock take and way forward. 30 October 2013. This time frame has been adapted from these reports. Please note that the actual times that these activities were to be carried out may not match these dates. The dates in this table are the planned dates except where actual dates were reported in the October 2013 report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity - 2013</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of audit firm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First spot checks and reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>E&amp;Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of Verification Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToRs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of RFPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits and reporting of Verification Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st visits and report (25% of pilot schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd visits and report (25% of pilot schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd visits and report (25% of pilot schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th visits and report (25% of pilot schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Development Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCB induction and review of training materials</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building of national and provincial MoESA staff (45)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDPs of 132 schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP ToT roll out to 500 MoESAC staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 schools SDP submitted for review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the pilot SDPs orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-out to 7,004 Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National roll-out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and continued support phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MoPSE / UNICEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Financial Management Training                                                 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |         |       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity - 2013</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Group (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Group (B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Pilot 132 School Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, methodology adjustment and workplan for roll-out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training roll-out to remaining schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of capacity building activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of pilot orientation for SDPs for 132 schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of project report of orientation to 7,004 schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>SNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of FM pilot training and SDPs orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of the pilot of the SIG programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplan and outline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gathering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and report writing</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact evaluation of the grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of baseline questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and entry for 132 pilot schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and report writing of baseline data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of baseline questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing of revised questionnaires on 132 pilot schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and report writing (feeding into pilot evaluation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Annex I. Implementation Plan for 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity - 2014</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Management Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vital</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of monitoring plan for all MoPSE levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vital</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of and support to monitoring of programme at all levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set-up of Payments and IT systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools information factsheet / form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and finalise template</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of template by schools in primary school rollout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearance from MoF to open bank accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening bank accounts in primary school rollout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of school details (including bank account)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Access Database</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMT training and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data entry for pilot and rollout schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systems assessment and Verification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baker &amp; Tiley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot checks and reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baker &amp; Tiley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of Verification Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToRs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of RFPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits and reporting of Verification Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined visits for orientation (MoPSE, UNICEF, VA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoPSE, UNICEF, VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits and reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Development Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll-out to Primary Satellite and P3 Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of SDP for primary satellite and P3 schools</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and reporting (all levels)</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and continued support phase</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Management Training</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training roll-out to remaining schools</td>
<td>MoPSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of training (including testing pilot school heads)</td>
<td>MoPSE / UNICEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation of the pilot of the SIG programme</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to SIG programme based on evaluation</td>
<td>MoPSE / UNICEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation for roll out to secondary satellite and S3 schools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection of roll-out schools</td>
<td>GMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank accounts for roll-out schools</td>
<td>GMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools’ information and fact sheet and verification</td>
<td>GMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of SDPs for roll-out schools</td>
<td>GMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology adjustment (if necessary)</td>
<td>GMT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disbursement related activities</th>
<th>Done in 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request for disbursement (FACE form) – pilot schools</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement for Term 1 – pilot schools</td>
<td>GMT / UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Term 1 disbursement to district office – pilot schools</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for disbursement (FACE form) Term 1 and 2 – rollout schools</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement for Term 1 – rollout schools</td>
<td>GMT / UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Term 1 disbursement to district office – rollout schools</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 1 FACE form and narrative report – pilot schools</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Term 2 disbursement – pilot schools</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement for Term 2 – all schools</td>
<td>GMT / UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Term 2 disbursement to District Office – all schools</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 2 FACE form and narrative report – all schools (Term 1 and 2 for rollout schools and Term 2 for pilot schools)</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Term 3 disbursement – all schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement for Term 3 – all schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Term 3 disbursement to District Office – all schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term 3 FACE form and narrative report – all schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for Term 1 (2015) disbursement – all schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex J. Newspaper article concerning Metropolitan Bank

Bank manager flees clients . . . as cash crunch bites

OBERT MAKAVITI
STAFF REPORTER

A METROPOLITAN Bank branch manager in Mutare fled for dear life and sought refuge at a police station after scenes of angry bank clients turned violent after failing to access their money. It has emerged.

The angry depositors besieged Mutare Central Police Station howling for the blood of the manager, identified as Ephraim Mupengwa.

After chaos broke out at the bank’s Mutare branch, police intervened and rescued Mupengwa and took him to the police station for safety with disgruntled clients in tow. They accused the bank’s management of giving them endless excuses whenever they sought to withdraw their money.

A NewsDay reporter witnessed the drama.

This came as the cash squeeze continues to bite with no end in sight. Smaller financial institutions have been hit the hardest by the persistent cash crunch in the
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One of the demonstrators, Don Marandane, charged: "We decided to come here to open a docket against this bank. They are holding the manager, but we will not leave here until we get satisfactory answers. The whole administration of Metropolitan Bank must be arrested. Every single day I come intending to withdraw my money, but I am given excuses. My brother's son was in hospital and he needed money to be operated. Because of this insensitivity, I couldn't access my money and he eventually died."

Some of the demonstrators said the cash crisis had strained their relationships with landlords over unpaid rentals.

In Harare yesterday, AfriAsia Kingdom Zimbabwe Limited (AKZL)'s banking unit placed a maximum withdrawal limit of $50, barely a week after shareholders approved the bank's recapitalisation exercise.

When a NewsDay crew visited the bank's branch at Karigamombe Arcade, some clients intending to make withdrawals said they were advised to wait for deposits before the bank could dispense the cash.

The bank's automated teller machine which were working up to lunchtime could not dispense cash when the news crew visited the bank later in the day.

Sporadic efforts to get a comment from AKZL group chief executive officer Lynn Mukanowe shuro were fruitless as she was not picking up her mobile phone last night.

The cash crises have affected most businesses with some companies contemplating shutting down or retrenching staff.

Experts say large commercial banks with strong shareholder support have, however, managed to weather the storm at a time when small banks, predominantly locally-owned, were facing viability problems due to high levels of non-performing loans. According to a banking sector survey carried out by a local brokerage and advisory firm, bad debt constituted 13.8% of the $3.67 billion loan book as at June 30.

*feedback@newday.co.zw*
Annex K. Goromonzi District Monitoring Form

Goromonzi District School Improvement Grant (SIG) Pilot Project
Monitoring and Evaluation Form

Name of School: .........................................................................................................................

Term : ..................................  Date : .............................................

Registration No.:..............................  EMIS No.: .............................................

Name of Head: .........................................................................................................................

Contact Number (s): ................................................................................................................

(a) SIG Financial Records: (Availability at school)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty Cash Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Registers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG Minute Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment Vouchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheque Book</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock Control Register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Face Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Term:...............)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(i) **Cash and Bank (Balances)**

(ii) **Cash Book Presentations**

(iii) **Bank Reconciliations (signed by compiler, reviewer and Head)**

(b) **Procurement (Committee, Quotations, Comparative Schedules)**

(c) **SIG Minutes**

(d) **Invoices / Receipts (Stamped)/ Payment Vouchers**
(e) Areas funded by SIG (physical check of eligible expenses)
1. .................................................................
2. .................................................................
3. .................................................................
4. .................................................................
5. .................................................................
6. .................................................................

Comments on eligibility of expenditure
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Annex L. Detailed Recommendations

The following more detailed recommendations are made concerning the pilot and the rollout of the SIG. They have been grouped into similar categories and numbered for ease of implementation.

**Recommendation 1. Manuals**

a. It is recommended that the proposed GMT manual is updated and revised into a guidance manual for the GMT to take cognisance of:
   - The five pillars;
   - All the relevant training and training documents;
   - The finalized structure of the GMT;
   - The procedures followed for each grant disbursement;
   - The time frame for the next two years (2014 and 2015); and
   - Roles and responsibilities.

b. The process of approving the manuals and distribution of these manuals needs to be completed: SDP manual, School Minimum (Functionality) Standards, GMT Operational Manual. The GMT Operational Manual needs to be formalised to empower the GMT.

c. Schools need to be given copies of the SDP manual.

**Recommendation 2. Grants Management Team**

a. The GMT needs to be restructured slightly. A SIG management team with formal fortnightly meetings and additional meetings when required is needed to reduce delays in implementation.

b. Schools Psychological Services / Special Need to be involved at all levels of the programme including the design of questionnaires and visits to schools (where appropriate).

c. All positions of the GMT need to be filled with full time personnel for this programme to work. It is recommended that until this is done that the rollout should be put on hold.

**Recommendation 3. Bank accounts**

a. Schools should be allowed to open bank accounts for SIG funds with banks of their own choice. MoPSE should negotiate with the relevant banks to allow the schools to operate these bank accounts free of bank charges (except for replacement cheque books).

b. Central purchasing of PAID stamps for all schools.

c. SDCs should be included as signatories on the bank accounts.

**Recommendation 4. Finance**

a. MoPSE needs to match the funding provided by the donors to help meet the funding gap and to move the programme to the next phase.
Recommendation 5. Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

a. A monitoring and evaluation framework needs to be developed.
b. Monitoring and evaluation systems and framework must be set up at all levels (head office, province, district and school). The framework needs to include times of activities to be carried out.
c. There is a need for reporting structures and knowledge of their roles and responsibilities.
d. The monitoring and evaluation needs to be built into the annual work planning of district offices across the country.
e. A monthly reporting system needs to be established whereby changes in information on the schools and issues from the schools can be communicated to the GMT as well as a system to communicate vital information quickly.
f. Information flow needs to go both ways, i.e. from schools through the correct paths to the GMT and vice versa. Feedback is needed from the GMT on information provided.
g. A set of procedures needs to be put in place so that information on changes in school details can be communicated to the GMT so that adjustments to payments can take place.
h. Data collection forms, data entry formats, analysis formats and reporting formats need to be developed for each level.
i. Training is needed to implement the monitoring and evaluation framework.

Recommendation 6. Monitoring

District offices

a. It is recommended that a SIG District Committee is set up in every district comprising the DEO, the District Accountant, the Education Officer and the Remedial Tutor to manage the SIG coordination and activities.
b. District offices will need resources and training for monitoring and support to the SIG.
c. SIG monitoring needs to be built into the annual work plans of the district and provincial offices. It needs to become part of the regular monitoring. Schools need to be visited at least once a year.
d. Monitoring of schools by District Offices needs revised standardised forms to include the items needed for monitoring the SIG as well items for monitoring the whole SDP of the school. A system then needs to be set up where the data can be captured and analysed. Quantitative data is more appropriate for this.
e. Monitoring must include the receipt of the money by the schools.
f. Monitoring at school level should be expanded to cover SDPs.
g. Schools need to keep copies of all forms and reports submitted to the district office.

Recommendation 7. Baseline Indicators

a. It is recommended that the core indicator framework be amended based on the lessons learnt from the baseline (see Annex F for a first revision) and that the questionnaires used for the pilot baseline be amended to collect ‘need to know’ information and remove the ‘nice to know’ information. The baseline next year for the rollout to the 4,500 schools can then be used to set the baseline values for the indicators and the target values for the indicators.
b. The values for the baseline indicators should not be based on the values collected in the baseline of the pilot as these values have been influenced by the implementation that has already taken place.

Recommendation 8. Training

a. It is recommended that there be continual training at cluster level for schools and their stakeholders. To be included in these trainings is the functions and roles of the SDCs, development and implementation of SDPs, and financial management.

Financial Management Training
b. A strategy needs to be developed for the school heads who failed their post-workshop tests for the financial management training. This should start with an analysis of the characteristics of the school heads that failed the test.

c. Retesting of the school heads to be done at the end of the first term 2014 to check on the impact of the financial management training.

d. It is recommended that a post-workshop survey of participants of the financial management training be done at the end of the year.

e. All new staff should receive induction on finance and administration before taking up their posts.

f. The current financial management training should have more days.

g. Participants of the financial management training indicated that they had no reference material such as the acts (e.g. Public Finance Management Act) and circulars. The reference materials need to be distributed to all schools.

h. In the stock take and way forward of the financial management training it was recommended that there be a “more systematic capacity building effort of finance offices and managers as part of MoPSE’s mandate to ensure compliance with regulations and instructions. Refreshment of content and induction for new appointees should be taken into account as part of an institutionalised capacity.

i. The District Accountant felt that the practice in the financial management training was not adequate e.g. for writing up cash books and doing bank reconciliations. The District Accountant wants to address this through cluster training of the school heads, deputy heads, senior teacher, clerks, bursar and one representative of the SDC (treasurer) on a regular basis (termly) with the school bringing their own books to work on. This recommendation should be adopted.

j. Train schools on how to develop lists of suppliers.

Recommendation 9. School Development Plans

a. There is a need for annual reviews of the SDP with respect to the whole SDP and the items that the SIG can be spent on as situations do change in schools.

b. ECD teachers should be included in the SDP and SIG consultation and information processes.

c. There is a need for continual (at least once a term) sensitization of all stakeholders on SDPs.

d. The school heads should cascade the SDP training and information to all stakeholders.

e. Transparency of the school development planning should be encouraged e.g. financial records should be displayed e.g. printout put on a window of the school office and the SDP should be available to all stakeholders.

f. Four copies of the SDP should be submitted to the District Office for approval. One of these copies which has been approved and stamped should be returned to the school. The other three copies are for the district office, provincial office and the GMT.

g. It was suggested that clusters of schools should meet for extra support and discussion on SDPs and SIG.

Recommendation 10. Design

a. The definition of P3 and S3 has caused confusion in the selection of the schools for the pilot. Initially it was thought that the classification was to do with the financial status of the school however it has now been indicated that it is to do with the rural / urban situations of the schools. For the rollout there is a need to review the targeting and SIG amounts to better respond to the needs of the most disadvantaged.
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