



Global Partnership for Education Programme in South Sudan 2013-2016/7



Teacher Moses Langoya, the class teacher for grade one, with learners under a Tree at Ayii Central before the completion of the construction of the new school, 2015



Teacher Achem Rose Komakech with grade three learners inside the newly constructed CFS Classroom in Dec., 2015 at Ayii Central, Dec, 2015



3rd Progress Report – February 2016



GPEP is managed by UNICEF



GPEP is co-funded by USAID

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| MAP OF SOUTH SUDAN..... | 2 |
| ACRONYMS | 3 |
| PROGRAMME SUMMARY | 4 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 5 |
| 1.0 EDUCATION SECTOR ANALYSIS | 8 |
| 2.0 RESULTS AND ACHIEVEMENTS | 10 |
| 2.1 COMPONENT A: NATIONAL SYSTEMS STRENGTHENING..... | 12 |
| 2.2.1 Literacy and numeracy learning..... | 12 |
| 2.2.2 Primary School Leadership and 2.2.3 School Inspection and Supportive Supervision..... | 14 |
| 2.2.4 Support to sector policy development, strategic planning and review | 15 |
| 2.2 COMPONENT B: COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL BASED EDUCATION SERVICE DELIVERY | 21 |
| 2.2.1 Support to Literacy and Numeracy Learning..... | 22 |
| 2.2.2. Support to School Management Committees (done)..... | 22 |
| 2.2.3. Support to School Supervision (done) | 23 |
| 2.2.4. Procurement in Support of Learning (done)..... | 23 |
| 2.2.5 Support to out-of-school children and youth (done)..... | 28 |
| 2.2.6. Support to County Education Centres | 28 |
| 2.3 COMPONENT C: LEARNING AND SHARING LESSONS LEARNED (COMPLETED) | 29 |
| 2.3.1 Research (completed)..... | 29 |
| 2.3.2 Communication | 29 |
| 3.0 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS, PARTNERSHIPS AND PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT | 30 |
| 4.0 MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION | 30 |
| 5.0 CHALLENGES TO PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION | 31 |
| 6.0 LESSONS LEARNT..... | 31 |
| 7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS / WAY FORWARD | 32 |
| 8.0 EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE..... | 32 |
| APPENDIX 1 | 33 |
| APPENDIX 2: 2015 JSR ACTION POINTS AND FINANCIAL SUMMARIES..... | 36 |
| FINANCIAL SUMMARIES | 36 |
| APPENDIX 3: FUNDS UTILISATION AS OF 31 JANUARY 2016 | 38 |

MAP OF SOUTH SUDAN



ACRONYMS

| | | |
|--------|---|--|
| AES | - | Alternative Education Systems |
| AET | - | Africa Educational Trust |
| CEC | - | County Education Centre |
| DFID | - | Department for International Development |
| ECD | - | Early Childhood and Development |
| EDoG | - | Education Donor Group |
| EGMA | - | Early Grade Mathematics Assessment |
| EGRA | - | Early Grade Reading Assessment |
| EiE | - | Education in Emergencies |
| EMIS | - | Education Management Information System |
| ESA | - | Education Sector Analysis |
| ESP | - | Education Sector Plan |
| GESP | - | General Education Strategic Plan |
| GESS | - | Girls Education South Sudan |
| GPE | - | Global Partnership for Education |
| GPEP | - | Global Partnership for Education Programme |
| IIEP | - | International Institute for Education Planning |
| IMED | - | Improved Management for Education Delivery |
| ITB | - | Invitation to Bid |
| JSC | - | Joint Steering Committee |
| JSR | - | Joint Sector Review |
| LEG | - | Local Education Group |
| M&E | - | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| ME | - | Managing Entity |
| MoEST | - | Ministry of Education, Science and Technology |
| NEF | - | National Education Forum |
| PEG | - | Partners in Education Group |
| PEO | - | <i>Payam</i> Education Office |
| PTA | - | Parent Teacher Association |
| RTL | - | Room to Learn |
| SIL | - | Summer Institute of Linguistics (South Sudan) |
| SMC | - | School Management Committee |
| SMOE | - | State Ministry of Education |
| SSP | - | South Sudanese Pound |
| TTI | - | Teacher Training Institute |
| UNICEF | - | United Nations Children's Fund |
| USAID | - | United States Agency for International Development |
| WTI | - | Windle Trust International |

PROGRAMME SUMMARY

| | |
|---|--|
| Grant number | SC130196 (GPE) SC130645 (USAID) ¹ |
| Donor | Global Partnership for Education (GPE) |
| Report Type (Progress) | 3rd Progress Report |
| Report Due Date | 29 February 2016 |
| Period Covered by Report | 01 February 2015 – 31 January 2016 |
| Duration of Contribution | 2013-2016 |
| Assisted Country | Republic of South Sudan |
| Total Contribution Amount | USD 38,627,000 (2013-2016) - GPE USD 30,138,962 (2013-2017) - USAID |
| Total Contribution Amount Received to Date | USD 25,320,009.20 - GPE USD 20,917,602.00 - USAID ² |
| Programmable Amount Received to Date | USD 23,663,803.32 – GPE USD 19,367,803.67 - USAID |
| Funds utilized (Programmable Level) (July 2013–January 2016) | Total Amount Utilised (GPE+USAID): ³ USD 23,144,841.35 USD 13,701,835.89 – ACTUAL USD 9,443,005.46 - COMMITMENTS |
| UNICEF Contacts | Shaya Ibrahim Asindua Deputy Representative Email: sasindua@unicef.org Phuong T. Nguyen Chief, Education & Adolescent Development Email: ptnguyen@unicef.org Faika Farzana Resource Mobilisation Specialist Email: ffarzana@unicef.org |
| MoEST Contact | Michael Lopuke Lotyam Undersecretary Email: michlopuke@gmail.com |

¹ USAID funds amounting to USD 13,358,399 (total contribution amount including cost recovery) were received in December 2013 and coincided with escalation of conflict in South Sudan and therefore approval for utilization of USAID funds was received in September 2014.

² Amount reflected refers to USAID Obligated Amount

³ Funds utilization amounts in the report are only interim figures. The final financial statement will be made available after expiry of the contribution by the UNICEF Comptroller

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This third progress report provides an overview of implementation of South Sudan's Global Partnership for Education Programme (GPEP) funded by GPE and USAID over the three year period to end of January 2016. In support of the General Education Strategic Plan (GESP) 2012-2017, the GPEP aims to contribute to improvements in the education sector through three main strategies, namely

- 1. Strengthened national systems that are fundamental to providing equitable access to quality education;*
- 2. Improved school performance, and in the process generate model approaches for improving quality; and*
- 3. Attract additional support to the education sector in South Sudan by demonstrating sustainable successes.*

Due to the crisis that erupted in December 2013, there was a cautious start to programme implementation in the first quarter of 2014. Since then, progress has been achieved as reported below:

1. Component A – National Systems Strengthening

Adaptation of EGRA⁴ and EGMA⁵ type tests into five languages was completed and assessments administered to seventy P3 learners (40 girls and 30 boys) in Dinka and Nuer. The remaining assessments in three languages (Bari, Toposa and Zande) will be conducted in February 2016. These assessments are designed to serve a diagnostic purpose to inform the literacy and numeracy teaching and learning materials that will be used in P1 to P4 classrooms to enhance early literacy in mother tongue and English.

A baseline study was conducted to provide understanding of the prevailing situation and to inform the curricula for both the primary leadership and school inspection programmes.

Annual progress and 2014-15 financial reports were presented at the 2015 Joint Education Sector Review, held in November 2015. The JSR was attended by 146 participants from the National Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) State Ministries of Education, Finance and Local Government, sector partners including both development

⁴ Early Grade Reading Assessment

⁵ Early Grade Mathematics Assessment

and humanitarian actors. The Ministers signed off on key Action Points for implementation during 2016.

Curriculum development has continued and in 2015 the following was achieved:

1. The formal primary curriculum was adapted to the non-formal Alternative Education System (AES) with financial support from DFID.
2. The national and foreign languages conference at the June 2015 MoEST Conference under the theme: “Unity in diversity through multilingualism for a peaceful South Sudan.”
3. In collaboration with UNESCO, Secondary School Technical and Vocational Education (TVET) curricula were developed by teams of 58 instructors (5 female, 53 male) to revise the secondary schools’ technical and vocational curriculum.
4. A core group of 24 curriculum writers (one female) developed model teaching and learning materials based on a unit of work from selected subjects to use for piloting the new curriculum during the first term of 2016. The aim of the pilot is to:
 - Identify issues faced by teachers and students in using the materials
 - Help develop the training programmes for all teachers to meet these issues
 - Provide exemplar materials for the training programmes:
 - Students’ work
 - Testimonies from students and teachers
 - Reflections from supervisors
 - Create centres of expertise that can serve as ‘hubs’ to support the implementation of the curriculum
 - Create a cohort of expert teachers who can contribute to the training

In February, a team of teachers will be oriented on the new curriculum and trained to use the learning and teaching materials in their schools. Supervisors will also be trained to provide supportive supervision during the pilot to be implemented in February/March 2016.

The National Languages Implementation Guidelines (2015) were endorsed to provide options on the strategic way forward in realising the effective use of mother tongue instruction for early literacy and numeracy.

English language competencies of teachers was identified as a barrier in effective teaching from P4 when learners transition from mother tongue to English as the medium of instruction. A policy framework to provide guidance on strategies to improve English language competencies among teachers was approved in July 2015.

The Sector-wide Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy has been drafted. This strategy will be finalized when the new education sector policy has been completed.

2. Component B – Strengthening Community and School-Based Service Delivery

Having advertised widely locally and through Reliefweb, a pre-qualification exercise was undertaken to secure competent construction companies. Expressions of Interest were received from 76 companies. These companies were jointly assessed by MoEST and

UNICEF resulting in 34 companies being pre-qualified. It is these pre-qualified firms that have formed the pool of qualified contractors that are invited to participate in the bidding processes for the school construction component.

Construction of the model full primary schools was completed in Eastern Equatoria State, furniture delivered and boreholes completed in December, 2015. Five more schools are under construction in Western Equatoria and contractors have been secured for the ten schools for Lakes and Warrap whilst the bidding process is underway for the final set of five schools in Northern Bahr el Ghazal.

Enrolments have increased by an average of 4% between the year 2014 at the start of the project and the end of 2015 as illustrated in Table 1.0.

| Year | Boys | Girls | Total |
|------|-------|-------|--------|
| 2015 | 6,933 | 7,235 | 14,168 |
| 2014 | 6,654 | 7,032 | 13,686 |

Table 1.0: Comparison of Enrolments for 2014 and 2015.

As well, by December 2015, a total of 41 County and Payam Supervisors (7 female) from three of the five States where schools are being constructed have been trained on effective school governance so as to facilitate training of Parent Teacher Associations (PTA) and School Management Committees (SMC) and ensure functionality of governance structures in their States.

3. Component C – Learning and Sharing Lessons

The GPEP baseline study was completed and validation meetings held in the five States, where twenty-five school sites had been identified to model construction and programme interventions, and a meeting held with national MoEST and partners to disseminate the findings of the baseline.

The completion of the baseline resulted in the finalisation of GPEP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework and indicators were then populated.

Two blogs have been published on the Global Partnership for Education website, where information was shared on South Sudan’s GPEP progress on (1) Curriculum development and (2) Mother tongue as language of instruction for improved early literacy.

4. Component D – Inception

The GPEP governance structures have become more functional and increasingly proficient in providing effective programme oversight. The GPEP Technical Working Group is chaired by the Director for Planning and Budgeting and members are MoEST Directorates with programmatic responsibilities in the GPE programme, and also includes representatives of GESS, RTL and IMED. The Joint Steering Committee, chaired by the MoEST Undersecretary and Education Donor Group Chairperson has provided guidance on programme realignment issues and oversight on the four flagship programmes, namely, the Global Partnership for Education Programme, Improved Management for Education

Delivery (IMED), Girls' Education South Sudan (GESS) and Room to Learn (RTL). The National Education Forum, which is South Sudan's Local Education Group (LEG), has met twice during this reporting period.

Challenges

The main challenges during this reporting period were:

1. Delays due to consensus building and challenging programming environment affecting 3 components of the GPE programme: (1) School Leadership and School Inspection Programme; (2) selection of contractors for school construction and (3) Literacy and Numeracy which was delayed by application of conflict sensitivity in language selection. Additional delays were faced in facilitating synergy in the GPEP and RTL components of strengthening literacy among early grade learners.
2. Unexpected onset of insecurity in previously stable areas in Western Equatoria.
3. The education sector budget has been decreasing and the assumption, at the beginning of the programme, that teachers' salaries would be paid regularly and on time no longer holds.
4. Uncontrolled inflation has resulted in reduction of the real value of the South Sudanese Pound. Salaries remain stagnant and are not paid regularly impacting on teacher morale as review of civil service (including teachers) remuneration has not been completed. However, the Ministry has indicated that processes to increase salaries and improve terms and conditions of service are underway.
5. Construction unit costs are exorbitant due to scarce supply (limited number of construction companies in the country) and high demand for the construction works. Most of these are international companies. Furthermore, virtually all the construction materials are imported from neighbouring countries. There is also limited availability of skilled workforce, with most skilled workers coming from neighbouring countries.

1.0 Education Sector Analysis

Even before the 2013 conflict, only one in ten children in South Sudan completed primary school, with 1.4 million children out of school across the country. The ensuing two years of violence has forced 413,000 more children out of school, and led to the destruction of 331 schools.

The 2015 EMIS reports that currently only 43 per cent of primary school-aged children are enrolled and less than 10 per cent complete the 8-year primary cycle, which is far less than half the average for Eastern and Southern Africa. However, since 2013 primary school enrolment has increased in seven states and the numbers of children accessing pre-primary school education is also increasing.⁶ A complementary report to the 2015 EMIS, emanating

⁶ MoEST (2015) EMIS

from an assessment of the three conflict-affected states, confirmed that Education in Emergencies has reached some 250,000 children, the majority of whom were learning in classrooms under trees, tents or temporary shelters, whilst the majority of teachers (70%) are unqualified.⁷

Despite the prevailing challenges, progress against sector priorities as articulated in the GESP 2012-2017 has been substantial as was reported and discussed at the 2015 Annual Joint Sector Review: (1) EMIS processes were localised thereby increasing the Ministry's capacity for execution of the Annual Education Census, data analysis and reporting; (2) developments on the sector's Transformation Plan, such as the restructuring process as well as other key national and state level annual achievements; (3) the new general education structure, with updated duties and functions of officers; (4) innovative programmes such as Back to Learning, Learning for Peace; (5) the South Sudan Schools' Attendance Monitoring System (SSSAMS) to enhance monitoring of learner enrolment and attendance; school capitation grants and girls cash transfers; (6) progress on the new national formal and non-formal education curriculum; (7) establishing and improving Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) and alternative education systems (AES); (8) sector budgets, cash transfers and capitation grants, teacher salaries, and human resources (piloting of human resource management).

Starting in 2014-15 financial year the Government of South Sudan has been allocating SSP 60 million (USD 21 million) annually as capitation grants which has so far benefitted 3,119 primary schools (70%).⁸ The received grants have benefitted a total of 1,143,824 learners, of whom 40% are girls. The government grants in support of primary schools are complemented by DFID-funded secondary school grants and girls' cash transfers for those enrolled in the fifth year of primary to the final year of secondary education. By November 2015, 223 secondary schools (69%) were benefiting from the capitation grant 32,531⁹ girls have received the DFID-supported cash transfer and are regularly attending school. Capitation and Operation Grants are being disbursed to States for utilization at County, Payam and school levels. However, it was acknowledged that the grants do not always reach the intended beneficiaries due to delays in disbursements which is initially disbursed from central government to the State Ministry of Finance, followed by transfer to the State Ministry of Education before it can be disbursed to schools. Capitation grants are conditional and schools are required to have School Development Plans (SDP), among others, in order to receive them. On the whole, schools use grants to purchase teaching and learning supplies and improve the learning environment. Among the challenges are quality of school development reports and timely financial reporting.

South Sudan's commitment to education is articulated in MoEST's Transformation Agenda. Concrete steps towards this Agenda in 2015 include the Ministry's concerted efforts to protect education grants and to explore options to transfer grants or "in kind" options to

⁷ MoEST (2015) Education in Conflict: Mixed Research Report on Greater Upper Nile.

⁸ <http://www.sssams.org/sbrr/profile.php>

⁹ Ibid

conflict-affected areas. In a bid to ensure clear roles, responsibilities and accountabilities for all employees at all levels of the Ministry of Education, job descriptions have been completed and approved by the Council of Ministers for operationalization. In recognition of the need to attract and retain qualified teachers, the Ministry has initiated the revision of teachers' terms and conditions of service.

Increased attempts towards effective coordination in education has resulted in the finalization and publication of the 2015 MoEST Partner Mapping Exercise, documenting the work of education partners in South Sudan. Supported by the Education Donor Group, this exercise was conducted jointly by the MoEST and Partners in Education Group, a forum formed in 2015 and comprised of NGOs which support the education sector. The (Education) Partner Mapping contributes not only to efficient planning and management of education service delivery but also towards increasing mutual accountability and transparency between education development partners and MoEST. One hundred and eleven partners were found to be engaged in humanitarian as well as development efforts in the education sector, though the exercise was limited to nine out of ten states due to insecurity and inability to access areas in one of the key conflict-affected states.

With funding support from GPE and technical assistance from UNESCO IIEP and UNICEF, South Sudan an Education Sector Analysis (ESA) has just been completed in January 2016, which also incorporates Conflict and Disaster Risk Reduction analysis undertaken in country, particularly through the UNICEF-supported Peacebuilding, Education and Advocacy (PBEA) project. This analysis will provide the much needed evidence to inform necessary priority setting for the development of the Education Sector Plan (ESP) which will be completed by June 2016.

Although much progress was achieved during 2015, the MoEST requires increased and sustainable domestic resources to address the persistent gaps still facing the sector. There are inadequate numbers of trained teachers, insufficient teaching and learning materials, large numbers of out of school children and limited capacity to monitor existing programs due to logistical and security challenges. Furthermore, there is limited capacity for financial (grants) management from State Ministries through county and payam structures to school level. Security concerns severely affect service delivery particularly in conflict affected areas. Moving forward there is need to prioritize the greatest challenges in the sector, increase transparency on education grants, sensitize communities on the importance of education, and continue to implement the various programmes that are having a positive impact on the sector.

2.0 RESULTS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

The overall goal of GPE programme is to contribute to the GESP to deliver quality basic education services in challenging circumstances through: 1) strengthening National Education Systems; 2) ensuring education services delivery are community and school-based; and 3) showcasing success by evidence-based approaches.

The GPEP for South Sudan has four major components:

- A. Component A - National Systems Strengthening with the following four sub-components:
 - 1. *Strengthening literacy and numeracy learning in primary schools;*
 - 2. *Strengthening primary school leadership;*
 - 3. *Strengthening school inspection and supportive supervision; and*
 - 4. *Strengthening sector policy development, strategic planning and review.*

- B. Component B - Strengthening Community and School-based Education Service Delivery with the following seven sub-components:
 - 1. *Support to Literacy and Numeracy learning;*
 - 2. *Support to School Management Committees;*
 - 3. *Support to School Supervision;*
 - 4. *Procurement in support of learning;*
 - 5. *Improvements to physical infrastructure to improve learning;*
 - 6. *Support to out-of-school children and young people; and*
 - 7. *Strengthening of CECs to provide a learning support service to schools.*

- C. Component C - Learning and Sharing Lessons with the following sub-components:
 - 1. *Research tracking of the GPE experience (Baseline, Mid-Term, Endline and Action Research); and*
 - 2. *Communication.*

- D. Component D – Inception was completed in early 2014.

The GPE Programme “Delivering Quality Basic Education in Challenging Circumstances” was approved by the GPE Board in 2012. As part of the Inception Phase, the programme was further refined resulting in the 2013 “Refreshed GPEP” document. Due to the armed conflict that erupted in December 2013 and other factors, substantive implementation was delayed by one year and three months and started effectively in March 2014.

This third progress report of the GPEP for South Sudan focuses on the first three major components as outlined above against the programme outputs of the refreshed GPEP Design document. Component D which is the Inception Phase was completed in 2014 comprised of ground-setting and preliminary programme activities leading to the finalisation of the “Refreshed” GPEP Implementation Plan which was endorsed by Government and donors. The Joint Steering Committee (JSC) was established in 2014 as a key governance

structure to provide oversight on the four sector flagship programmes - GPEP, GESS, IMED and RTL. The JSC, is chaired by the MoEST Undersecretary and the Education Donor Group (EDoG) Chairperson with membership from MoEST Directorates, Donors (DFID, EU, USAID, UNESCO and UNICEF) and programme managers for GPEP, GESS, IMED and RTL meets quarterly and has met four times in 2015 to deliberate on programmatic realignment and financing issues.

Some activities have continued beyond the inception phase. In particular GPEP M&E Framework development and mapping of synergistic elements of the four flagship sector programmes (GESS, IMED, RTL and GPEP). As a result a Big 4 forum has been established which facilitates sharing of progress and experiences as well as enables effective programme collaboration.

2.1 Component A: National Systems Strengthening

This component aims to contribute to improving learning outcomes at primary school level through strengthened: (1) Literacy and numeracy learning; (2) Primary School Leadership; (3) School Inspection and supportive supervision; and (4) Sector policy development, strategic planning and review.

2.2.1 Literacy and numeracy learning

The progress under Literacy and Numeracy Learning is reported against the following planned outputs and approved activities:

- 1. National learning outcomes and assessment tools in literacy and numeracy*
- 2. National literacy and numeracy strategies developed and disseminated to all 3,700 primary schools and other key stakeholders*
- 3. Literacy and numeracy 'kits' for P 1-8 are designed in line with the strategy*
- 4. Literacy/numeracy-focused teacher development interventions designed*
- 5. National literacy and numeracy strategy reviewed and strengthened*

The literacy and numeracy sub-component is being implemented under the technical support of Montrose Consultancy (UK) who work closely with the Examinations Secretariat, Planning, Curriculum and National Languages Directorates. Oversight is provided by a Reference group that is composed of these directorates as well as SIL, GPEP, RTL and USAID.

South Sudan has about 68 national languages¹⁰ and the Education Act (2012) states that instruction in the early years of schooling, up to the third grade, is to be conducted in mother tongue/local language. The recently developed South Sudan curriculum also reflects this policy which is in line with credible literature and evidence of the educational advantages of mother tongue usage to improve early learning. In order to initiate the literacy and numeracy project, a few languages had to be selected and it would have be those used in the programme sites. However, a 'conflict sensitive' approach to language selection was proposed. Working with the National Languages Directorate together with the Summer

¹⁰ MoEST (2015). Implementation Guidelines for National and Foreign Languages.

Institute for Linguistics, a paper was developed providing guidance on a conflict sensitive selection process. This paper was approved by the Reference Group and provided inputs to an official memo signed by the MoEST Undersecretary approving the use of the five languages that are used by 65% of the population (Bari, Dinka, Nuer, Toposa and Zande) for this project. Since RTL also had literacy components, and programmatic synergy was crucial, it was agreed that (1) GPEP would be responsible for three languages – Dinka, Nuer and Zande whilst Bari and Toposa would be covered by RTL resources and (2) RTL engage Montrose so that their scope of work is expanded and the outputs could be consolidated into a comprehensive whole.

Thereafter the first three listed below are common programmatic elements and would be jointly undertaken:

1. Develop literacy and numeracy assessments in the five languages, English and Mathematics.
2. Administer to third grade learners in schools where the medium of instruction (Moi) for the first three years is one of the five languages.
3. Develop a literacy and numeracy strategy to enhance early learning and distribute to all primary schools, county education centres and teacher training institutes.
4. Develop “kits” for literacy and numeracy learning in the first four grades of primary education which is to be distributed to primary schools.
5. Train a core team of teacher trainers and teachers to facilitate training in early learning.

2.2.1.1 National learning outcomes and assessment tools in literacy and numeracy

The EGRA and EGMA type assessments would be used to determine grade 3 learners’ proficiency in the Language of Instruction, English and Mathematics. The assessments are designed to primarily serve a diagnostic function so as to inform the strategy and design of teaching and learning “kits”.

The assessments in Dinka and Zande would be administered in a sample of GPEP schools, whereas Dinka assessments would be administered to a sample of learners in the temporary schools set up for internally displaced children in the Juba Protection of Civilians (PoC) site.

In September, teams of linguists were assembled to be trained to facilitate the adaptation of assessment tools into the three languages funded by GPE. Due to deteriorating security in Western Equatoria, the Zande team could not travel to Juba for this workshop. However two teams of five linguists for each of Dinka and Nuer teams (all male), worked with Consultants to adapt the tools. They were piloted and went through a further verification process.

In late October 2015, a five and a half day training was conducted including practical sessions in selected pilot schools. Out of an initial ten (8 male and 2 female) trainees and four MoEST officials, seven (four for Dinka and three for Nuer) assessors successfully completed the training wherein assessors had to be able to administer the tests in a non-threatening manner, exhibit high levels of accuracy in the process of data collection and be adept at managing data entry in tablets loaded with Tangerine. Immediately after training, assessors were deployed to schools to the data. MoEST officials did not participate in data collection in a bid to ensure objectivity of the exercise which includes classroom observations which might be affected by perceived “MoEST officials” school visit.

Data collection was undertaken in November 2015 in Northern Bahr el Ghazal and in the Juba PoC. The Dinka tools were administered in five schools sampling ten learners per school in Northern Bahr el Ghazal and the Nuer tools were administered in two schools sampling ten learners in each school in the Juba PoC. Altogether the assessments were administered to forty girls and thirty boys.

Due to protracted contractual finalisation between Montrose and RTL, it was agreed that adaptation processes for the remaining three languages be initiated in January to ensure data collection soon after the beginning of the 2016 academic year starting in the second week of February. In addition, it was agreed additional Nuer assessors be trained so that data could be collected from three “normal” schools operating in Upper Nile and Unity to complement the rather small sample set from Juba PoC.

In summary for GPEP, fourteen language specialists, only one woman, were trained worked by Montrose consultants to adapt the tools into Dinka, Nuer and Zande. Whereas for Room to Learn project, eight linguists (all men) adapted the tools into Bari and Toposa.

The preliminary results have been generated based on the assessments conducted in Dinka and Nuer however it was agreed that a substantive report that provides a consolidated perspective of findings on literacy and numeracy competencies of learners with individual language chapters to enlighten on nuances to consider for each language.

2.2.2 Primary School Leadership and 2.2.3 School Inspection and Supportive Supervision

Primary School Leadership and School Inspection and Supportive Supervision (PSLP) are complementary and are being implemented as parts of a consolidated programme within an Institutional Contract with a Consortium of NGOs and private Teacher Training Institutes. As implementation progresses, the programme outputs will be reported separately for the School Leadership components and for School Inspection and Supervision.

Primary School Leadership Outputs:

- 1. National school leadership policy and professionalization strategy developed*
- 2. National school leadership standards established*
- 3. Primary School Leadership Professional Programme (PSLPP) designed*

4. *School leadership teams (in all primary schools have undertaken the PSLPP*
5. *Primary school leadership manual developed and distributed to all 3,700 primary schools*

School Inspection and Supportive Supervision Outputs:

1. *National school inspection/supervision mapping exercise undertaken*
2. *Strategy for strengthening school inspection and supportive supervision*
3. *School Supervisor Professional Programme (SSPP) designed and accredited*
4. *All 800 school inspectors/supervisors have completed the SSPP*

As stated in the previous report, the Institutional Contract for the delivery of the Primary School Leadership Inspection and Supervision Programme (PSLP) was awarded to the Save the Children Consortium. After signing of the contract with Save the Children Consortium at the end of 2014, the early part of 2015 was spent in seeking approval from the MoEST on the strategies proposed to achieve the targets of the PSLP. Consensus was eventually achieved and programme planning resumed including realistic costing of training budgets. A revised detailed implementation plan was developed. Consortium partners identified state coordinators from a pool of trainers in South Sudan to be located at the State Ministries and coordinate programme activities at state level.

The PSLP Consortium introduced the project to senior state level MoEST officials including SMoEST Director Generals and their Directors of Budgeting and Planning. The DGs and Directors reaffirmed that this project would greatly benefit primary education programmes in the states.

Independent researchers¹¹ were contracted to conduct a baseline assessment/situation analysis and mapping of primary school leadership, inspection and supervision in 10 States. This would inform the standards, policies and guidelines as well as the curriculum for the basic courses on leadership, supervision and inspection.

2.2.4 Support to sector policy development, strategic planning and review

The expected programme outputs under Support to sector policy development, strategic planning and review include the following:

1. *The MoEST Planning Directorate is strengthened (supported through **IMED** programme)*
2. *Up to four annual sector reviews are undertaken*
3. *The ongoing national education policy development process is strengthened*
4. *Emerging needs regarding policy development and strategic planning met*

The GPEP is one of four complementary sector programmes that is meant to contribute to system strengthening. In order to reduce duplication, it was agreed that 'strengthening of the Planning Directorate' would be best achieved through IMED programming which is

¹¹ Charlie Goldsmith Associates/Forcier Consulting

embedded in that Directorate. Hence, the first output “The MoEST Planning Directorate is strengthened” has been dropped and will be consolidated into the IMED outputs.

2.2.4.1 Joint Sector Review

The second Joint Education Sector Review was held from 10 to 12 November, 2015 with 146 (128 male and 18 female) education stakeholders. They included officials from the National Ministries of Education, Science and Technology, Finance and Local Government. The ten states of South Sudan were represented by the State Ministers of Education, Directors General for Education, Directors of Planning and Budgeting, Directors General of Finance and Local Government. Participation also included representatives from UN Agencies (UNICEF, WFP and UNHCR), development partners (DFID, USAID and EU), international and national NGOs, and Community Based Organisations (CBOs). Under the theme “Sustainable Quality Education for All”, the 2015 Joint Sector Review (JSR) was focused on five key objectives:

- 1. Launch of the 2015 Annual Education Census / Education Management Information System (EMIS)*
- 2. Assess performance of the Education sector (MoEST and Development Partners) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014-15.*
- 3. Review of public financial management and payroll issues: execution of operating and salary transfers to States, Counties and Schools.*
- 4. Review progress on system strengthening, coordination and communication.*
- 5. Presentation and review of key sector issues at the sub-national level.*

Opened by H.E. Vice President of South Sudan, the 2015 JSR provided opportunity for reflection on the sector’s progress in conflict and non-conflict affected areas, persisting and new challenges as well as to chart a way forward in view of the challenging environment. Key resolutions included the need to strengthen accountability for timely disbursement and for appropriate utilization and reporting at all levels of the system, hence the participation of the Ministries of Finance and Local Government at this year’s JSR. Also highlighted was the need to improve information flow from the national to the local level, and to strengthen inter-ministerial communication, especially at the state level. Incidentally, these were also identified as bottlenecks in the 2014 JSR. Recommendations were proposed to streamline disbursements of capitation grants, operating and salary grants from National and State to the decentralized level of schools. It was agreed that beginning in December 2015 a high level inter-ministerial meeting facilitated by the National Minister for Education would be convened to communicate required actions regarding education grants and their management as well as expected accountability roles at all levels of the decentralized system. An awareness campaign was proposed as a means to inform the public about capitation grants which confirm government’s commitment to increasing access to education for South Sudanese children. Finally, it was agreed that training on financial management and reporting processes from the national, State, and school level was imperative and should be prioritized in 2016. The 2015 JSR Action Points were signed off by all the Ministers (see Appendix)

2.2.4.2 Curriculum Development

During this reporting period there was significant progress in the curriculum development process, the following were co-financed by DFID and GPE. DFID provided resources for the adaptation of the curriculum to fit the Alternative Education System as well as printing of the Curriculum Framework, Subject Overviews for ECD, Primary, Secondary, Community Girls and Alternative Education Programmes.

From April to June the Curriculum Foundation (UK), provided technical support for the adaptation of the formal primary curriculum to the Alternative Education System (AES) which is the non-formal component of primary education. AES consists of two programmes – the Community Girls Schools (CGS) is a two year course that covers lower primary education, i.e. to fourth grade, and the Accelerated Learning Programme (ALP) is a four year course that is equivalent to the primary education cycle. A total of 50 experienced AES facilitators worked with curriculum writers (who had written the formal curriculum) in subject groups to develop the ALP and CG curricula.

In September 2015, the MoEST hosted a ceremony to “launch the new national curriculum”. The main purpose of the launch was to mark the official public announcement by the Ministry on the realization of a significant milestone of having completed the design and content of the first comprehensive education programme (the curriculum) of South Sudan. The curriculum is a home-grown product developed by South Sudan for South Sudan children but is of equivalent standards to those of neighbouring countries. The launch was attended by the Vice President, members of the Cabinet, the Parliamentary Committee on Education, MoEST and SMoEST officials, donors, UN agencies, PEG as well as 20 representatives of publishers based in Juba, Kenya, Uganda and Rwanda.

DFID providing funding to print the curriculum materials which were distributed at the launch and further disseminated to the National Ministry for information and familiarization by State Ministries, Counties and Payams, Teacher Training Institutes and Universities.

1. South Sudan Curriculum Framework – 15,000 copies
2. Subject Overviews: Early Childhood Development; Primary 1 to 8; Secondary 1 to 4. – 11,300 copies
3. Subject Overviews: Accelerated Learning Programme Subject Overviews: Community Girls Schools – 5,600 copies
4. South Sudan Learning and Teaching Materials Policy – 1,000 copies

During the launch, it was noted that there was an urgent need to provide adolescents and young people with “livelihood skills”. It was agreed that it would be prudent to review the Secondary TVET curriculum so as to complete Secondary Education. In South Sudan, there are 3 types of TVET Secondary Schools: Agricultural, Commercial and Technical. In collaboration with UNESCO, a writing workshop was convened to train 58 TVET instructors (5 female, 53 male) to revise the vocational curriculum. Working with Curriculum Foundation and a core group of curriculum writers, UNESCO’s TVET expert from

Botswana, the Secondary TVET curriculum was drafted. The TVET Overviews were developed and modules for each of the programmes. The number of modules drafted were:

| Agricultural Schools | |
|--|-------------------|
| Programme | Number of Modules |
| Crop Production | 20 |
| Animal Production | 19 |
| Horticulture | 8 |
| Agricultural Engineering | 14 |
| Agricultural Economics | 9 |
| Soil Science & Fertility (S1-3) | 5 |
| Food technology (S2) | 2 |
| Bee keeping (S3) | 2 |
| Agri-forestry (S4) | 3 |
| Agricultural Research and Extension (S4) | 4 |
| Total | 86 |

| Commercial Schools | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Programme | Number of Modules |
| Financial Accounting | 20 |
| Financial Mathematics | 14 |
| Economics | 26 |
| Costing (S2-4) | 12 |
| Office Practice (S1) | 7 |
| Management (S2) | 9 |
| Taxation (S3) | 9 |
| Government Accounts (S4) | 7 |
| Total | 105 |

| Technical Schools | |
|---|-------------------|
| Programme | Number of Modules |
| Tech Drawing (Civil and Mechanical Engineering) | 20 |
| Automotive | 26 |
| Electrical Installation | 25 |
| Building and Construction | 37 |
| Carpentry and Joinery | 18 |
| Tailoring | 16 |
| Travel and Tourism | 12 |
| Total | 154 |

The next steps in 2016 entail:

- Writing modules for Catering and Hotel Management, Plumbing, Welding and Metal Fabrication, Cooling System and Refrigeration.
- Discussions with relevant sector employers on expected competencies of TVET course graduates.

- Develop assessment procedures that are in line with an agreed South Sudan Qualifications Framework.

Piloting of the Curriculum

The pilot project has been initiated starting with the development of a sample of exemplar learner and teacher materials. Facilitated by Curriculum Foundation, a team of 24 writers (one female) drafted a unit of learner and teacher materials in each of the following subjects for use in the pilot project: English – P3; P7 and S3; Maths - P1; P5 and S3; Science – P3 and P7; Social Studies – P1 and P5; Geography – S1 and Physics – S1.

In February, teachers will be identified to participate in the pilot. These teachers will be oriented on the new curriculum and trained to use the prepared materials. These materials will be used for teaching a unit presented in exemplar materials in selected schools in seven States during the first term of 2016.

The aim of the pilot is to:

- Identify issues faced by teachers and students in using the materials
- Help develop the training programmes for all teachers to meet these issues
- Provide exemplar materials for the training programmes:
 - Students' work
 - Testimonies from students and teachers
 - Reflections from supervisors
- Create centres of expertise that can serve as 'hubs' to support the implementation of the curriculum
- Create a cohort of expert teachers who can contribute to the training
- Enable a groups of School Supervisors and County Education Centre Directors to support teachers
- Create prototype materials that can help the design of textbooks and teacher guides.
- Provide examples to Development Partners of how the new curriculum will tackle Literacy and Numeracy, and will include elements such as Peace Education, Life Skills and Human Rights.

National Languages Implementation Guidelines

Successful curriculum implementation is impacted by both the language of instruction in the classroom as well learning and teaching materials availability and accessibility for use by children and teachers. The latter include textbooks and other curriculum support materials. In this regard, the MoEST undertook consultative processes to finalise the implementation guidelines on national languages. The guidelines take into account diversity in languages and contribute to reduced exclusion of children to effective learning and improved learning for girls and boys in the first few years of schooling. The National Languages Implementation Guidelines were drafted in 2014 to provide options on the strategic way forward in realising the effective use of mother tongue instruction. Subsequently, in June 2015, the MoEST convened a National and Foreign Languages Conference with the theme:

"Unity in Diversity through Multilingualism for a Peaceful South Sudan." This forum, where 169 (148 male and 21 female) senior education management and language specialists from all ten States and national MoEST participated, was to facilitate discussions on effective instruction in National Languages and the place of Foreign Languages in the Education System in South Sudan. The meeting endorsed the National Implementation Guidelines which are to be used to ensure operationalisation of the policy on languages of instruction (LoI).

Accelerated English Language Policy Framework

A proclamation by the Government to make English the LoI from the fourth year of schooling (Primary 4) onwards prompted education sector partners to engage in Intensive English Training Programmes to improve teachers' competencies. The GPEP aimed to support the sector to develop and introduce a systematic approach to enhancing teachers' competencies in English. Under the guidance of the AES, Curriculum and Teacher Development Directorates, Windle Trust International (WTI), a technical NGO partner, undertook a situation analysis on the use of English as a LoI in P4 classrooms in 5 states and thereafter developed a Policy Framework on Accelerated English for Teachers. The policy framework was endorsed by the Ministry of Education in July 2015. The aim is to design structured and accredited language courses to meet the existing needs as well as a strategic roll-out plan to ensure that the system is able to track progress and systematically increase English language proficiency of teachers to improve effective teaching and learning in the classroom.

Sector wide M&E strategy

The Sector Wide M&E Strategy was developed through a participatory and systematic process involving all key stakeholders in the Education Sector in South Sudan. There were three key approaches used to generate the knowledge base for the formulation of the M&E Strategy. These were: Desk Review, Participatory Assessment (PIA), Semi-open interviews and Validation Workshop. During the Desk review sessions the Results Frameworks of pertinent documents were reviewed - the General Education Strategic Plan, the GPEP, GESS, IMED and RTL matrices, M&E reports and relevant document was analysed to determine: (i) relevance of objectives, results areas and activities; (ii) applicability of data collection methods; (iii) relevance of key target groups, and (iv) applicability of indicators. The Participatory Assessment (PIA) is similar to Focus Group Discussion but has a controlled number of participants and it entailed visiting two states on the basis of relative stability in terms of intensity of conflict. The PIAs were held at Payam level and had one group of five primary school pupils; one group of five girl pupils (9-12 years); one group of five boy pupils (9-12 years); one group of five school committee members – alternatively parents; one group of five adult learners; one group of five parents with children with learning difficulties or disabilities, and one group of five informal leaders. The Semi-Open interviews were moderated with a questionnaire that had themes such as equity, access, finances, etc. and each key informant interview asked questions on each of the themes: (1) What has worked well; (2) What has not worked well; (3) Impact; and (4) Proposed changes.

The results were compiled into reports and zero draft M&E strategy was formulated based on the findings. The Strategy aims to assist the education sector measure results, outcomes. Specifically will measure progress on policy and programme implementation at all levels of the system. The strategy will aid the MoEST be able to determine how much progress is being made towards national targets such as ...“Towards an educated and informed nation by 2040” as expressed in the South Sudan Vision 2040 as well as global education indicators.

A Validation Workshop that drew stakeholders from the state level as well as national level was held to review the zero draft resulting in a draft that will be finalised after the MoEST, with support from UNESCO IIEP has finalised the ESP 2017-2021.

Minimum Basic Schools Construction Standards and Guidelines

The establishment of minimum school construction standards and guidelines for South Sudan will ensure that all construction of schools (from temporary to permanent structures) adheres to agreed minimum standards for child friendly and safe learning spaces. This will enhance enrolments and attendance and boost education achievements as per the General Education Strategic Plan, 2012 to 2017.

These standards were developed through a participatory process involving all key stakeholders in the school construction sector in South Sudan. Field assessments were carried out in Four States of South Sudan (Eastern Equatoria, Central Equatoria, Jonglei and Western Bahr El Ghazal) where various Education actors were consulted and at least 24 basic (primary) schools visited and assessed. During the assessments, parents, head teachers and teachers of public and private schools from all the assessed states were consulted on various aspects of school infrastructure and feedback was obtained.

Following the field assessments and consultations, a national consultation was carried out where representatives from each state participated, including Engineers and Planners involved in Education infrastructure from each of the Ten States of South Sudan. These participants were invited to verify the field assessment findings and to seek further contributions and feedback as part of the standards development process. Feedback from these consultations informed the development of the final draft document.

The final draft was dully validated by a reference group in October, 2015. Thereafter the document has been reviewed by the senior leadership at the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology and the line Minister has authored a foreword for the final document. These standards are now being published for distribution.

2.2 Component B: Community and School based Education Service delivery

This component contributes to improved and effective school and community-based education service delivery to serve as models for scaling up efforts of quality service provision. This focus of this component was to operationalise policies and materials

produced through activities in Component A in the GPEP schools. Therefore delays in Component A where materials were to be developed have affected implementation in classrooms, schools and CECs. The execution of Component B will facilitate the testing of innovative supplementary teaching and learning materials as well as modelling of effective in on-the-job training of teachers, school leaders, *payam* supervisors, county inspectors, County Education Managers and School Management Committees to improve learning and school effectiveness. This Component also includes strengthening of County Education Centres and determining learning needs of out-of-school Children around the targeted school catchment areas.

The expected programme outputs under each of the sub-components are outlined in the below with their associated achievements to date.

2.2.1 Support to Literacy and Numeracy Learning

The expected programme outputs under Support to Literacy and Numeracy Learning in GPEP supported schools include the following:

- 1. Literacy and numeracy testing is conducted in at least 25 GPEP-supported schools, and they are each aware of their status against the national standards*
- 2. At least 25 schools each receive 16 literacy and numeracy kits, for piloting*
- 3. At least 200 teachers in 25 schools have benefited from training that strengthens the way they support literacy and numeracy learning*
- 4. Any other actions recommended in the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategy are tried and tested in at least 25 schools*

Literacy and Numeracy assessments have been conducted among 70 third grade learners (40 girls, 30 boys) in two languages in 7 schools in November 2015. Preliminary results indicate challenges in the teaching of “letter sounds” in the two languages. Learners perform much better in Numeracy than in the Literacy assessment for both Lol and English. The literacy and numeracy strategy as well as teaching and learning “kits” will be developed upon completion of assessment reports.

2.2.2. Support to School Management Committees (done)

The expected programme outputs under Support to School Management Committees in GPEP supported schools include the following:

- 1. Technical contribution made to developing policy, strategy, training, etc. in relation to strengthening community engagement*
- 2. All non-literate SMC members in at least 25 schools have had the opportunity to pursue literacy classes*

The MoEST in partnership with GESS and with involvement of GPEP produced a School Management Handbook. This Handbook is being used to roll out training of School Management Committees. During this reporting period County and Payam Supervisors from 3 of the 5 States where schools are being constructed, were trained as Master Trainers to facilitate training of SMCs in their constituencies. A total of 41(38 male and 3 female)

were trained and developed action plans to show how they intended to roll out the training to school-communities.

2.2.3. Support to School Supervision (done)

The expected programme outputs under Support to School Supervision in GPEP supported schools include the following:

- 1. 25 schools (or more) receive at least three supportive supervisory visits from inspectors / supervisors each year*
- 2. At least 25 schools successfully prepare and submit school performance reports*

This component has not been initiated and is in part dependent on the workplace tools as well as basic training for Supervisors and Inspector which is to be conducted as part of the Primary School Leadership Supervision and Inspection Programme. Structured supportive supervisory visits will be monitored and oversight provided by County-based tutors and mentors.

2.2.4. Procurement in Support of Learning (done)

The expected programme outputs under Procurement in Support of Learning in GPEP supported schools include the following:

- 1. A 'Teaching & Learning School Support Package' is designed collaboratively*
- 2. A strategy for community-led furniture building is articulated*
- 3. At least 25 schools receive Teaching and Learning School Support Packages*
- 4. At least 25 schools are furnished in line with the strategy*
- 5. At least 25 schools are constructed or rehabilitated according to need*
- 6. Maintenance training provided to small teams (as determined by SMC) in at least 25 schools*

2.2.4.1. Overall Implementation Strategy

The overall structure of the implementation strategy for this project is designed to emphasize capacity building and sustainability, by ensuring government involvement in all project stages of the school construction programme and community participation and ownership of the Project and its activities.

The Joint Steering Committee provides oversight during the implementation of the programme, supported by a Technical Working Group (TWG) which brings together UNICEF (the GPEP team), key ministry personnel and development partners.

As the Managing Entity (ME), UNICEF works closely with the national MoEST and the various state MoESTs together with other education partners (including Education Cluster partners) as well as with the benefiting communities, under the general guidance of the Reference Group in the delivery of this programme component.

Communities were consulted by a joint assessment team made up of UNICEF, national MoEST and state MoEST representatives during the participatory and evidence-based selection of the 25 schools to benefit from the infrastructure improvement component of GPEP.

Guided by the GPEP school selection criteria, school site findings were discussed and validated by the state authorities prior to endorsement of the beneficiary school sites. Communities for each of the selected 25 schools constituted School Management Committees (SMC) where they did not exist. The SMCs are engaged in the school construction process, through regular site meetings. SMC members are also engaged in training on aspects of post-construction maintenance and sustainability of the completed school facilities.

2.2.4.2. Participatory Design Process

A single prototype school design has been developed by an independent engineering/architectural consultancy with the participation of all key stakeholders. This prototype design has been approved by the National Ministry of Lands, Housing, and Physical planning and is being used for all GPEP schools. Site specific changes to the prototype design are being adopted based on the findings from the feasibility studies carried out by Quality Assurance institutions for each of the sites. All other pre-construction stages are with the full participation of the MoEST engineers, including in the joint evaluation of bids which served to enhance capacity and ownership.

2.2.4.3. Participatory Construction

- **Pilot Phase:** The construction of the first 5 schools in Eastern Equatoria (pilot phase) started on 05th March 2015. These were substantially completed on 30th October 2015, and handed over to the MoEST on 15th Dec. 2015. The construction cost for the five schools was \$2.84 million. Hence an average cost per school of \$568,000. Drilling of the five boreholes was finalized by the 30th January 2016, with five boreholes costing \$77,125.00 and hence an average cost of \$15,425 per school. School furniture has been supplied to each of the schools at a total cost of \$122,568, and amounts to an average cost of \$24,513.60 per school. The average cost for quality assurance and site supervision per school was \$55,000. Hence an average total cost of \$662,938.6 per school covering the costs of actual construction, provision of portable water, quality assurance and site supervision as well as furnishing.
- **Second Phase:** The Construction for Phase 2 five schools in Western Equatoria State started on 01st October 2015. These are expected to be finalized by the 30th April 2016. The construction cost for the five schools was \$2.504 million which averages to \$500,998.53 cost per school. Procurement of furniture was initiated on 8th February 2016 and is expected to be delivered at the schools in time for the handover. Drilling of boreholes is also expected to be completed prior to the handover of schools in May 2016.

- **Final Phase:** Part one of the tendering for ten (5 in Warrap and 5 in Lakes) of the final fifteen schools was finalized in December 2015 and the contracts have been duly awarded and the work commenced on 8th February 2016. These are expected to be finalized by the 08th September 2016. The construction cost for the ten schools was \$5.405 million. This reflects an average cost per school of \$540,467.59. Tendering for part two of the final phase constituting five schools for Northern Bahr El Ghazal was initiated on 8th February, 2016. Solicitation process for furniture and boreholes is to follow.

2.2.4.4. External Review and the Role of the Supply Division

The UNICEF Construction Unit, at the Supply Division (SD) as a regulatory and monitoring unit, has provided timely support to the South Sudan UNICEF office during the GPEP planning, procurement and construction management processes. The office has also involved the SD Construction Unit in carrying out an external evaluation of GPEP construction to review the designs and overall project management at the early stages of the project in April 2015. This provided recommendations and feedback on key areas, especially the quality of the designs, and the overall project management with the aim of ensuring that ultimately best value for money is achieved on this project. Two other reviews are scheduled at the project-mid-point to review implementation of recommendations from the first review and to evaluate overall project implementation. A final end-point review will focus on project closure and capturing overall lessons learned.

2.2.4.5. Challenges

Delivering social services in South Sudan is challenging to say the least: over the past several decades there has been very little investment in basic infrastructure (less than 300 kilometres of paved roads). Much of the country is inaccessible during the rainy season (which lasts almost half of the year) and frequent flooding makes an already bad situation worse.

Many areas are still regarded as high security risks, this is especially so when trying to reach the most underserved and difficult to reach populations in the country. The entire school construction cycle from site selection through implementation and oversight is hindered by the fragile security situation in the country. As such, all South Sudan Country Office (SSCO) field missions must proceed in convoys of at least two vehicles and this obviously restricts the number of oversight visits to be conducted.

Construction unit costs are exorbitant due to scarce supply (limited number of construction companies in the country) and high demand for the construction works. Most of these are international companies. Furthermore, virtually all the construction materials are imported from neighbouring countries. There is also limited availability of skilled workforce, with most skilled workers coming from neighbouring countries.

For the past couple of years there has been a steep rise in inflation with a very volatile exchange rate between the South Sudanese Pound and United States Dollars. To

compound an already complex situation, there is a huge variance between the official Bank of South Sudan exchange rate and the market (street) rate. In the last two years, the official rate has been SSP3 equivalent to 1 USD but the unofficial rate has gone up from SSP5 to 1 USD in March 2014 to SSP18 to 1 USD in December 2015. In December 2015, the government of South Sudan devalued the SSP making the official exchange rate SSP 18.5 to 1 USD. However, this resulted in the unofficial rate increasing to as high as 28SSP to 1 USD.

Furthermore, the Bank of South Sudan has recently imposed limitations on the amount of US dollars that can be cashed at local banks, US\$2,000 per day, while freezing all electronic transfers in US dollars outside the country. This has affected cash flows for school construction contractors, grossly affecting their materials mobilisation plans.

The project has also been hampered by the scarcity of fuel (both diesel and petrol) in the market for most of the year in 2015. This has affected the timely mobilisation of materials to sites, as well as affected the operation of equipment on site.

Finally, given the fragile situation of much of the country, most government institutions are weak with a limited skilled workforce to participate in project implementation processes and thus requiring a substantial capacity building component.

2.2.4.6. Risk Management

Effective Planning: A detailed implementation plan for the school construction component of GPEP was developed at the start of the project with the involvement of all key stakeholders, including the GPEP team, South Sudan UNICEF Supply Section, Supply Division Construction Unit, as well as government counterparts. This plan was based on the results of a market survey to update project cost projections and allow for realistic budget re-alignments. Furthermore, this plan includes a risk management matrix that is updated regularly. In the context of South Sudan, alignment of the construction period with the dry season is very critical and this plan clearly defines this. As such the construction of the 25 schools has been sequenced in 3 phases aligned to accessibility which is influenced by rainfall patterns.

Fit-for-Purpose Simplified Designs: The designs have been simplified to ensure that they are fit-for-purpose in a sense that they emphasise using locally available materials as much as practically possible, minimise environmental degradation and are guided by the principles of safe and child friendly schools. This ultimately ensures that the costs of construction are reduced and the actual construction is non-complex.

Pre-Qualification of Competent Contractors: The pre-qualification of contractors through a widely advertised process both in the local media as well as on Relief-web has allowed for an increase in the number of competent contractors that are invited to bid for the school construction project. A total of 76 companies submitted their Expressions of Interest which were assessed by MoEST (1 – Engineer and 1 Procurement Officer) and UNICEF (1 GPE

Engineer & 1 WASH Specialist) resulting in 34 companies being pre-qualified. It is these pre-qualified firms that have formed the pool of qualified contractors that are invited to participate in the bidding processes for the school construction component.

With an increase in competition, there is a marked reduction in the construction unit costs. For example, by comparison, the average unit cost for phase 1 schools is US\$568,000 while for phase 2 schools it is US\$500,998.53, and for phase 3 it is US\$540,467.59. It is noteworthy that phase 1 schools are located in a much more accessible State as compared to phase 2 schools, and thus phase 2 schools would have been much more expensive, were it not for the factor of increased competition. Similarly, phase 3 schools are located in hard to reach areas compared to phase 1 and phase 2 schools, and yet the average cost is less than phase 1 schools.

Full Time Site Supervision: By making use of competent quality assurance consultancy firms to provide full time site supervisors, there is a guarantee that the contractors will execute the works as per the contract specifications. Furthermore this allows for tracking of progress to ensure that constraints are addressed promptly, even with limitations in accessibility, since these supervisors are full time on site.

Site Documentation: The use of site manuals, diaries and master registers ensures that site supervisors refer to the same templates during the full time site supervision, as well as document progress to mitigate against time overruns.

Joint Construction Monitoring: The involvement of government counterparts in pre-construction and during construction provides for the much needed capacity building, while allowing for increased ownership of the schools. Furthermore, even with the challenges of accessibility, regular oversight, at least once every month for each of the sites, ensures that there is effective project management of the works.

Community and Local Authorities Engagement: By engaging the communities in the pre-construction and construction processes through regular meetings and trainings, there is a likelihood of increased sustainability of the completed facilities. Furthermore, the local authorities become the locus for trouble shooting any localized occurrences of insecurity.

Effective governance structure: By having an established and effective governance structure, whereby at the upstream level there is the Joint Steering Committee while downstream there are established School Management Committees, this ensures that there is timely decision-making at the strategic level and project sustainability and ownership at the community level. For all technical issues, there is an established Reference Group that meets regularly, while on site there are regular site meetings that are attended by the site supervisor, the contractor and the SMC members.

Currency of Contracts: An important lesson learned is that in the context of South Sudan, it is important that all contracts for school construction are effected in United States Dollars due to the volatility of the local currency.

Construction Timeline: Owing to the multiplicity of challenges in the context of South Sudan, one key lesson learned is that the school construction programme requires a minimum of 7 months. Within this period, contractors must be supported with timely guidance on mobilization of key resources especially the materials, personnel and equipment.

2.2.5 Support to out-of-school children and youth (done)

The expected programme outputs under Support to Out-Of-School Children (OOSC) and Youth in the catchment areas of GPEP supported schools include the following:

- 1. Staff in up to five CECs are able to support schools in undertaking an OOSC needs assessment*
- 2. Out-of-school children and youth in 25 school catchment areas are engaged in educational activities appropriate to their needs*

During this reporting period, after much deliberation on this activity, OOSC assessments in the GPEP catchment areas have been initiated. The findings will inform appropriate alternative education needs of out of school children. It is anticipated that the newly constructed schools can also serve as alternative education sites after formal school hours.

2.2.6. Support to County Education Centres

The expected programme outputs under Support to County Education Centres (CEC) in the catchment areas of GPEP supported schools include the following:

- 1. Up to five CECs are rehabilitated, furnished and equipped*
- 2. A core team is established in each of (up to) five CECs, consisting of (at least) one Government of the Republic of South Sudan (GRSS)-appointed manager and one experienced co-manager*
- 3. Up to five CECs have undertaken vision-crafting, strategic planning and are practicing cyclical action planning – implementation – review*
- 4. Up to five CECs are able to support the achievement of GPEP outputs in their catchment area on an ongoing basis*
- 5. A sustainability strategy is in place*

There are 10 CECs and 3 Teacher Training Institutes that have been identified as potential capacity development hubs for teachers' as well as head teacher training activities for schools within vicinity of CEC/TTI. This is to ensure that training activities are not isolated to GPEP schools but extends to all schools within the Payam.

In this reporting period, CEC/TTI site assessments have been initiated to be able to (1) document staffing arrangements and existing capacities as well as capacity challenges that

may exist and (2) to be able to define the package of in-service training materials to be procured to ensure effective training.

2.3 Component C: Learning and Sharing Lessons Learned (completed)

This component aims to facilitate structured knowledge management throughout the life of the GPEP in order to 'track the GPE experience' in South Sudan. The main elements involve the development of baseline and summative evaluation. Where possible, action research for knowledge management and advocacy, i.e., on learning outcomes, enrolment, retention and progression of girls and boys, and participatory school management, will be conducted during 2016 and 2017 academic years.

2.3.1 Research (completed)

The key Research outputs are articulated as follows in the GPEP Design document:

- 1. A programme baseline is established, challenges are identified and findings are disseminated to schools, their communities and other stakeholders*
- 2. Progress at the halfway point is measured and programme adjustments are made*
- 3. Programme impact is measured and lessons are learned from the GPE experience*
- 4. Other emerging questions are answered through smaller research projects*

Africa Educational Trust (AET) was contracted to establish the GPE programme baseline under the guidance of the Reference Group established as a sub-committee of the Education Sector-wide M&E Working Group. Due to the slow start of the programme in late 2013 and further compounded by crisis in 2014, the GPEP baseline study was only initiated in September 2014 and completed in March 2015. The baseline findings have been used to populate key indicators in the GPEP Results Matrix.

2.3.2 Communication

The key outputs under the subcomponent of communication is defined as follows:

- 1. A joint communication strategy is in place*
- 2. Success stories are shared*
- 3. Lessons learned are shared*

During this reporting period, Terms of Reference were developed and a bid for development of the Education Sector Communication Strategy advertised. The key components of the bid are (1) working with MoEST and partners to develop a sector wide strategy with M&E system (2) undertake a capacity analysis and provide basic training for relevant staff in the MoEST to be able to manage the Strategy.

During this reporting period, two articles have been published on the GPE Blog --- one on Curriculum Development and the other on Mother Tongue and Early Grade Literacy and Numeracy. In addition news articles on the launch of the National Curriculum was published on UNICEF South Sudan site and twitter.

The GPEP experiences are being documented for lesson and experience sharing. Human Interest Stories of learners, teachers and curriculum writers are being developed for lesson sharing and publication through appropriate media articles, blogs, etc.

3.0 INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS, PARTNERSHIPS and PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

The MoEST is the primary stakeholder and has, through Reference Groups and Technical Working Group, been engaged in the implementation of the GPE programme. Opportunities for capacity development of key staff are sought and exploited. Working Groups involving MoEST and partners provide oversight and technical guidance for the planning and implementation of the following programmatic areas: curriculum development, strengthened literacy and numeracy outcomes, school leadership and inspection as well as M&E. The Joint Steering Committee continues to provide overall strategic direction and management for the four sector programmes. Chaired by Undersecretary, membership includes a representative of State Ministers of Education, MoEST Director Generals, donors (DFID, EU, and USAID), UNICEF, UNESCO, as well as Team Leaders for IMED, GESS, RTL and GPEP. The JSC meets quarterly to deliberate on programme progress, challenges and approves strategic programmatic/budget amendments.

The Technical Working Group comprises all directorates with programmatic responsibilities in GPEP to ensure MoEST Senior Management is keenly informed of programmatic developments emanating from the various Reference Groups and is able to take timely decisions on programme related issues.

GESS, IMED, RTL and GPEP are strategic complementary programmes that were designed to contribute to sustained sector strengthening in a synergic manner. Efforts to ensure continued harmonisation, elimination of duplication and safeguard MoEST ownership continue and reflected in the collaboration between GPEP and RTL on Literacy and Numeracy activities.

EDoG comprised of donors, Partners for Education Group (PEG) and Education Cluster partners continues to provide strategic guidance and capacity development, including on conflict-sensitive education planning and programming, resilience building strategies, as well as assisting in resource mobilization efforts for the sector. The DFID co-funded curriculum development in this reporting period.

4.0 MANAGEMENT, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The GPEP M&E Framework which comprises of key indicators, baselines and targets has been developed for each programme component. Most of the activities under Component A of the GPEP work plan covers strengthening of the national education system while Component B is targeted to specific activities concentrated in the five focused States. However due to realisation of the need to realign the GPE Programme and Budget, the M&E Matrix has undergone some modifications.

5.0 CHALLENGES TO PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

Delayed endorsement of programme sites has been the main challenge for commencing implementation of Components B and C, which were exacerbated by the conflict that erupted in mid-December 2013. However, noticeable progress has been noted in Component A, particularly in the area of curriculum development.

The main challenges during this reporting period were:

1. Delays due to consensus building and challenging programming environment affecting 3 components of the GPE programme: (1) School Leadership and School Inspection Programme; (2) selection of contractors for school construction and (3) Literacy and Numeracy which was delayed by application of conflict sensitivity in language selection. Additional delays were suffered to facilitate synergy in the GPEP and RTL components of strengthening literacy among early grade learners.
2. Unexpected onset of insecurity in previously stable areas in Western Equatoria.
3. The education sector budget has been decreasing and assumption that teachers' salaries would be paid regularly and on time no longer holds.
4. Uncontrolled inflation has resulted in reduction of the real value of the South Sudanese Pound. Salaries remain stagnant and not paid regularly impacting on teacher morale as review of civil service (including teachers) remuneration has not been completed.

6.0 LESSONS LEARNT

The following are the key lessons learnt during the reporting period:

- (1) The Global Partnership for Education Programme has been successful in attracting diverse partners and stakeholders in South Sudan to rally around similar goals and objectives for improving the Education Sector in South Sudan. The USAID complementary contribution to the GPEP fund is testimony to this. The collaboration among sector partners as reflected in the collaborative efforts, e.g., in contributions to SMC Toolkit led by GESS; in joint efforts on literacy and numeracy with RTL; in Sector-wide M&E Strategy development with IMED, has contributed to synergistic programming that contributes to the realisation of sector goals and facilitation of the first ever Joint Sector Review;
- (2) Consultancies have a capacity development component to ensure skills transfer to relevant government officials. Namely: the training of linguists to adapt learning assessments into 5 national languages; training of assessors for literacy and numeracy data collection included Examinations Research officials; contractor assessment involving MoEST engineers and procurement officials.
- (3) Need to have a strategy to guide programme when previously stable GPEP sites become volatile
- (4) Increasing MoEST leadership in Reference Groups as programme implementation picks up.
- (5) ITB method for school construction has increased government participation in all the evaluation processes.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS / WAY FORWARD

The following are the key recommendations for the way forward in 2016:

1. Having streamlined the GPEP plan into strategic components, there is need to complete the realignment processes by developing quarterly targets and secure Reference Groups oversight to monitor and discuss at monthly meetings.
2. Contribute to the MoEST's review and revision of the Education Sector Plan and the new GPE programme application processes.
3. Engage sector partners to contribute to the development of the Education Communication Strategy.
4. Use the ESP to complete the M&E Strategy and its associated resource mobilisation to support its operationalization.

8.0 EXPRESSION OF GRATITUDE

The Government of the Republic of South Sudan and UNICEF wish to extend their sincere gratitude to GPE and USAID for support that has been provided to the South Sudan's GPEP. The program will go a long way in strengthening education systems in South Sudan that ensures that the country progresses towards the meeting the goals of Education for All and post-2015 development agenda in order to accelerate equitable access to quality education for South Sudan's children.

Appendix 1

The matrix below provides the expected outputs of the GPEP 2013-2016.

| Sub-components | | Key outputs | Progress to date |
|----------------|--|---|--|
| A1 | Strengthening literacy and numeracy learning in primary schools | National learning outcomes and assessment tools in literacy and numeracy for students of one of the early years, probably P4 or possibly P3 | Literacy and Numeracy Assessments adapted into five national languages. Assessments administered in English and the five languages. Reference Group that includes RTL provides oversight and guidance. |
| | | National literacy and numeracy strategies developed and disseminated to all 3,700 primary schools and other key stakeholders | Strategies under development |
| | | Literacy and numeracy 'kits' for P 1-8 are designed in line with the strategy | Not yet initiated |
| | | Literacy/numeracy-focused teacher development interventions designed | Not yet initiated |
| | | National literacy and numeracy strategy reviewed and strengthened | Not yet initiated |
| A2 | Strengthening primary school leadership | National school leadership policy and professionalization strategy developed | Save the Children Consortium contracted and baseline/sitan conducted to provide inputs to standards. All States introduced to programme. Reference Group involving GESS established and providing oversight. |
| | | National school leadership standards established | |
| | | Primary School Leadership Professional Programme (PSLPP) designed and accredited | |
| | | School leadership teams in all primary schools (i.e. 9,600 school leaders, of which some 38% are women) have undertaken the PSLPP | |
| | | Primary school leadership manual developed and distributed to all 3,700 primary schools | |
| A3 | Strengthening school inspection and supportive supervision | National school inspection / supervision mapping exercise undertaken | Save the Children Consortium contracted and baseline/sitan conducted to provide inputs to standards. All States introduced to programme. Reference Group involving GESS established and providing oversight. |
| | | Strategy for strengthening school inspection and supportive supervision is articulated (in line with the new schools inspection framework) | |
| | | School Supervisor Professional Programme (SSPP) designed and accredited | |
| | | All 800 school inspectors / supervisors have completed the SSPP | |
| | | Progress in implementing the inspection / supervision strengthening strategy is reviewed | |
| A4 | Strengthening sector policy development, strategic planning and review | The MoEST Planning Directorate is strengthened | IMED leading the component. Three TAs have provided support to the Planning Directorate – one in National MoEST and other two are to be placed at SMOESTs |
| | | Up to 4 annual sector reviews are undertaken, and the process is strengthened | JSR conducted in November 2015 and Action Points produced |
| | | The ongoing national education policy development process is strengthened | National Curriculum ECD, Primary, Secondary and Alternative Education launched. National Languages implementation guidelines produced. School Construction Standards produced |
| | | Emerging needs regarding policy development and strategic planning are met (within the funding available) | Sector wide M&E Strategy drafted. |
| Sub-components | | Key outputs | Progress to date |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---|
| B1 | Support to Literacy and Numeracy learning | Literacy and numeracy testing is conducted in at least 40 GPEP-supported schools, and they are each aware of their status against the national standards | Literacy and numeracy tests initiated and conducted in 7 schools to date |
| | | At least 40 schools each receive 16 literacy and numeracy kits, for piloting | Kits to be developed, informed by results of literacy and numeracy assessments |
| | | At least 320 teachers in 40 schools have benefited from training that strengthens the way they support literacy and numeracy learning | Not yet initiated |
| | | Any other actions recommended in the National Literacy & Numeracy Strategy are tried and tested in at least 40 schools | Not yet initiated |
| B2 | Support to School Management Committees (SMCs) | Technical contribution made to developing policy, strategy, training, etc in relation to strengthening community engagement | SMC Handbook developed by MoEST & GESS to be used in training |
| | | All non-literate SMC members in at least 40 schools have had the opportunity to pursue literacy classes | 41 County and Payam Supervisors trained as master trainers to train PTAs and SMCs. |
| B3 | Support to school supervision | 40 schools (or more) receive at least three supportive supervisory visits from inspectors / supervisors each year | Not yet initiated |
| | | At least 40 schools successfully prepare and submit school performance reports each year | Not yet initiated |
| B4 | Procurement in support of learning | A 'Teaching & Learning School Support Package' is designed collaboratively | Underway |
| | | A strategy for community-led furniture building is articulated | Done |
| | | At least 40 schools receive Teaching and Learning School Support Packages | Kits to be developed and distributed |
| | | At least 40 schools are furnished in line with the strategy | Furniture provided for the 5 EES schools completed |
| B5 | Improvements to physical infrastructure to enhance learning | At least 40 schools are constructed/upgraded/rehabilitated according to need | Five schools completed in EES, 5 underway in WES and 10 contracted for Lakes and Warrap |
| | | Maintenance training provided to small teams (as determined by SMC) in at least 40 schools | Ongoing at each school site |
| B6 | Support to out-of-school children and youth | Staff in up to 5 CECs are able to support schools in undertaking an OOSC needs assessment | 15 Clusters and 3 TTIs staff assessment underway |
| | | Out-of-school children and youth in 40 school catchment areas are engaged in educational activities appropriate to their needs | OOSC assessment to be initiated |
| B7 | Strengthening of CECs to provide a learning support service to schools | Up to 5 CECs are rehabilitated, furnished and equipped | Not started 15 Clusters and 3 TTIs training supplies needs assessment to be conducted. |
| | | A core team is established in each of (up to) 5 CECs, consisting of (at least) one GRSS-appointed manager and one experienced co-manager | Not started |
| | | Up to 5 CECs have undertaken vision-crafting, strategic planning and are practicing cyclical action planning – implementation – review | Not started |
| | | Up to 5 CECs are able to support the achievement of GPEP outputs in their catchment area on an ongoing basis | Not started |
| | | A sustainability strategy is in place | Not started |

| Sub-components | Key outputs | Progress to date |
|----------------|-------------|------------------|
|----------------|-------------|------------------|

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| C1 | Research: <i>Tracking the GPE experience</i> | A programme baseline is established, challenges are identified and findings are disseminated to schools, their communities and other stakeholders | Baseline study completed and validation workshops held. |
| | | Progress at the halfway point is measured and programme adjustments are made | |
| | | Programme impact is measured and lessons are learned from the GPE experience | To be conducted in 2017 |
| | | Other emerging questions are answered through smaller research projects | |
| C2 | Communication | A communication strategy is in place | Advert for institutional consultancy, bids received and assessed by MoEST and UNICEF |
| | | Success stories are shared | Curriculum Development process & national languages as Lol for improved literacy and numeracy published on GPE blog |
| | | Lessons learned are shared | Two annual reports produced so far with a section on Lessons Learned |

| Sub-components | | Key outputs | Progress to date |
|----------------|--|---|--|
| D1 | <i>A priori</i> decision-making | Schools to be supported by GPEP are identified based on the agreed criteria; for the purposes of facilitating implementation, the recommended configuration is 5 clusters of ± 8 schools in the catchment areas of 5 CECs | Completed |
| | | Principles of engagement are agreed by all collaborating partners (MOU) | Has been evolving and becoming more concrete. GPEP and RTL collaboration on Literacy and Numeracy; GPEP and GESS on School Supervision |
| | | The idea of an overarching Steering Committee for GESS, GPE and Room to Learn (and the EU-funded IMED) is considered and agreed, and the TOR developed | Joint Steering Committee was established and became functional in July 2014 |
| D2 | Implementation re-planning | GPE technical team is briefed fully by UNICEF Education Team, GESS Team and USAID | Done |
| | | Implementation plan and budgets are revisited in the light of the above decisions | Done |
| | | Implementation plan is agreed by GRSS, programme funders, other DPs providing dovetailed support, and UNICEF | Done |
| | | Implementation partners are identified and contracted | Done |
| D3 | Building GPEP ownership | Stakeholders at national, state, and relevant county and <i>payam</i> levels are fully aware of and buy into the programme | Done and Orientation meetings at state level during GPEP Baseline Assessment Field Data Collection also helped to facilitate this but this is on-going and will continue to evolve |
| D4 | Establishing an M&E framework | M & E framework developed | Done |
| D5 | Establishing programme management structures, systems and procedures | Structures, systems and procedures in place for <i>inter alia</i> : Financial management, reporting, security, health and safety, risk management, environmental assessment, document management | Done and will keep on evolving over time |

Appendix 2: 2015 JSR Action Points and Financial Summaries



JSR 2015 Ministers
Commitments .pdf

Financial Summaries



Donor Statement by
Nature of Expense (U)



3rd GPE Progress
Report - Financial U

Appendix 3: Funds Utilisation as of 31 January 2016

| APPENDIX : FUNDS UTILIZATION AS OF 31ST JANUARY, 2016 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| Ref | Result Component and Activities | GPE | | | | USAID | | | | TOTAL - GPE + USAID | | | Overall Commitments as of 31/01/2016 | % of Actual Utilization over Received to Date |
| | | Approved Budget | Received to Date | Actual Expenditure as of 31/01/2016 | Commitments as of 31/01/2016 | Approved Budget | Received to Date | Actual Expenditure as of 31/01/2016 | Commitments as of 31/01/2016 | Overall Approved Budget | Overall Total - Received to Date | Overall Actual Expenditure as of 31/01/2016 | | |
| A | National Systems Strengthening | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| A1 | Strengthening literacy and numeracy learning in primary schools | - | | - | - | 3,500,000.00 | | 118,406.40 | 473,625.60 | 3,500,000.00 | | 118,406.40 | 473,625.60 | |
| A2 | Strengthening primary school leadership | 8,858,000.00 | | 8,813.38 | 3,861,050.00 | 2,221,495.00 | | 891,012.00 | 1,188,016.00 | 11,079,495.00 | | 899,825.38 | 5,049,066.00 | |
| A3 | Strengthening school inspection and supportive supervision | | | - | - | 4,000,000.00 | | - | - | 4,000,000.00 | | - | - | |
| A4 | Support to sector policy development, strategic planning and review | 2,900,000.00 | | 2,831,799.38 | 399.00 | - | | - | - | 2,900,000.00 | | 2,831,799.38 | 399.00 | |
| Total A | | 11,758,000.00 | 8,282,331.16 | 2,840,612.76 | 3,861,449.00 | 9,721,495.00 | 6,778,731.28 | 1,009,418.40 | 1,661,641.60 | 21,479,495.00 | 15,061,062.45 | 3,850,031.16 | 5,523,090.60 | 25.56 |
| B | Community and School-based Education Delivery | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | | 15 schools | | | | 10 schools | | | | 25 schools | - | | | |
| B1 | Support to literacy and numeracy learning | 1,380,000.00 | | - | - | 1,020,000.00 | | - | - | 2,400,000.00 | | - | - | |
| B2 | Support to School Management Committees | 460,000.00 | | 53,086.52 | - | 340,000.00 | | 79,846.51 | - | 800,000.00 | | 132,933.03 | - | |
| B3 | Support to school supervision | 460,000.00 | | - | - | 340,000.00 | | - | - | 800,000.00 | | - | - | |
| B4 | Procurement in support of learning | 920,000.00 | | - | - | 580,000.00 | | 39,780.00 | - | 1,500,000.00 | | 39,780.00 | - | |
| B5 | Improvements to school infrastructure | 9,982,000.00 | | 2,003,084.19 | 2,718,301.60 | 7,378,000.00 | | 2,310,765.41 | 1,179,260.91 | 17,360,000.00 | | 4,313,849.60 | 3,897,562.51 | |
| B6 | Support to out-of-school children and youth | 690,000.00 | | - | - | 510,000.00 | | - | - | 1,200,000.00 | | - | - | |
| B7 | Strengthening of CECs to provide a learning support service | 2,492,500.00 | | - | - | 1,842,283.00 | | - | - | 4,334,783.00 | | - | - | |
| Total B | | 16,384,500.00 | 11,358,625.59 | 2,056,170.71 | 2,718,301.60 | 12,010,283.00 | 8,328,155.58 | 2,430,391.92 | 1,179,260.91 | 28,394,783.00 | 19,686,781.17 | 4,486,562.63 | 3,897,562.51 | 22.79 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C | Learning and sharing lessons | 1,200,000.00 | | | | 929,803.00 | | | | 2,129,803.00 | | | | |
| C1 | Research project | | | 249,229.93 | - | | | 34,048.00 | - | | | 283,277.93 | - | |
| C2 | Communication | | | - | 22,398.00 | | | - | - | | | - | 22,398.00 | |
| Total C | | 1,200,000.00 | 946,552.13 | 249,229.93 | 22,398.00 | 929,803.00 | 581,034.11 | 34,048.00 | - | 2,129,803.00 | 813,474.00 | 283,277.93 | 22,398.00 | 34.82 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| D | Inception | 678,000.00 | 221,209.00 | | | 525,990.00 | | | | 1,203,990.00 | | | | |
| D1 | A priori decision-making | | | - | - | | | - | - | | - | - | - | |
| D2 | Implementation re-planning | | | - | - | | | - | - | | - | - | - | |
| D3 | Building local GPEP ownership | | | 8,995.30 | - | | | 12,529.34 | - | | - | 21,524.64 | - | |
| D4 | Establishing an M&E framework | | | 154,722.77 | - | | | 10,645.16 | - | | - | 165,367.93 | - | |
| D5 | Establishing programme management structures, systems, procedures | | | - | - | | | - | - | | - | - | - | |
| Total D | | 678,000.00 | 473,276.07 | 163,718.07 | - | 525,990.00 | 387,356.07 | 23,174.50 | - | 1,203,990.00 | 860,632.14 | 186,892.57 | - | 21.72 |
| | Direct Support to Programme Implementation | 29,963,000.00 | 21,060,784.95 | 5,309,731.47 | 6,602,148.60 | 23,245,071.00 | 16,075,277.05 | 3,497,032.82 | 2,840,902.51 | 53,208,071.00 | 37,136,062.00 | 8,806,764.29 | 9,443,051.11 | 23.71 |
| E | Direct Programme Support Costs (Admin & Oversight) | 6,137,000.00 | 2,603,018.37 | 3,260,225.71 | (45.65) | 4,661,375.00 | 3,292,526.62 | 699,246.54 | - | 8,437,435.00 | 5,895,544.99 | 3,959,472.25 | (45.65) | 67.16 |
| | Total (A+B+C+D+E) Programme Amount | 36,100,000.00 | 23,663,803.32 | 8,569,957.18 | 6,602,102.95 | 27,906,446.00 | 19,367,803.67 | 4,196,279.36 | 2,840,902.51 | 61,645,506.00 | 43,031,606.99 | 12,766,236.54 | 9,443,005.46 | 29.67 |
| F | Indirect Programme Support Cost (Cost Recovery) | 2,527,000.00 | 1,656,205.88 | 599,897.00 | - | 2,232,516.00 | 1,549,798.33 | 335,702.35 | - | 4,593,456.00 | 3,206,004.21 | 935,599.35 | - | 29.18 |
| | TOTAL 4-YEAR PROGRAMME BUDGET | 38,627,000.00 | 25,320,009.20 | 9,169,854.18 | 6,602,102.95 | 30,138,962.00 | 20,917,602.00 | 4,531,981.71 | 2,840,902.51 | 68,765,962.00 | 46,237,611.20 | 13,701,835.89 | 9,443,005.46 | 29.63 |

| DETAILS OF CONTRACTUAL COMMITMENTS AGAINST GPE GRANT AS OF 31/01/2016 | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|--|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Result Component | PO/ Contract # | Description of Contractual Commitment | Vendor Name | Open Balance on PO/ Contract (\$) | Start Date | End Date |
| A2 | 43172640 | Strengthening of Primary School Leadership | Save the Children | 3,861,050.00 | 23.01.2015 | 23.01.2018 |
| C2 | 43188416 | Development of Education Visibility Materials | Wired Video | 22,398.00 | 01.12.2015 | 31.03.2016 |
| B5 | 81036711 | Printing of training Docs, PTA Manual validation, etc | GT Trading Investment Co. Ltd | 2,300.00 | | |
| B5 | 43188834 | Technical Support – School Construction | Mebrahtu Berhane | 32,500.00 | 10.11.2015 | 09.05.2016 |
| B5 | 43179523 | Engineering & Site Supervision Services (EES Schools) | Pharos Architect | 7,111.14 | 01.01.2015 | 30.06.2016 |
| B5 | 43188433 | Engineering & Site Supervision Services (Warrap Schools) | IBB International Ltd | 221,872.00 | 04.11.2015 | 31.08.2017 |
| B5 | 43188328 | Engineering & Site Supervision Services (NBS Schools) | Astroid Building Consultancy | 314,150.00 | 03.11.2015 | 31.08.2017 |
| B5 | 43185917 | Construction of Namaiyiku PS - WES | Anisa Trading | 365,539.60 | 01.10.2015 | 30.04.2017 |
| B5 | 43186032 | Construction of Muku PS - WES | Jomboloko Construction | 412,467.86 | 01.10.2015 | 30.04.2017 |
| B5 | 43186034 | Construction of Gamanapke PS - WES | Pan-China Construction Group | 501,117.19 | 01.10.2015 | 30.04.2017 |
| B5 | 43186034 | Construction of Kpotonayo PS - WES | Pan-China Construction Group | 490,651.78 | 01.10.2015 | 30.04.2017 |
| B5 | 431860036 | Construction of Naduru PS - WES | Aksons Investment Ltd | 369,313.31 | 01.10.2015 | 30.04.2017 |

| Non PO/Contract Commitments | | | | 1,632.07 | | |
|--|-------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|------------|------------|
| TOTAL CONTRACTUAL COMMITMENTS AS OF 31ST JANUARY, 2016 | | | | 6,602,102.95 | | |
| DETAILS OF CONTRACTUAL COMMITMENTS AGAINST USAID GRANT AS OF 31/01/2016 | | | | | | |
| SN | PO/ Contract # | Description of Work | Vendor Name | Open Balance on PO/ Contract (\$) | Start Date | End Date |
| A1 | 43172640 | Strengthening Primary School Leadership | Save the Children | 1,188,016.00 | 23.01.2015 | 23.01.2018 |
| A2 | 43172441 | Improve Literacy & Numeracy among Primary School | Montrose | 473,625.60 | 19.01.2015 | 30.09.2016 |
| B5 | 43188426 | Technical Support – School Construction Project | Mindaye Yonas | 32,500.00 | 1.12.2015 | 08.05.2016 |
| B5 | 43174539 | Torit Model PS – EES | MBF Construction | 136,779.62 | 01.03.2015 | 01.10.2016 |
| B5 | 43174539 | Construction of Torit One PS – EES | MBF Construction | 125,449.97 | 01.03.2015 | 01.10.2016 |
| B5 | 43174539 | Construction of Ikwoto PS – EES | MBF Construction | 116,375.50 | 01.03.2015 | 01.10.2016 |
| B5 | 43174625 | Construction of Ayii PS - EES | JAMBO Construction | 116,617.30 | 01.03.2015 | 01.10.2016 |
| B5 | 43174625 | Construction of Dereto PS - EES | JAMBO Construction | 139,737.01 | 01.03.2015 | 01.10.2016 |
| B5 | 43190094 | Drilling of Boreholes – EES Schools | The Great Ruaha Drilling (SS) Ltd | 77,125.00 | 01.12.2015 | 09.02.2016 |
| B4 | 81036578 | Furniture – EES Schools | Baseline International Services | 76,788.00 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|----------------------------|---------------------|------------|------------|
| B4 | 81036596 | Furniture – EES Schools | Joseph & Brothers Workshop | 6,000.00 | | |
| B5 | 43188433 | Engineering & Site Supervision Services (Rumbek Schools) | IBB International Ltd | 217,707.00 | 04.11.2015 | 31.08.2017 |
| B5 | 43171039 | Engineering & Site Supervision Services (WES Schools) | IBB International Ltd | 133,900.00 | 13.05.2015 | 30.10.2016 |
| Non PO/Contract Commitments | | | | 281.51 | | |
| TOTAL CONTRACTUAL COMMITMENTS AS OF 31ST JANUARY, 2016 | | | | 2,840,902.51 | | |