

**USAID/Uganda: Education  
Sector Investment Program  
Review**

**Site Visit Final Report**

**The Basic Education and Policy Support  
(BEPS) Activity**

**Contract No. HNE-I-00-00-00038-00  
Task Order No. 02**

**CREATIVE ASSOCIATES INTERNATIONAL**

*Prepared by:*

**Creative Associates International, Inc.**

**Ian Smith  
Teacher Training Specialist**

**USAID/Uganda: Education  
Sector Investment Program  
Review**

**Site Visit Final Report**

**The Basic Education and Policy Support  
(BEPS) Activity**

**Contract No. HNE-I-00-00-00038-00  
Task Order No. 02**

*Prepared for:*

**The Global Bureau  
Human Capacity Development Center  
US Agency for International Development**

**September 2000**

# CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Background.....	1
Goals/Purpose/Objectives /Statement of Work .....	1
Results/Outcomes .....	1
Lessons Learned .....	1
Recommendations.....	2
<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Description of BEPS.....	3
Background of Task Order .....	3
Goals/Purpose/Objectives /Statement of Work .....	3
<b>II. ACTIVITIES.....</b>	<b>4</b>
Task 1. Assist the Education Sector Investment Program (ESIP) Teacher Training Working Group .....	4
Task 2. Participate in the ESIP Plenary Review, April 3-14, 2000 .....	4
Task 3. Prepare Post-ESIP Review Paper Recommending Teacher Training Conditionalities Required to Institutionalize USAID’s Past Investments in the Area.....	4
Schedule.....	4
<b>III. RESULTS/OUTCOMES ACHIEVED RELATED TO SOW .....</b>	<b>6</b>
General.....	6
Other Results (e.g., institution building, linkages between/among educators, organizations, new ideas/needs generated, etc.).....	7
<b>IV. LESSONS LEARNED .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Re Policy Planning and Implementation .....	7
Related to Stakeholder Participation.....	9
<b>V. RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>11</b>
Appendix A: Statement of Work .....	12
Appendix B: Spreadsheet.....	14
Appendix C: Teacher Development and Management Plan (Primary Education): Comments	15
Appendix D: Pupil Assessment .....	19
Appendix E: District Education Management .....	25
Appendix F: An In-service Teacher Training Master Plan: Some Thoughts .....	32
Appendix G: Post-ESIP PAPER.....	37

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **BACKGROUND**

USAID/Uganda was seeking to consolidate and continue educational reforms undertaken by the Government of Uganda (GOU) over the past seven years through the Support for Primary Education Reform (SUPER) Project, which ended in May 2000. Continued disbursement of \$18 million in non-project funds is contingent on concurrence by the semi-annual Education Sector Investment Review (ESIP) by donor and GOU Ministry of Education and Sports representatives to review progress to date and projected government plans for meeting established policy conditions. An experienced Education Specialist with special expertise in teacher training policy was requested by the Mission to participate in this semi-annual review process.

### **GOALS/PURPOSE/OBJECTIVES /STATEMENT OF WORK**

The Teacher Training Policy Specialist was contracted to provide technical assistance through three tasks:

- assist the ESIP Teacher Training Working Group for three full days (March 29-31) to put final touches on a Teacher Development Management Plan or TDMP (a condition for the April 2000 review);
- participate in the Education Sector Investment Program (ESIP) plenary review from April 3-14, 2000 as USAID's advisor/representative in the ESIP teacher training working group; and
- prepare a post-ESIP review paper recommending future teacher training conditionalities required to institutionalize USAID's past investments in this area.

### **RESULTS/OUTCOMES**

The task order produced three deliverables: assistance to the ESIP Teacher Training Working Group, to include discussion notes and a spreadsheet; full participation in the Education Sector Investment Program plenary review from April 3-14, 2000; and a post-ESIP review paper, which reviews ESIP plenary actions, summarizes teacher training conditions met and unmet, and offers recommendations for the final two years of SUPER conditions in the domain of teacher policy

### **LESSONS LEARNED**

Broad-based, overarching *teacher* education development plans addressing policy development and educational improvement should be followed up with smaller, more focussed policy papers that address specific issues.

Sectorwide approaches to improve education should address managerial as well as policy issues.

Labor-intensive, participatory teacher training approaches can be difficult to sustain financially and managerially once donor support is no longer available.

National teacher training institutions should be *more strongly represented* in national education sector reviews.

To be most effective, broad-based, nationally-focused teacher development plans should receive *a more institutionalised form* of input and feedback from *district representatives*.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The process of developing the Teacher Development and Management Plan should be brought to a close during 2000 and not prolonged beyond this. Key areas requiring action and decisions should be addressed by alternative, more focused processes.

More focus should be given to quality, i.e., improved performance, and coordinated, regular, and effective (not ad hoc) training and improved coordination of teacher development activities.

One ESIP Review out of the annual cycle of two reviews should focus exclusively on implementation and exclude policy debate.

ITEK should be represented at a more senior level in future ESIP reviews, and means should be found for enabling local authorities to review primary education policies as a group prior to their being tabled at ESIP Reviews.

A forthcoming ESIP Review should examine closely MoES commitment to and utilization of the TDMS system as a basis for decisions on further capital investment and recurrent support.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **DESCRIPTION OF BEPS**

The Basic Education and Policy Support Activity (BEPS), a new multi-year initiative sponsored by USAID/Washington's Global Bureau, Human Capacity Development Center, is designed to improve [the quality, effectiveness, and access to formal and nonformal](#) basic education. BEPS focuses on several important program areas: basic education; educational policy analysis and reform; restorative and additive educational work in countries in crisis (presence and non-presence); and [the alleviation of](#) abusive child labor.

As an IQC contract [type](#), BEPS operates through both core funds and Mission buy-ins [to provide both short- and long-term assistance](#) to Missions and Regional Bureaus. Services being provided include policy appraisals and assessments, training and institutional strengthening, and the design and implementation of pilot projects, feasibility studies, applied research studies, seminars/workshops, and evaluations. Under BEPS, USAID also will be compiling and disseminating results, lessons learned, and other generalizable information through electronic networks, training workshops, national conferences, quarterly and annual reports, publications, and other vehicles.

This consultancy was the result of a Mission buy-in from USAID/Uganda.

### **BACKGROUND OF TASK ORDER**

USAID/Uganda was seeking to consolidate and continue educational reforms undertaken by the Government of Uganda (GOU) over the past seven years through the Support for Primary Education Reform (SUPER) Project, which ended in May 2000. Continued disbursement of \$18 million in non-project funds is contingent on concurrence by the semi-annual Education Sector Investment Review (ESIP) by donor and GOU Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) representatives to review progress to date and projected government plans for meeting established policy conditions.

An experienced Education Specialist with particular expertise in teacher training policy (CLIN 003-A) was required by the Mission to participate in this semi-annual review process. CAII selected Ian Smith to serve in this position.

### **GOALS/PURPOSE/OBJECTIVES /STATEMENT OF WORK**

The Teacher Training Policy Specialist was to provide technical assistance through three tasks:

- assist the ESIP Teacher Training Working Group for three full days (March 29-31) to put final touches on a Teacher Development Management Plan (TDMP) (a condition for the April 2000 review);
- participate in the Education Sector Investment Program (ESIP) plenary review from April 3-14, 2000 as USAID's advisor/representative in the ESIP teacher training working group; and

- prepare a post-ESIP review paper recommending future teacher training conditionalities required to institutionalize USAID’s past investments in this area.

A complete statement of work is provided in Appendix A.

## **II. ACTIVITIES**

### **TASK 1. ASSIST THE EDUCATION SECTOR INVESTMENT PROGRAM (ESIP) TEACHER TRAINING WORKING GROUP**

The technical advisor provided assistance to the Teacher Education Department in costing the TDMP. Some notes on unit costs (left with Department) and a sample spreadsheet based on plan objectives and options were provided to the GoU team and is attached as Appendix B. The consultant also prepared a short paper entitled, “Teacher Development and Management Plan (Primary Education): Comments” for the Commissioner for Teacher Education (See Appendix C, TDMP Comments).

### **TASK 2. PARTICIPATE IN THE ESIP PLENARY REVIEW, APRIL 3-14, 2000**

The consultant attended the ESIP Plenary Review, which was convened in Kampala. The Review involved an opening in Kampala, workshops and field visits in Masindi, and follow-up sessions back in Kampala. An agenda may be available through USAID/Kampala.

### **TASK 3. PREPARE POST-ESIP REVIEW PAPER RECOMMENDING TEACHER TRAINING CONDITIONALITIES REQUIRED TO INSTITUTIONALIZE USAID’S PAST INVESTMENTS IN THE AREA**

At the commencement of the assignment, the consultant was asked to provide specific design input to two future conditionalities being considered by USAID for support. These related to promotion of the Pupil Assessment (see Appendix D) and improved District Education Management (Appendix E). The consultant worked intensively with the UNEB, EPD, and SUPER staff to produce the attached papers, which were used as raw material by the Mission for internal pre-review discussions.

At the conclusion of the ESIP review the consultant prepared a paper covering ESIP Plenary Actions, Teacher Training Conditionalities Required to Institutionalize USAID’s Past Investments in the Area, and Recommendations for the Final Two Years of SUPER Conditions in the Domain of Teacher Policy. This is presented as Appendix F, Post-ESIP Review Paper.

## **SCHEDULE**

An assignment summary is provided in Figure 1.

**Figure 1**  
**Ian Smith: Assignment Summary**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Documentation</b>
28 March	Travel to Uganda from Cairo	
29 March	Travel to Uganda, arrival and orientation	
30 March	Met JL <sup>1</sup> , was sent to TE Department and asked by them (CE/TE and staff) to assist finalization of TDMP by providing advice on budgeting Met SUPER staff. Completed various administrative items, including printer hire, stationery purchase, mobile phone airtime setup, and vehicle hire.	
31 March	Met JL and discussed conditionalities for SUPER NPA and was asked to prepare position paper on Assessment and Decentralization. Met CE/EPD and ACE/ M&E to discuss Assessment	Budget framework spreadsheet. TDMP Costs
1 April	Prepared draft papers on Assessment (copy given to ACE/M&E), discussed Decentralization with JE of EPD and also prepared paper	Pupil Assessment and District Education Management
2 April	Worked with JL on reviewing two conditionality papers and adding SOW for TA to assist in implementing the two conditions. Finished reviewing the TDMP and drafted comments	Comments on TDMP
3 April	Attended opening of ESIP, gave CE/TE TDMP Comments paper, traveled Masindi	
4 April	Masindi workshop participation	
5 April	Masindi field visits and return to Kampala	
6 April	Attended ESIP sessions. Gave feedback on trip to plenary. Represented USAID in donor meeting on conditionalities and drew attention to interest in Assessment.	
7 April	Met JL; briefed her on ESIP and agreed on USAID participation strategy	

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations of names: JL = Joan Larcom, SM = Sarah Mayanja, TDMP = Teacher Development and Management Plan, CE = Commissioner Education, TE = Teacher Education, EPD = Education Planning Department, ACE = Assistant Commissioner Education, M& E = Monitoring & Evaluation, JE = Joseph Eilor

	(decided that IS best deployed in Primary Working Group). Attended ESIP review. Chaired session on audit and made various points from floor. Discussed Pupil Assessment paper with NAPE Coordinator	
8 April	Amended Pupil Assessment Document based on prior day discussions. Prepared key issues paper for USAID participant in TE Working Group in coming week. E-mailed Creative for various administrative documents.	ESIP TE Notes
9 April	Met with donor groups on accountability issues.	
10 April	Attended ESIP plenary and Primary, Double Shift, and teacher education working groups	
11 April	Attended ESIP teacher education working group and primary education report-back sessions; contributed to donor “draft undertakings proposal” session	
12 April	Attended ESIP Plenary sessions to review and discuss group work	
13 April	Attended ESIP Plenary sessions to review draft Aide Memoire	
14 April	Attended final ESIP plenary sessions to agree and present Aide Memoire and provided USAID with hard and soft copies of all reports and papers	
15 April	Final organization of report and travel back to home base	
16 April	Dispatch of final report to CAII	

### III. RESULTS/OUTCOMES ACHIEVED RELATED TO SOW

#### GENERAL

Task 1: A final costed draft TDMP was produced by the ESIP Teacher Training Working Group and was ready for submission by the April 2000 ESIP Review, thereby meeting one of the key conditionalities for ESIP donor fund release.

Task 2: The ESIP Plenary Review was completed successfully. The consultant contributed to both the Teacher Training Working Group and a Primary Education Working Group, focusing on double-shift and multi-grade staffing

experiments. Each group developed clear proposals for the next steps, which were debated in the final plenary sessions and incorporated in Aide Memoire undertakings where relevant. A detailed record of the Review Working Group and Plenary Sessions is available from the Education Planning Department, MoES, Kampala.

Task 3: The USAID Mission requested specific support with developing detailed proposals of two conditionalities for internal discussion by the Mission. The first related to Pupil Assessment (see Appendix D) and the second concerned District Education Management (see Appendix E). At the completion of the ESIP Review, the consultant provided a further paper reviewing other possible conditionalities to support the USAID institutionalization of USAID's past investments in this area. The consultant offered to meet with the Mission to discuss each of these products and ESIP in general, but such a meeting did not materialize.

#### **OTHER RESULTS (E.G., INSTITUTION BUILDING, LINKAGES BETWEEN/AMONG EDUCATORS, ORGANIZATIONS, NEW IDEAS/NEEDS GENERATED, ETC.)**

Most of these are summarized in the Post ESIP Review Paper (Appendix F). In addition, the consultant assisted an informal donor group in debating appropriate donor strategies for supporting the Government of Uganda in implementing its accountability and transparency procedures and systems.

The consultant was able throughout the review to discuss the process and possible areas of improvement with key MoES personnel such as the Director of Education and the Commissioners of Education Planning and Teacher Education.

#### **IV. LESSONS LEARNED**

##### **RE POLICY PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION**

*Broad-based, overarching TEACHER education development plans addressing policy development and educational improvement should be followed up with smaller, more focussed policy papers that address specific issues.*

The Teacher Development and Management Plan (TDMP) has been under development now for almost two years. The document has improved greatly in this time, and the role of stakeholders in shaping the strategic thinking within it has grown considerably. In other words, the process has been valuable.

It is not so clear, however, that the product is or will continue to be useful. The options contained within the latest draft reflect minimal prioritization and little selection or choice between competing options. In some ways this is understandable. A public plan can legitimize action by airing the options while reducing the political "fallout" by being inclusive of all the options. However, choices must be made eventually if systems efficiency goals are to be achieved and in

this respect an overarching TDMP may be less useful in driving decision making than small focused policy papers on specific issues.

*Sectorwide approaches to improve education should address managerial as well as policy issues.*

The sectorwide approach in Uganda's education sector is progressing very well. It is clearly very successful in accomplishing many of the general objectives of a sectorwide approach, such as government policy leadership, transparent sector funding strategies, and a holistic integration of the majority of the sectors' activities within one framework.

Although policy is clearly a critical priority in a sectorwide approach, however, management issues (e.g., the capacity to implement programs, make administrative decisions, and execute policy choices) also are critical to the effective running of a system. Where policy is discussed, management tends to be relegated to the margin. There is a danger that ESIP reviews will always focus on policy issues, thereby giving insufficient supportive review time to the inevitable management constraints faced by implementers. Including management issues on the agenda of future ESIP Review meetings might be beneficial.

*Labor-intensive, participatory teacher training approaches can be difficult to sustain financially and managerially once donor support is no longer available.*

The main USAID investment in primary teacher education over the last six years has been the development of the Teacher Development and Management System (TDMS). Other agencies (Netherlands Embassy, Irish Aid, and the EC) have now come in to support the national expansion of the system. It is interesting to note that none of the conditions finally agreed upon during the review specifically relate to this investment. This may be a sign of strength (i.e., TDMS is so well established that it does not need that extra leverage provided by conditionalities) or weakness (i.e., TDMS is still seen as an alien system that does not as yet possess a powerful lobby in its support).

It is too early to be sure which of these scenarios is more predominant. There were already worrying signs that the MoES is unwilling to utilize the system to its full potential (for example, the consultant perceived a reluctance to use TDMS to train a new intake of untrained teachers). GoU does appear committed to taking on the quite considerable recurrent costs of the TDMS system (though the signs are also mixed in this respect because Phase III PTCs were reporting an absence of funding). This issue needs to be given greater prominence at a forthcoming review. If MoES is not ready to utilize the system fully (resulting in high unit costs for services) or is unwilling to fund it adequately (incapacity to deliver services adequately), then it would make sense to dismantle the system before more resources are wasted on expensive infrastructure.

## **RELATED TO STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION**

*National teacher training institutions should be **STRONGLY REPRESENTED** in national education sector reviews.*

The Institute of Teacher Education Kyambogo (ITEK) is a key institution in teacher education. Some consider it the key institution. It has critical responsibilities in carrying forward the reform of teacher education achieved by MoES with USAID support. Yet it continues to be under-represented at a forum such as ESIP. ESIP planners should always ensure that ITEK is represented by a senior staff member who is familiar with primary teacher education reform issues.

*To be most effective, broad-based, nationally-focused teacher development plans should receive **A MORE INSTITUTIONALISED FORM OF** input and feedback from district **REPRESENTATIVES**.*

A key component of the reform process in Uganda is decentralization. The design of effective workable policies would benefit from senior level District input (from Chairmen, Chief Administrative Officers, etc.). This is not adequately accomplished by sample representation during ESIP Reviews where most non-MoES personnel attend without a mandate. It might be worth considering whether MoES should not institute a system whereby policies relating to district responsibilities that it plans to propose be reviewed first by the Local Authorities Association.

## **V. RECOMMENDATIONS**

As a result of this consultancy, the technical advisor has presented a number of recommendations for teacher training policy for the next two years of SUPER. These recommendations are included in the Post ESIP Paper, Teacher Policy Conditions for the Final Two Years of SUPER (see Appendix H). In addition, the technical advisor poses the following recommendations:

- The process of developing the Teacher Development and Management Plan should be brought to a close during 2000 and not prolonged beyond this. Key areas requiring action and decisions should be addressed by alternative, more focused processes.
- More focus should be given to quality, i.e., improved performance, and coordinated, regular, and effective (not ad hoc) training and improved coordination of teacher development activities.
- One ESIP Review out of the annual cycle of two reviews should focus exclusively on implementation and exclude policy debate.

- ITEK should be represented at a more senior level in future ESIP reviews, and means should be found for enabling local authorities to review primary education policies as a group prior to their being tabled at ESIP Reviews.
- A forthcoming ESIP Review should examine closely MoES commitment to and utilization of the TDMS system as a basis for decisions on further capital investment and recurrent support.

## **APPENDICES**

## **APPENDIX A: STATEMENT OF WORK**

### **Background:**

USAID's education aid package, Support for Uganda Primary Education Reform (SUPER), has sustained the Government of Uganda's (GOU) educational improvement for seven years and is estimated by some to be one of USAID's more successful education endeavors. The non-project assistance component will not end until 2001 and has \$18 million to disburse against two more sets of policy conditions. However, the project activity that supported past reforms through appropriate technical assistance will conclude May 2000. Support from BEPS for further assistance will be necessary, beginning with technical assistance during the Education Sector Investment Program (ESIP) review in April 2000.

The ESIP agreement, supporting a "basket" of donor funds to be released against common conditionalities, has been endorsed by 12 donors; local representatives of these donors meet with the GOU regularly to review progress towards these conditions. Semi-annually, donors and various government departments meet in plenary to decide on future government undertakings towards conditions precedent.

### **Objective:**

Mission requires the services of a specialist in teacher policy (CLIN 003-A) to participate in the semi-annual plenary where a consortium of donors and Uganda's Ministry of Education and Sports review Ministry progress at meeting a series of conditions that will determine the release of donor funds.

### **Level of Effort:**

Specialist will provide technical assistance for three tasks: 1) assist the ESIP Teacher Training Working Group for three full days (March 29-31) to put final touches on a Teacher Development Management Plan or TDMP (a condition for the April 2000 review); 2) participate in the Education Sector Investment Program (ESIP) plenary review from April 3-14, 2000 as USAID's advisor/representative in the ESIP teacher training working group; and 3) prepare a post-ESIP review paper recommending future teacher training conditionalities required to institutionalize USAID's past investments in this area.

### **Deliverables:**

- 1) Pre-ESIP review and final recommendations on the TDMP in preparation for distribution to donors;
- 2) Full participation in the ESIP Teacher Training working group discussions during the plenary;

- 3) Final report reviewing ESIP plenary actions, teacher training conditions met and unmet, and recommendations for final two years of SUPER conditions in the domain of teacher policy.

**Reports:**

The contractor shall submit the draft TDMP paper to USAID no later than March 31, 2000. The contractor shall submit draft on teacher training conditionality no more than one week after the close of the ESIP April 2000 plenary (i.e., on or before April 17, 2000).

**APPENDIX B: SPREADSHEET**

**APPENDIX C: TEACHER DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT PLAN (PRIMARY EDUCATION):  
COMMENTS**

**Memorandum**

To: Margaret Ocen, Commissioner for Teacher Education

From: Ian Smith, USAID Consultant

Cc: Joan Larcom, USAID

Date: 3/4/00

Subject: Teacher Development and Management Plan (Primary Education): Comments

**1. General**

1.1 In general this is an excellent product. It covers many of the main issues and presents the options very clearly. It is a high quality document and represents a clear increment in terms of the Departments capacity.

1.2 The plan presents many options and in many cases proposes studies and surveys as a preliminary step before taking decisions on those options. This is a cautious and sensible approach. On the other hand:

- Studies do not always clearly answer questions of policy choice;
- A delay in making a choice can often have quite high costs;
- The system may not have the capacity to address all the issues at one time.

I would therefore recommend reducing and prioritizing the options, which could then form a set of objectives for the coming year.

1.3 The problems of the system are generally well elaborated in the plan. It is also often very useful to look at what attempts have been made to rectify the situation in recent years and to analyse the extent of and reasons for success and failure of those efforts. The history of the patient's treatment can become more important in identifying the appropriate cure than the original symptoms.

## **2. Specific Issues**

### **2.1 Recruitment & Deployment Cycle for Teachers**

The commitment to develop an agreed annual cycle for these key teacher management actions is excellent. The proposed cycle is quite long from sitting exams in April (leaving the PTC) to deployment in November and arrival on the payroll in January. There may be a danger of PTC graduates finding alternative jobs. Is it possible to return to the old system of temporary appointment prior the teachers obtaining their results or just speeding up the results process?

### **2.2 Teacher Shortages**

The plan contains many linked proposals for increasing the supply of teachers to certain “disadvantaged” rural areas. These include:

- reducing problems of inter-district transfers;
- addressing gender disparities;
- better advertisement of vacancies;
- establishing a predictable and known recruitment and deployment cycle;
- improving management of the payroll (faster appearance on the payroll);
- in-service training of student teachers who agree to serve in these areas;
- equitable access to continuing professional development; and
- providing teachers housing.

I would suggest that you continue to work on all these strategies. This would be safer, and maybe more cost-effective, than relying on one strategy. Some improvements such as better payroll management or the improved deployment system are still new or recent. It will take several years of good management to convince more teachers to move to isolated areas. Let us not rush to say these actions have failed.

On the issue of housing I would suggest that MoE and districts explore mobilising alternative sources of support such as communities, sub-counties and NGOs. Housing styles vary widely in the country and local strategies may prove more viable. Matching grants rather than full provision may prove a good local government strategy to maximize the incentive to other groups to be involved in this area. Matching grants for housing could be directed towards schools with unqualified teachers.

### **2.3 Continuing Professional Development for Teachers**

This is a crucial area in terms of improving learning quality. Issues of the relationship between up-grading and short courses need to be clarified. A more detailed assessment of what is already being done by training institutions, CCTs, schools, inspectors and others would have been useful.

It is not clear whether the intention is to make a plan or to develop a strategy. I would suggest that a strategy and policy are needed in the medium term though a plan may be adequate for the next year. I will share with you a copy of a paper I recently prepared on developing a policy (Master Plan) for CPD.

This strategy will need to deal with the reform of up-grading. It is a pity that the current NTC led DEP and ITEK's new initiative in this area not mentioned. It seems that change is taking place without a strategy. The planned specialisation of NTC's by secondary subject areas may make it more difficult for them to run the DEP because some NTC's may not retain staff with expertise in the primary subjects. Of course more fundamentally the purpose and nature of upgrading needs fundamental analysis.

CPD is one of the areas where the DfID's suggestion of forming a Professional Body for teachers might be very useful in developing a framework for designing, delivering and accrediting CPD.

#### **2.4 Continuing Professional Development for Tutors**

Recently this activity has been almost entirely "project funded". Has this now been incorporated into the MTBF and 2000/01 budget?

#### **2.5 Tutor Appointment and Filling of Vacancies**

It is marvelous if the problem of PTC understaffing is about to be solved. It would have been interesting in the plan to see a table showing the current status as regards confirmed staff against the current agreed establishment.

Some discussion of the adequacy of the agreed tutor/student ratio in enabling the kind of participatory and reflective training advocated in the Plan would also have been enlightening. What has happened to the idea to add some CCT posts to reduce some cases of excessive school to CCT ratios? What do you think will be the impact of not establishing the outreach Head of Programme position?

#### **2.6 CCT Roles/The Outreach Programme**

The proposal to re-define the CCT's role is important and timely. It would have been useful to have some more definite proposals in the plan. The outreach programme is hardly mentioned in the TDMP. I did not find any reference to head teacher management training and community mobilisation. Is this intentional? In the absence of a clear rationale for the outreach programme in the TDMP what is the basis for the considerable current investment in TDMS national expansion.

## 2.7 Implementation Plan

This is very good indeed but it would have been good if the Objectives and Outputs of the plan were cross-referenced to the main body of the report. It is not always clear where to look for more detailed discussion of a particular objective.

There is no mention of monitoring outputs. Has any progress been made in developing a system of tracking the training outputs of PTCs, the outreach programme and NTCs? There is a hint of this issue in section 3.5 strategy 3 but it not very clear.

Have all aspects of the MTBF been reflected in the Plan and visa-versa. For example I could not see the provision for non-core PTC rehabilitation or furniture procurement in the MTBF?

## 2.8 Report Sections 3.5 & 3.6

These appear to be incomplete in my copy of the plan. These sections need more explanatory text.

## 2.9 ITEK

I could not find a discussion of the role of ITEK in the training of teachers, tutors and school managers. In fact it would be useful for the plan to contain an organisational description of the stakeholders in teacher education.

**Many activities supported by the TDMS Secretariat are now being continued by ITEK. Do they have any capacity building needs related to taking over such activities?**

## APPENDIX D: PUPIL ASSESSMENT

### Proposed Condition Precedent to the 8<sup>th</sup> Tranche Of Support Uganda Primary Education Reform Non-Project Assistance Grant

#### 1. Background

- 1.1 Uganda's primary education reform process is now in quite mature. Resource mobilisation for key inputs such as classrooms, teachers, instructional materials and a teacher support network have all been achieved at sustainable levels. ESAC tranche release conditionalities cover most of the major resource commitments of GoU. All major donor assistance to the education sector is coordinated through the MoE led ESIP process. It is understood that conditionalities for individual donor grants will be set in the context of ESIP and will either conform to general common conditionalities or complement and reinforce agreed government/donor strategies.
- 1.2 With the substantial resource flow into primary education which has taken place in the last few years it is important to obtain an understanding of the impact of that investment on pupil learning outcomes. [Statement on current levels?]
- 1.3 Continuing quality improvements in primary education need to be based on an accurate diagnosis of the learning problems or students. The teacher development and management system (TDMS) which has been established needs to be directed towards critical learning needs by such diagnosis and there may be possibilities for similar focusing in inspection services, school management and even resource input mixes.
- 1.4 Uganda has established a National Assessment of Progress in Education (NAPE). It commenced its first national assessment exercise in 1996 and carried out a second one 1999. So far NAPE has focused on the four core subjects of English, Mathematics, Social Studies and Science with Health. No testing has been done of the other two core subjects of science and social studies. NAPE is a section of the Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB).
- 1.5 ESIP has established 16 indicators to measure the success of the reform. Indicator No. 8 reads: "The Percentage of pupils having reached at least grade 4 of primary schooling who master a set of nationally defined basic competencies disaggregated by gender". This indicator is best measured by UNEB through the NAPE programme.
- 1.6 NAPE was established under the World Bank supported Primary Education & Teacher Development Project (PETDP). It is still largely funded from the development budget. It was agreed in the October 1999 ESIP review that NAPE should be evaluated. It was further recommended that a plan for national assessment be jointly drafted by UNEB and the Education Planning Department (EPD) with presentation of the plan at the April 2000 review. However, completion of the plan is now re-scheduled for an international conference on the theme of assessment in August where NAPE and some other

international assessment programmes<sup>2</sup> of which Uganda is a participant will present and discuss their programmes.

- 1.7 The October review also recommended that NAPE reports should illustrate clearly what children can and cannot do in relation to the curriculum. Thereby providing more valuable feedback into the teacher up-grading, curriculum review and instructional development processes. This work is currently underway.

## **2. Objectives**

- 2.1 The objective of the proposed condition precedent would be to firmly establish a system of national assessment of primary education progress, which builds on the current investment in NAPE and shows a clear programme of work for the next three years. The system should be incorporated immediately into the MTBF [recurrent budget] for sustainability. It should show clearly how the assessment system would provide feedback for quality improvement [and how specific targets for learning achievement might be set [future possibility: at present too political].

## **3. Draft Condition**

- 3.1 A long-term plan for the National Assessment of Progress in Education will be prepared and approved by MoE. The plan will have at minimum the following elements:
- A three year costed plan of operation which is incorporated into the MTBF presented to the April 2001 ESIP review [and government recurrent budget for 2001/02]
  - A specific programme of assessment of primary pupil learning achievement in core subjects over the next three years;
  - A programme of report dissemination that maximizes the feedback process for teachers, teacher educators, instructional materials developers, inspectors and curriculum designers.
  - A sample report based on 1999 data showing clearly pupil achievement against each curriculum topic tested and analysing pupil achievement against attendance [to check if possible now or in 2000 assessment];

---

<sup>2</sup> Others include Summative Assessment, Continuous Assessment (CA), SAMEQ (Southern African Committee for Monitoring of Educational Quality) and MLA (Monitoring of Learning Achievement) which are multi-country comparative assessment efforts funded from a variety of sources.

#### **4. Implementation Process**

- 4.1 Implementation of this conditionality should be relatively smooth because most necessary activities are already contained within the plans for NAPE and EPD.
- 4.2 The first step is to prepare a draft plan proposal, which can be presented to the International Conference in August. Elements of that plan already exist. They probably require strengthening (see section 5) and in the case of developing an improved assessment report probably also require international TA.
- 4.3 Draft plan would be presented to the August conference. It would then be amended in the light of this peer review.
- 4.4 The final draft would have to be presented first to the UNEB Board and then the MoE Top Management for approval. This would have to be done before the end of 2000 so that the budget for the plan could be included in the MoE MTBF and recurrent budget of UNEB.
- 4.5 The approved plan and MTBF could be presented to the April 2001 ESIP Review while the recurrent budget should be passed by parliament in June 2001.
- 4.6 If evidence of the plan implementation is required then an annual assessment exercise, report and dissemination process are all feasible within the 12 months July 2000 to June 2001 implementation cycle
- 4.7 The annual cycle proposed by NAPE for national assessment implementation is:
  - Preparation including design (Q4 April - June)
  - Administration of exercise (Q1 July - Sep [with July being ideal since it lies in the middle of 2<sup>nd</sup> term of the year])
  - Analysis (Q2 Oct - Dec)
  - Report writing (Q3 January – March)
  - Dissemination/feedback (Q4 April - June) and preparation of next assessment

#### **5. Support Needed in Implementation**

- 5.1 The NAPE plan needs to be refined before presentation to the August international conference. The priority areas for strengthening are:
  - Institutionalization of NAPE within UNEB, staff training and TA required and the recurrent budget (organisational and finance issues);
  - Greater elaboration and institutionalization of the feedback process for assessment results to teachers, teacher educators, instructional materials developers, inspectors and curriculum designers (learning improvement)

- An example of an assessment report analysed in a way, which enables clear diagnosis of learning achievements and problems against the curriculum.

5.2 NAPE would probably benefit from receiving technical assistance during the drafting of the plan from an education planner with a good understanding of organisational, financial and teacher development/learning improvement issues.

5.3 NAPE staff would find it very informative to undertake a study visit to countries with greater experience in national assessment. A combination of a Latin American country with a strong assessment programme and the USA is proposed. The visit should take place before the August 2000 Conference.

#### 5.4 SOW for Assessment Plan Development Consultant

**Objective:**

To assist UNEB develop a medium term plan for NAPE which ensures financial and organisation sustainability, adequate provision for staff and (local consultant/part time staff) development and fulfills expectations with regard to feedback for learning improvement.

**Level of Effort:**

Six weeks (or three x two weeks) to work with NAPE staff and EPD.

1. Two weeks in May 2000 to review current plan and assist in strengthening and addressing issues of sustainability and feedback.
2. Two weeks in July to review final document before presentation to August conference.
3. Two weeks August conference to assist in capturing consensus on amendments to the plan and production of final draft for presentation to UNEB Board and MoE Top Management.

**Deliverables:**

1. Notes on review of current plan; analysis of requirements (guidelines) for producing final draft.
2. Comments on draft plan and record of other advice given
3. Summary of conference recommendations in respect of plan and comments on final draft plan

**Requirement:**

Specialist in national assessment planning and management. Experience in establishing national assessment systems in developing countries from an institutional and managerial perspective.

5.5 There may be a need to provide NAPE staff (and consultant) training to develop a model report format and analysis skills which would ensure that NAPE data is maximally useful in diagnosing learning outcomes against the curriculum.

## 5.6 SOW for Assessment Analysis and Utilisation Expert

### **Objective:**

To assist UNEB develop a national assessment analysis process and report format which adequately describes the learning achievements of pupils against curriculum expectations and provides feedback in sufficient detail (against curriculum and geographical dispersion) to inform and empower teacher educators, instructional materials producers and curriculum developers.

### **Level of Effort:**

Six weeks (in two tranches of four and two weeks) to work with NAPE staff and EPD.

1. Four weeks in May 2000 to review latest assessment data and draft report and assist NAPE to develop maximal benefit from current data and plan for future enhancement of assessment.
2. One week in November 2000 to review analysis of next assessment process and make recommendations for both analysis and report writing.

### **Deliverables:**

1. A draft guideline on analysis of assessment data and a draft format for the assessment report and a sample report which maximally uses the 1999 assessment data
2. Comments on the ongoing data analysis process at the time of the visit and comments on any amendments required in the proposed report format.

### **Requirement:**

Specialist in national assessment analysis and utilisation for feedback into the learning system. Experience in establishing national assessment systems in developing countries from the perspective of their utilisation in improving learning outcomes and for systems accountability.

## 6. Means of Verification

6.1 The condition may be verified from the following documentation:

- A NAPE plan (minimum three year costed) approved by UNEB and MoE which includes a description of the feedback process for assessment results to teachers, teacher educators, instructional materials developers, inspectors and curriculum

designers and a sample assessment report showing learning achievements against curriculum topics;

- An April 2000 MTBF version showing a line item for UNEB which matches UNEB MTBF budget and which includes NAPE line items;
- A 2001/02 approved MoE budget including UNEB and matching a UNEB budget, which includes NAPE line items.

## **APPENDIX E: DISTRICT EDUCATION MANAGEMENT**

### **Proposed Condition Precedent to the 8<sup>th</sup> Tranche Of Support Uganda Primary Education Reform Non-Project Assistance Grant**

#### **1 Background**

1.1 Uganda's primary education reform process is now in quite mature. Resource mobilisation for key inputs such as classrooms, teachers, instructional materials and a teacher support network have all been achieved. ESAC tranche release conditionalities cover most of the major resource commitments of GoU. All major donor assistance to the education sector is coordinated through the MoE led ESIP process. It is understood that conditionalities for individual donor grants will be set in the context of ESIP and will either conform to general common conditionalities or complement and reinforce agreed government/donor strategies.

2 In the Education Sector there has been rapid decentralisation of the primary education sub-sector, particularly the operational planning and management of primary schools. Further decentralisation is envisaged in the near future including decentralisation of the development budget and payroll management. The new role of MoE will be confined to regulation, facilitation, mentoring and monitoring while direct management of implementation will be the responsibility of districts. Already MoE finds it very difficult to exercise any sanctions against "non-compliant districts even in respect of the development budget". Regular mechanisms of MoE monitoring district performance in some respects is being established with the development of an EMIS however a mechanism for monitor the education planning and decision making process at district level does not at present exist.

2.2 Districts are not always well prepared with appropriate skills and experience to take on their new responsibilities. In response to this MoE has immediate plans to implement a "decentralised capacity building" programme which will start with a focus on critical issues related to strategic national initiatives in primary education and will gradually become a demand driven district defined staff and stakeholder staff development/capacity building programme.

2.3 MoE has made a very considerable investment in the teacher development and management system (TDMS) which now covers the entire country and has provided districts with the means of easily reaching all their practicing teachers, head teachers, school management committees etc with skills development and other training activities. The TDMS is based on nationally funded and managed core Primary Teachers Colleges. The integration of the districts' staff development and school quality improvement programmes has not yet been fully achieved in the context of decentralisation. The synchronization of quality improvement objectives and plans between districts and PTCs would greatly increase the impact of their collective efforts.

- 2.4 Current initiatives to strengthen district level primary education management capacity include the “decentralised level capacity building” programme which is expected to plan 15 district programmes by June 2000 for implementation in 2000/01 and to plan the balance of 30 programmes in the same year. SUPER Project has recently sponsored workshops at PTCs to plan the development of PTC based “Programme Boards” which would develop with full stakeholder involvement (including districts) periodic training plans, which are fully integrated with district plans.
- 2.5 The body charged with democratic supervision of a district’s education programme is the District Education Committee. This committee is formed from district councilors. Non-voting officers from the district may be called to present their departments work programmes. The representation of offices varies greatly from district to district. Some districts invite only the DEO while others include the DIS, the Secretary District Service Commission (critical in teacher management issues) and a few include the core PTC Principal because of the PTC’s central role in teacher in-service training.
- 2.6 The proposed conditionality should strengthen current capacity building initiatives of MoE by establishing a mechanism, which would enable MoE to monitor district education management activity.

## **2. Objectives**

The objective of the proposed conditionality is to ensure that districts are carrying out active management of their primary education programmes and in particular are conducting termly district education committee meetings that do the following:

- Are attended by a quorum of members and all relevant technical officers [specify now or in workshop]
- Consider in their deliberations a comprehensive range of issues covering the major areas of education management and national strategic programmes; [specify now or later]
- Submit reports (minutes) of meetings to MoE so as to enable MoE to develop relevant support, capacity building and advisory programmes for the districts.

## **3. Draft Condition**

- 3.1 MoE will agree with districts a minimum regularity of DEC meetings, a recommended standard membership of relevant officers, a recommended minimum agenda of topics for regular discussion at those meetings, and an agreed format for DEC minutes to be sent to the PS MoE for review.
- 3.2 MoE will keep a record of minutes submitted, the frequency of topics discussed and membership and will maintain both a summary record [in a format to be agreed] and original copies of minutes.

- 3.3 MoE undertakes that out of a target 45 x 2 DEC meetings (one per term in the 3<sup>rd</sup> term 2000 and 1<sup>st</sup> term 2001) at least 75% will be held or which 75% will be attended by a quorum of members and 75% of agreed stakeholders and that coverage of agreed key topics will be recorded by MoE.
- 3.4 MoE further agrees that it will organise a visit to each non-compliant district to meet with the DEC at least once before June 2001.

#### 4. Implementation Process

4.1 Implementation will commence with a planned set of regional meetings of districts under the “decentralised level capacity building” programme. This is planned for the period April to June 2000. Invited participants should also include Secretaries of DSCs and core PTC Principals. Facilitators should include representatives from primary and Teacher Education Department as well as EPD.

4.2 The workshops will discuss and propose the following:

- Standard attendance at DEC meetings of relevant education stakeholders/officers [including should we insist DEO, DIS, Secretary DSC, core PTC Principal, non-core PTC Principal, gender officer, etc.]
- Standard key topics to be discussed [should we include a set of key topics: see next point]
- Introduce a DEC minute format (or even a standard district education sector report format which would meet all/most MoE report needs)
- Introduce/agree proposed MoE sanctions (action) against districts which fail to report (EPD suggestion non-handover of district equipment and vehicles, non-approval of decentralised capacity building plans)

4.3 Mandatory subjects for DEC Meetings could include the following:

- Teacher Management including deployment, recruitment, vacancies;
- Teacher Discipline: sanctions and incentives and actions in severe cases;
- Teacher Professional Development: PTC outreach programmes (CC level), school and inspectorate (district level) programmes;
- Girls Education Promotion Programme;
- Schools Facilities Development;
- Instructional Materials Management;
- Performance Assessment: indicators (EMIS), inspectorate, national assessments and other monitoring;
- School Management and Community Mobilisation Issues;
- Finance: Wage, Non-wage (UPE) and development budget control and accountability mechanisms;

- Capacity Building Programmes (MoE, local staff development and other initiatives); and
  - Donor coordination (NGO and other district based education support programmes).
- 4.4 After the workshops EPD would draft a proposal for core DEC membership and core topics to MoE Top Management. This would be agreed by Commissioners Planning, Teacher Education and Primary Education before submission to Top Management.
- 4.5 Once approved by Top Management and no later than the end of 2<sup>nd</sup> Term 2000 this would be officially communicated to districts by the PS, MoE. This would specify the office to which DEC minutes should be sent and their format. It would specify sanctions for non-compliance if it were decided to use these.
- 4.6 An officer in EPD would be given responsibility for maintain the minutes files and collating results.
- 4.7 MoE officers would be given general instructions to collect copies of DEC minutes during their visits to districts (ideally this should be two copies: one to CE
- 4.8 An interim report would be submitted to PS, MoES on 3<sup>rd</sup> term 2000 DEC meetings. The PS would ensure that non-compliant districts DECs visited by MoE officers during January – February 2001.
- 4.9 A final report would be prepared in May 2001 after 1<sup>st</sup> term 2001 and again non-compliant districts would be visited.

## 5. Support Needed in Implementation

- 5.1 Support would be useful in preparing for the workshops, at the workshops themselves, in developing a visit programme (capacity building programme) for non-compliant districts and developing the EPD summary analysed DEC minutes reporting format.
- 5.2 The key skills required are institutional development and educational administration / planning and gender issues. A three-person consultancy team could be made available to MoE for the workshop planning. One international TA and two local. The two local TA would support MoE during the workshop programme itself. One of the two local TA should be a gender specialist. The international TA would return to assist MoE in planning the follow up programme to non-compliant districts.

### 5.3 SOW for an Expert in Educational Management and Institutional Development

**Objective:**

To assist MoE (EPD/Primary Education/Teacher Education):

1. to develop a component of a regional workshop programme to promote district education management by Districts Education Committees (DEC)

and

2. To develop a capacity building (training) module for use by MoE staff visiting districts which have failed to develop the DEC to the targeted levels of performance mutually agreed by the MoE and districts.

**Level of Effort:**

Four weeks (or 2 x two weeks) to work with MoE staff.

1. Two weeks in May 2000 to develop the structure and content of a workshop session which would introduce the concept of wider technical officer involvement in DECs and agree on core areas of education management to be reviewed by the DECs on a regular basis.
- 1 Two weeks in Oct/Nov July to develop with EPD/TE and Primary Departments a visit programme (standard itinerary, topics and session contents) for visits to non-compliant districts.

**Deliverables:**

1. Guidelines for the aforementioned workshop session and evidence of a training session for workshop facilitators;
2. Guidelines for a MoE visit programme for non-compliant districts.

**Requirement:**

Specialist in educational management and institutional development. Understanding of the Uganda decentralisation process a great advantage. Ability to facilitate institutional ownership of the development of this process for monitoring district management of education.

#### 5.4 SOW for a Local Equity Expert

**Objective:**

To assist MoE to promote the active and equitable management by district's of the their primary education systems.

**Level of Effort:**

Three months divided into short assignments over a period of one year from May 2000 to April 2000 to be specified by USAID mission/MoE working principally with EPD staff. Task may include (but will not necessarily include)

1. Participate in workshop design programme for introduction and planning of the activity with districts and ensure that equity issues are incorporated adequately.
2. Participate in MoE regional workshops as an observer or facilitator (depending on MoE request) and ensuring that district input/ideas on the proposed District Education Management Monitoring process are adequately captured and recorded and that equity issues are fully discussed and incorporated in proposals.
3. Assisting MoE to capture workshop recommendations and draft a communication from MoE to districts which incorporates the conditionality undertaking in a realistic and achievable manner;
4. Assist EPD MoE to establish a system for documenting and analysing the returns from DEC meetings
5. Assist MoE to develop with EPD/TE and Primary Departments a visit programme (standard itinerary, topics and session contents) for visits to non-compliant districts
6. Participate in some MoE visits to non-compliant districts to observe this capacity building activity and give feedback on how the visits can be improved;
7. Carry out necessary verification work connected with the general condition and in particular the equity elements thereof as specified by MoE/USAID
8. Another assignments deemed critical to improving district education management by MoE/USAID

**Deliverables:**

1. Reports on each period of assignments with copies of all documents produced e.g. session notes, trip reports, data analysis attached.
2. Analysed reports on the submission of DEC minutes to MoE by district, topic and showing membership composition.

**Requirement:**

Specialist in education and equity issues. Good understanding of educational management and decentralisation in Uganda. Knowledge of recent reform efforts especially the TDMS system and added advantage. Ability to analyse simple statistics. Experience in workshop facilitation.

6. **Means of Verification**

- 6.1 Verification of DEC attendance, minutes and topics discussed would be provided by the analysed minutes kept by EPD. This could be cross-checked by audit on a sample basis of copies at districts. Interim verification of the activity would be provided by the workshop reports and the PS, MoE communication to districts.
- 6.2 Verification of the follow up of non-compliant districts would be provided by a list of trips undertaken and accompanying trip reports from the officers leading those visits.

## APPENDIX F: AN IN-SERVICE TEACHER TRAINING MASTER PLAN: SOME THOUGHTS

### Introduction

A Master Plan can take many forms. Having a Master Plan does not imply any particular system for coordinating training. The Master Plan could recommend many different kinds of coordinating systems and strategies. It is probably also good if the plan encourages diversity and variety in the types and form of training opportunities available.

### Purpose

The purpose of having a master plan is to help all parties to the professional development of a teacher to plan their own contribution to that process better:

- The teacher should be able to see the benefit and training in the context of general professional development;
- The employers of teachers (different sections of the state and the private sector) should be assured that the training system can meet the evolving needs of teachers for enhanced skills, knowledge and attitudes and should be able to better plan the resource requirements of training;
- The training providers (institutions and programmes) should be provided with a means of predicting the evolving training requirements of the teacher profession and be strengthened in providing quality courses to meet those needs.

### Key Components of an In-Service Teacher Training Master Plan

Below are some questions, which a Master Plan should ideally try to answer. With each question are some possible options. The paper does not include all the possible questions or all the possible options. It tries to highlight some of the more important ones.

#### **Question 1: Does the government want inservice training to be a systematic part of a teacher's professional life?**

Sample Alternative 1A: No. Teacher training is not a priority compared with other pressing needs such as books and buildings so it can be an occasional ad hoc activity.

Sample Alternative 1B: No. Pre-service teacher training is more than adequate for current demands on teachers. Older teachers should organise their own inservice professional upgrading.

Sample Alternative 1C: No. Because we do not have enough funds to train all teachers every year. (This is not a good reason because you can still have a systematic approach if non-school based training is offered only every five years and low- or no-cost school based training can be key element of a professional system).

Sample Alternative 1D: Yes. A system is needed to guide teachers in what training they need, to ensure that the knowledge, skills and attitudes of each teacher are regularly enhanced, to

help plan and ration the available resources for in-service training and to help training institutions to evolve their programmes with changing needs.

**Question 2: Who should decide the training needs of the individual teacher?**

Sample Alternative 2A: The employer, based on national standards that take into account a teacher's grade, subject and seniority, decides the training needs of an individual teacher.

Sample Alternative 2B: The employer decides the training needs based on an individual assessment from a supervisor (inspector).

**Sample Alternative 2C: The teacher decides his/her training needs based on national guides for minimum levels of training, required levels for promotion, advice from inspectors, guidance from subject panels and other indicative sources.**

Sample Alternative 2D: The employer is told by the training providers which categories of teachers they wish to train. The employer chooses individuals to fill the quota.

**Question 3: Who should decide how the training of the individual teacher is delivered?**

Sample Alternative 3A: The training institutions plan courses and then some teachers are ordered to attend those courses.

Sample Alternative 3B: The training institutions plan courses. The employer decides which teachers should attend which courses at which institutions.

**Sample Alternative 3C: The training institutions plan courses. The school or the teacher decides which courses at which institutions the teacher should attend.**

Sample Alternative 3D: The same as Alternatives 3B or 3C but the training institutions are requested to make a tailor made courses by the employer, school or a group of teachers.

**Question 4: How is in-service training to be counted towards a teacher's career?**

Sample Alternative 4A: Training is not considered in anyway when considering a teacher's promotion.

Sample Alternative 4B: Training is considered in a general way as one among several factors when considering a teacher's promotion. But it is not essential for promotion.

**Sample Alternative 4C: Training is divided into two kinds. One kind is mandatory before receiving a promotion to a certain position and other training is given general consideration.**

Sample Alternative 4D: A certain amount of training each year must be acquired by each teacher to be considered for promotion or even to be allowed to continue teaching. This alternative can be combined with Alternative 4 C.

Note: If inservice training is to count towards a teacher's career, then it must be decided who should maintain the teacher's record of training. Alternatives include the teacher, the employer or a professional association.

Here training institutions could include public and private universities; employer training department such as the Governorate Education Directorate Training Departments; central government training agencies; donor programmes; NGOs; private training companies; school based training programmes; self study using written or electronic media. With increasing access the Internet providers could be national or international.

**Question 5: Which training institutions can be allowed to offer in-service training?**

Sample Alternative 5A: Only government controlled institutions.

Sample Alternative 5B: Any training institutions registered by government to offer inservice courses.

**Sample Alternative 5C: All training institutions, which are both registered as institutions and whose courses have been approved.**

Sample Alternative 5D: Any training institution selected by a training organiser (the later could be a teacher, a school or an employer)?

Note different answers might be given to this question depending on whether the training was mandatory for promotion or voluntary for enrichment.

**Question 6: How is training to be compared or quality assessed?**

Training for personal enrichment does not have to be compared though the individual teacher might value guidance on the relative quality of different courses. However, if courses are to be mandatory for career development there should be some system of establishing minimum standards and equivalence.

Sample Alternative 6A: Each course is assessed and rated after being run for part or the whole of its duration.

Sample Alternative 6B: Each course proposal is assessed and rated in advance. A selection could be inspected during implementation.

**Sample Alternative 6C:** Some training institutions are given the authority to assess and rate their own courses or a group of institutions could develop a self governing peer review and assessment system.

Sample Alternative 6D: All courses are accepted and rating is based on study time and topics.

Obviously there are many possible permutations of the above alternatives.

**Question 7: Who should carry out the quality assurance work discussed in question 6?**

There are almost as many potential suppliers of quality assurance services as there are training institutions. Examples, which come readily to mind, include the Inspectorate at either central or local level; a central training authority such as ITEK or a professional association of teachers; or independent evaluators. Combinations are possible; for example, a central authority could employ independent evaluators or an association to do the bulk of the work.

**Question 8: Who should pay for the training of the teacher?**

This question has two sections. The first bears responsibility for finding the resources for paying for training: the teacher or society. In some professions the trainee pays for in-service training directly or as a quasi-salary benefit.

If society pays for a teacher's inservice training: Who is given control of the resources to pay for the training? Here there are several alternatives.

Sample Alternative 8A: Teachers are given cash or vouchers to pay to training institutions for courses.

Sample Alternative 8B: Schools are given cash or vouchers to pay to training institutions for courses in which they wish their teacher's to participate.

**Sample Alternative 8C:** A selected level of government (a Governorate Directorate, a central training institutions, a programme unit) is given funds or vouchers to pay training institutions to deliver courses for selected teachers.

Sample Alternative 8D: Selected training institutions are given funds directly by the Treasury to run courses for teachers (as happens with the pre-service training of teachers, PTC outreach programmes or district inspectors).

**Question 9: How should the resources be allocated to a teacher's training?**

The big question here is: Should there be a rational formula to allocate resources to in-service teacher training such as an amount per teacher or should a traditional supply-side system of funding training institutions and short-term projects be maintained.

If it was decided to use a rational formula this would have to be combined with some of the options from question 8 and alternatives could include:

Sample Alternative 9A: A standard amount is provided every year for every teacher.

Sample Alternative 9B: An amount is provided for each teacher every year varying according to the teachers subject specialisation and teaching level (primary, preparatory or secondary).

Sample Alternative 9C: **The amount provided for a teacher varies according to his/her length of service; for example, a small amount could be given each year with a much larger amount in special years before the teacher is due for promotion.**

Sample Alternative 9D: Methods could be explored of linking resources provided for a teacher's in-service training to their performance. Though this is common in the private sector, public sector professions have generally resisted such performance-related benefits

**Question 10: How should training courses be matched with trainees?**

The answer to this question is really an accumulation of the options selected from earlier questions. But it is possible to distinguish three principle alternatives.

Sample Alternative 10A: A supply-side option starts with training institutions and resources. It designs training that can be delivered within the budget and then it uses a variety of methods to fill the courses such as advertisement, selection, co-option, orders etc.

Sample Alternative 10B: A demand-led option gives the trainees or their employers the purchasing power to buy training courses or places on training courses and allows these purchases to select according to their preference.

Sample Alternative 10C: The "standards" approach is something of a mixture with decentralised purchasing of training being guided by guidelines on training requirements for teachers in different situations and with courses limited by accreditation.

**APPENDIX G: POST-ESIP PAPER**

*Prepared by:*

**Creative Associates International, Inc.**

**Ian Smith  
Teacher Training Specialist**

**Beyond ESIP**

**Actions, Teacher Training Conditionalities,  
and Recommendations for Teacher  
Training Policy for the Final Two Years of  
SUPER**

**The Basic Education and Policy Support  
(BEPS) Activity**

**Contract No. HNE-I-00-00-00038-00  
Task Order No. 02**

*Prepared for:*

**The Global Bureau  
Human Capacity Development Center  
US Agency for International Development**

**June 2000**

## **ESIP Plenary Actions**

During the first week of the review the funding agencies met and reconfirmed the following as areas for undertakings/conditionalities:

### **General**

Financial Resource Commitments  
Process of ESIP  
Financial Management

### **Strategic**

Equitable Access  
Quality  
Efficiency

### **Monitoring & Evaluation**

Sector Policy  
Structure  
Capacity Building/Decentralisation

An explanation was received of the forthcoming World Bank Public Expenditure Reform Credit, (PERC), which will be the new mechanism for World Bank lending to Uganda. PERC undertakings will have to be complimentary to the ESIP process and visa versa. PERC may reduce funding agency leverage within ESIP as sector specific funds become less significant.

### *Teacher Training*

Teacher Training undertakings are discussed in more detail in the sections below. The rest of this section makes a few comments on some of the other undertakings.

### *Financial Commitment*

“Budget and releases are in line with MTBF, MoES, and PAF guidelines maintaining a minimum of 31% of recurrent discretionary expenditure for the education sector with at least 65% of this for primary and ensuring that the non-wage component is maintained at a minimum of 35%.”

I would anticipate difficulty in meeting this target because government appears unlikely to take actions needed to fill all vacant positions for primary teachers (salary under-spending) and to continue certain budgeted TDMS programmes for the training of new teachers and school managers (non-wage under-spending).

### *Monitoring & Evaluation*

“A system for monitoring and evaluating progress in the sector, including EMIS and NAPE is planned, costed and functioning nationally by October 2000.”

This is consistent with the proposal drafted before the ESIP Review meeting which focused on NAPE. If USAID were able to provide technical assistance to support this undertaking this would definitely be appreciated by UNEB (the institutional home for NAPE). The undertaking does not explicitly address the issue of moving NAPE from the development budget to the recurrent budget and ensuring long institutionalization of the programme.

### *Basic Learning Materials*

This is a contentious area. The Ministry would like to move resources away from core subjects to the other curriculum subjects. It is also determined to retain centralized materials procurement despite the fact that there are manifest inefficiencies in the system (unable to implement annual cycle within 12 months, non-delivery to schools of cycle 5 books, procurement anomalies in cycles 4 and 6). This area is best handled by a funding agency with direct earmarking of its resources to Learning Materials.

## Teacher Training Conditions (Met and Unmet)

The table below reviews the current undertakings related to teacher education.

	Action Before April 2000	ESIP Report Status	Comments
A. Completion before further budget support release (including ESAC tranche release 2 98/99) and in the case of 1,2 & 3 carried forward to current review			
1	Outstanding teachers arrears payment completed and measures in place to prevent accumulation of further arrears	Partially achieved.  Paid up to 97/98. Arrears for 98/99 cleared but will be subject to CAOs accounting for earlier arrears  Consultations still ongoing in MoES but MoPS to take final action	Arrears up to 1999 crystallised and payment schedule in progress  Measures to prevent future arrears (e.g. slow access to payroll, post transfer/payroll coordination, annual increments etc) are not clear. Field reports suggest that problem may re-occur. MoPS seems slightly complacent but has been asked to produce a report on mechanisms in place to prevent future arrears. This report was not made available to the Review.
2	Updating teachers payroll:  All teachers on payroll and paid in a timely manner	Partially achieved  Most govt. teachers are on the payroll and policy guidelines are in place for managing the payroll in future  A survey is being carried out by MoES to establish this position.	Comments as for previous item  The definition of “all on payroll” may be an unrealistic, though ideal, target. This is reflected in the new conditionality for Oct 2000 which puts the target at 85%.  Figures presented by MoPS suggest 86,000 out of target 101,000 or 86% in latest available figures.
3	Integrated teacher development plan completed	Draft plan available	A respectable plan produced.  The many options for action need to be prioritised and

	Action Before April 2000	ESIP Report Status	Comments
			<p>agreed</p> <p>Major areas of omission such as TDMS, continuing professional development need to be filled</p>
4	TDMS Recurrent cost incorporated in the MTBF	<p>“Achieved”</p> <p>TDMS recurrent costs incorporated in the MTBF</p>	<p>The MTBF does include TDMS recurrent costs (100% absorption as from 1/7/00).</p> <p>However, Phase III PTCs due for GoU recurrent funding from 1/7/99 (postponed from 1/7/98) have received no non-wage funds since the beginning of the financial year. The funds have been released by MoFEP so this is serious failure of a commitment, which MoES should rectify immediately.</p>
<b>B. New undertakings for current review</b>			
1	<p>Primary Teachers Vacancies: all of the newly established posts (125,804) are to be filled by July 2000. (This has been revised downwards during the review (see next section).)</p>	<p>In progress.</p> <p>Announcement for all Grade III unemployed teachers to report for registration at coordinating centres ongoing.</p> <p>Guidelines on district ceilings already sent to districts</p>	<p>Districts are expressing difficulty in filling vacancies with qualified teachers.</p> <p>MoES should assist districts to close this gap by several strategies rather than a single strategy. These strategies should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incremental improvements in the recruitment process at all levels</li> <li>- Improvements in payroll management (providing teachers far from home with assurance of regular pay)</li> <li>- Recruitment of new PTE in-service students to fill current vacancies</li> <li>- Recruitment of retired</li> </ul>

	<b>Action Before April 2000</b>	<b>ESIP Report Status</b>	<b>Comments</b>
			teachers on contract - Pilot programme of teachers housing development in priority districts

## **Teacher Policy Conditions for Final Two Years of Super**

### *Focus Areas for Final Two Years*

Teacher policy conditions for the final two years of SUPER could focus on three areas.

- **Access/Equity:** ensuring that adequate numbers of teachers are allocated to schools including those in more isolated communities;
- **Efficiency:** promoting the use of various strategies to increase the efficiency of utilisation of teachers within schools so as to minimise the actual occurrence of very large classes
- **Quality:** consolidation of the TDMS system to support continuous quality improvement and/or feedback on trends in learning outcomes (assessment) to teacher professional development programme;

During this current review the following key actions were identified by the Teacher Education Working Group as priorities:

- Completion of teacher deployment and allocation strategies including annual recruitment and deployment schedules; use of PTE students to fill vacancies; improvement payroll management; initiatives for housing. (Access/Equity)
- Completion of TDMP based on TDMS/Pre-service evaluation and including a review of the purpose and policy of upgrading to diploma level (Quality)

[These were converted into two conditions (1) requiring 85% of target 125,000 teachers to be on the payroll and measures in place to attract teacher to disadvantaged districts by October 2000 and (2) fully a costed and endorsed TDMP which includes recruitment and training policy]

- Complete staffing in PTCs and NTC so that policies on PTC rationalization, TDMS staffing and NTC specialisation are effectively implemented;

The Primary Education Working Group raised the issue of teacher utilization, with the objective of reducing actual pupil-teacher ratios (school and class level) using a variety of techniques (double shifting, multi-grade teaching in middle grades, re-allocation of “upper primary subject specialist teachers” to larger classes) (Efficiency)

This was converted into a condition stating, “Teacher utilization studies are completed, and a costed action plan is included in the MTBF and in place by October 2000.”

It might be noted that there were no direct TDMS conditions. This reflects a general absence of this topic in the ESIP discussions. MoES does not appear proud of the system it has developed and seems reluctant to use it to its full potential. This needs to be addressed in the evaluation. TDMS is not a cheap system, and if it cannot be utilized to an acceptable level then its continuation may not be justifiable.

### *Future Condition Ideas*

The following are possible teacher education conditions for the next two-year which may become relevant priorities.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Condition Objective</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1	TDMS recurrent funding taken over by GoU	Quality	This is a previous condition, which has been implemented at the level of budgetary provision, but which has been imperfectly implemented (Phase III PTCs no non-wage funds in 1999/2000). It may need to be refreshed if GoU is really committed to TDMS
2	<p>Improve coordination of teacher development activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- by establishing a national framework</li> <li>- by improving decentralised planning between districts, TDMS PTCs, and ESA</li> </ul>	Quality	<p>Teacher development for trained teachers needs to be focused on improved performance, coordinated, regular and effective (not ad hoc).</p> <p>Establishing a framework may be accomplished by TDMP completion but might need a separate effort. Coordination of planning at decentralised level may need central push because actors report to different authorities</p>
3	Teacher Education Policy and role of ITEK to be clarified	Quality	USAID/WB support secretariats to carry out many ITEK responsibilities for much of 1990s. ITEK needs to give clear leadership now that project structures have been closed. ITEK needs to build the capacity to do this effectively. ITEK is about to receive University status and may fail to take on its Teacher Education policy role. If ITEK lacks commitment alternative structures may need to be revisited
4	TDMS Output Monitoring Systems fully operationalised and managed by MoES	Efficiency	The substantial investment made by GoU, USAID and other donors in the TDMS system needs to be continuously justified by demonstrating its cost-effectiveness

No.	Condition Objective	Category	Comment
			as a teacher and school development delivery system. Without this even recurrent budget support becomes difficult to justify. MoES systems to report on outputs are not yet robust. A condition would give this extra priority in MoES work programmes
5	Agreement of CCT role	Quality	If this is not clearly articulated in the TDMP or if it is agreed but overtaken by a failure to utilise CCTs in “traditional programmes” such as PTE and Head Teacher Management training then CCT task re-definition may become urgent to preserve the effectiveness of the TDMS delivery system
6	Re-design of diploma upgrading for primary teachers.	Quality	<p>The Diploma in Primary Education is the main qualification up-grading channel for primary teachers. It takes considerable resources used by NTCs. It is not related to performance in the classroom. It may become difficult for NTCs to implement when they start specialising in their secondary teacher training roles. ITEK has started to deliver a similar course. None of this has clear purpose.</p> <p>This could relate to TDMS if it were decided to make the diploma more school based and to utilise the TDMS network to deliver all or components of this system.</p>