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The purpose of this report is to enable DFID-Uganda to better understand the context for supporting girls’ education in Uganda, and identify potential options for support that could form the basis for a business case. The Terms of Reference are in annex 1.

In line with DFID briefing, girls’ education is examined in the wider perspective of primary and secondary education for boys and girls in Uganda: helping girls to receive a quality education requires an improvement in provision for both boys and girls.

The findings in this report are based on:

(i) documentation provided by DFID, government and other development partners, and via the Internet;

(ii) interviews with staff of the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES), Development Partners and other stakeholders in the education sector;

(iii) the local and international experience of the authors.

In agreement with DFID, the field visit proposed in the TOR was deemed inappropriate given the short timescale and opportunities to interview in Kampala contacts ‘from the field’.

In line with the DFID briefing, the interviews:

(a) made it clear that this consultancy was contributing to the background to help plan for future Uganda programme directions and did not necessarily indicate that DFID-Uganda would be doing more in the sector;

(b) focused first on general issues of primary and secondary education and then, in this context, on girls’ education. All interviewees saw the main overall issue as the poor quality of education provision for both boys and girls; for most interviewees, interventions specifically targeting girls were seen as lower priority. However the conclusions drawn from the discussions are those of the authors; they are not necessarily an accurate reflection of the views of the interviewees.

This assessment is being carried out by HEART (Health & Education Advice and Resource Team) a consortium of 8 Partners: Oxford Policy Management, CfBT, IDS (Institute of Development Studies), HERA, FHI360, Ipact, University of Leeds and LSTM (Liverpool School of Tropical medicine) supported by DFID.

This report was managed by CfBT.
For further information contact Kieran Cooke [kcooke@cfbt.com].

Disclaimer
The Health & Education Advice & Resource Team (HEART) provides technical assistance and knowledge services to the British Government’s Department for International Development (DFID) and its partners in support of pro-poor programmes in education, health and nutrition. The HEART services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations in international development, health and education: Oxford Policy Management, CfBT, FHI360, HERA, the Institute of Development Studies, IPACT, the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine and the Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development at the University of Leeds. HEART cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this report. Any views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, HEART or any other contributing organisation. The production of this report does not oblige DFID to fund the project.
Executive summary

Context and Need for DFID support

Ugandan Context
The Vision of Uganda’s National Plan 2010/11-2014/15 is ‘a transformed Ugandan society from a peasant to a modern and prosperous country within 30 years’. But economic and social development is severely constrained by:

- An undereducated and unskilled workforce whose high growth rate (3.7% per annum) contributes to high unemployment. Female participation in skilled employment is far below that of men, whilst half of women in rural areas are in unpaid family work.
- High population growth, 3.2% - the third highest in the world - with little action to reduce fertility. Low levels of education are a contributory factor as noted in the National Plan, whilst the rapid increase in school age children places severe demands on education and the economy.
- Significant health problems including resurgent HIV/AIDS, malaria and high mortality from pregnancy and childbirth. Family illness makes it difficult for families to support children in school, especially girls who are seen as carers and substitute parents for their siblings.
- Declining systems of governance and accountability, in education as in other sectors. The drivers of past conflict persist: further violence resulting from poor governance, ethnic divisions or unequal regional development would have a rapid and damaging impact on economic progress.

Education Context
Sector structure and policy

The Ugandan education system comprises:

- 3 years of private, pre-primary Early Childhood Development (ECD);
- 7 years of primary education from age 6, finishing with the Primary Leaving Examination (PLE); 30% of schools are private covering 13% of primary pupils;
- Post-primary education, comprising for an individual child either:
  - 4 years of lower secondary education leading to the Uganda O-level Certificate of Education, followed by 2 years of upper secondary education leading to A-level; 69% of schools are private covering 40% of pupils; or
  - secondary-level business education, technical education and vocational education and training (BTVET);
- Tertiary education comprising, for an individual, either higher education or tertiary level BTVET.

Uganda adopted a Universal Primary Education (UPE) policy in 1997. In 2006, UPE was made fee-free and compulsory, the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES) providing grants to schools in lieu of fees. The 2008 Education Act extended UPE to Universal Post-Primary Education and Training (UPPET), including Universal Secondary Education (USE). MOES provides grants to (some) government-aided schools, and pays scholarships to some private schools under a public-private partnership (PPP). In 2012, a number of grants and scholarships were also given at upper secondary level under a further policy of Universal Post-O-Level Education and Training (UPOLET). MOES also encourages, but does not fund, universal ECD.
The sector has a good sector policy framework for equity and inclusion covering location, disadvantaged groups, special needs and gender equity.

Sector Management

Primary education is overseen by District Education Offices (DEOs), whilst secondary schools and primary teachers colleges (PTCs) are overseen by MOES. ‘Foundation bodies’ (mostly church based) of both private and government-aided schools manage their schools through a School Management Committee (SMC) at primary level or Board of Governors (BOG) at secondary level. These are responsible for the management and supervision of the school programme in partnership with DEOs and MOES. However, many BOGs and SMCs are inactive and many DEOs are seriously understaffed, underfunded and thus relatively ineffective. There are systems in place for in-service primary teacher training, though not as yet for secondary in-service training. Both the primary and secondary curricula have recently been revised, though over-ambitiously in terms of the associated need for teacher training and the provision of instructional materials.

Sector Financing

Although the education budget itself is well balanced, the proportion of the national budget going to education is declining (13.1% in 2011) and is very low by regional standards. Education funding has been crowded out by National Core Projects in Energy and Transport. Funding for the evolving Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP), the basis for the Education Sector Wide Approach (SWAp), has steadily declined rather than increased as intended, with a current shortfall of US$150 million. UPE capitation grants are 40% below the amount planned in the ESSP.

Education outcomes

Under-funding, rapid expansion (through population growth and UPE/USE) and inadequate management, have led to low and declining education outcomes for girls and boys:

- Whilst initial primary enrolment and attendance rates have increased since 2000, and are high for boys and girls from all social backgrounds, only one third of students survive to the end of primary education. This is far below the fraction in neighbouring countries and the Education Millennium Development Goal (MDG) target of universal completion of primary education. Only 20% of students reach O-level and only 10% reach A-level, with very marked differences between regions, districts and particularly income groups.

- Less than half of primary students meet the minimum levels of literacy and numeracy in the National Assessments of Performance in Education (NAPE); and in the second year of secondary education, less than half meet the minimum NAPE standards for mathematics, whilst less than a quarter meet the minimum standards for science.

- Whilst gender equity is good up to primary year 5, after this level girls drop out more rapidly than boys, with a growing gender gap for secondary education and very large and growing gender gap for BTVEET. Girls have a lower pass rate than boys at PLE. And whilst more girls than boys achieve a pass at O-level, their performance is worse above the basic level. Girls score well below boys in the NAPE assessments of numeracy/mathematics and science. Girls also have lower access to what is already an inadequate provision for inclusive education.

- Survival rates are, overall, slightly better in private schools, gender equity is similar and PLE performance is slightly higher, though with wide variations. But this is at 17 times the cost. Performance at secondary level depends more on student investment (e.g. fees) than type of school, but private schools appear to achieve higher performance for the same investment.
Interventions to improve education outcomes

The drop in government funding to the sector in real terms has been accompanied by a significant decrease in Development Partner (DP) support, especially budgetary support and project support to primary education. Most new DP funding to the sector is going to BTVET. USAID provides the main bilateral support to primary education, focusing on literacy, and there is significant funding from international NGOs. For secondary education, the main support comes from the World Bank dealing with access, instructional materials and central reforms. Irish Aid has reduced its support to education and now focuses on Karamoja sub-region. JICA funds a Secondary Science and Mathematics Teachers Programme (SESEMAT).

Irish Aid and UNICEF have been the main non-NGO DPs supporting girls’ education, alongside the Uganda chapter of the Forum for Africa Women Educators (FAWE). Irish Aid has supported a technical (non-established) Girls Education Unit in MOES, but funding comes to an end in December. Irish Aid also supports secondary girls’ bursaries and secondary school construction in Karamoja. UNICEF leads the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI). It also receives DFID support for Girls’ Education Movement (GEM) clubs in schools and for girls’ scholarships.

There is an effective Government system for sectoral coordination, both internally and with DPs, the latter including a Quality Education Initiative monitoring 12 disadvantaged districts. DPs also have their own coordination system within the sector. Last year DPs identified gaps in DP support to gender policy, science for girls in secondary schools, and early grades numeracy.

Impact and Outcome for Proposed Support

The intended impact of DFID support for girls’ education could be an increased proportion of better-educated women able to contribute to a reduction of poverty in Uganda. This would lead, in turn, to improved national and family incomes, improved family health and an increase in women entering business and the professions including teaching.

The medium term requirement for this impact is an increased proportion of girls completing primary and secondary education and having improved learning outcomes. More research is needed on causes of drop-out and low achievement, especially for girls, but these appear to include:

- affordability and cost-effectiveness – high user costs of even fee-free primary education and especially of secondary education alongside a low quality of provision exacerbated by high teacher absenteeism and poor teaching;
- teenage pregnancy and early marriage;
- the lack of a safe environment for learning including water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) facilities;
- negative expectations from the school on girls’ ability to succeed, exacerbated by the shortage of female teachers, and cultural discrimination against girls with the expectation that they will care for sick relatives and provide unpaid or under-paid labour.

Many of these factors can be tackled by a whole school development approach to quality improvement including: improved governance, teacher-training and quality assurance; the provision of a safe, ‘pupil-friendly’ and especially ‘girl-friendly’ learning environment; community involvement to strengthen parental support for education especially of girls and including adolescent mothers.

Given that the major part of such improvement in quality will be common to boys and girls, a twin track approach is recommended. The proposed outcome for future DFID support is: an improved
quality of primary and secondary education for all children within schools supported by DFID, and a reduction in gender barriers to girls’ participation and achievement in these schools.

Feasible Options

If DFID does not intervene, it is unlikely that another DP will provide significant support to the outcome proposed above, especially at primary level. Support from DFID can help:

(a) Improve the quality of education using the World Bank ‘School Effectiveness Model’:
- Strengthen school-level governance, district oversight and social auditing to reduce teacher and head-teacher absence and monitor standards of school operation and management;
- Improve school leadership, organisation, culture, quality assurance and support through a ‘whole school development’ approach to school improvement;
- Enhance school resources through a performance-based enhancement of school grants linked to the planning and execution of a school improvement program;
- Improve teacher performance through enhanced in-service training.

(b) Reduce barriers to girls’ education, building on DFID’s existing experience through UNICEF, by:
- Providing a secure, ‘girl friendly’ environment in the school as part of the whole school development approach and in-service teacher training;
- Using community participation activities linked to the school and GEM clubs to reduce discrimination against girls, including by supporting the return to school of young mothers;
- Reducing cost barriers to quality secondary education for girls most likely to benefit by providing merit-based scholarships to private schools as part of the PPP, possibly linked to private sector strengthening;
- Enhancing teacher training in relation to girls’ education, especially in numeracy, mathematics and science;
- Strengthening national dialogue, policy and strategy development for girls’ education with support from an established and strengthened MOES Girls’ Education Unit that undertakes research, monitoring and advocacy within and beyond the sector.

Options for DFID to support these areas include:

(i) school, district and central level support to improve the effectiveness of a sample of disadvantaged, government-aided primary schools as indicated in (a) above;

(ii) extending the school development process backed by performance-related grants to government-aided secondary schools;

(iii) strengthening governance in government-aided secondary schools;

(iv) providing merit-based girls’ scholarships to private schools, possibly linked to a PPP for school construction and development.

Other optional additions include: gender-oriented in-service teacher training at secondary level, especially in relation to science and mathematics; support to the Education Standards Agency; gender-oriented support to pre-service teacher training; support to early grades numeracy.

---

1 See Theory of Change diagram in Annex D.
**Possible delivery mechanisms and overlap with other DFID programmes**

Given the scale of the problem and the low level of government and other DP resources, a national DFID-funded programme would not be cost-effective. A narrow geographical focus along the lines of Irish Aid support to Karamoja is logistically simpler, but a wider, more representative geographical sample could have more impact on the sector as a whole.

Funding and procurement through government is not appropriate given the problems of low governance and accountability that the program is tackling and the innovative nature of the grants and school development. However, funding should shadow that of government where possible. Capacity development should build on existing government and NGO initiatives, including that of the Joint Christian Council given the high level of church involvement, and take due account of private sector initiatives. And the programme as a whole should be well integrated into the ESSP and sector coordination mechanisms.

Besides synergies with other programmes in the education sector, DFID support to the education sector would enhance and be enhanced by support to the health sector. There might be useful synergies in co-locating DFID education and health initiatives in the same districts, where appropriate for both sectors. There is also the potential for mutual enhancement of education support and DFID’s programmes for wealth creation, governance and security, and other hunger, poverty and vulnerability programmes.
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG</td>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTVET</td>
<td>Business education, technical education and vocational education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>District Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEO</td>
<td>District Education Office/Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Development Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSC</td>
<td>District Service Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCC</td>
<td>Education Sector Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSAPR</td>
<td>Education and Sports Sector Annual Progress Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSP</td>
<td>Education Sector Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawe</td>
<td>Forum for African Women Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEM</td>
<td>Girls' Education Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>Gross Enrolment Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOES</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOFPED</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEF</td>
<td>Medium Term Expenditure Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPE</td>
<td>National Assessment of Performance in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDC</td>
<td>National Curriculum Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>Net Enrolment Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERP</td>
<td>Primary Education Reform Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFM</td>
<td>Public Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLE</td>
<td>Primary Leaving Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>Primary Teachers' College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>Student Classroom Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESEMAT</td>
<td>Secondary Science and Mathematics Teacher Education Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STR</td>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAp</td>
<td>Sector Wide Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDMS</td>
<td>Teacher Development Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UACE</td>
<td>Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEB</td>
<td>Uganda National Examinations Board UNGEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGEI</td>
<td>United Nations Girls Education Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPE</td>
<td>Universal Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPOLET</td>
<td>Universal Post-0-level Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPET</td>
<td>Universal Post-Primary Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>Universal Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 CONTEXT AND NEED

1.1 The Ugandan Context

Uganda is a low-income country with a per capita GDP of US$1,400\(^2\) aspiring to become a middle-income country by 2040. Uganda’s national plan sees its economic growth as severely hampered by an inadequately educated and trained work force. ‘There is a high growth rate of 3.7 per cent per annum in the unskilled labour force but what the economy requires is skilled labour hence contributing to high levels of unemployment and under-employment\(^3\). At present, female participation in skilled employment is far below that of men, whilst half of women in rural areas are in unpaid family work.\(^4\)

Uganda’s ability to reach its social and economic goals is also hampered by its high population growth rate of 3.2% per annum, the third highest in the world, little action being taken to reduce fertility.\(^5\) ‘The daunting challenge of attaining a relatively higher per-capita income level in the face of a rapidly rising population … will require a massive increase in skilled labour\(^6\). This also places heavy demands from the increasing numbers of children needing education. The causes of high fertility include low levels of education’\(^7\). The education of girls, especially to secondary level, has been shown in many studies to have a significant impact on reducing the birth rate\(^8\).

There are significant health problems in Uganda, including resurgent HIV/AIDS, with over 130,000\(^9\) new HIV infections in 2010, 1.2 million people living with HIV including 150,000 children and 2,600 teachers, and an ongoing problem of AIDS orphans. Every day, 16 women die from pregnancy or childbirth. Malaria is the country’s biggest killer, yet only 41% of the population use mosquito nets. High levels of family ill health and parental death make it more difficult for families to support children in school, and especially girls who are expected to care for sick relatives and substitute for sick or deceased parents.

Standards of governance are stagnating: widespread corruption and weak systems of accountability, in education as in other sectors, remain day-to-day concerns for citizens, investors and development partners. In addition, there are major regional, district and especially urban-rural differences in access to government services including education, and in the quality of these services. There has been no peaceful transition of power since independence. The drivers of past conflict persist: further violence resulting from poor governance, ethnic divisions or unequal regional development would have a rapid and damaging impact on economic progress.

---

2 The CIA World Factbook (2013) ranks Uganda 202nd of 220 countries in terms of per capita income.
4 Hisali A. (2011), ‘Trade, employment and gender: the case of Uganda’, OECD 2010, www.oecd.org/site/tad/cite/48722379.pdf, [accessed 18.03.2013]. This also quotes the percentages for female over total participation in various forms of employment: education and health 44.7%; all government employment 37.1%; public administration 9.9%; commercial sector real-estate, finance and similar 35.3%; transport and communications 8.3%; unpaid family worker 73.4%.
8 ‘Latin America and the Caribbean, sub-Saharan Africa and Western Asia display the largest differentials: in these regions, women with a secondary or higher education ultimately have about 3 children fewer than women with no education.’ UN Population Division Report ‘Population, Education and Development’, 2003
9 The education-related statistics in this paragraph are from the 2010 Uganda Education Statistical Abstract; other data is from the DFID-Uganda Operational Plan 2011-2015
1.2 The Ugandan Education Context

1.2.1 Sector structure and scale

Uganda’s education sector system:

- 3 years of pre-primary education in 6,579 10 private ‘Early Childhood Development’ (ECD) Centres;
- 7 years (from age 6) of compulsory, primary education in 17,865 primary schools. 30% of primary schools are private and 70% ‘government aided’; 75% are in rural areas, and 8% are partially or fully boarding.
- ‘Post primary education’ comprising the following streams:
  - 6 years of secondary education (4 lower secondary, 2 advanced secondary) in 3,234 secondary schools. 69% of secondary schools are private and 31% ‘government aided’. 45% are in rural areas, and 34% are partially or fully boarding.
  - Basic vocational education, as an alternative to lower secondary education, in community colleges and village polytechnics.
  - As an alterative to advanced secondary education, business education, technical education and vocational education and training (BTVET) in one of over 230 government and private colleges, including 47 government and 6 private Primary Teachers’ Colleges (PTCs).
- 2 to 5 years of post-advanced-secondary ‘tertiary education’ covering higher education (8 government universities, 30 private universities, plus a number of other higher education institutions) and tertiary level BTVET institutions.

1.2.2 Sector policy

Uganda’s education policy is, in terms of its long-term trajectory, in line with international best practice. However it is over-ambitious given Uganda’s current resources and education budget.

Equitable access to quality education is part of Uganda’s Poverty Eradication Action Plan, and forms the following strategic objectives of the Ministry of Education and Sports (MOES): ‘Education for the disadvantaged groups from 6 years to 18 years; ‘Ensure equal access by Gender, District and Special Needs at all levels of Education.’ The last of six ‘Overall Policy Thrusts from the Revised Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) 2007-2015 is: ‘improving the delivery of education services in disadvantaged areas of Uganda and to vulnerable groups including the disabled’.

In regard to gender, the ESSP notes the following: ‘Promoting Gender equity in education is an overarching principle that cuts across all areas of educational services. National Strategy for Girls’ Education in Uganda (2000) aimed at eradicating barriers that keep girls from education and it endorsed the importance of girls’ education under the previous ESIP. The Gender in Education Sector Policy was introduced in 2009 and it enforces the Ministry’s agenda on gender equity under the ESSP. Now “gender mainstreaming no longer an option but mandatory”.’

---

10 The data in this section is from the 2010 Uganda Education Statistical Abstract being the most complete, up to date statistics available. (For example, the 2011 Education Statistical Abstract was only able to include data for 2,361 ECD Centres.)
The ESSP also notes that: ‘The Basic Education Policy for Educationally Disadvantaged Children (2006) is to be complemented by a new and costed policy on special and inclusive education for formal and non-formal education’.

The Uganda Government has developed a series of universal education policies that provide measures to increase enrolments by reducing user costs especially for low-income families:

- Uganda’s policy of fee-free, compulsory Universal Primary Education (UPE) was launched in 1996. Tuition fees are paid to the school by government through a capitation grant, alongside a school facilities grant and examination fees.

- UPE was extended to Universal Post Primary Education and Training (UPPET) and regulated, along with UPE, in the 2008 Education Act. Tuition-free Universal Secondary Education (USE) is funded in government-aided secondary schools on a similar basis to UPE: the placing of any financial demands or barriers against enrolment is illegal, although parents can make voluntary payments.

- Whilst encouraging and funding an expansion of the government-aided secondary schools, Government is also seeing to more rapidly expand secondary education under USE by funding scholarships to private secondary schools as a Public Private Partnership (PPP) in line with the National Development Plan’s ‘Business Approach’.

- In 2012, Government also similarly allocated grants and scholarships for post-O-level BT&VET and upper secondary education, as the start of a Universal Post-O-level Education and Training Policy (UPOLET).

- Access for all to (private) pre-school education is also encouraged, for example by encouraging primary schools to develop an ECD centre feed in to their courses.

1.2.3 Sector management

There are sound, decentralised structures for managing the education sector. But low capacity in terms of numbers and training of managers, especially at institution and district levels, means that few of these systems operate efficiently or provide adequate accountability.

The 1997 Local Government Act made District Councils responsible for pre-primary and primary education. MOES remains responsible for post-primary and tertiary education including primary teacher education, and overall strategic and sectoral oversight.

The 2008 Education Act defined primary School Management Committees (SMCs) and secondary school Boards of Governors (BOGs) to be responsible for the school and its resources, including school grants and scholarships, acting through its secretary: the School Head Teacher. They are responsible for the school grants and scholarships paid direct to the school by the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MOFPED). However, most SMCs and BOGs are inactive. The school ‘foundation body’ has a key role in agreeing with Government the appointment of the Head Teacher, chairing the SMC or BOG, and nominating half the membership of the SMC and 5 of 12 BOG members. The Education Department of Uganda Joint Christian Council reports

---

11 SMC nominees must include at least 2 women and the BOG nominees at least one woman. Besides representatives of the foundation body, the SMCs or BOGs comprise representatives of local government, parents, staff and former students. The foundation bodies of the 3,234 secondary schools (government-aided and private) include religious foundations (1216 schools, mainly Catholic and Church of Uganda); private entrepreneurs (1118 schools) and community schools (514 schools). MOES does not provide statistics on foundation bodies for primary schools.
that 78% of education institutions in Uganda have either a Catholic, Church of Uganda or Orthodox Church foundation body.

Private schools are inspected for registration and licensing by the Ministry of Education using guidelines from the Education Standards Agency (ESA).

School curricula for all schools are set by the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC), and examinations and assessments by the Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB). The primary school curriculum has recently been amended towards thematic as opposed to subject-based teaching in P1 to P3, and with more emphasis on continuous assessment. A lower secondary level curriculum is currently being developed with again a curriculum that moves away from the conventional curriculum subjects. Both curricula are very different from those teachers will have experienced, and require a high level of teacher training if they are to be taught effectively. However, teachers received very little in-service training for the new primary curriculum, there is currently no system for secondary-level in-service training, and pre-service courses are slow to change to the new approach.

Primary education teachers receive their initial training in a Primary Teachers’ College (PTC). Primary level in-service training, under the Teacher Development Management System (TDMS), is organised by an ‘Outreach’ department of a number of ‘Core PTCs’ operating through a network of other PTCs. Pre-service teacher training is provided in a smaller number of National Teachers’ Colleges and Education Faculties of Universities. There is currently no system of in-service training for secondary school teachers. All teacher-training curricula are set by Kyambogo University (formerly Kyambogo National Teachers’ College).

The ESSP notes that action needs to be taken to (a) reduce the pool of untrained teachers; (b) attract a better quality of applicant (noting that, despite a recent increase in salary, teaching tends to be seen as the career for those who are qualified but unable to get any other employment); (c) remove ‘ghost teachers’; (d) reduce teacher and head-teacher absenteeism; (e) strengthen in-service training to improve teaching methodology, especially in relation to the new early-years thematic curriculum (many teachers having very poor teaching styles based on dictation and rote learning, with little use of education materials but excessive student testing based on past examination questions).

According to the 2008 Education Act, no person shall teach in any public or private school unless registered as a teacher. Applicants who have successfully completed the appropriate pre-service teacher education course can apply to the Director of Education to be registered. The Director of Education can also deregister a teacher ‘found guilty of misconduct’ or one who ‘has contravened or failed to comply with any condition of his or her license to teach’ on the advice of the Education Service Commission. In practice, such deregistration is very rare – teachers cannot easily be ‘sacked’. Registered primary school teachers are recruited for government-aided schools at district level by the District Service Commission (DSC) and managed by the District Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). All Government secondary teachers, teacher college staff and all national education sector staff are recruited and managed by the regionally based Education Service Commission on behalf of the Ministry of Public Service. Schools and individuals can request transfers but this is a long process. MOFPED pays all salaries direct to the employee.

Government and development partner plans are combined and costed in the ESSP, their implementation coordinated through an Education Sector Consultative Committee (ESCC) and Annual Review covering all relevant ministries, the main education institutions, DPs, civil society and the private sector. ESCC has technical working groups on financial management, sector policy and management, and monitoring and evaluation.
1.2.4 Sector financing

ESSPs to implement UPE policy were to have been financed by an annual increase in the education budget in real terms. However, whilst increasing in nominal terms, the budget has decreased in real terms leaving, in 2011/12, a shortfall of $105 million. Education’s share of total government expenditure has declined from a high of 20.6% in 2002/03 to 16.6% in 2006/07 and 13.1% in 2011 (reduced from 13.6% by supplementary budgeting), reflecting an increase in budget shares for energy and transport. The initial education budget estimate for 2012/13 is 14.9% and 17.4% for 2014/15, but these figures are expected to fall significantly in the final allocation. The Global Partnership for Education (GPE), from which Uganda is seeking support, requires supported countries to allocate a minimum of 18% of the national budget to education. Uganda’s education share of national income, 3.2% of GDP\(^\text{13}\), is also well below that of other East African Community (EAC) countries (Kenya 6.7%, Tanzania 6.2%) and the 6% recommended by GPE.

The 2010/11 – 2014/15 National Development Plan (NDP) notes the decrease in the education fraction of GDP from a peak of 7% in 2004 and its ongoing decline as a percentage of Uganda’s Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF). The NDP has the strengthening of Human Resource Development as its first priority, and sees inadequate education and training as one of the main constraints on the economy. It makes many references to the importance of education and training to social and economic development, including a reduction in the rate of population growth, and notes the major problems in sectoral outcomes. The NDP notes that ‘the current budgetary allocation is inadequate for the required expansion of service delivery in the sector to meet the projected social demand over the next decade’. But it offers few suggestions for overcoming this problem, other than better targeting of education grants and reducing the costs of especially secondary education. Thus the declining education budget does not appear to be an explicit policy within the NDP. The main cause of the decline appears to be the ‘National Core Projects’ in which education only features as a small ‘National Non-Formal Skills Development Programme’. These projects take the first call of budget resources. Thus the energy sector, which dominates the Core Projects, increases its MTEF allocation 3.5 times between 2010/11 and 2014/15. The transport sector also increases its allocation. Most other sectors suffer a minor decline, in the case of health by around 12%, whilst education suffers a 32% decline. The reasons for this higher decline in education financing are not apparent from the NDP. Though the NDP expects the declines in education and other sector funding to be reversed as the Core Projects are completed.

Budgeting across the education sector is in accordance with international benchmarks: over 50% goes to primary education and over 20% on non-salary recurrent expenditure. A minimum of 8% of the recurrent budget is earmarked for instructional materials.

The education vote is split between:

(a) MOES, for school construction and renovation, instructional materials, teacher development, assessment, monitoring and national level supervision (26% of education budget);

(b) Government Tertiary Level Institutions (8% of education budget);

(c) Local Government education budget (66% of education sector budget) which covers:
   - Salaries of government teachers in schools and post-primary BTVET institutions;
   - Capitation grants (23%) and school facilities grants (7%) to government schools and primary and lower secondary level BTVET institutions, and including

---

12 Except where otherwise noted, the data in this section is from the 2013/14 Education Sector Budget Framework Paper and the December 2012 Belgian Technical Cooperation Education Sector Budget Analysis

• Grants for school fees to 739 private schools forming part of the University Secondary Education (USE) Public Private Partnership (PPP) and 220 private schools forming part of the University Post O-level Education and Training (UPOLET) PPP;
• School facilities grants for primary school construction and renovation;
• District level education inspection and monitoring.

All grants have fallen in real terms. UPE capitation grants are 40% below the ESSP estimate. DEOs, District Inspectorates and teacher education institutions are seriously under-funded and under-staffed and thus constrained in their effectiveness.

Apart from the PPP, all private institutions are funded entirely through fees and donations, and managed by their Directors within government regulations and subject to government accreditation (licensing) and inspection. The PPP itself, although deemed a cost-effective way of expanding facilities for the rapidly increasing secondary education cohort, is significantly subsidising private secondary education beyond ESSP and budget projections.

The ESSP notes the Government of Uganda policy that ‘the state should finance 90 percent of the cost of primary education, 60 percent of the cost of academic secondary education, 40 percent of the cost of BTET and 50 percent of the cost of high tertiary education’. Government-aided lower secondary education is around 6 times as expensive as primary education whilst BTET is around 15 times as expensive as primary education. For government-aided schools, government provides teachers, textbooks, equipment and, for UPE/USE/UPOLET students, school fees. Parents pay for (or provide) other costs including food, uniforms, transport and writing materials.

A World Bank study\(^\text{14}\) identified average, annual per pupil costs to the household of primary and secondary education in 2006 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Government/Private</th>
<th>Fees (US$)(^\text{15})</th>
<th>Other costs (US$)</th>
<th>Total cost (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Government-aided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Government-aided</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Per-pupil annual costs to households in 2006** (Source Winkler and Sondergaard 2008)

A 2003 study\(^\text{16}\) of school dropout in Uganda found the costs of education to be a significant factor and thus a barrier to education for poorer students. However, even under UPE and USE, parents who can afford it are, according to the 2008 Education Act, able to voluntarily supplement school resources. And although UPE and USE have tended to make many parents see education as the State’s and not their responsibility, many parents are willing to pay - as is evident from the growing private sector. Thus there is scope for government to encourage more parental and community support whilst focusing existing grants more towards those who need them. There may also be scope for improving the efficiency of government-aided secondary schools and thus reducing the grants needed to give an acceptable quality of education. This is an approach being followed within the World Bank project.

---


\(^{15}\) This should have been zero for government-aided primary schools had schools been correctly implementing the UPE policy in place in 2006

\(^{16}\) Musisi N et al. (2003), ‘Attendance Patterns and causes of dropout in primary schools in Uganda: a case study of 16 schools’, Makerere University Institute of Social Research, Kampala
1.3 Education Outcomes

1.3.1 School and BTVET access indicators

Annex B summarises the data relating to access to schools in Uganda. There are significant problems with, and apparent contradictions between, data sets due to: (a) the tendency of school and other institution heads not to keep adequate records or to inflate numbers that determine their capitation grants\(^\text{17}\), (b) gaps in the data supplied to the Education Management Information System (EMIS), (c) uncertainties over the age of students. The MOES Statistical Abstracts note these problems.

Figure 1 shows primary school net enrolment ratios for boys and girls since 2000. This suggests fairly healthy progress towards UPE and gender equity at primary level.

![Figure 1: Percentage primary school net enrolment ratios since 2000](Source: EMIS 2000-2012 data presented in the Education and Sports Sector Annual Performance Report October 2012)

However, when we look at the levels of pupil enrolment in each level of education as shown in Figure 2, a different picture emerges. There is a **very high level of dropout** from P1 (primary year one) onwards, with less than one third of students, male and female, surviving to P7. This survival rate has increased steadily since 2003 when only 21% of boys and 23% of girls reached P7. But it is half the survival rate of 61% and 68% respectively in 2000, and is far below the survival rates to P7 in Kenya and Tanzania. **Uganda is far from the Millennium Development Goal of universal completion of primary education.**

From primary 6 onwards, increasingly fewer girls than boys are enrolled. But the main problem, as for boys, is the continuing high level of dropout, with less than 20% of boys and girls reaching O-level and less than 10% reaching A-level.

Figure 3 shows the growth in secondary school enrolments since 2000. This growth is well above the population growth rate and has accelerated since the launch of USE, though most of the increase is a carry through from the launch of UPE.

Figure 2 does not capture the 24% of secondary school leavers entering BTVET institutions. These enrolments since 2000 are shown in Figure 3. Enrolments have also grown significantly in this subsector, but with a very large and growing gap between male and female enrolment.

\(^{17}\) Musisi N et al. (2003), ‘Attendance Patterns and causes of dropout in primary schools in Uganda: a case study of 16 schools’, Makerere University Institute of Social Research, Kampala, found that: ‘In trying to verify the data supplied to EMIS, the research team found that information from school records examined was in disarray. There was no single school out of those visited that had complete records for a complete year, leave alone the period for which UPE has been running.’
Other access indicators include a high level of over-age enrolment (51% for P1 and 81% at secondary level) and high rates of repetition of primary school grades (10%) – in contravention of
the government policy of automatic progress to the next year of education. Both rates are higher for girls than boys. And both of these have a negative impact on the retention of girls in school. Late entry means that girls reach puberty mid way through primary school, and what many rural communities regard as marriageable age. (The official marriageable age is 18 but many girls marry much earlier). Repetition doubles the cost of studies for families (as well as government) and repeating students tend to drop-out.

The rates of those registered as having special needs are below those actually requiring special help by a factor of between 4 and 8, with girls more discriminated against than boys. In many countries, children with disabilities form a major proportion of those not in school. Only 2.8% of boys and 2.2% girls in Ugandan primary schools pupils are registered with special needs, with a similar proportion at pre-school level. Few pupils so registered reach secondary education.

Variations by region and family income

![Graphs showing regional variations in gross enrolment ratio (GER) and gender equity](image)

**Figure 5: Regional variations in the gross enrolment ratio (GER) and Gender Equity**
(Source: Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2010)

Figure 5 shows that regional variations in access and gender equity are greatest at secondary level and only minor at primary level, though are also significant for ECD. There are larger variations between districts, 6 in the North having a primary level GER below 50%.

![Graph showing school net attendance ratios by wealth quintile](image)

**Figure 6: School net attendance ratios by wealth quintile**
(Source: Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2011)

Figure 6 shows that family income has a relatively minor impact on primary attendance and gender equity in attendance at all levels; however it has a major impact on attendance ratios for ECD and secondary education.
Figure 7: Levels of Education of women aged 15 to 49 by wealth quintile
(Source: Uganda Demographic and Health Survey 2011)

Figure 7 shows that whilst there is a high dropout rate for all income quintiles, the rate is highly dependent on family income, and especially marked between the highest quintile and other quintiles.

Public-Private differences in enrolment

Enrolment at primary level is overwhelming in the government-aided sector: whilst 30% of primary schools are private, they cater for only 13% of primary pupils. Similarly, whilst 69% of secondary schools are private, they cater for only 40% of secondary students. The gender balance for private schools is similar to government-aided schools. Drop-out rates are high in both, but significant lower in the private sector: 24% of boys and 23% of girls drop out from private primary schools after P1 compared with 31% for both sexes in government aided primary schools.

1.3.2 Sector quality outcomes

Examination performance

Primary Leaving Examination (PLE)

Pass rates in 2011 were 88% for boys and 85% for girls. The proportion of girls in the total entry was 49.3%, whilst the proportion of girls in those passing was 48.3%.

Uganda Certificate of Education O-levels

The proportion of girls sitting for O-levels in 2010 was 46.5% of the total candidature. The pass rate was slightly higher for girls (96.2%) than for boys (95.8%). However the performance index for boys was higher for boys (50%) than for girls (46%).

Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education (UACE)

The proportion of girls sitting UACE in 2010 was 41% of the total candidature. Those achieving a score allowing entry to tertiary institutions was higher for girls (71%) than for boys (66%).
National Assessments of Performance in Education (NAPE)

P3 Assessments

In 2011, only 47.3% of boys and 48.5% reached the expected level of literacy; 45.6% of boys and 46.9% of girls achieved the expected level of oral reading; and 65% of boys and 61% of girls achieved the expected level of numeracy.

P6 Assessments

In 2011, only 42.1% of boys and 40.6% of girls reached the expected level of literacy; 49.6% of boys and 41.7% of girls achieved the expected level of numeracy.

S2 Assessments

In 2011, 64.9% of boys and 67.9% reached the expected competence in English Language; 43.9% of boys and 32.2% of girls achieved the expected competence in mathematics; 24.2% of boys and 14.9% of girls achieved the expected competence in biology.

As shown in Figure 8, primary assessments improved to 2008, but have declined since 2010.

As shown in Figure 9, the assessments for S2 have shown a steady decline in performance, except for an improvement in mathematics results over the last year.
Private schools

A recent study of the technical efficiency of primary schools in Uganda\(^{18}\) found that, whilst private schools achieved higher performance in the PLE (performance index 54% compared with 44% for government aided schools), urban private schools in particular had much lower efficiency; private school per student investment was 17 times that for government aided schools (around $140 for private schools and around $8 for government aided schools). A 2008 study on secondary schools\(^{19}\) found that, whilst for both government and private schools performance depended strongly on the per-student investment, private schools achieved higher performance for the same investment.

Other measures of Quality of Education Provision

Student Classroom Ratio (SCR) and Student Teacher Ratio (STR)

**ECD:** The average SCR in 2010 for permanent classrooms was 50, varying from 43 in central and southwest sub-regions to 1,596 in the north-east sub-region – and even 419 for any kind of building. The average STR was 25, varying widely from 23 in central and east regions to 79 in the northeast sub-region, with much larger variations between districts.

**Primary:** The average SCR was 67 in government schools, 32 in private, and 58 overall. The range extended from 28 in Western Region private schools to 80 in private North-east sub-region schools (and 80 in Eastern and Northern Region government schools). In some districts, the SCR is over 100 and well over 100 for P1 students\(^{20}\). The STR was 57 in government schools, 26 in private schools and 49 overall. The range extended from 24 in Central Regional private schools to 99 in private schools in North Eastern sub-region. Again, the range was even wider between districts and communities. SCRs increased by around 2% in all schools between 2011 and 2012. STRs remained constant in government-aided schools but fell by around 8% in private schools.

**Lower secondary:** Under the IDA-support Post-primary Education and Training Project, MOES is increasing the SCR and STR, from 64 and 27 respectively in 2007, to 70 and 33 in 2011. The intention is to increase double-shift schooling, allowing one class to use a classroom in the morning and another in the afternoon, thereby halving the effective SCR for each class. SCRs were constant between 2009 and 2011 but then increased by 14%, whilst STRs increased by 21%.

Teacher-pupil absenteeism

The monitoring of 585 primary schools through UNICEF’s eduTrac showed that head-teachers were absent 37% of the time in term 2 and 39% in term 3. Teachers were absent 24% of the time in term 2 and 28% in term 3. Pupils were absent 25% of the time in term 2 and 26% in term 3. A study of reasons teachers gave for their colleagues’ absenteeism in one district in Uganda\(^{21}\) included involvement in income-generating activities (40.7%), domestic problems (28.4%), transport problems (19.9%), and collecting salaries from the bank (10.6%). The main reason head-teachers gave for teacher absence was sickness (33%), though community respondents denied this. Pupil performance correlated with teacher absence, and pupils interviewed identified teacher absence as the main cause of poor performance.


\(^{20}\) MOES (2010), Quality Enhancement Initiative First Monitoring and Evaluation Report

Teacher qualifications
In 2010, 63% of primary school teachers were qualified to Grade III level, the minimum for serving teachers (O-level pass and 2-3 years of successful pedagogical training in a primary teachers’ college). 1.3% were below this level, 16.7% possessed a diploma and 2.7% a degree.

Pupil Textbook Ratio
At lower secondary level, MOES has the target, as part of the Post-primary Education and Training Project, of reducing the pupil textbook ratio from 11 in 2007 to 4 in 2011.

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)
In 2010, 32% of ECD centres have piped water, 35.5% access a borehole, 12% possibly no water source. 66% of schools had their water source within 1 km of the school.

14% of primary schools had piped water, 51% access to a borehole, 21% a well or spring, whilst 8.4% relied on a rainwater tank

The number of ECD students per ‘stance’ (toilet or urinal) was 22 on average, varying from 17 in central region to 346 in north-east sub-region (or at a district level, between 9 and 1,626). The number of primary school students per ‘stance’ was 38 on average, varying from 29 in central region to 40 in northern region (and more widely at district level).

Food
Children cannot learn efficiently if they are hungry. Parents are expected to provide breakfast before children go to school and a packed lunch if they are staying in the afternoon. In practice, many parents find difficulty with this. In the QEI sample of the 12 districts with the worst education outcomes, only 28% had eaten breakfast before their morning classes and only 15% of those staying for the afternoon came with a lunch, though a further 23% went home for lunch. For 13%, lunch was prepared by the school. But just under half had no meal before their afternoon classes.

School violence and teenage pregnancy
The UNICEF-supported eduTrac monitoring by mobile phone, in a sample of 646 primary schools, found that on average 2.5 cases of violence were entered into the report book per school per year. We also learned of as yet unpublished evidence suggesting that 70% of children, including both sexes, are sexually abused within or outside the school. A survey by the Uganda chapter of the Forum for Africa Women Educators (FAWE)22 found that 40% of pupils have (unprotected) sex, 30% of girls in low category schools have had sex for money (some perhaps to cover the costs of schooling). 35% have given birth before the age of 18. This was seen by teachers and pupils interviewed in this survey as the biggest single cause of girls dropping out of school.

1.4 Interventions to improve education outcomes

1.4.1 Continuing Government and Development Partner Coordination and the ESSP

Since 1992, the sectoral coordination between MOES, DPs and civil society has operated through an Education Sector Wide Approach (SWAP). All support to the sector is expected to be in accordance with the ESSP and coordinated through the ESCC and its task forces. The EU provides sector budget support against criteria linked to implementation of the ESSP, though other sector budget support, for example from Irish Aid (IA) is being phased out.

Much of the ESSP and its reporting through the annual Education and Sports Sector Annual Performance Report (ESSAPR) covers routine ongoing activities. However, successive ESSAPRs also have a particular focus and include some project activity. The 2012 theme was ‘addressing learning outcomes for enhanced competences, with emphasis on the need to stem declining proficiency levels in literacy and numeracy at primary level; and declining performance in English, Physics, Mathematics and Biology at secondary level.’ An additional concern was an ‘inability to import required skills for employability and entrepreneurship at BTWET and tertiary levels of education’. However, gender and social inclusion were not part of the agreed recommendations and reforms for 2011/12. Projects referenced in the ESSAPR included World Food Program (WFP) for food schools in Karamoja (with uncertain continuation depending on US grain supplies), and government provision of seeds and other agricultural support to encourage Karamoja youth to diversify from cattle keeping.

In 2008, MOES and DPs agreed a Quality Enhancement Initiative (QEI) to focus on quality improvement in 12 ‘least performing districts’23 (several no longer being ‘least performing’). In practice, only UNICEF has provided support alongside MOES particularly to these districts; but they have been used by the ESSAPR all DPs as a monitoring tool for the ESSP.

DPs in the education sector have their own coordination mechanism. An overall coordinator is appointed each January (currently Irish Aid) and a co-coordinator in June (currently Belgium, to be replaced by UNICEF). The working group coordinators and teams are shown in Annex C.

1.4.2 DP interventions

The major channel for DP support to education in Uganda since 2003 has been sector budget support. The 2009 statement of the 2007-2014 ESSP noted such support from the World Bank, the European Union, the African Development Bank, and the governments of the Netherlands, Ireland and Belgium, with a joint budget support framework established in 2009. Bilateral and EU budget support was suspended in 2012 due to inadequate financial controls.

DP project support to primary and post-primary education in 2009 included Irish Aid, USA, UNICEF, Germany, Japan, WFP, UNCHR, UNFPA and UNESCO. The main existing DP-supported programmes are shown in Annex C.

DPs last year identified in particular the following gaps in DP support: gender policy, female science in secondary education, early grades numeracy.

Primary Education

Irish Aid had provided the main DP funding for primary education, in 2007-2009 providing €25.7m

23 The QEI districts are Lyantonde and Mubende (Central Region); Kyenjojo and Bulisa (Western Region); Bududa and Bukedea (Eastern Region); Nakapiripirit, Kaabong, Oyam, Amuru, Arua and Nebbi (Northern Region).
of sector budget support and €15.6m of project support through a Primary Education Reform Programme (PERP). This supported the review of the Primary Teacher Education Curriculum, UNEB, Education Service Commission, Directorate of Education Standards, NCDC, two districts and a PTC ICT project. PERP ended in 2009, and current education project support from Irish Aid is only for secondary education, not primary education, and focuses on Karamoja. Irish Aid’s 2010 to 2012 Country Strategy states: ‘In education, support will concentrate on the Sector Strategic Plan, the quality education initiative and the Karamoja education programme. This represents a significant reduction in interventions in the sector .... Irish Aid is currently completing the rehabilitation of 13 post primary institutions in the Karamoja region and will continue to support a secondary school bursary scheme. Ireland is also working with Japan on a joint teacher training initiative that is helping to improve the quality of instruction in science and mathematics in Karamoja.’

An independent evaluation of Irish Aid’s 2007-2009 Country Strategy Paper\(^{24}\) noted the positive impact of the Education Programme but the need for greater focus within the programme and more effective high-level policy engagement, though did not discuss the move to secondary education. The following quotation from the evaluation is also interesting given the comments in 1.2.4 above on government underfunding of the sector: ‘MOES’s Planning Department – while acknowledging that budget support should be the preferred modality – also stated that Irish Aid should continue to fund projects, both on- and off-budget, because of their urgency and they would not receive priority under the MOFPED budget approvals and ceilings’.

Between 2006 and 2011, USAID provided just under $40m to primary and secondary education through a UNITY project. UNITY provided technical support to MOES to improve the quality of primary education whilst focusing on the northern and eastern regions of Uganda that were negatively affected by conflict. UNITY supported curriculum reform, teacher professional development, HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation, increasing parental and community involvement in school management, and developing and tracking education policies. The latter emphasis was further supported between 2009 and 2011 (now extended to 2014) by support at primary level to the strengthening of EMIS. The mid term evaluation of UNITY endorsed the overall impact of the programme, but recommended a much tighter focus and more emphasis on basic literacy. A new $56m programme to 2016 tightly focuses on support to early years literacy, including related mother tongue teaching and materials. This was launched in 2012.

‘Citing concerns over corruption, poor standards and poor public financial management, the Dutch government decided in November 2011 to withdraw some €14 million ($18.9 million) worth of annual assistance for Uganda’s education sector\(^{25}\). The Dutch Ambassador to Uganda ‘explained that several of the Dutch government’s concerns over how education sector programs in Uganda were handled have gone unaddressed, prompting the government to “ask ourselves some uncomfortable questions.” “We decided to shift our focus to productive areas like agriculture.”’

Belgium no longer funds general education, apart from finalizing the construction of two National Teachers’ Colleges, and instead has expanded its support to BTVET.

The remaining main source of official DP support to primary education is through UNICEF, with a $4.4m ‘Basic Requirements Minimum Standards’ Programme (with Netherlands funding), a $5.7m School Garden Project (with Netherlands funding) and a $9.5m Knowledge and Policy Development Project, the latter including support to Girls’ Education with funding from DFID.


There is also major support to primary education from International NGOs, including $18.8m from World Vision for an Access to Basic Education Programme, $12m from Save the Children and $2.5m per annum from Plan International ($1.3m for ECD and $1.2m for Quality Education).

Secondary Education

The main DP support to secondary education is from the World Bank Post-Primary Education and Training Project, now in its second phase: $125m 2013-2015. This focuses on: increasing access through school construction and policies to lower the cost of government-aided schools; improving quality through pre-service teacher training (expanding facilities), establishing a system for in-service teacher and head-teacher training, providing textbooks and science equipment, and developing the curriculum and associated assessment and examinations; reforming and strengthening BTVET. Secondary education infrastructure is also being supported by the African Development Bank (constructing schools and BTVET centres) and Belgium (constructing National Teachers’ Colleges).

Irish Aid is supporting secondary education in Karamoja by providing $28.5m for school construction and $2.4m for girls’ bursaries. An Independent evaluation of Irish Aid26 endorsed the impact of the bursaries after the allocation criteria had been tightened up and made more transparent, though it also recommended further action in this direction.

JICA’s system for in-service training and support for its $0.4m SESEMAT science and mathematics project is based on training centres located in a number of high quality government-aided secondary schools.

Girls’ education

Irish Aid and UNICEF have been the main DPs supporting girls’ education, alongside and via the NGO FAWE. Irish Aid has supported a technical (non-established) Girls Education Unit in MOES with funding coming to an end in December. Irish Aid also supports secondary girls’ bursaries and secondary school construction in Karamoja. UNICEF leads the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI). It also receives DFID support for Girls’ Education Movement (GEM) clubs in schools and for girls’ scholarships.

Public Private Partnerships

ARK (Absolute Return for Kids) and PEAS (Promoting Equality in African Schools) are two international limited companies that are building and managing a network of rural private secondary schools in Uganda27. Funding comes from MOES bursaries, in this case received in advance, alongside philanthropic investment. Schools are expected to be self-sufficient within two years of opening. Two schools have opened so far, and 8 more are expected to open by end 2014, with ARK training teachers to run intensive ‘catch-up courses’ to improve literacy and numeracy for all students. ARK/PEAS also hope in future to contract-manage new government-built schools.

GEMS Education is another international limited company that hopes to open an international secondary school in Uganda in September 201328. GEMS Education operates a number of such

schools globally\textsuperscript{29}, and encourages their students to support education for low-income communities. The Varkey GEMS Foundation\textsuperscript{30}, launched in 2010, is the philanthropic arm of GEMS Education, operating as an education-focused International NGO that has so far disbursed $40m globally, including refurbishing 16 classrooms and training 10,000 school head-teachers in Kenya.

The above summary of intervention is based on a short visit and search of background documentation. There may be other interventions, especially in the private and NGO sectors, with important lessons for the proposed DFID assistance. Further analysis and consultation should be undertaken to ensure that DFID assistance builds fully on opportunities and lessons from current and past interventions in the sector.

\textsuperscript{29} GEMS Education, together with its technical consultancy wing GEMS Education Solutions, is one of a number of organisations - including the not-for-profit agency CIBT - that manage schools in a number of countries and provide education technical consultancies.

2 IMPACT AND OUTCOME FOR PROPOSED SUPPORT

2.1 Impact on poverty reduction in Uganda

The intended impact of DFID support for girls’ education could be an increased proportion of better-educated women able to engage in productive economic activities and contribute to a reduction of poverty in Uganda.

Education for girls, as much as for boys, is a basic human right. The gender MDG has the target of eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education by 2005 and in all levels of education by 2015.

A large body of international evidence\textsuperscript{31} shows that this is also likely to lead to:

- A reduction in Uganda’s very high birth-rate and the demands it places on the economy. A 100 country study by the World Bank found that 4 additional years of education reduced fertility by roughly one birth per mother. A 65 country analysis found that doubling the proportion of women with secondary education would reduce average fertility rates from 5.3 to 3.9 children per woman. The expansion of female secondary education may be the best simple policy for achieving sustained reductions in fertility.\textsuperscript{32}

- Improved economic growth, employment prospects, family incomes and livelihoods especially for the poor. A 100 country study by the World Bank showed that increasing the share of women with secondary education by 1% boosts annual per capita income growth by 0.3%.\textsuperscript{33}

- Improved family health and nutrition. An extra year of girls’ education can reduce infant mortality by 5-10% - ‘especially striking in low income countries’.\textsuperscript{34} Also, educated girls are less likely to contract HIV\textsuperscript{35}. Young rural Ugandans with secondary education are three times less likely than those with no education to be HIV positive.\textsuperscript{36}

- An increase in the number of women entering business, the professions and political life; and as part of this, an increases proportion of female teachers providing a role model for further improving retention and learning outcomes of girls in schools.


\textsuperscript{34} Schultz T. (1993), ‘Returns to Women’s Education in Developing Countries’, in Women’s Schooling: Barriers, benefits and Policy, eds. King E and Hill M., John Hopkins University, Baltimore


2.2  **Medium term requirements for the impact to be achieved**  

The proposed impact requires an increased proportion of girls to successfully complete primary and secondary education. At present, two thirds of girls (and boys) do not even complete primary education – Uganda is far from achieving the education Millennium Development Goal (MDG 2) target of universal completion of primary education. (Completion rates for girls and boys are much higher in the neighbouring countries of Kenya and Tanzania and are therefore achievable for Uganda.) Uganda is also far from achieving the gender MDG: there is high gender inequity in secondary and post-secondary education.

**Tackling dropout from primary schools**

A study of drop-out from primary schools commissioned by MOES in 2003 sought children’s, teachers’ and community views on the causes of drop-out in 16 schools in 8 districts of all four regions of Uganda. The major factor identified by those who had dropped out was the 'lack of school requirements' (33%) and parents' inability to provide for this (15%). For girls, the second biggest factors were loss of a parent (30%) and early pregnancy (15%). Chronic family illness and grade repetition were also significant factors for girls (both 10%). Communities listed early marriage as the major cause (11% for female dropout but also 10% for male dropout), followed by families not valuing education (11% girls, 8% boys) and income related factors. The quality of instruction was not included in the list. However, children's main views on what should be done to improve matters reflected strong concerns about quality: ‘improve teaching standards’, recruit and supervise well good teachers’, ‘stop harsh punishments to pupils’, ‘treat children well’, ‘increase teachers' salaries to motivate them’.

A 2001 study of gender-specific barriers to girls’ primary education identified, on the demand side the following barriers: pregnancy (main factor) and early marriage (second most important factor); economic factors; the impact of traditional cultural beliefs; caring for the family; security fears, generally but especially in areas of conflict. Supply side constraints included sexual and general violence against girls, inadequate sanitary facilities, and negative expectations from the school, reinforced by insufficient exposure to educated women.

These barriers (though not necessarily their priority ordering) were echoed by those we interviewed and by the 2012 evaluation of the United Nations Girls’ Education Initiative (UNGEI) in Uganda.

A 2008 cross-country review of literature on children dropping out of primary school identified a relative dearth of research, particularly on ways of countering drop-out and enable children to return to school. Key recurring factors were the high costs of schooling for poorer families linked to the poor quality of education provided for such families. The review noted that in any situation a range of factors will interact leading to a child leaving school.

---

37 This forms part of the Theory of Change, see annex D.

38 The US Population Reference Bureau 'The World's Women and Girls 2011' data sheets show the mean gross primary completion rates 2005-2010 for boys and girls respectively as: Kenya 89%, 91%; Tanzania 102%, 102%; Uganda 56%, 56%. UNESCO statistics are incomplete but show a similar pattern.

39 Musisi N et al. (2003), 'Attendance Patterns and causes of dropout in primary schools in Uganda: a case study of 16 schools', Makerere University Institute of Social Research, Kampala


42 Hunt F. (2008), 'Dropping out from school: a cross-country Review of Literature', Create, University of Sussex
A study of Ghana and Tanzania\textsuperscript{43}, two countries that have significantly reduced school dropout, identified ways in which this had been achieved. These included means that are already in place in Uganda: fee-free policy, school grants and scholarships, and attempts to reduce over-age attendance. (The latter, \textit{inter alia}, reduces the proportion of girls reaching puberty midway through primary education.) The other successful approach was an emphasis on quality improvement. This was also seen by all those interviewed as a basic requirement for improving retention.

Given changes that might have occurred since the 2001 survey and the lack of any more recent, in-depth research, this is an area requiring further study. DFID support to the proposed outcome should be guided by further research on the relative importance of factors leading to drop-out in Uganda, especially in potential target districts, the extent to which they could be tackled through improved school effectiveness and other measures that might be possible and necessary to reduce the barriers to girls continuing their education.

\textbf{Improving progression to and through secondary education}

Most of the factors affecting dropout from primary school are likely to also apply at secondary level. Low family income is likely to be even more critical given the much higher user costs of secondary education. Thus scholarships are likely to be more effective at this level. Learning achievement, yielding success at O-level, will also be important to justify the expenditure. The main problem here for girls is their relatively poor performance in mathematics and science.

But again there appears to be a lack of recent research on survival and performance of boys and girls in secondary schools in Uganda, and any additional factors applying for girls. Again further research should be undertaken to underpin any DFID support.

\textbf{Learning outcomes}

The inadequate learning outcomes of boys and girls, but especially girls, is shown by the poor results in the National Assessment of Progress in Education (NAPE) assessments. These are carried out annually in years 3 and 6 of primary education (P1 and P2) and year 2 of secondary education (S2). They provide a snapshot on the improvement of learning outcomes from girls, although they are not effective for monitoring over a single phase of DFID intervention given the timescale needed to reverse the factors leading to low pupil achievement.

Improving learning outcomes for children attending school will depend on: (a) the child’s innate abilities; (b) factors within that child’s home environment that determine motivation and time spent studying at school or at home (for example other tasks that the child needs to undertake at home and parental concern for the child’s education); and (c) the effectiveness of the school. The last of these is the area in which an education project can have a significant direct impact, and is the area on which DFID support should therefore focus. Making a school more effective is also a potential means of reducing school drop-out: (a) by making the school more cost-effective; (b) by removing or reducing sexual and general violence and negative gender stereotyping; and (c) by encouraging a more positive attitude towards education, and the education of girls in particular, within the local community, including, for example, encouraging adolescent mothers to return to school.

A twin-track approach

A synthesis report on Girls' Education in Africa commissioned by DFID in 2004\textsuperscript{44} identified a twin track approach towards improving girls' access to education: (a) making education systems more accessible to both boys and girls; and (b) gender analysis and targeted gender-specific interventions. This was proposed for increasing enrolment, and Uganda’s UPE policy was cited as a good example of track (a). But the logic also applies to tackling dropout-out rates and poor learning achievement, noting that in both cases the gender differences are much smaller than the overall problem common to both boys and girls. In this case the twin track would involve: (a) improving school effectiveness to reduce dropout and improve learning achievement for both sexes; and (b) tackling the factors that mainly or solely impact on female dropout and learning achievement.

2.3 Proposed outcome from future DFID support to girls’ education

In the light of the above, the proposed \textit{outcome} for future support is an improved quality of primary and secondary education for all children within the target schools, and a reduction in gender barriers to girls' participation and achievement in these schools.

Quality will be measured through an assessment of school effectiveness in the target schools. This is likely to include measures such as: attendance rates of head-teachers, teachers and students; teaching and learning approaches in line with the curriculum and making effective use of learning materials; and efficient processes of school planning, management, quality assurance and staff development. Gender barriers will need to be identified for the schools and indicators and targets identified towards their removal. Significant progress is likely to be achieved over a period of around 5 years if sufficient funds are available in relation to the number of school and districts targeted.

2.4 DFID’s current and recent support to girls’ education in Uganda

DFID funding through UNICEF is currently supporting the Girls Education Movement (GEM) in Uganda – through school clubs promoting girls’ retention and completion of lower secondary education, and secondary level scholarships for girls. Besides the 2012 evaluation of United Nations Girls Education Initiative (UNGEI) in Uganda\textsuperscript{45}, the programmes were reviewed by DFID in February 2013.

2.4.1 GEM clubs

These have been introduced in 30\% of primary schools in 14 districts. In addition to improving whole-school interventions on WASH, including menstruation management, many of the GEM clubs sensitize the school community through posters and writings, and develop income-generating activities.

On the positive side, GEM has reasonably good country coverage, is a key player in UNGEI activities and is a valued member of the Gender Task Force on Girls’ Education. The volunteer force of GEM members is trained, enthusiastic and willing to work. GEM has identified the need for a more realistic model of BTVET for women, situated in community values around education.

---

\textsuperscript{44} Gibson S.(2004), Girls' Education in Africa: and overview of what works', IDL group, Bristol.

\textsuperscript{45} UNGEI (2012), 'Formative evaluation of the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative Uganda Report, UNGEI, New York,
On the negative side, GEM is entirely reliant of DFID funding and limited capacity, especially for monitoring and evaluation and follow-up support. No baseline has been established for key indicators in GEM schools and evaluation is reliant on ‘one off’ stories of success rather than clear signs of trends in improvement on any relevant indicators. UNICEF has not required GEM to have a child protection policy, and does not appear to have allocated sufficient resources to training, which largely uses a simple cascade model leading to patchy and inconsistent operation in schools. The GEM programme is not situated in a broader programme of targeted support to girls’ education, is not addressing most of the key issues in girls’ education, and does not provide a robust pilot for testing what works. It does not provide a means for DFID to support girls’ education policy in Uganda in terms of DFIDs global comparative advantage.

DFID should not at this stage scale up its support or encourage GEM to expand its model to other schools but rather to strengthen its operations in its existing schools. This should include developing systematic monitoring and evaluation and follow-up, and a child protection policy. It could employ a mentoring system using role models - alumni members and local female school-teachers. It should also involve developing a gender orientation with SMCs and Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs). In this way, it could also form a useful component of the proposed future support to girls’ education through improved learning in schools.

2.4.2 Girls’ scholarships

These have not been merit-based on the most academically successful students, but instead have targeted the most vulnerable. But non-merit scholarships have not proved effective elsewhere: a recent evaluation of the longest running and largest girls stipend programme (in Bangladesh) found very little positive impact on a range of outcomes including enrolment. Some serious tensions can arise between recipients and non-recipients, and GEM reported anecdotal evidence that some scholarship recipients in Karamoja might be targets for sexual harassment for this reason.

In contrast randomised controlled trials of merit-based girls’ scholarships, for example in Kenya, have found them to be highly successful, with spin-off improvements for the whole school including teacher attendance. It is therefore recommended that non-merit-based scholarship be discontinued in favour of merit-based scholarships, and that the latter be included in the proposed future support to girls’ education in Uganda.

2.4.3 Vocational Training

DFID have supported vocational training for girls at the Northern Uganda Youth Development Centre in Gulu. It is the authors understanding that this centre is not currently operating. BTVET is an area of education with high gender inequity, where DFID could add a gender emphasis alongside other DPs active in this area. However, this would be better undertaken as part of a programme focusing on skills development for youth generally rather than as and adjunct to the proposed support to primary and secondary education. And the focus for support to girls’ education needs to be at the foundation, primary level given the very drop-out rates, and include lower secondary level to increase the entry of girls into teaching and other professions.


3 FEASIBLE OPTIONS

3.1 Consequences of not intervening

If DFID does not intervene, it is unlikely that another DP will provide significant support to the outcome proposed above. In the absence of DFID support, the options for improvement in girls’ education in Uganda are limited and progress will be much slower than is likely with DFID support.

As noted in section 1.1.6, education outcomes are currently declining for both girls and boys. Funding for primary and secondary education is also declining in real terms, both from government and development partner sources. And funding for the quality of primary and secondary education is further constrained by increased numbers entering secondary education and BT
d 
VET as a result of the USE, UPPET and UPOLET policies. In addition, the number of development partners involved in primary education and their associated funds has fallen sharply since the 1990s. USAID and Irish Aid are now the only bilateral donors. USAID funding is tightly focused on literacy, including mother tongue reading and materials, and Irish Aid funding is focused on Karamoja. They do not, for example, cover the key issues of school governance and in-service training.

The World Bank has a major programme in secondary education. But the focus is on infrastructure, instructional materials, curriculum development, and establishing a system of secondary in-service training. A major focus is on cost-saving measures such as double-shifting and increasing student teacher ratios to reduce unit costs for secondary education rather than on school governance and whole school development. The programme focuses on key reforms at the national level but is unlikely to significantly improve implementation at district level.

UNICEF is supporting girls’ education, but, as noted with current DFID-funded activities, not necessarily in a way that will lead to major systemic gains.
3.2 Theory of Change

This report’s overall theory of change is summarised in the diagram in Annex D on which the headings in this section are based.

3.2.1 Improving the quality of primary and secondary education

School Effectiveness

The quality of education is determined by the effectiveness of the school in terms of teaching and learning. Figure 10 shows (though not in its original form) the World Bank’s school effectiveness model\(^48\). Each one of the items in the boxes must be in place for the school to be effective.

![Figure 10: School Effectiveness Model](image)

(i) Accountability mechanisms and school governance: Teacher and Head-Teacher Absence

Teacher and head-teacher absence were issues raised consistently by those interviewed, and are prominent in the ESSAPR. Teacher absence has a major impact on student achievement. In reporting evidence-based guidance on what makes schools effective, the 2005 Education for All Global Monitoring Report\(^49\) identified teachers as the prime factor and learning time as the second. The number of hours of instruction has been shown to be a robust determinant of cognitive achievement\(^50\). A study in Zambia indicated that each additional 5% increase in teacher absence results in a reduction of 4% to 8% of a year’s learning for the typical student\(^51\), another that


\(^{49}\) UNESCO, Education for All, the Quality Imperative, EFA Global Monitoring Report 2005, p.17.

\(^{50}\) Mandel P and Sussmuth B, Total Instructional Time Exposure and Student Achievement: An Extreme Bounds Analysis Based on German State-Level Variation, CESifo Working Paper 3580, Sept 2011

reducing absence by 10 percentage points would increase child test scores by 0.10 standard deviations. In addition, teacher absenteeism results in costs, estimated at between 10% and 24% of primary school education expenditure in developing countries. In Zambia, for instance, annual losses due to absenteeism were estimated at 0.31% of the country's GDP.

The absence of the head teacher is particularly damaging, not just demoralising and setting a bad example for teacher and students but also precluding effective school leadership and management, and restricting the use of educational materials and equipment as the head teacher normally takes the keys.

Some absence may be legitimate and unavoidable. However, much is not and is avoidable: as noted in section 1.3.2, teachers have identified income-generating activities as a major reason for absence, and communities have questioned the high level of sickness claims. It is likely (though firmer evidence is needed on this), and an assumption implicit in the ESSP and for those interviewed, that much of teacher/head-teacher absence is due to low motivation and ineffective accountability mechanisms and processes, including school governance.

There are a number of routes to stronger accountability, as noted in the ESSAPR, and in a study of teacher absenteeism in Ugandan Primary Schools:

(a) Strengthen school governance. The ‘foundation body’ of the school is supposed, according to the 2008 Education Act, to participate in ensuring the school’s proper management, including moral values and attitudes, and in monitoring and evaluating the school’s education provision. It is to do this through their nominees who chair the SMC or BOG and comprise half the SMC membership and 5 of the 12 BOG members (the single biggest representation). The SMC or BOG is supposed to supervise the head teacher who in turn, acts as secretary to implement their decisions. Unfortunately, probably most SMC, BOG and foundation bodies of government aided schools are not aware of their role, and do not have the capacity or motivation to implement it.

However, there is the possibility of changing this. For example, the Education Department of the Uganda Joint Christian Council, whose Catholic, Church of Uganda and Christian Orthodox members are apparently the foundation bodies for 78% of Uganda’s education institutions. They have set up an apparently successful pilot to make a sample of SMCs aware of their role (with a copy of the regulations) and to train and motivate or sensitise them and their head teacher to their responsibility to the parish and the children and parents within that parish. Whilst taking advantage of moral guidance from the local priest, the pilot has remained non-sectarian, successful including, for example, a number of Islamic schools in its training.

(b) Strengthen district oversight and inspection

The primary school and its staff are responsible to the district government. Unfortunately most district education offices and their inspectorates are severely understaffed and (linked to this) underfunded. The termly inspections also tend to be cursory ticking of checklists, which do not necessarily imply a thorough inspection. And there is rarely any effective follow-up to weaknesses that might be found within the schools, providing a system of quality assurance and support.

---


Thus at present many district offices are ineffective in terms of accountability and support to schools. UNESCO Institute for Education Planning have studied issues in strengthening district education offices in Uganda\(^5\), noting that little attention has been given to this, and offering suggestions for taking it forward.

(c) **Employ ‘social auditing’**

A form of ‘social accountability has been employed in many schools in Uganda by displaying school accounts on the school noticeboard. This principle can be extended, including using social accountability to improve staff attendance and quality improvement more generally. A DFID-funded project in Andhra Pradesh, India, successfully trained illiterate mothers to inspect and report on local school quality using a simple traffic-light scorecard process\(^6\). UNICEF have also piloted an SMS system of checking on staff attendance in Ugandan schools with community involvement, and a pilot study has examined a scorecard approach in Uganda\(^7\).

Another approach that has been used to encourage greater attendance of teachers in school, or more usually to encourage teachers to schools in poor areas, is the provision of teacher housing. However, this can be relatively ineffective in situations of poor governance at school level and weak district administration. We heard reports of long delays in getting districts to appoint teachers to schools where staff houses had been built, the houses in the meantime remaining empty. Anecdotal experience of school improvement programmes and whole school development in Ghana suggests that, where these are in place, schools and districts can themselves identify ways of reducing teacher absence tailored to their situation.

(ii) **Improve school leadership, organisation and culture, plus quality assurance and support**

‘Whole school development’ has proved effective in the UK, and in countries and situations where it has received DFID funding (e.g. Ghana, Ethiopia, Palestinian refugees). Whole school development includes school improvement planning, implementation, monitoring and follow-up by the head teacher and teachers, and preferably with the school managers, and in liaison as appropriate with parents, student representatives and the local community. School improvement can include infrastructure and equipment (the physical environment and instructional aids in the school effectiveness model), but more especially school-based staff development and support, and a system of school-based quality assurance. External teacher training, inspection and support operates far more effectively and efficiently when it is supporting the school’s own programme of quality improvement. Whole school development needs to be led by the head-teacher supported by the school managers, which will require significant training: most head-teachers and most SMC and BOG members do not have any background in management and leadership.

Effective whole school development involves links and partnerships with parents and the community, involves local level quality assurance and support, and takes into account the well-being, attendance and motivation of all students.

(iii) **Enhance school resources**

---


56 Galab S et al. (2013), ‘Community-based accountability for school improvement: A case study from rural India’, CIBT Education Trust, Reading.

In Uganda, school operation and improvement is funded primarily through ‘capitation grants’ and ‘school facilities grants’. These were intended to replace school user costs, in particular school fees. Unfortunately, they have declined in real terms and are now well below the level needed for the school to be effective (annual capitation grant around $2.5 per student at primary level [$40 at secondary level], less than the $4 examination fees paid by government). The school grant has had a perverse effect of distorting school reporting on enrolments.

The DFID programmes in Ghana and Ethiopia have shown the advantage of adding an additional allocation linking an enhancement of the school capitation grant to the school improvement plan. It is also possible to ensure that the plan captures specific action on improving access and quality provision for girls. Approaches to ensure effective management and accountability of the school grant also off the strengthening of overall accountability and reporting.

Textbooks have been found to be an important factor in student achievement particularly ‘in the poorest countries where teacher quality may be low and where facilities and resources are scarce and generally of poor quality’.

However in Uganda the problem is not so much the provision of textbooks to schools - indeed MOES with the World Bank is lowering the target for the textbook:student ratio. The problem is that textbooks and other instructional materials are not used; books remain in cupboards – locked when the head teacher is not there. Teachers tend to teach to past examination questions rather than materials that will give pupils understanding and non-examination-based motivation. The need is to ensure that (a) the head teacher is there and the materials supplies to the school can be used, and (b) the school and its teachers are motivated, and able, to make good use of the materials.

(iv) Improve teacher performance

The quality of teaching is critical for student achievement. Teacher effectiveness was found in one investigation to have accounted for 50 percentile points in student mathematics achievement. Whilst the quality of teaching depends on the quality of teachers recruited and their motivation – both affected by the low teacher salaries in Uganda – it also depends on the continuing professional development of the teaching force. Uganda has established what is in principle an effective process for in-service primary teacher education through the Teacher Development and Management System (TDMS). Outreach Departments in a number of Core PTCs manage and provide the in-service teacher training through a network of coordinating centres, each of which coordinates a cluster of 20 to 45 outreach schools (less in sparsely populated areas). One of the schools in each cluster acts as the coordinating centre school.

The TDMS system was effective when originally set up, but its operation is now severely restricted and of much lower quality. It is badly in need of ‘renovation’ in terms of equipment (e.g. the motorbikes for the Coordinating Centre Tutors) and training and updating for the core PTCs. Primary school teachers of the new thematic curriculum, which includes the introduction of continuous assessment, have received only 2 days training, and the number of teachers and schools has increased significantly since 2003. PTCs are not allowed to charge fees yet the recurrent funds provided by MOES have fallen significantly in real terms and are not adequate for fully effective staffing and operation, let alone this expansion and ‘renovation’ (e.g. well under $1 a day per student for all expenses including fees; annual fund for tutor motorcycle maintenance and fuel is $30).

59 Sanders W and Rivers J, Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Academic Achievement, University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Centre, Nov 1996

HEART (Health & Education Advice and Resource Team)
Given increasing enrolments, especially at secondary level, the supply of new teachers is numerically sufficiently important to ensure that their training enables them to teach the new curricula effectively. Unfortunately, the development of new teacher training curricula and associated tutor staff development are lagging well behind developments at school level. This is partly the result of a blockage at Kyambogo University that, as the former leading National Teacher Training College, is responsible for the national teacher training curricula. Since Kyambogo has become a university, it has become constrained in its ability to support this development and its role for secondary teacher training in other universities is unclear. Nevertheless, individual PTCs could still improve their own pre-service training whilst linking with Kyambogo to ensure national coordination. One key area is in regard to school based assessment with which teachers are currently finding great difficulty. Similarly, the central reforms of secondary teacher training under the World Bank programme provide an opportunity for strengthening pre-service at national teachers' colleges and universities.

Teaching Early Grades Numeracy

This was raised by several interviewees as an area urgently needing support from a development partner. Many countries have seen the key importance of assessing and developing early grades literacy and numeracy as bases for subsequent learning. Science and mathematics is the area of the curriculum which girls are finding particularly difficult and which constrains their future success. The problem starts, for both girls and boys, with poor teaching of, and materials for, early grades numeracy. At present, NAPE testing is providing the information needed to diagnose problems and use them to guide teachers and MOES towards improving these competences. USAID will be following up on the NAPE tests on early grades literacy, but there is currently no government program or DP support for early years numeracy.

(iv) Improve the physical environment

Building more schools may not be as cost-effective a way of improving the quality of education compared with the other factors above, but seems to be able to attract funds more readily than ‘soft’ inputs to the sector. A World Bank Review of determinants of Primary Education outcomes in developing countries\(^6\) notes the following ‘There is some ambiguity in the importance of this factor [school buildings, classrooms and furniture, sanitation facilities, and other types of school “infrastructure”] which may be partly explained by evidence suggesting that the quality of facilities may be more important in disadvantaged settings. Also, costs of hardware inputs affect their marginal productivity; where construction costs are higher, hardware seems to have less per dollar impact. Finally, there seems to be a threshold effect of facility quality; a minimum basic quality of school facilities matters significantly. Above this threshold, its impact appears negligible. The strategy of reducing class size is one of the most costly and controversial in terms of impact. Research results are mixed, though it does seem to make a difference in the early grades. However, it does seem clear that excessively large classes (above 60 students per teacher) are detrimental to learning’.

The key issue is that schools should at least reach a minimum standard. The Education Standards Agency (ESA) is responsible for ensuring that new schools, especially private schools, have achieved the criteria required for licensing and registration, and to ensure that these standards are maintained. However, the capacity of the ESA is limited in terms of the rate of appearance of new schools, there are many existing poorly performing private schools that do not meet the standards, and there is little help for those schools that do not meet the standards. Support to improve the
standards and management of these schools, in conjunction with the ESA, would help raise the overall level of school effectiveness in Uganda.

### 3.2.2 Reducing gender barriers to girls’ participation and achievement

As noted in section 2.2, a number of gender barriers to Ugandan girls’ participation and achievement in education have been identified: pregnancy and early marriage; economic factors; the impact of traditional cultural beliefs; caring for the family; security fears, generally but especially in areas of conflict. Supply side constraints included sexual and general violence against girls, inadequate sanitary facilities, and negative expectations from the school, reinforced by insufficient exposure to educated women.

Some of the ways of tackling these barriers have been studied, for example: on the re-entry of pregnant girls in primary and secondary schools in Uganda\(^\text{(62)}\), and the training of female teachers (to help, for example, with school expectations and role models)\(^\text{(63)}\). There is also a wealth of international research, and experience from DFID-funded programmes, FAWE, UNGEI and other sources.

The need is to (a) further develop this research in different district and school contexts in Uganda; (b) to support effective implementation of the more promising strategies by schools and districts being supported by DFID, including the provision of merit-based girls’ scholarships and supporting GEMS clubs in schools supported by DFID school grants; (c) to monitor and evaluate implementation, particularly of pilot approaches; and (d) to provide a means of advising MOES and encouraging related national policy and strategy development and mainstreaming.

A key aspect of linking in with national policy and implementation is to: (a) have a project task force involving key departments in MOES and other stakeholders; and (b) strengthen the impact of the Girls’ Education Unit in MOES. This unit is not part of the MOES establishment but is funded until end December 2013 by Irish Aid. DFID should seek to extend the operation of the unit in a manner that ensures its formal establishment (e.g. through matched DFID and government funding).

The actions discussed above to improve school effectiveness for boys and girls are also key to tackling these gender specific barriers. For example head teachers, governing bodies and teachers, in the context of whole school development, are able to improve school discipline so that girls are less likely to be assaulted and made pregnant, and to be girl-friendly in encouraging achievement and in regard, for example, to menstruation (as in some schools, having a room set aside with water and emergency pads, and to ensure that girls – and boys - understand menstruation beforehand). Whole school development offers an opportunity for girls clubs and for the school’s interaction with the local community to campaign for girls’ rights to education. Feasible options for DFID support.

---


\(^{63}\) Uganda MOES (2012), ‘A report on a study of female teacher training, recruitment and deployment in Uganda’, Joint report by MOES and UNICEF.
3.2.3 Supporting Girl’s Education through Improved Learning in Primary Schools

**Description:**

Project support to improve school effectiveness in a sample of government-aided primary schools in poorly performing districts in North and West regions, involving activities at school level and linked support at district and national levels:

(a) School level support:

- Improving governance and accountability by strengthening school management committees and school foundation body (owners), community/social-accountability and head-teacher training;

- Performance related enhancement of the school capitation grant and/or school facilities grant linked to gender-linked school improvement plans improving retention and learning outcomes;

(b) District level support to schools through:

- Strengthening the Teacher Development Management System for in-service training based on primary teacher colleges within the district, with an emphasis on student assessment, gender and inclusive education;

- Strengthened district level monitoring and supervision, upgrading the district education office and its collection and use of data, linked to EMIS, and the operation of the district inspectorate;

(c) National level support to girls’ education by:

- Strengthened linkage to national education policy, planning and monitoring through a project steering committee, linked to the Education Sector Consultative Committee, involving key national level stakeholders;

- Assisting the establishment of the MOES Girls Education Unit to sustainably improve demand for girls’ education through research-based advocacy, monitoring and catalytic action.

**Feasible extensions to this option**

- Further strengthening of the primary teachers’ colleges in the districts, including pre-service training, linked to Kyambogo University and MOES oversight of primary teacher education;

- Support to early years assessment of numeracy through the Uganda National Examinations Board.

**Rationale:**

- Whilst the major benefits of girls’ education are seen from those who complete secondary education, two thirds of girls do not complete primary education;

- Improved learning achievement in secondary schools is dependent on an adequate quality of primary education;
• The key problems in the lower achieving schools are low accountability (inadequate control by districts and school managers), poor teaching standards, and poor management, planning and quality control. These problems are greater at primary than secondary level.

3.2.4 Support Girl’s Education through Improved Learning in Schools

Description

Project 3.5.1 plus performance related enhancement of the universal secondary education (USE) grants to government-aided secondary schools within the target districts, gender-linked school improvement plans improving retention and learning outcomes. Linkage for these schools to the JICA-funded SESEMAT with strengthening of science and mathematics learning, strengthening the gender emphasis.

Feasible extensions to this option

• Improving governance and accountability in government aided secondary schools within the target districts by strengthening school boards of governors, foundation bodies, community/social-accountability and head-teacher training;

• Reducing economic barriers for girls to continue and succeed in secondary education by girls’ scholarships to private schools linked to the Public Private Partnership scholarship scheme; this could include the option of entrepreneurs, including ARK-PEAS, using the scholarship funds towards constructing and supporting new private secondary schools;

• Improve the standards and management of poorly performing private schools in conjunction with the Education Standards Agency;

• Include gender sensitive in-service teacher training linked to the development of the national in-service training scheme.

Rationale:

• The major benefits of educating girls will not be realised if they do not continue through, and achieve, at secondary level. This includes an increase in the number of women teachers which itself has a major impact on the retention and achievement of girls in primary and secondary schools.

3.2.5 Assumptions and Risks

The proposal assumes, inter alia, that:

• Technical support to school managers and foundation bodies in Uganda can motivate and enable these bodies to improve school governance and accountability including head-teacher and teacher absenteeism and effective school monitoring and evaluation.

• Performance-based grants to schools alongside leadership training and technical support can motivate head-teachers and teachers to develop effective school improvement plans and a whole school development approach to quality improvement.

• Capacity development support to DEOs and District Inspectors alongside their involvement in performance grants and revitalising school managers can improve the motivation and ability of these DEOs and Inspectors to improve their monitoring of and support to school effectiveness.
The TDMS system for in-service training is essentially sound and can be strengthened through capacity development to raise the competence of teachers, especially in regard to the new thematic curriculum and continuous assessment.

Merit-based scholarships for girls who could not otherwise do so to attend private schools will avoid some of the victimisation problems of purely vulnerability-based scholarships, and will improve the retention in schools of girls most able to benefit from secondary education.

With more initial development partner support, the Girls’ Education Unit will become an established and effective part of MOES planning and monitoring.

MOES staff will actively participate in the project steering committee and take on board lessons learned from the project in their planning and support for other schools and districts.

Project sustainability will be supported by a significant increase in the budget for education after completion of the National Core Projects in the Energy and Transport sectors (from 2015), or reducing the costs of education by, for example, focusing grants on the most needy schools and communities.

The following are some of the potential risks associated with this project:

- Government may not increase its commitment and support to education in financial terms within the medium term. It may also not take measures to ensure that, within the existing budget, an adequate level of grants reaches disadvantaged schools where parents are not in a position to supplement these grants on a voluntary basis.

- Sustainability may thus be only partial, in terms of capacity development. The putting in place enhanced grants, scholarships, expansion of PTC in-service training, and a higher impact girls’ education unit, may not be adequately funded in the medium term by government without external support.

- Introducing parallel systems (e.g. separate protected grants and accounts, procurement by external agents) may divert attention from improving existing grants and mechanisms.

- NGOs and other implementing agents may not have the capacity to manage and monitor the project effectively.

- School management committees and district offices may not be capable of strengthening accountability sufficiently to make a major impact on head-teacher and teacher attendance and effective school management;

- Other factors such as the new curriculum (which is highly ambitious, especially at secondary level) may prevent teachers from teaching effectively.
4 POSSIBLE DELIVERY MECHANISMS

4.1 National or Localised

A national, government-led, multi-partner programme to improve the quality of education, with high levels of accountability, is the most effective way of raising the quality of the education system as a whole, with possibilities for additional funding for deprived areas and students and for exemplar centres of excellence. But it is only feasible where there is a high level of government and development partner financial commitment to the sector and acceptable levels of accountability. In Uganda, the proportion of the national budget, and of GDP, going to the education sector is relatively low, there is a relatively low and decreasing level of development partner funding to the sector, and there are significant problems of accountability. Any national performance-related grants from DFID would, for example, be unlikely to be of the scale needed for a significant impact on quality, as would the measures needed to ensure the funds were used effectively.

Thus in Uganda, it may be more appropriate to focus resources on a limited sample of schools and districts, albeit with a reasonable geographical spread to assist the application of lessons learned to other schools and districts. The districts and schools could be a representative sample, or those in more disadvantaged communities or with poorer education outcomes for girls, or a combination.

Direct support through District Local Governments would strengthen their role of overseeing primary education: inspecting all primary schools, public and private; oversight of primary teachers, head teachers and school managers; and oversight of the allocation, use and monitoring of grants and scholarships (though these would go straight from the project to schools in the same way the government funds go direct from MOFPED to schools). For secondary schools and teachers colleges, DFID funds would be managed and disbursed at district level, in liaison with MOES, but would not go through District Local Governments, as they do not have oversight of secondary education and teacher training.

However, the programme should be clearly part of the national ESSP and budget and have an effective means for ensuring lessons learned are fed in to the national system.

4.2 Public or private sector

Despite the rapid expansion in the number of private schools, especially at secondary level, the overwhelming majority of low-income families send their students to government-aided schools. Given, on balance, the higher efficiency (performance divided by user costs) in the private sector at secondary level, it may be appropriate to copy the MOES PPP programme and direct girls’ scholarships to private secondary schools, though they could also be directed to high quality government-aided secondary schools. The scholarships could also be used by entrepreneurs, including ARK-PEAS, towards creating new, high quality private schools, though this as yet on a very small scale and is unlikely to be manageable on a large scale. Similarly, high cost private schools, such as the proposed new GEM-Education International School – and cost government-aided schools, could be project partners in strengthening the effectiveness of poorer, less effective schools, whether government-aided or private. (This is already, to some extent, the system employed by SESEMAT.) But overall, the major impact for poorer students and communities is likely to be achieved via government-aided schools rather than supporting the private sector.
4.3 Government Systems and Contracted Agents

There are advantages in terms of sustainability for passing funds through government systems to the extent that this is feasible from the viewpoint of financial accountability. However, given the nature of the proposed support – capacity-building and performance-based grants – and the problems of accountability that the proposed DFID support is intended to tackle, it might be inappropriate to put any money directly through MOFPED into existing government budget lines.

Nevertheless, funding for grants and scholarships might be able to go to protected accounts at institutional level and where possible at district level alongside the respective government budget lines. Once schools and districts have been assessed as adequately accountable, they could be allowed to spend and procure goods on the same basis as for government funds; where this accountability is yet to be so assessed, they could be spent against, for example, the school's investment plan but by a separate procurement agent. Teacher and leadership training could be similarly funded through PTCs under the TDMS.

The provision of other forms of capacity development at district level could be funded through NGOs, including for example the Joint Christian Council, and/or a contracted implementing agency or agencies. Central technical support and the overall management of the programme could be through a single contracted agent or consortium.

Support at primary level could alternatively be managed through UNICEF or a major International NGO, but neither is likely to have adequate capacity for this (noting the concerns raised in section 2.3). Support at secondary level could be managed by the World Bank as an addition to their next phase of financing. But this tends to be problematic, especially given the MOES focus of the World Bank project and the district-based emphasis of proposed DFID support.
5 INTERACTION WITH OTHER DFID SUPPORT

There is a strong interaction between the health sector and girls' education. HIV/AIDS and other forms of ill health in the family are a significant factor in girls dropping out of school to care for the family. And better-educated girls are less likely to have HIV/AIDS and low standards of health and hygiene (for example failure to use mosquito nets and condoms) leading to ill health. And an increase in the quantity of well-educated women and men provides the health sector, and other sectors, with more productive human resources. Thus DFID support to the education and health sectors is mutually reinforcing. Though this does not necessarily imply that there should be any direct link between projects in health and education, other than in terms of potential advantages of being in the same district where this is relevant to both sectors, building synergies and through general lessons on service delivery in the Ugandan context.

Other possible beneficial relationships are possible. For example, the use of social auditing and general community involvement in the school encourages wider participation of that community and other developmental activities. And a community that has been sensitised to its responsibilities and potential in regard to general community development is likely to be more effective in supporting and socially auditing schools.

The only obvious negative impact on other sectors from increased support to education is in terms of potentially reducing attention to, and funding for, other sectors.
Annex A  Terms of reference

Developing a strategic case for DFID Support to Girls' Education in Uganda  8/01/2013

1.  Objective

The objective of the assignment is to support DFID Uganda to better understand the context for supporting girl's education in Uganda, identify potential options for support and potentially developing a business case based on those options for DFID support.

2.  The Recipient

The recipient of the services is DFID Uganda.

3.  Scope of work

The Consultant will support DFID Uganda to:

Phase One

1) Understand the context for supporting education outcomes, particularly for girls, in Uganda, including trends and trajectory of enrolment, equity, and quality of education, the policy context, public/private mix of supply, and current development partner support;

2) Develop an evidence based theory of change for girl's education outcomes in Uganda, including identifying key supply-side and demand-side constraints;

3) Examine the key strengths, weaknesses and opportunities within DFID-U's current interventions on girls' education;64 65

4) Identify potential options for DFID to contribute to education outcomes for girls in Uganda, considering both the supply and demand for education.

Phase Two (dependant on the findings of Phase One)

5) Develop and appraise potential options for DFID support and further develop a preferred option.

4.  Methodology

The Consultant will work with the DFID Uganda MDG Team (especially the Social Development Adviser and the Team Leader) to gather relevant evidence pertaining to girls' education in Uganda. The methodology to be used will include but not be limited to:

- A desk review of programme documents, relevant documents on girls' education in Uganda, and global evidence on girls' education;

---

64 Including bursaries for secondary education, efforts to reduce violence against girls in schools and an emerging pilot DFID centrally are discussing with Social Finance on a Development Impact Bond on education.

65 Building on separate rapid review of these interventions that will be undertaken in early February 2013
Discussions with the DFID-U Team;
Meetings with relevant stakeholders – including but not limited to Ministry of Education, UN Agencies, Development Partners, NGOs and Private Sector;
A field visit to better understand the quality, supply and demand for education in Uganda.

5. Reporting

The consultant will prepare and submit the following outputs in two phases:

Phase one

a) A presentation of preliminary findings to DFID Uganda at the end of the first phase of in-country work;
b) A draft narrative report (meeting the requirements of a DFID business case strategic case and options and covering items 1 - 4 of the scope of the ToR) by 25th February 2013 [since amended to 5th March];
c) A final report by 15th March 2013 [since amended to 5th April];

Phase two

Concrete deliverables and timing for Phase two will be dependent on the findings of the first phase and will be agreed with the consultant before commencing the second phase.

6. Timeframe

The assignment will be completed in up to 25 working days staggered over two phases (an indicative 16 days allocated for phase one and 9 days for phase two). Phase 1 of the assignment will commence on 11th February 2013 and end by 15th March 2013 [since amended to 1st March and 5th April respectively]. The start and end dates of phase 2 will be determined dependent on the outcome of phase 1, but expected to end by May. It is expected that in-country work will be needed for both phases.

7. Key Personnel

The Consultant shall field a highly professional and skilled team comprising of technical staff with specialized skills and proven practical experience in education programmes including girls’ education, designing programmes to improve the quality of education, etc. The team shall include one international expert as Team Leader and one national expert.

8. Background

Since the inception of Universal Primary Education in Uganda in 1996, primary school enrolment has been increasing steadily. However, the cohort retention rates are very low - many children are dropping out before completing a full cycle of primary education. Although challenges exist in access and equity, the quality of primary education is poor and yet little has been done to improve it. There is also low enrolment and completion (especially by girls) at the secondary and vocational levels.
DFID Uganda currently has the following interventions towards the promotion of girls' education:

**Primary Education:** Through the UN Joint Programme on Gender Equality (JPGE), UNICEF is supporting the establishing of Girls Education Movement (GEM) clubs in schools in ten selected districts to encourage the retention of girls and boys in school and return of 102,550 dropouts (66,000 girls) to school by 2015.

Under the Peace, Recovery and Development Plan (PRDP), DFID is also supporting the construction of 2000 primary teachers’ houses towards addressing teacher absenteeism and improving the quality of education in Northern Uganda.

**Secondary Education:** Through the UN Joint Population Programme (JPP) and GEM, 1000 bursaries have been given to girls in eight districts which were selected based on constraints hindering growth - including poor transport infrastructure and limited girls’ access to education. To date GEM has awarded scholarships to 1000 girls of whom 83% are in secondary school and 17% in Basic Technical and Vocational Education and Training (BTVET) institutions.

**Vocational Education:** Through the Northern Uganda Youth Development Programme, vocational training will be given to 100,000 youth (30% girls) by 2015. In addition, through the UN Joint Population Programme, vocational training has been taking place, and a labour market analysis has been conducted to inform the design of a strategy for a more focused response.

DFID Uganda is undertaking this scoping exercise to feed into a portfolio review in the context of declining (and currently frozen) general budget support; and to inform the development of a strategic case for DFID’s support to girls’ education.

---

66 DFID-Uganda does not have an education programme; these interventions are structured as outputs of other larger programmes.
Annex B  Education access statistics

Overview by subsector

Pre-primary

In 2010, there were 105,428 boys and 109,369 girls enrolled in Early Childhood Education, that is around 13% of the age group.

Primary

In 2010, there were 8,374,648 pupils enrolled in primary school, representing a gross enrolment ratio (GER) of 128% and net enrolment ratio (NER) of 90%. 51% of the Primary year 1 (P1) new entrants were overage and 5% underage, leading to the high level of GER.

The gender difference in enrolment was insignificant at 0.3% in favour of girls.

The gross intake ratio (GIR) to P1 was 134% in 2010 whilst the net intake ratio was 70.2% in 2010 (69.5 for boys and 70.9 for girls). This shows a high level of delayed, overage enrolment but could also include children not enrolling at all.

Uganda government policy is that promotion to the next year of schooling should be automatic as repetition is inefficient and therefore expensive. Nevertheless, the average repetition throughout primary education was 10.9% in 2010, the highest levels being 11.6% in P1 and 12% in P6, the former probably representing underage children and the later pupils being held back as unlikely to pass the P7 Primary Leaving Examination (PLE). Repetition was slightly higher for boys (11.1%) than girls (10.6%).

There is a very high level of dropout for boys and girls. Only 32% of boys and 31% of girls starting P1 continue to P7. The largest dropout rates are from P1 to P2 (31% of boys and girls leaving school) and from P6 to P7 (34% for boys, 38% for girls).

Secondary

In 2010 there were 1,235,692 students enrolled in secondary school, 53.4% male and 46.6% female, representing a GER of only around 28%, falling from around 37% for lower secondary to around 11% for advanced secondary. 81% of those entering S1 were over-age. Of the 1,088,558 (88%) in lower secondary education, 48% were girls, whilst of the 147,134 (12%) in advanced secondary education only 42% were girls (41% in S6).

The average repetition rate for both girls and boys was 2.6%, with peaks of 5.4% in S4 (O-level examinations) and 4.7% on S6 (A-level examinations).

The transition rate to lower secondary education, 65% overall, was higher for boys (67%) than girls (64%), whilst the transition to secondary level BTVEI is far higher for boys than for girls. The

---

67 Data from the 2010 Uganda Education Statistical Abstract, has been used here as this is the latest year for which reasonably complete statistics are available.

68 GER is the ratio of children in school to children of the intended age group. NER is the ratio of children of the right age group in school to children in that age group. The extent to which GER exceeds the NER gives a measure of the number of over-age (or, less commonly, underage) children enrolled.
average dropout from general secondary education is significantly higher for girls (around 27%) than boys (around 24%), the largest dropout in both cases occurring in and after S1.

**BTVET and Tertiary Education**

Of the 1,088,744 students leaving secondary school in 2008, 262,621 (24%) entered BTVET and 155,082 (14%) entered some form of tertiary education.

**Differences between the public and private sectors**

Whilst 30% of primary schools are private schools, they cater for only 13% of primary enrolment. The gender balance for primary schools is essentially the same as for government primary schools. But whilst drop-out is still high, especially after P1 and P6, it is significantly less that for government schools, and lower for girls. The overall dropout from private primary schools is 65% for boys, 63% for girls as opposed to 72% for boys and girls in government primary schools. 24% for boys and 23% girls dropout during and after P1 as opposed to 31% for both sexes in government schools. After P6, the private rates are 26% for boys, 24% for girls as opposed to 34% for boys and 38% for girls in government schools.

Whilst 69% of secondary schools are private schools, only around 40% of the enrolment is in secondary schools.

**Regional variations in access**

For ECD, whilst the ratio of girls to boys is similar in all regions (slightly favouring girls), the GER for boys and girls is around 19% in Central Region, 10% in Eastern Region, 11% in Northern Region and 13% in Western Region.

For primary education, the ratio of girls to boys and GER for boys and girls varies are respectively around 51% (gender ratio) and 119% (GER) in Central Region, 50% and 144% in Eastern Region, 48% and 120% in Northern Region and 50% and 130% in Western Region. This suggests fairly full enrolment but with a large proportion of overage children in Eastern Region. District level data from the Uganda Bureau of Statistics shows Kalingala (Central Region) and 4 Districts in Northern Region having a primary NER of less than 50%, in one case (Amudat) only 24% (though the large number of districts with an impossible NER of over 100% indicates the limitations of this data).

For secondary education, the ratio of girls to boys in government schools varies from 37% in Northern Region to 48% in Central Region, whilst for private schools the figures are 37% and 53% respectively. However, for private schools in the North Eastern sub regions, the ratio of girls to boys is only 27% compared with 41% for government schools. The GER for boys varies from 19% in Northern Region to 38% in Central Region and for girls from 11% to 40% respectively.

**Access for children with special needs including orphans**

**Pre-primary**

12,465 pupils (6,909 boys & 5,559 girls) with special needs were registered in all ECD centers, 2.5% of the overall enrolment. The main categories of disability were hearing impairment (27.4%), mental impairment (26.2%), autism (15.9%), physical/motor impairment (14.4%), visual disorders (12.1%) and multiple handicaps (4.0%).
Primary

205,018 pupils (108,246 boys and 96,772 girls) with special needs were registered in primary schools, representing 2.4% of overall enrolment. The main categories were hearing impairment (29%), visual impairment (24%) and mental impairment (23.7%). The proportion registered varied, for boys, between 1.7% in South West sub-region to 3.1% in North sub-region, and for girls between 1.4% to 3.3% in these same regions.

1,350,541 pupils in primary schools had lost either one or both parents, comprising 16.1% of the total enrolment. The proportion was slightly higher for boys (16.4%) than girls (15.9%). Central Region had the highest proportion (20.6%) and Eastern the lowest (12.9%).

Secondary

MOEC statistics abstracts do not include special needs pupils at secondary level.

General

The proportion of children in school registered with special learning needs is far below the proportion that will have these needs, by a factor of between 4 and 8. This means either that most of those having such needs are either in school and unable to take full advantage of the learning opportunity, or are not in school. In many countries, children with disabilities form a high proportion of those out of school.

Girls’ access to education

Gender differences are minimal in pre-school and in primary school to P6, in intake rates, enrolment, repetition and drop-out. In most cases, girls have a small advantage, although female primary enrolment is slightly below male enrolment in Northern region (48% girl/boy ratio). Also girls with special needs are at a disadvantage as the proportion of boys with special needs in both pre-primary and primary schools is significant larger than for girls.

The major level of drop-out between P6 and P7 is significantly larger for girls than boys (38% as against 34%), the transition rate to general secondary education is higher for boys than girls (with relatively few girls entering BTVET), and girls drop out of secondary school at an increasingly higher rate than boys throughout secondary education. By S6, girls form only 41% of the total enrolment.

Girls also appear to be discriminated against in relation to special needs and those with one or no parents.

On a national scale, private secondary schools achieve a slightly better gender balance than government schools. But in the North Eastern sub-region, the reverse is true: whilst the overall gender balance government and private schools is markedly worse here than in other sub-regions, private schools have a much higher gender imbalance here than government schools.

Trends and trajectories

All enrolments have shown a steady increase, but not all at above the rate of population growth: The GER for pre-primary education has increased steadily from 2.3% in 2005 to 14% in 2010. The figure is lower for 2011 but this appears to be due to data collection problems;
The NER for primary education has oscillated between 91% and 96% between 2006 and 2010, but appears to have dropped to 90% in 2011;

The GER for lower secondary education has risen steadily over the last decade from 20% to 35%, with a jump from 25% to 30% in 2007 corresponding to the introduction of the MOES Universal Secondary Education (USE) policy.

The primary year 1 gross intake rate (GIR) peaked at 153% in 2005 and the net intake rate (NIR) bottomed at 56%. Since then, the divergence has decreased to the present 134% and 61% respectively, showing a decrease in overall enrolment. Repetition rates have declined marginally, and survival rates to P7 have increased from their nadir of 21% of boys and 22% of girls in 2003, but are still only half the rates of 61% and 68% respectively in 2000.

The proportion of special needs children has stayed constant over the last decade, as has the gender imbalance. The enrolment of orphans doubled from 6.8% to 17% in 2007, with no gender imbalance. It has since declined to the present 16.4% for boys and 15.9% for girls.

The gender parity index for enrolment has steadily increased at all levels to the extent that it is not an issue below P7 (apart from inequitable access for special needs students and orphans). However, there has been no improvement in gender parity for transition to secondary education, a small (and possibly insignificant) reduction in the proportion of girls enrolled in secondary education, and a marked decline in the proportion of girls in BTVET.

---

Annex C  Development Partners Coordination and Programmes

Development Partner Coordinators and Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Other Development Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary and primary</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>USAID, UNHCR, World Bank, Irish Aid, ILO, Netherlands Aid via UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Irish Aid, African Development Bank (ADB), Belgium (BTAC), JICA, UNFPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTVET</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>European Union (EU), JICA, Netherlands (EKN), ADB, WB, GTZ, ILO, Irish Aid, South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Irish Aid, UNHCR, Netherlands, WB, Belgium (VLIR), South Korea, Islamic Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and PFM</td>
<td>Irish Aid</td>
<td>EU, WB, Belgium, UNICEF, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development Partner Programmes

Primary level:

USAID: Literacy $56m (2012 to 2016); EMIS $3.2m (extended to 2014)
UNICEF: Basic Requirements Minimum Standards (with EKN funds): $4.4m
    School garden project (with EKN funds): $5.7m
    Knowledge and policy development: $9.5m
ILO: Improved access linked to removing child labour: $0.48m
INGOs: World Vision, Equitable access to basic education, $18.8m;
    Save the Children Fund, $12m to education in 2012

Secondary level:

World Bank: Post primary education and training project: APL2 2013-2015: £125m
Irish Aid: School construction in Karamoja: $28.5m
    Girls' bursaries in Karamoja: $2.4m
JICA: SESEMAT science and mathematics project: $0.4m
BE: Construction of 2 national teachers' colleges: $26,
ADB: Infrastructure
Annex D  Theory of Change

**IMPACT:** Increased proportion of better-educated women able to engage in productive economic activities and contribute to a reduction in poverty in Uganda

- Higher proportion of girls complete secondary and primary education
- Higher achievement of girls in secondary and primary education

**OUTCOME:**
- Improved quality of primary and secondary education for all children and...
- ...a reduction in gender barriers to girls’ participation in schools.

- Increased attendance of school heads, staff, students
- Increased school resources
- Improved school systems for planning, quality assessment and quality improvement
- Improved teacher performance
- Identification and monitoring of barriers. Activities to combat them, including advocacy for policy and culture change

**SCHOOL-LEVEL GOVERNANCE OUTPUTS**
Function school management committee/governors. Management and Standards. Social auditing

**DISTRICT LEVEL GOVERNANCE OUTPUTS:**
- Strengthened District Monitoring and inspection

**SCHOOL FINANCING OUTPUTS**
- Enhancement of school grants with performance-linkage to school improvement

**TEACHER PERFORMANCE OUTPUTS**
- Strengthened Teacher Development and support

**GENDER SPECIFIC OUTPUTS**
- Strengthened girls education unit and national task force. Girls’ scholarships
- Encourage more female teachers
Annex E: Key Documents Consulted

N.B. The overall documentation consulted also included, and went beyond, that cited in the footnotes throughout this report.

Uganda Government Documents
- National Development Plan, 2010/11-2014/15
- Education Sector Strategic Plan, 2004-2011
- The Education (Pre-Primary, Primary and Post-Primary) Act 2006
- Uganda Education Abstracts 2009, 2010 and 2011

DFID Documents
- DFID Operational Plan 2011-2015, updated June 2012
- DFID-Uganda Education Data Update, ‘Results and Value for Money of Bilateral Aid to Education’
- Girls’ Education in Africa, An Overview of What Works, 2004
- What Works in Girls’ Education in Ghana, 2011
- Impact Assessment of Inclusive Education Approaches in Uganda, DFID 2011
- Business Cases for Girl’s Education Programme in Ghana and Education Quality Improvement Programmes in Ethiopia and Tanzania

Documents from Other Development Partners
- Education Development Partner Mapping Matrix 2012
- First Monitoring and Evaluation Report for the Quality Enhancement Initiative
- Policy brief on Education Sector Budget Analysis in Uganda, Belgian Cooperation, 2012
- FAES 2011 Survey: Re-entry of Pregnant Girls in Primary and Secondary Schools in Uganda
- MOES/JICA SESEMAT Programme and newsletter
- JICAUN Development Assistance Framework for Uganda 2010-201
- UNGEI, Formative Evaluation of UN Girls’ Education Initiative, Uganda Report, April 2012
Annex F: Persons consulted

Ministry of Education and Sports
Dr Daniel Nkadda, Commissioner Pre-Primary and Primary Education, MOES
John Mary Agaba, Commissioner Secondary Education, MOES
Martin Omaga-Loican, Commissioner Special Needs, MOES
Margaret Nserekob, Commissioner Teacher/Instructor Education and Training, MOES
Margaret Kasiko, Gender Technical Adviser, MOES
Andrew Tabura, Education Officer, Teacher/Instructor Education and Training
Nuunu Priscilla Vanessa, Administrative Officer, SESMAT Programme, MOES
Musoke Paul, National Trainer, SESEMAT Programme, MOES
Richard Webber, Teacher Support Consultant
Laura McInerney, Education Adviser, NCDC

Development Partners
Ali Forder, Head of MDG Team, DFID Uganda
Irene Among, Social Development Adviser, DFID Uganda
Diana Sekaggya-Bagarukayo, Education and Local Development Adviser, Irish Aid Uganda
Keith Gristock, Head of Development, Embassy of Ireland
Margo O’Sullivan, Chief of Education and Coordinator Learning Programme, UNICEF Uganda
Innocent Mulindwa, Senior Education Specialist, World Bank Uganda
Mariella Ruiz-Rodriguez, Team Leader, Education, Health Sekking Behaviour, USAID Uganda
Jan de Ceuster, Education Adviser, BTC Uganda (Belgian Development Agency)

International NGOs
Patrick Tumusiime, Associate Director Partnership and External Engagements, World Vision
John Wilson Tereraho, Education Specialist, World Vision
Els Heijnen Maathuis, Technical Advisor, Save the Children

Other Interviewees
Monica Kamya, Ag. Deputy Head Teacher, Kanjuku Secondary School, Kayunga District
Okello Patrick Ginyako, Principal, Bwera PTC, Kasese
Fr. John Byamukama, Head of Education Department, Uganda Joint Christian Council