



1. Project Data

Project ID P147486	Program Name TZ-Education Program for Results	
Country Tanzania	Practice Area(Lead) Education	
L/C/TF Number(s) IDA-55270,IDA-60610	Closing Date (Original) 30-Jun-2018	Total Program Cost (USD) 175,832,650.27
Bank Approval Date 10-Jul-2014	Closing Date (Actual) 31-Jan-2022	
	IBRD/IDA (USD)	Grants (USD)
Original Commitment	122,000,000.00	0.00
Revised Commitment	185,591,510.70	0.00
Actual	175,832,650.27	0.00

Prepared by Judyth L. Twigg	Reviewed by Salim J. Habayeb	ICR Review Coordinator Eduardo Fernandez Maldonado	Group IEGHC (Unit 2)
---------------------------------------	--	---	--------------------------------

2. Program Context and Development Objectives

a. Objectives

The program's objective, as stated in the Financing Agreement (p. 5) and the Program Appraisal Document (PAD, p. 2), was "to improve education quality of the Recipient's primary and secondary schools."

As most of the program's actions and results areas covered primary through secondary education, this Review will assess achievement of a single objective, to improve education quality in primary and secondary schools. (This departs from the ICR's approach, which assessed primary and secondary education separately.) The ICR also assessed achievement of a third "implicit" objective, "institutional strengthening and



systemic improvements," but this Review treats institutional strengthening as an output toward achievement of the quality objective specified in the Financing Agreement.

Targets for two key outcome indicators were adjusted downward at a 2019 restructuring. However, program achievement exceeded both the original and revised targets in one case, and did not meet either the original or revised targets in the other case. As the efficacy and outcome ratings would therefore not be affected by a split rating methodology, this assessment chooses not to do a split rating.

b. Were the program objectives/key associated outcome targets revised during implementation?

Yes

Did the Board approve the revised objectives/key associated outcome targets?

Yes

Date of Board Approval

13-Sep-2019

c. Will a split evaluation be undertaken?

No

d. Components

The program was designed to support the government's broader education reform program, the Big Results Now in Education (BRNEd). It was aligned to the entire BRNEd program of expenditures, with the exclusion of construction activities. As such, it supported the following results areas:

Strengthening performance of schools and improving the system's transparency supported public ranking of all schools by exam results and a national (sample-based) 3R (reading, writing, and arithmetic) assessment in early grades.

Motivating teachers and schools through incentives supported school incentive grants (SIGs) for primary and lower secondary schools, awarded to schools with improved year-on-year performance in national examination results, and non-monetary incentives to motivate teachers in primary and secondary schools.

Addressing insufficient support and unequal resource distribution supported development and training on school improvement toolkits, exposing head teachers and heads of school to best practices in school management and quality improvement; 3R teacher training through a cascade model in regions most in need of support; a Student Teacher Enrichment Program (STEP) to train teachers and identify and support low-performance students; and timely delivery of capitation grants for primary and secondary schools, particularly to ensure that books and materials reach schools.

Periodic disbursements were triggered by achievement of disbursement-linked indicators (DLIs). The PAD (p. 18) noted that the BRNEd program did not cover some activities in the basic education program: ongoing curriculum revisions, regular teacher training, early childhood or adult education, and payment of



teacher salaries. These areas were supported by the government's overall education program and other development partners.

The government replaced BRNEd in 2016 with its new Education Sector Development Plan (ESDP) 2016-2021, which included continued focus on implementation of education quality reforms to improve primary and secondary school performance. Importantly, however, the new ESDP also incorporated the government's decision to abolish formal and informal school fees in December 2015 under a flagship Fee-Free Basic Education Policy (FBEP). The resulting rapid expansion of enrollment (from 8.2 million primary students in 2013 to 10.9 million in 2020, and from 1.8 million to 2.3 million secondary students over the same time period) posed a challenge to the education system in logistical terms. Additional International Development Association (IDA) financing was approved in 2017 (see Section 2e) to help bridge part of the immediate financial gap created by the enrollment surge and to build the capacity of central, local, and school-level entities to maintain and improve quality service delivery even as enrollments increased. Results areas and DLIs were added in the areas of system-level reforms to policies and procedures, school quality assurance, student survival and girls' transition to secondary school, distribution of textbooks, and improvements in numeracy for primary students. Some original DLIs and outcome targets were also adjusted.

e. Comments on Program Cost, Financing, Borrower Contribution, and Dates

The program was approved on July 10, 2014, and became effective on December 5, 2014. It underwent a mid-term review in August 2016. The program closed on January 31, 2022, three years and seven months after its original closing date of June 30, 2018.

At appraisal, it was estimated that four years (2014-2018) of the BRNEd program would cost US\$416 million. In addition to this operation (a US\$122 million IIDA credit), BRNEd was to be financed through US\$100 million from the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DfID), US\$30 million from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), and US\$164 million from the government. Additional IDA financing in the amount of US\$80 million was added on May 23, 2017, following the government's introduction of FBEP and the 2016-2021 ESDP, bringing the total program cost to US\$496 million. Actual program cost totaled US\$890.8 million: US\$175.8 million from IDA (US\$95.4 million of the initial credit, and US\$80.4 million of additional financing), US\$106 million from DfID, US\$116 million from SIDA, and US\$493 million from the government.

In addition to the 2017 additional financing, which also extended the closing date from June 30, 2018, to January 31, 2020, the program was restructured three times:

- September 13, 2019: Adjustments to the results framework, reallocation of funds among DLIs, and changes to the Program Action Plan (PAP), all in response to increased basic education enrollments resulting from the FBEP. The program's closing date was extended from January 31, 2020, to January 31, 2021.
- January 22, 2021: Tanzanian schools were closed for three months due to the COVID-19 pandemic. A DLI was added to incentivize local government authorities (LGAs) to ensure that children returned to and completed school. The program's closing date was extended from January 31, 2021, to January 31, 2022.



- April 12, 2021: The impact of the pandemic further delayed program implementation, necessitating adjustments to the results framework and reallocation of funds among DLIs.

3. Relevance

a. Relevance of Objectives

Rationale

Relevance to country context and government strategy. Tanzania's Vision 2025 strategy, adopted in 1999, strongly emphasized access to education, eliminating primary school tuition fees and expanding schools throughout the country. As a result, primary school enrollment increased from 4.8 million in 2001 to 8.4 million in 2010—bringing the primary net enrollment rate to 95 percent in 2011—and secondary school enrollment almost quintupled. Education quality, however, did not keep pace with gains in access that produced an increasing student population. At the time of this operation's appraisal, there had been a national outcry in Tanzania about declining examination results and poor learning outcomes. The percentage of students passing primary school leaving examinations had fallen from 58.3 percent in 2011 to only 30.7 percent in 2012, and similar declines had taken place at the secondary level. Major challenges included teacher absenteeism, low rates of teacher time-on-task, lack of incentives for teachers and school administrators, poor working conditions and training for teachers and school heads, limited student achievement and school performance measurement, low levels of information and empowerment for communities to advocate for better education, and high inequality across districts in per-capita public education spending.

In February 2013, the president launched the BRNEd program to produce tangible improvements in student outcomes at the primary and lower secondary levels in a short period of time. The plan entailed replacing the government's traditional approach to planning and budgeting with a more rigorous process of identifying challenges, setting goals, prioritizing key activities based on evidence, developing specific intervention details and implementation plans (including budget requirements for the specific interventions), and operationalizing a strong monitoring process from the central to the local levels. BRNEd implementation was expected to yield: (i) in the short term, system-level improvements in the form of more efficient use of financial and human capital resources at central and local levels; (ii) in the medium term, tangible improvements in actual education service delivery through improved accountability and incentive mechanisms at the school level; and (iii) in the long term (over the four-year time frame of the plan), tangible but realistic improvements in student learning outcomes. The PforR was designed to support implementation of the BRNEd program. The PforR remained relevant even under the dramatic shift in approach with the government's ESDP 2016-2021 and introduction of fee-free schooling, as the additional financing supported sustained quality of education at all levels even as enrollment rapidly expanded.

Alignment with World Bank strategy. The objectives were tightly aligned with the Country Assistance Strategy at appraisal (2012-2016), which contained an objective to improve capital and the social safety net, with an outcome on improved access and quality of education, and an objective to promote accountability and governance, with an outcome to improve the accountability and efficiency of public management that focused on service delivery in the social sectors. The Country Partnership Framework at closing (CPF, 2018-2022) had a focus area on boosting human capital and social inclusion, with an objective to improve the



quality of health care and education. The CPF specifically supported this PforR, stating that "the World Bank has increased its focus on addressing quality deficiencies and moving away from financing of inputs" (CPF 2018-2022, p. 51). A new CPF is currently under development.

Appropriateness of the PforR instrument. The PforR provided financing to incentivize implementation of the government's own thoroughly developed program. The Bank's technical expertise, global knowledge, and leverage were well positioned to shift focus in Tanzania's education sector away from inputs toward increased efficiency of existing expenditures and an enhanced focus on quality outcomes through service delivery improvements. The BRNEd enjoyed strong political commitment at the highest levels, including championship from the country's president. It had a robust monitoring system to encourage accountability of key implementers. The PforR supported the BRNEd's results orientation and incentive-driven approach. It leveraged and strengthened existing central and local government systems, including public financial management, social and environmental systems management, and procurement management. It aligned incentives along different levels of the education service delivery chain. Tanzania was already familiar with disbursement against results-based indicators through the Urban Local Government Strengthening Program (2013-2020, US\$255 million). In addition to catalyzing results-based financing, the Bank's involvement was expected to bring tangible value added through its technical expertise; its provision of a platform for marshaling technical support, consensus-building, and donor harmonization around systemic and institutional change; and its support for research on the design and effectiveness of the PforR approach.

Rating

High

b. Relevance of DLIs

DLI 1

DLI

Recipient has completed all the Foundational Activities

Rationale

This DLI was intended to ensure that a robust system-level framework for the results-based financing model had been established. It was considered "foundational," ensuring that necessary procedures and processes were in place to enable progress on other DLIs, representing strong incentives to institutionalize prerequisite systems. It contained five parts, each of them one-time activities that revised, updated, or introduced guidelines, tools, or operational manuals. Each of the five parts had a binary (yes/no) outcome, sequenced at the beginning of the program to set the basis for further implementation.

- DLI 5.1 on agreement to a four-year BRNEd budget framework, coded against specific budget lines in the government's FY2013-14 budget.
- DLI 5.2 on the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT, later reorganized to the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology, MoEST) reviewing and revising education management



information system (EMIS) job descriptions in line with the appropriate civil service grading system and finalizing and approving the school census format and guidelines and disseminating those guidelines to all district education officers in FY2013-14.

- DLI 5.3 on the MoEVT and Prime Minister's Office, Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG), agreeing on a format for measuring and collecting verifiable data related to the transfer of capitation grants to schools in FY2013-14.
- DLI 5.4 on MoEVT having prepared a list of all primary and secondary schools with information on location, number of students, and number of teachers in FY2013-14.
- DLI 5.5 on MoEVT having prepared a format for measuring and collecting verifiable data related to the primary pupil-to-teacher ratio (PTR) at the school and LGA level and disseminating a summary primary PTR report format, with guidance notes to all LGAs, and establishing baseline values for 2013-14 and, in agreement with PMO-RALG, four-year targets for primary school PTRs in FY2013-14.

Rating

High

DLI 2

DLI

Recipient has evidenced timely and adequate resource flows for the program

Rationale

This DLI had two parts: DLI 2.1 was to disburse on verification of compliance with BRNEd budget disbursement, measured by quarterly release of funds per the BRNEd budget framework; and DLI 2.2 on verification of primary and secondary schools receiving capitation grants on time. Achievement of the DLI, which entailed transfer of funds directly from Treasury to schools, was necessary to ensure timely and adequate financing of program activities, with appropriate disaggregation by level.

Rating

High

DLI 3

DLI

Recipient has produced an Annual Summary Education Performance Report (ASEPR) and annual school-level education management information system (EMIS) data by each local government authority (LGA)

Rationale

This DLI was to incentivize improved results monitoring and data management at different levels of service delivery. It was divided into two parts, DLI 3.1 and DLI 3.2, which would disburse on verification of school-level data monitoring and analysis at the central and district levels, respectively. DLI 3.1 required release of an ASEPR in an acceptable format, and DLI 3.1 required annual school-level basic EMIS (BEMIS) data being made available online. Reliable information systems and regular monitoring and reporting were essential steps on the results chain toward achievement of the program objective.



Rating
High

DLI 4

DLI

Teachers have been deployed efficiently across and within districts

Rationale

This DLI was to ensure equitable teacher deployment across and within districts. It was divided into two parts: DLI 4.1 required meeting of the annual target for number of LGAs achieving an acceptable range for pupil-to-teacher ratios (PTRs); and DLI 4.2 required each LGA to meet the annual target for acceptable range of primary PTRs. Efficient teacher deployment was a key step on the results chain toward achievement of the program's objective.

Rating
High

DLI 5

DLI

Number of schools receiving SIGs as indicated in the program design

Rationale

This DLI, incentivizing effective implementation of key BRNEd initiatives, was divided into three parts:

- DLI 5.1 required SIG and STEP guidelines to be prepared. This was another "foundational" DLI, setting up procedures necessary to achieve recurrent DLIs 5.2 and 5.3.
- DLI 5.2 was disbursed based on annual targets for number of schools that have received SIG grants.
- DLI 5.3 was disbursed based on annual targets for number of schools that conducted STEP activities.

The DLI was effectively sequenced and ensured that resources would be made available in a timely manner and in amounts necessary to implement quality improvement activities. However, the DLI could have further incentivized specific directions of activity under the SIG grants and STEP activities to ensure that funds were appropriately allocated by schools toward actions that would contribute to improved education quality.

Rating
Substantial

DLI 6

DLI

Recipient has demonstrated an increase in student learning outcomes



Rationale

This DLI incentivized achievement of the project's objective in terms of 3R assessment results. DLI 6.1 required MoEVT to develop, in agreement with PMO-RALG, 3R assessment tools. This was a "foundational" DLI, setting up policies and procedures necessary for achievement of the recurrent DLI 6.2. DLI 6.2 disbursed according to annual targets on improvement in words per minute in the national 3R assessment. This DLI was directly linked to achievement of the program's objective.

Rating

High

DLI 6 REVISION 1

Revised DLI

Recipient has met the agreed target of national average on level 2 addition and subtraction submodule in the national 3R assessment

Revised Rationale

This new part of the DLI (DLI 6.3) was added at the 2017 additional financing to introduce another dimension to education quality improvement, directly linked to achievement of the program's objective.

Revised Rating

High

DLI 7

DLI

Primary and lower secondary education survival rates (added at 2017 additional financing)

Rationale

This DLI incentivized LGAs to achieve year-on-year increases in aggregate primary and lower secondary education survival rates (DLI 7.1), disaggregated by gender (DLI 7.2). This DLI was added because the large influx of students under the free basic education policy brought more students from disadvantaged backgrounds, who were at comparatively high risk of dropout, into the school system. This DLI rewarded LGAs to support survival and retention, and to address barriers to girls' participation. This DLI was appropriately responsive to the enrollment surge created by the free basic education policy, though it contributed indirectly to the program's objective of improved quality of education. It also would have been stronger if it had focused on completion rates rather than just survival.

Rating

Substantial

DLI 8

DLI



School quality assurance framework (added at 2017 additional financing)

Rationale

This DLI incentivized schools to display school reports cards based on whole school inspections (DLI 8.1) and to meet agreed targets for increase in school quality scores for selected schools to be inspected twice in consecutive years (DLI 8.2). This DLI focused on providing schools and communities with clear and concise feedback on quality and recommendations for improvement implementable at the school level. The quality scores emphasized issues that were addressable at the school level, such as teacher attendance and effort, allocation of resources, provision of equitable services to girls and students with disabilities, and compliance with minimum standards established in 3R and STEP training programs. The ICR notes that school quality assurance frameworks had been shown to improve curriculum implementation in schools by identifying both what is working well and areas for improvement. This DLI was an important part of the results chain toward achievement of the program's objective.

Rating

High

DLI 9

DLI

Support for policy, planning, and innovation (added at 2017 additional financing)

Rationale

This DLI incentivized meeting agreed targets for the number of new commissions granted to support policy, planning, and innovation. Specifically, this DLI incentivized creation of solutions to the problem of inequitable distribution of teachers due to structural and administrative barriers to reallocating teachers within and across LGAs (inadequate funding for teacher reallocation allowances, inappropriate initial allocation of newly qualified teachers to LGAs, use of subject specialist teachers in higher grades of primary level), supporting achievement of DLI 4. New policies included the preparation of a selection system where students nearing completion of lower secondary levels were able to choose their school to continue to advanced-level secondary, supporting effective allocation of students based on their preferences and on their lower secondary leaving exam results; development of an online application for teacher postings; and integration of a teacher transfer system with the payroll database. Introduction of this DLI was relevant to addressing an issue that had been identified as increasingly important during early program implementation, but disbursement based only on the number of commissions granted to support policy innovations did not take the quality or potential effectiveness of newly developed policies into consideration.

Rating

Substantial

OVERALL RELEVANCE RATING

Rationale



The objectives were strongly relevant to country context and Bank strategy. The DLIs were well articulated, with clear definitions and verification protocols. They were sequenced effectively, with some DLIs framed as "foundational" outputs prerequisite to achieving more outcome oriented DLIs, incentivizing results as needed to ensure that policies and procedures were in place to support implementation. The DLI matrix retained relevance with changes introduced to reflect new priorities that emerged as a result of the FBEP, supporting continued attention to improved quality of education even as enrollment expanded.

There were no shortcomings in the relevance of objectives and minor shortcomings in the relevance of DLIs. The aggregation of both dimensions is indicative of a high rating for overall relevance.

Rating
High

4. Achievement of Objectives (Efficacy)

OBJECTIVE 1

Objective

Improve education quality in Tanzania's primary and secondary schools

Rationale

The theory of change underpinning the operation was clear and convincing. Strengthening transparency through school participation in the 3R assessment and release of school rankings would identify lagging schools, students, and teachers, allowing for better planning and focused remedial attention. Awarding of performance-based incentive grants and teacher awards would increase teacher motivation and effort. Implementation of school improvement tool kits, 3R teacher training programs, and STEP would provide teachers and school administrators with the means to improve performance. Timely delivery of school capitation grants would improve textbook and materials availability, facilitating improved student performance. The results areas added with the 2017 additional financing—the development of a quality assurance system, addition of incentives for student survival and girls' transition to secondary school, incentives for improvements in pupil-teacher ratios, and support for textbook delivery—added new dimensions to the activities aimed at improving teacher/school incentives and student performance. Taken together, these results would lead to improved education quality in Tanzanian schools. The theory of change also acknowledged the importance of effective sequencing of activities: the school rankings and 3R assessments, along with school and teacher incentive grants, could effect change almost immediately, while the teacher training programs, STEP, and capitation grants would see impacts unfold in the medium-term. A key assumption was that teachers' salaries, financed by the government separate from this PforR, would continue to be paid on time, a reasonable assumption at appraisal given prior trends.



Intermediate outcomes (some of the intermediate outcome indicators were classified as disbursement-linked results, DLRs):

The BEMIS is fully operational, with comprehensive school-level data routinely uploaded to the Tanzania Open Data portal. The ASEPR provides comprehensive information on student enrollment and retention, teacher employment and distribution, textbooks, and exam results, by region and district, based on school-level data uploaded in BEMIS. All 184 LGAs provide complete information on AESPR indicators, with all data available in the Open Data portal.

More than 10,000 schools carried out STEP training for 5,459 primary and 1,139 secondary teachers to strengthen remedial instruction and support to low-performing students. In addition, 60,000 early grade teachers were trained on 3R.

The primary PTR increased from 42.6 in 2014/2015 to 62 in 2020/2021, driven by the significant increase in the number of primary students, a continued nation-wide shortage of teachers, and a temporary suspension of new teacher deployments during program implementation resulting from a government qualification and payroll verification exercise for public sector employees. The ICR (p. 25) also reports on structural issues limiting the ability of LGAs and MoEST/PMO-RALG to redistribute teachers within or across LGAs to address inequities.

33 percent of primary schools provided evidence of receipt of textbooks showing subject and grade levels, not reaching the target of 100 percent of schools. The share of pupils with English textbooks in Standard 4 decreased from 26.3 percent in 2014 to 18 percent in 2016, not meeting the target of 50 percent. The share of pupils with mathematics textbooks in Standard 4 decreased from 26.3 percent in 2016 to 21 percent in 2018, not meeting the target of 50 percent. The ICR (p. 26) reported that textbook distribution was disrupted by the introduction and then withdrawal of a new curriculum that would have increased the primary level from six to seven years, by the withdrawal of printed textbooks that contained errors, and by lower-than-planned budget releases for procurement of textbooks (only 39 percent of the budgeted amount was released in 2020/2021).

83 percent of capitation grants were released monthly in full to all primary schools in each LGA, and 84.38 percent were released to secondary schools, in both cases exceeding the original target of 80 percent, but not reaching the revised target of 100 percent.

72.5 percent of public primary and secondary schools had school report cards on display during inspections, exceeding the target of 50 percent of schools. In 2019, 37 percent of schools received follow-up visits based on these inspections, exceeding the target of 10 percent. By 2019, 100 percent of sampled schools showed increases in school quality scores (the ICR does not describe how sample schools were selected).

262 primary schools received SIGs based on performance, not reaching the target of 300 primary schools. 138 secondary schools received SIGs based on performance, exceeding the target of 100 secondary schools. The ICR (p. 24) notes that "the SIGs have reportedly created competition among schools and have proven to be an effective driver of school motivation to improve learning, encouraging greater school and community attention to student learning outcomes."

The volume of outstanding teacher salary claims older than three months declined from 25 billion Tanzanian shillings in 2014 to 15.9 billion shillings in 2019, not reaching the target of 2 billion shillings. Although this was



not a program DLI, it was an essential step toward improved teacher motivation. The ICR (p. 24) notes that "the data on teacher claims is not good, and it has been difficult to report on teacher claims consistently."

Outcomes

The national average for reading correct words per minute (wpm) in the Oral Reading Fluency module of the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) among grade 2 students improved from 17.9 wpm in 2014 to 26.18 in 2020, exceeding the original target of 21.9 wpm and the revised target of 18.9 wpm. However, the percentage of students achieving the benchmark oral fluency score (50 correct words per minute) in the EGRA improved from 4.7 percent in 2013 to 5.2 percent in 2019, not meeting the original target of 8 percent or the revised target of 6.5 percent.

The percentage of students in grade 2 achieving minimum overall numeracy skills increased from 7.9 percent in 2016 to 17.1 percent in 2018, exceeding the target of 12 percent. The national average on the Level 2 addition and subtraction sub-modules of 3R assessments among grade 2 students improved from 22.6 percent in 2016 to 39.9 percent in 2018, exceeding the original target of 30 percent and the revised target of 26.8 percent. However, the national average on the Level 1 subtraction sub-module of the Early Grade Mathematics Assessment among grade 2 students remained essentially stable, at 5.5 correct answers per minute in 2014 and 5.6 correct answers per minute in 2018, not reaching the original target of 6 or revised target of 7 words per minute. The ICR speculates that the surge in enrollment of many previously out-of-school children, producing higher PTRs due to inadequate numbers of teachers, presented challenges in reaching some learning assessment targets.

The percentage of teachers present in the classroom during unannounced visits in primary and secondary schools increased from 47 percent in 2014 to 57 percent in 2018, exceeding the original target of 53 percent and the revised target of 56 percent.

The average teacher knowledge score in mathematics (primary) increased from 63.1 percent in 2016 to 64.9 percent in 2018, exceeding the original target of 51 percent and meeting the revised target of 65 percent. (The original target combined mathematics and English knowledge scores, explaining why the original target was lower than the baseline.) The average teacher knowledge score in English (primary) decreased from 41.9 percent in 2014 to 37.4 percent in 2018, not achieving the original target of 51 percent or the revised target of 45 percent.

Pass rates on the Certificate of Secondary Education Examination (CSEE, secondary school leaving exam) were reported, but these were pitched as higher-level outcomes, acknowledged to be beyond the time frame and attribution of the program.

- The overall CSEE pass rate increased from 70 percent in 2014 to 86 percent in 2020.
- The national average pass rate on the CSEE in mathematics increased from 16.8 percent in 2016 to 20.1 percent in 2020, not meeting the original target of 22.3 percent, but achieving the revised target of 20 percent. The female pass rate in mathematics increased from 12.8 percent in 2016 to 16.2 percent in 2020, exceeding the original target of 17.9 percent and the revised target of 14.4 percent.
- The national average pass rate on the CSEE in English increased from 56.2 percent in 2016 to 73.6 percent in 2020, not meeting the original target of 74.8 percent, but exceeding the revised target of 72.2 percent. The female pass rate in English increased from 52.5 percent in 2016 to 71.6 percent in 2020, not reaching the original target of 73.8 percent, but exceeding the revised target of 68.9 percent.



- The national average pass rate on the CSEE in sciences increased from 53.6 percent in 2016 to 63.7 percent in 2020, not meeting the original target of 71.4 percent, but exceeding the revised target of 56.4 percent. The female pass rate in sciences increased from 45.7 percent in 2016 to 57.4 percent in 2020, not meeting the original target of 64.2 percent, but exceeding the revised target of 48.8 percent.

The pass rate on the Primary School Leaving Assessment (also a higher-level outcome) was also reported, an increase from 57 percent in 2014 to 82 percent in 2020. The national primary survival rate improved from 64 percent in 2017 to 74 percent in 2021 (from 67 percent to 79 percent for girls, and from 62 percent to 69 percent for boys).

The total number of student beneficiaries of the program was 15.3 million, exceeding the original target of 12.1 million and the revised target of 14.2 million. The total number of teacher beneficiaries was 0.32 million, exceeding the original target of 0.29 million and the revised target of 0.30 million. The share of female student beneficiaries was 50.1 percent, exceeding the target of 50 percent.

Rating
Substantial

OVERALL EFFICACY

Rationale

Efficacy is rated Substantial, but with caveats. Outcome targets were reached at all levels for teacher attendance, and at the primary level for reading outcomes. Significant improvements were observed in school-leaving exam results at both the primary and secondary levels. However, mathematics and teacher knowledge outcomes at the primary level were mixed, including the non-achievement of some intended outcomes, as were results related to textbook distribution and pupil-to-teacher ratios.

In terms of attribution, although the PforR supported a major portion of the government's quality improvement efforts in primary and secondary education, other programs also likely impacted results. Concurrent Bank-financed poverty mitigation projects, for example, provided cash transfers to poor households linked to improved educational outcomes, likely contributing to achievement of this program's objective. However, given its support for most of the activities in the government program, it is reasonable to attribute observed outcomes in large part to the PforR's investments.

Rating
Substantial

5. Outcome



The program was initially highly relevant to country context, government strategy, and Bank strategy at appraisal, and it remained relevant throughout implementation, even as government strategy in the education sector shifted. DLIs were well articulated, with clear definitions and verification protocols, and effective sequencing. Outcome targets were reached at all levels for teacher attendance, and at the primary level for reading outcomes. Significant improvements were observed in school-leaving exam results at both the primary and secondary levels. However, mathematics and teacher knowledge outcomes at the primary level were mixed. With High relevance and Substantial efficacy based on Substantial achievement of the project's single objective, overall Outcome is rated Satisfactory.

Outcome Rating Satisfactory

6. Risk to Development Outcome

The program incentivized putting in place strategies, guidelines, systems, procedures, and tools that strengthened the institutional capacity of implementing agencies to continue delivering quality improvements after program closure. However, the increased enrollments following the FBEP continue to present challenges to sustaining the program's results. Supporting education quality outcomes will require ongoing government commitment to budgeting for priority expenditures, including textbooks, capitation grants to schools, and teacher salaries; the ICR (p. 42) implies that this commitment is not solid. Per-student spending on primary education has declined by 62 percent from 2014/2015 and 2019/2020 because of the increased number of children enrolled. The share of education spending in the overall government budget has declined from 17.5 percent in 2014/2015 to 11.6 percent in 2020/2021. However, the government's most recent EDSP (2021/2022-2025/2026) prioritizes "the provision of high quality and relevant education at all levels of education," and based on the performance of this PforR, development partners plan to provide continued financial and technical assistance, helping to close financing gaps.

7. Assessment of Bank Performance

a. Quality-at-Entry

The program's objectives and priorities were derived from extensive stakeholder consultations, focusing on interventions that could address challenges quickly and that could have maximum impact. The PforR instrument and results/DLI frameworks were well constructed to incentivize and measure change. The sequencing of "foundational" DLIs, followed by subsequent actions to be enabled by those DLIs, was an effective design strategy. Although other financing instruments were considered, the PforR (the first-ever Bank-financed PforR in support of an education program) was seen as having advantages over alternatives: it would promote a results-oriented program and implementation culture, focusing attention away from inputs toward achievement of outcomes and efficiency of expenditure; it would adopt a direct, incentive-driven approach to achieving the development objective; it would leverage and strengthen



existing central and local government systems; and it would align incentives along different levels of the education service delivery chain.

Institutional arrangements were well specified in the PAD (pp. 26-29), with the MoEVT responsible for overall implementation of education sector programs in the country, and PMO-RALG, through LGAs, responsible for coordinating, providing technical support, and allocating resources for actual implementation of primary and secondary education programs. The Education Ministry Delivery Unit (MDU) was responsible for overall program management and monitoring. Explicit mechanisms were put in place to harmonize dialogue and coordination between the Bank, DfID, and SIDA, the three development partners supporting the BNREd. DfID provided US\$7 million in parallel technical assistance for program preparation, covering implementation readiness, longer-term implementation support, results monitoring, and support for student assessment systems.

The program's overall risk rating at appraisal was Substantial (PAD, pp. 38-39 and Annex 5). Risk assessment focused on insufficient financing to implement BRNEd activities and their non-implementation, mitigated through technical assistance and the DLIs; challenges related to M&E capacity and data adequacy, mitigated through technical assistance and the DLI associated with EMIS data; and overall program implementation capacity, mitigated through strengthening of existing service delivery mechanisms through the establishment of delivery unit "catalyzers" responsible for day-to-day activities, working under the umbrella of the Education MDU. A Program Action Plan (PAP) was designed to mitigate, to the extent possible, the technical, fiduciary, and safeguard risks associated with the program. None of the identified risks materialized, and the government achieved all foundational DLIs within the first year of implementation, indicating that the program's quality at entry was strong.

The ICR (p. 41) identified the lack of an explicit program objective on institutional strengthening as a shortcoming, but this review views institutional strengthening as an output contributing to achievement of the specified objective to improve education quality, rather than an objective in and of itself.

Quality-at-Entry Rating

Satisfactory

b. Quality of supervision

Implementation support was timely, results focused, and well documented in aides-memoire and Implementation Status and Results Reports (ISRs). The Bank team was hands-on and responsive to the client's and program's needs. In particular, the team responded immediately to the government's new priorities following presidential elections in 2015, putting in place additional financing that would respond to the expected surge in school enrollments, and then adjusting the implementation schedule, results matrix, and DLIs further when the effects of increased student numbers became clear. The PAP was used as a living document, with adjustments made during implementation to drop activities that were no longer required, fine-tune those that needed adjustment, and introduce new activities in response to shifting government priorities.



Quality of Supervision Rating

Satisfactory

Overall Bank Performance Rating

Satisfactory

8. M&E Design, Implementation, & Utilization

a. M&E Design

The program's objective, logic, and results framework, constructed around DLIs that would contribute to achievement of key outcome targets, were relatively straightforward. Outcome indicators measured grade 2 performance in literacy and numeracy, teacher attendance, and teacher competency. The targets for grade 2 3R scores were set realistically, given that the baseline environment was reflective of a continuing decline in education quality. The DLIs were a mix of outcome, output, and process indicators in areas critical for improving learning outcomes but identified as weak or poorly functioning in background assessments. They effectively linked incentives to key points within the BRNEd program's results chain (PAD, Annex 4). Baselines, targets, data sources, responsibility for monitoring and verification, and verification protocols were clearly specified for all indicators. Improvement of student performance on school leaving examinations was considered to be a high-order objective of the program, beyond its scope in terms of timing and attribution. It is noteworthy that, though the objective was to improve education quality at both the primary and secondary level, there were initially no outcome indicators measuring quality improvements at the secondary level (an indicator was added at the 2017 additional financing).

Three major monitoring systems were in place to measure progress on outcome and intermediate indicators and DLIs: the National EMIS, maintained by MoEVT, with data collected through an annual school census; data on student performance maintained by the National Examinations Council of Tanzania and including results data from annual school leaving examinations; and BRNEd's own M&E system, with the MDU team tracking indicators on a weekly and monthly basis, and data then collated by the newly established President's Delivery Bureau (PDB) to produce a public Annual Report. Verification of DLIs varied according to the nature of the DLIs, with responsibility distributed among the Bank team, donor partners, and an independent firm hired by MoEVT. The PAD (Annex 3) contained a detailed DLI verification protocol.

b. M&E Implementation

During implementation the PDB was dissolved, and M&E was led by the two sector ministries—MoEST and PMO-RALG—along with the MDU. This change of arrangements was purely an administrative one, as the same people continued to work in the same task areas. Routine monitoring proceeded as designed, although some key indicator data were not consistently updated over the final years of the program. Annual reporting followed the DLI and results framework matrices. The independent verification agency performed smoothly, making timely and concrete recommendations based on its findings. However, outcome indicator data on teacher presence and teacher knowledge depended on a follow-up Service Delivery Indicator survey that was not implemented.



The ICR (p. 38) notes that, when the government's education strategy was updated to include access as a priority and implement fee-free basic education, the program's objective could have been revised to include access in addition to quality. This would have been appropriate, given the extent to which the operation was intended to support the entirety of the government's program, but it could also be argued that maintaining quality as the sole objective served the important purpose of sustaining focus on quality outcomes even as enrollments surged.

c. M&E Utilization

M&E data and analysis were used continuously to inform Joint Implementation Support Missions (JISMs) and to adjust the program. JISMs identified areas where additional implementation support was required, assessed the impact of exogenous factors on program implementation, and identified the need for additional financing. The 2016 mid-term review, which was informed by routine monitoring data plus numerous technical studies, a process evaluation, and government priorities as outlined in its draft 2016-2021 ESDP, identified the strains placed on schools by enrollment surges, increased dropout rates, textbook shortages, challenges with teacher deployment, and disappointing performance at some levels and on some subjects in examination results. Some program targets were adjusted accordingly, and new results areas and DLIs were added.

M&E Quality Rating

Substantial

9. Other Issues

a. Safeguards

An Environmental and Social Management System Assessment (ESSA) was undertaken and disclosed, and feedback from stakeholders was incorporated into the PAP, indicators, and technical manual. No direct or significant environmental or social footprints were anticipated, and no major issues arose during implementation. The Bank routinely made recommendations on strengthening safeguard management, related primarily to staffing, grievance redress mechanisms, and lack of awareness of the ESSA at district offices and schools. The ICR does not report on the extent to which these recommendations were implemented.

b. Fiduciary Compliance

At appraisal, an Integrated Fiduciary Assessment found the legal and regulatory framework for the program's fiduciary systems to be comprehensive and in line with international principles and standards, but overall fiduciary risk was rated substantial. Identified financial management risks included possible under-funding of the government's development budget, as well as accounting and internal audit staff skills (especially at the LGA level). Procurement risks included inadequate constitution of Tender Boards, low staffing of Program Management Units (PMUs) in some LGAs, and inadequate procurement set-up and



staffing at many schools. Mitigation measures included contracting out the audit function to private external audit firms and training/TA for PMUs and schools. The Bank's ISRs reported that there was consistent compliance with agreed actions.

c. Unintended impacts (Positive or Negative)

None reported.

d. Other

10. Ratings

Ratings	ICR	IEG	Reason for Disagreements/Comment
Outcome	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Bank Performance	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of M&E	Substantial	Substantial	
Quality of ICR	---	Substantial	

11. Lessons

The ICR (pp. 43-47) offered a wide range of lessons in the areas of government ownership and development partner harmonization, program design and implementation, application of the split rating methodology, and designing outcomes and objectives. IEG restates some of the key lessons here:

A PforR instrument can support continued government focus on prioritizing results even during shifts in implementation context. In this case, the continuous dialogue between the government and the Bank (and other development partners) regarding progress on activities and achievements incentivized by the program's DLIs helped maintain focus on education quality and learning outcomes, even with the addition of fee-free basic education and added priority of expanding access,

Disbursement-linked incentives are most effective when they are aligned to institutions at the government or implementing agency level that can best influence the desired results. In this case, separate DLIs were well constructed to target schools, local government authorities, and institutions at the national level.



Learning outcomes can serve as effective outcome indicators, but only if the indicators carefully take contextual dynamics into account when specifying how learning is measured.

In this case, the significant expansion of student enrollment during program implementation meant that more students from disadvantaged backgrounds were included in the overall student population, and therefore the learning measures used at the beginning of the program were not necessarily appropriate later. New types of indicators, including learning-adjusted years of schooling and learning poverty, can provide more meaningful measures of progress in these kinds of situations.

12. Assessment Recommended?

Yes

Please Explain

To study the mechanisms by which the program maintained focus on education quality during a period of rising enrollment, and to understand how education gains for girls can be achieved through both targeted and nontargeted interventions.

13. Comments on Quality of ICR

The ICR's narrative was mostly clear and candid. It was strongly evidence-based, drawing data not only from the program's formal results framework but also from other sources of outcome data. It harnessed high-quality data, and its analysis was sound. Its lessons were comprehensive and should prove highly valuable to other operations in the sector, particularly as the use of PforR expands. However, there were moderate shortcomings. The ICR was exceptionally lengthy and highly repetitive. More importantly, it did not provide a clear and detailed accounting of revisions and additions of DLIs at the program's restructurings, making it challenging to assess which adjustments were made to the program's structure at what time. Its reporting of the program's Outcome rating was inconsistent between the main text (Satisfactory rating, p. 28) and the data sheet (Moderately Satisfactory, p. 3). The ICR also did not implement the split rating methodology correctly, assessing program achievement by separate periods rather than across the program's entire lifetime against both the original and revised outcome targets.

a. Quality of ICR Rating

Substantial