

SFG2257

Myanmar

**Additional Financing for the Decentralizing Fund to Schools
Project (P157231)**

Community Participation Planning Framework (CPPF)

DRAFT

2016-2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Program Background: Additional Financing for the Decentralizing Funding to Schools Program	1
B.	Ethnic Minorities and Legal Rights in Education.....	7
C.	Potential Impacts of the Stipend and School Grants Programs: Summary of Social Assessment.....	8
D.	Community Participation Planning Framework (CPPF)	12
1.	Objective of CPPF.....	12
2.	Applicable World Bank Policies.....	13
3.	Principles of CPPF.....	13
4.	Implementation procedures of CPPF.....	14
5.	Monitoring and Evaluation of the CPPF.....	19
6.	Grievance Redress Mechanisms	20
7.	Expenditure for CPP	21
	Annex 1: Stipend program implementation timeline (2015-2016)	22

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AY	-	Academic Year
CPP	-	Community Participation Plan
CPPF	-	Community Participation Planning Framework
DEPT	-	Department of Education Planning and Training
DBEs	-	Department of Basic Educations
DLI	-	Disbursement-linked Indicator
GoM	-	Government of Myanmar
MoE	-	Ministry of Education
EFA-NAP	-	Myanmar Education for All-National Action Plan
EGRA	-	Early Grade Reading Assessment
FGD	-	Focus Group Discussion
PTA	-	Parent and Teacher Association
SA	-	Social Assessment
SGSC	-	School Program Committee
TEOs	-	Township Education Offices
TGSC	-	Township Program Working Group

A. Program Background: Additional Financing for the Decentralizing Funding to Schools Program

1. Introduction

The proposed additional financing would provide support in three ways:

- It would expand and extend financing for the existing school grants, student stipends, related training, and early grade reading assessment (EGRA) activities. The programs would be extended for fifth and sixth years in addition to the four-year original project duration. During those two years, new Disbursement-Linked Indicators (DLIs) would be added, tied to increasing enrollment and retention of students and to timely reporting on learning outcomes.
- It would help design, implement, and evaluate a Teacher Mentoring program over a four-year period. New DLIs would be added, tied to the effective design, roll out, and evaluation of the program. The program will provide instructional support and advice to the roughly 40 percent of teachers in grades 1-5 who have been teaching for less than three years.
- It would add financing to the project to fill the funding gap for originally planned activities, which has resulted from exchange rate losses against the original DFAT 25 million Australian dollar commitment under the MDTF (around US\$20 million equivalent at the time of approval) and to a lesser extent against the exchange rate loss against the original International Development Association (IDA) credit amount of SDR 51.8 million (around US\$80 million equivalent at the time of approval).

The existing project will also be restructured in the following ways: (i) an additional development objective will be added for a new teacher mentoring program to be supported by the project; (ii) an emergency financing window will be added to the IDA credit and referenced in the PDO, the closing date of the project will be extended for two years to January 31, 2021; (iii) the addition of new DLIs associated with the AF; (iv) changes in the results framework related to the new PDO and new activities; (v) amending the relative IDA/MDTF disbursement percentages in the Financing Agreement (FA) and Grant Agreement (GA), which are currently set as 83 percent/17 percent IDA/MDTF financing, and adding a new disbursement category in the FA for the '0' contingent emergency response component; and (vi) the arrangements for social safeguards will be revised to reflect the Ministry of Education's (MoE) new system for township-level social assessment and consultation.

The additional financing will be supported by the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) using funds provided by Australia and Denmark. The total amount of additional financing by Australia and Denmark will be finalized and reflected in written communications from Australia and Denmark prior to negotiations of the amended financing and grant agreements for the project. The MDTF Steering Committee is expected to approve the additional funding prior to the signatures of the FA and GA.

2. Background and Rationale for Additional Financing

The original project objective was “to help improve and expand Myanmar’s School Grants Program and Student Stipends Program.” IDA provided SDR 51.8 million (about US\$80 million equivalent at the time of approval) in funding to support this objective, and Australia provided AUD 25,000,000 (about US\$20 million at the time of approval) through the MDTF. The project was designed to disburse against the achievement of 12 DLIs, and funding was earmarked for spending against agreed government budget codes in support of these programs.

To date, two years into implementation of this four-year program, the first six DLIs have been achieved, and about US\$42 million has been disbursed to Myanmar and allocated to townships and schools and, in the case of the stipends, to “at-risk” children and their families. The agreement disbursement ratio is 83 percent from IDA and 17 percent from the MDTF. The Bank is in the process of verifying with the MoE reporting for the three DLIs agreed for the project year three. Following this verification, it is expected that an additional US\$27 million will be disbursed by end of June 2016, bringing total disbursement to about US\$69 million. Overall, project implementation and progress towards achieving the project’s development objectives are rated satisfactory.

The ongoing project supports the education sector by strengthening decentralized service delivery which is part of the Bank’s Country Partnership Framework (CPF). The CPF is focused on three areas: reducing rural poverty; investing in people and effective institutions for people; and supporting a dynamic private sector to create jobs. Activities in these focus areas integrate four cross-cutting issues that are important for the achievement of the WBG twin goals: gender, conflict, governance, and climate change/disaster risk. The education project is part of the “investing in people and effective institutions for people” pillar. While the government of Myanmar’s education sector strategy is still in development, in-service teacher professional development has been identified as a key priority in drafts of the sector strategy and through the government’s Comprehensive Education Sector Reform (CESR) process.

The rationale for preparing additional financing at this time is as follows:

- The addition of funding to this operation is timely. Through this additional financing, the new ministry leadership is reconfirming its ownership of the existing schools grants and stipends programs and moving quickly to adapt the current results-based funding mechanism to its own priorities.
- Providing in-service continuous professional development to the approximately 90,000 primary school teachers; 40 percent of all teachers in grades 1-5, who have been teaching for less than three years, is among MoE’s highest priorities for improving the quality of teaching and learning in Myanmar. This justification is further strengthened by the fact that about 20 percent of all teachers were initially hired as temporary contract teachers.
- Adding grant funding to the project will move the ratio of credit to grant from its current 80–20 percent proportion to about 50-50 percent and thereby demonstrate that the initial IDA credit funding has served to leverage additional investments in the education sector.

- Additional financing will also allow the donor partners to begin to orient the focus of the DLIs for the existing program from an initial focus on design and outputs to a new focus on program impact in the next two to three years.
- The addition of a new development objective and support of a new program using the same DLI mechanism will allow the Bank, its donor partners, and the government of Myanmar to capitalize on the success of the results-based financing approach; it will also help demonstrate that the DLI financing mechanism can be adapted and expanded to support various government programs.

3. Proposed Changes:

Changes to the Development Objectives

The original project development objective (PDO) was “to help improve and expand Myanmar’s School Grants Program and Student Stipends Program.” This objective was appropriately narrow for the Bank’s first investment in the education sector in Myanmar. The new objective expands on this initial narrow scope. The proposed new objective is “to increase the share of primary-age children who complete their primary-level education.”

The new PDO is consistent with the existing school grants and stipends programs and with the new teacher professional development program. It is also one of the highest and most measurable objectives of the new government, as reflected in their election manifesto.

Changes to the Key Results Indicators

The original performance indicators for the project sought to monitor outputs under the school grants and stipends programs. For example, disbursements were linked to the amounts and timing of school grants and to the numbers of stipends paid to children at risk of dropping out. Under the additional financing, new indicators have been added to the project for years 5 and 6 which will help begin a transition to monitoring the development impact of the school grants and stipends programs. New indicators have also been added to monitor the rollout of the in-service teacher mentoring program. These indicators covering teacher mentoring are oriented towards outputs (similar to the initial school grants and stipends indicators), reflecting the start-up nature of these innovations. Learning outcomes will be monitored through periodic reporting on early grade reading and math assessments to be conducted at the state/region levels.

To continue to track the impact of the school grants program for basic education (grades 1-11), the following indicators will be monitored:

- a. Increases in the share of school grant spending on initiatives directly aimed at supporting teaching and learning (pedagogical materials, supplies, professional development, etc.).
- b. Continued increases in the amount of funding transferred directly to schools using a formula-based approach (e.g., in the case of primary schools, increase per school amounts from an average of about US\$300 per school annually in 2012-13 to

approximately US\$2,000 per school annually by 2020-21).

To track the impact of the student stipend program, the following indicators will be monitored:

- a. Increases in the transition rate of grades 5 and 6 in all townships selected for the stipends program.
- b. Increases in the primary completion rate for all townships selected for the stipends program.
- c. Continuing expansion of the stipends program from about 37,000 students in 2015-16 to approximately 200,000 students in 2020-21.

To begin tracking improvements and expansion of in-service mentoring programs for teachers, the following indicators will be monitored:

- a. The number of mentor teachers who have begun mentoring assignments in townships throughout Myanmar (expected to be at least 600 by school year 2020-21).
- b. The number of teachers who have received classroom assessment and feedback in schools throughout Myanmar (expected to be at least 80,000 annually by school year 2020-21).
- c. Increases in the coverage of learning outcome assessment surveys for grade 3 reading and math; emphasis will be placed on building capacity to measure and report on learning results.

The indicators defined above would be the basis for the project's new DLIs. Each DLI indicator would be monitored and reported on by MoE as part of the program and verified in "spot check" surveys by the World Bank. In addition, the World Bank would work closely with MoE to undertake periodic surveys in selected project townships, which will provide an external confirmation of progress on results. DLIs are provided in Annex 2.

Changes to the Project Description

Oversight and implementation: Few changes will be made to arrangements for project oversight or implementation. The project would continue to be overseen by a Steering Committee composed of senior MoE leadership, which would meet twice a year to review progress and endorse revisions to programs based on annual M&E. Disbursements would be made based on achievement of well-defined progress indicators, and results-based funding would be limited to agreed budget codes, which make up the eligible expenditure program. The World Bank would continue to support a parallel M&E program, in close cooperation with MoE, which comprises: (i) qualitative surveys including social assessments aimed at getting timely feedback on operational aspects of the programs; (ii) quantitative surveys (including school and household surveys) aimed at providing a more rigorous picture of program impact; and (iii) spot checks that serve to confirm MoE and subnational reporting on achievement of the DLIs.

Changes to the Disbursement of Funds

During appraisal and legal agreement negotiations for the additional financing, the World Bank will propose that the government adopt a new disbursement method that allows reimbursement of eligible government expenditure in lieu of the advance disbursement method that was originally adopted. The need to account for disbursement advances using government systems has added a layer of complexity to the DLI approval and disbursement processes. After two years of experience with DLIs and disbursement advances, the Ministries of Finance and Education will better understand the advantages in terms of simplicity and reporting of reimbursing MoE for funding already expended.

The amended IDA Financing Agreement and the MDTF Grant Agreement will include a covenant providing that the relative IDA/MDTF disbursement percentages will be specified in annual work plans and budgets approved by the Bank, which will then be adjusted from time to time as needed without amending the FA and GA. This approach will be reflected in the draft amendment letter. The funding from the original loan will be fully disbursed during the original four years project period. This would mean that the disbursement percentages of IDA and MDTF will be changed for the first two years of the additional financing, while funding will be all MDTF in year 3 and 4 of the additional financing.

As previously mentioned, the new disbursement arrangements will contain a new “0” contingent emergency response disbursement category in the IDA Financing Agreement.

Changes to Ongoing Programs

The basic description of the school grants and stipends programs will not change as a result of the additional financing. MoE will continue to monitor implementation of these programs and introduce annual improvements and upgrades based on the lessons of implementation experience and the findings of evaluations. For example, as mentioned above, the school grants schemes are expected to give increasing emphasis to teaching and learning priorities at the school level, as opposed to maintenance and repairs; and the stipends program will be tied more closely to township reporting on access and retention. Improvements to the school grants and stipends programs will continue to be reflected in annual updates to MoE’s program guidelines and to the content of annual training programs.

Additional Support for a Teacher Mentoring Program

A new program aimed at expanding and improving in-service teacher professional development with a focus on teacher mentoring will be designed, funded, implemented, and monitored in a similar way as the grants and stipends programs. The justification for using the results-based financing approach, which uses government systems and financing channels, is that it would put MoE in the lead in terms of using its own systems and own oversight to roll out a teacher professional development program that delivers improved teaching skills in the classroom. MoE is preparing the design, in collaboration with the World Bank and other interested donor partners. Final design of the new program will be one of the new DLIs for the additional financing. Additional DLIs developed for the additional financing (see Annex 4)

will track the rollout of the programs, moving progressively over the medium to long term from output-oriented triggers to triggers tied to monitoring the impact of the program. As with the school grants and stipends, the parallel M&E program will be crucial for monitoring results and the quality of program implementation.

The decision to focus narrowly on in-service professional development of teachers and, within that area, on a teacher mentoring approach, is based on several factors, as follows:

- Given the project's experience over the past two years, the World Bank has some confidence that the MoE will be able to design a simple school and/or cluster-based teacher mentoring program and related classroom observation instrument. In order to promote ownership and decrease implementation risk, the program is likely to be limited and simple in its initial design. MoE's donor partners have the capacity and funding to help MoE during the design phase to monitor and evaluate the program throughout implementation and to help improve and expand it over time. Quality assurance and links to other education initiatives (curriculum, materials, pre-service training, etc.) is expected to be a result of continuous interaction between MoE and its donor partners through working group interactions and the M&E program. This type of partnership and a focus on continuous quality assurance has worked well under the existing results-based project.
- Teachers in Myanmar have been exposed to active teaching methods and the child-friendly teaching approach for nearly two decades. Various donors including UNESCO, JICA, UNICEF, and many NGOs have supported training programs over the years aimed at introducing interactive teaching methodologies, although such programs have not been part of a national program which is owned and funded by MoE. The idea of harnessing some of this local knowledge and experience is a logical response to the fact that Myanmar has a young and inexperienced teaching force.
- The draft National Education Sector Plan, which remains to be finalized and endorsed by MoE leadership, effectively makes the case that the lack of continuous school-based or cluster-based mentoring of teachers represents a serious gap in efforts to invest in teacher quality. The lack of continuous support for teachers is especially serious given the large share (more than 25 percent) of new teachers currently employed in Myanmar's schools. MoE efforts have tended to focus on off-site, workshop-based training in which teachers are trained in mass outside their schools. The introduction of a mentoring program would help change the priority currently assigned to traditional off-site training.
- No donor is currently supporting teacher mentoring or school clusters in a systematic way. Other donors have included continuous school-level or cluster-based professional development in their programs, but these have tended to be relatively small scale and rely on significant hands-on donor support and direct funding of activities by the donor. UNICEF is currently supporting a small-scale professional development program that trains school heads to provide pedagogic support to teachers in their schools (School-Based In-service Teacher Education (SITE)). This program or elements of this program should inform the design of MoE teacher mentoring program.

- Other donors are actively engaged in supporting other priority activities in support of teachers. JICA is supporting the development of pre-service teacher training curricula, and UNESCO is actively engaged in providing policy advice and capacity building support for pre-service teacher training colleges. The links and potential complementarity with these programs and other efforts to provide in-service training, funded by government or donors, will be assessed and reported on during preparation.
- As part of its governance work, the World Bank is supporting a study on teacher compensation and redeployment. Policy advice in this area will be based on a SABER analysis which will benchmark Myanmar's teacher policies against international standards. This exercise is expected to be completed prior to the appraisal of this additional financing and help provide support for the priority given to in-service teacher professional development.
- Lastly, global experience is increasingly demonstrating the priority of providing teachers with continuous professional development and mentoring in their schools or in small school clusters. Some of this experience, particularly in Indonesia, will be used to justify the emphasis assigned to this subsector and inform the design of the approach to be adopted by government.

In order to reduce risk and promote quality in the initial years, the in-service professional development intervention will focus in the first year on about 40 townships and expand over time, similar to the stipends program in the original project.

Eligible expenditures in the form of specific budget codes will be agreed on during appraisal, which would be used by MoE to finance the teacher professional development program. MoE has allocated funding for these activities in its budget request for budget year 2016-17. The new budget codes to be used under the project would be reflected in the revised operations manual. Authorization has also been provided for hiring a limited number of mentor teachers – about 160 – at the township level in 2016.

Approval by the MDTF Steering Committee

The additional financing is expected to be approved by the MDTF Steering Committee prior to the signature of the MDTF grant agreement (expected August 2016). The World Bank and Australia have already expanded the level of resources devoted in the MDTF for monitoring and evaluation of the programs for the additional financing. This includes additional funding to monitor in-service training and teacher quality issues, as well as funding to help cover the costs of preparation and supervision of these programs.

B. Ethnic Minorities and Legal Rights in Education

It is estimated that there are more than 130 ethnic groups in Myanmar, though the government usually identified eight groups as major national ethnic races including Kachin, Kayah, Kayin, Chin, Mon, Bamar, Rakhine and Shan. Bamar is the largest group which comprises around 69%, followed by Shan at 8.5%, Kayin 6.2%, Rakhine at 4.5%, Chin at 2.2%, Kachin at 1.4%

and other groups at 0.1 %¹. However, the 2008 Constitution of Myanmar doesn't endorse or provide the approved list of races which are considered as national races.

The Constitution describes in Chapter 1 in clause 22 states that the Union shall assist:

- (a) To develop language, literature, fine arts and culture of the National races;
- (b) To promote solidarity, mutual amity and respect and mutual assistance among the national races;
- (c) To promote socio-economic development including education, health, economy, transport and communication, so forth, of less-developed National races.

There are currently few laws and regulations which explicitly mention race or ethnic minorities in Myanmar.

National Education Law described the following in its Articles:

42 (b) help to open classes to develop the ethnic groups' literature, language, culture, arts and traditions and to start subjects/majors in ethnic groups' culture, literature, and history in universities.

43 (a) Instruction can be in Myanmar or English or in a combination of Myanmar and English.

43 (b) If there is a need, an ethnic language can be used alongside Myanmar as a language of instruction at the basic education level.

44 In Divisions or States, teaching of ethnic languages and literature can be implemented by Division or State governments, starting at the primary level and gradually expanding (to higher grades.)

Supporting ethnic language learning. Ministry of Education implemented ethnic language learning program in Basic Education Schools since 2013-2-14 Academic Year. MoE supported salaries to 16,908 ethnic language teachers at the rate of kyats 30,000 per month and also made free delivery of ethnic language books of 44 languages from 18 States and Regions.

C. Potential Impacts of the Stipend and School Grants Programs: Summary of Social Assessment

MoE has undertaken a lessons-learned review of the social assessment processes conducted during implementation years 1 and year 2. The aims were to further integrate key social considerations into the education programs supported by the project and to further combine analytical and participatory approaches under the programs. Additionally, using the outcomes from the Social Assessment (SA), a Community Participation Planning Framework (CPPF) was updated in line with the scope and proposed activities of the AF which sets out principles and procedures to address potential risks identified in line with the Bank Indigenous Peoples Policy (4.10).

¹ The data is according to the 1983 population census. There is no more concrete updated reference on the composition size of ethnic groups.

Key Lessons Learned:

- (a) **Institutionalization process of Social Assessment:** On the institutional side, during year 2 of the project, two notable contributions were introduced in the area of social assessment and consultation: (i) states and regions undertook a consultative process for selecting townships that included needs-based criteria for designating priority townships. This generated tremendous ownership from education departments at national, township, and village levels; and (ii) a bottom-up participatory approach was introduced which was characterized by a great ownership and institutionalization process, sustainable social assessment, and consultation at the township level to support the process of selecting schools and selecting students within schools for the stipends program. At the same time, the process was institutionalized at different levels.
- (b) **Constraints for access to education.** Findings from this social assessment indicate that the reasons for the high number of school drop-outs, especially in Grades 7 and 8 are both financial and non-financial. Poor parents, and especially those in remote areas, face difficulties in sending their children to school. In all schools visited for the SA, much larger numbers of poor and needy students are found eligible to receive stipends than the program could afford. Lack of money is the most important barrier to education. Many of these poor students come from daily wage-earning or unstable income families with high numbers of children. SA respondents reported that difficulties increase from Grade 7, the first year of middle school, as the costs for school supplies and transportation to school increase at this grade level. Middle and high school students often have also to pay for additional private tuition if they are to do well in these higher grades. The estimated average monthly cost for middle school is about 30,000 Kyat and for high school, about 100,000 Kyat.² Respondents said this is beyond the means of poor parents, many of whom are daily wage earners (2,000-3,000 kyats per day). The costs can be significantly higher for high school students from remote villages who must either stay in boarding schools or with relatives. As a result, most poor villagers stop sending their children to school after the primary level. As for the non-financial constraints, key stakeholders interviewed raised remoteness as one of the three most important barriers³. One school headmistress in a remote village said that half her students drop out by the middle of each year due to difficulties to commute. Many remote villages are not connected by all-weather roads or transportation services to the towns that have middle and high schools. Students from some remote villages must travel by both boat and road to reach middle or high school, and during the rainy season, rivers and local roads are often unsafe. Many poor students drop out because they cannot afford to cover the cost of transportation or boarding schools, or because they do not have reliable relatives near schools at whose homes they can stay during school terms. The problem is more acute for middle or higher school students which are typically located in towns.

² These costs were calculated by the research team based on estimates provided by poor parents, school heads, teachers, and school committee members. The figure for costs is the average for the answers given by respondents in each township and the average for six townships.

³ Two other non-financial constraints identified are language for ethnic minorities and existing school evaluation systems. The detailed description of these two non-financial constraints is provided in the SA report.

- (c) **Stipend Program.** Overall, SA found that students and parents are generally pleased with the stipend program and they confirmed that the majority of funds do reach poor, eligible students. They mention that stipends, even though small in amount under the current allocation, greatly help poor students go to school, especially at the primary level. However it was also reported that the amount falls far short of needs for middle and high school levels where higher fees apply and which are typically located in cities and transportation costs are higher. The SA also found some gaps in the stipend program, many of which are related to institutional arrangements and implementation procedures. The study found that many eligible students and parents are not informed of the stipend program because local officials involved in the implementation such as TEOs and school headmasters are afraid of making the program known to the public which can create expectations that cannot be met. The current budget allocations allow giving stipends only to one or two students per school, while a lot more students are potentially eligible; interviews with schoolmasters indicate that only 22% of eligible students actually receive stipends. While the concern of school headmasters is understandable, the lack of transparency necessarily raises a concern about the selection of stipend beneficiaries, as was pointed out by participants of focus group discussion (FGD) who called for an increased participation of parents in the selection process to increase accountability of the program.

The stipends program was implemented differently across schools, depending on how TEOs and schoolmasters understand the very general guidelines provided to them. SA found that, because detailed implementation guidelines are not developed yet, the majority of TEOs lack a consistent understanding of the program's institutional arrangements. In some areas, the township education office works directly with schools in the area, in other areas TEOs have set up the Township Board for Selection of Students (TBSS) to oversee the allocation of stipends. Also, different selection criteria are used among townships, and even among schools within the same townships. One criterion that is common across schools is the orphanage, however, almost all schools use additional poverty related criteria in selecting beneficiary students, which vary depending on the preference and judgment of school headmasters and teachers where they are involved in the selection. No school is found to use ethnicity as a criterion, and FGD participants including ethnic parents indicates that they did not see the discrimination in the selection of beneficiaries on the ground of ethnicity.

- (d) **School Grants Program.** SA found that all schools are eligible for school grants to cover various operational expenditures. Compared with the stipend program which will be provided only to selected students from among other students who also meet eligibility criteria, the school grants program by design does not involve significant risks of social exclusion given the fact that all schools receive the grant. In fact, the SA did not find any discrimination or unfair treatment of schools involved in the implementation of school grants. It also found that school grants help schools cover many operating expenses such as stationery, sanitation, drinking water pots, chalk, dusters, painting the blackboard, and teaching and learning materials. Although the very limited size of grants makes it difficult for schools to address many critical needs, especially because only a narrowly defined range of cost items can be financed, many school headmasters interviewed mentioned that school grants are useful given the very limited operating budget available to schools.

As is the case for the stipend program, in year 1 implementation, parents or other stakeholders are not well informed of the usage of school grants, causing concerns about accountability in the use of grants. The school headmasters typically make decisions on the use of the grant, but only in some of the schools visited were the headmasters found to consult with the school board on the use of grants.⁴ Therefore, in year 2, the training manual was developed and improvements were made on Operational Guidelines according to the lesson learnt from the year 1. During the training of Trainers, the training was delivered in a participatory way, in some cases, using demonstrations. The training roll out was a cascade model, NPT to State/ Region, S/R to townships and Townships to schools. Then, consultation workshops were conducted in Township and Community levels inviting the representatives from minority and hard-to-reach groups as well as departmental officials and NGO, CSO, CBO representatives. The information of the School Grant and Stipend Program was announced and discussed, roles and responsibilities stakeholders and implementation procedures clearly described. With this efforts, the program implementations proved to be better in year 2. The same effort has been applied for year 3 and it is expected that in year 3 implementations will be much better in quality perspective.

- (e) **Existing grievance handling mechanisms.** Those with concerns or complaints would usually go to the classroom teachers or the school headmasters. Thus, the issues are normally dealt with internally and with no specific report or record on the cases. The SA found that parents interviewed consider it is important to strengthen feedback/ grievance mechanisms for the stipend and school grants program in order for the programs to be able to improve its fairness, transparency and effectiveness. DBE reinforces that complaints and how they are addressed and handled should be recorded at school, township and State/Region levels. The Department of Basic Education, Ministry of Education monitored and evaluated the activities which were implemented at school level. Established in July 2014, the Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group (MEWG) has been leading all monitoring and evaluation activities in close collaboration with development partners. This note reflects the information and discussions coming from multiple monitoring activities, including administrative data, multiple field visits by MEWG, and Qualitative Assessment by Save the Children. (See detailed in part of "Types of M & E activities). Furthermore, observation of documents (forms completed by school/township level) is the alternative way of monitoring.

(f) *Early Grade Reading Assessment and Follow-Up*

The Myanmar Ministry of Education conducted a rapid education assessment, as part of the CESR initiative, which identified the lack of reliable information on how well students are learning as a significant obstacle to improving the quality of education. It recognized that problems with learning in many schools- whether in other developing countries or in high income countries – often begin during the first year of a child's schooling. Consequently, it supported an Early Grade Reading assessment (EGRA) in 2014, adapted to the Myanmar context and language, to measure how well primary school children are acquiring fundamental literacy skills (such as learning to read) as one of its priorities. In addition to assessing reading ability (initially in Myanmar's Yangon region), the survey should also provide the Ministry with crucial information needed to develop benchmarks to measure and compare students' performance.

⁴ SA also found that school headmasters and teachers need to strengthen their financial knowledge and skill. The school headmasters interviewed mentioned that they did ask for financial training so that they can better manage this program.

⁵According to the recommendation on EGRA findings, "Design and pilot courses (pre-service) and workshops (in-service) to train teachers on best approaches to teaching reading, effective use of textbook, and assessment and reporting to track student's progress" it was planned to make a small pilot intervention on inservice teacher's intensive training and use some more efforts on improving student's reading and assess by the teachers themselves using assessment tools on reading. On the other hand, school heads, township level and district level officials will also monitor supportively so that closely looking on the pilot program has been doing well or any other gaps if necessary and find out how to fill the gap. Then, from the parent's part they have to read with their kids and encourage reading habit and cooperate in the reading intervention. In so doing, the intervention seeks for all the stakeholders participation.

In this context, a Reading Intervention needs to be carried out so that children from early grades can improve in reading skills which will be supportive in their learning next grades. Professionals especially in Myanmar Language Learning Methodology and Pedagogics from DMER, University of Education, Education Colleges, DBE, Myanmar Sar Commission, Ex-professors of Myanmar Language Department from Universities were formed a Group of "Early Reading Intervention", discussed and prepare a Teacher's Guide which will be followed by a training of early grade teachers to build capacity of the teachers to become professionals for children of early grades. The draft teacher's guide was prepared by a technical meeting and the process is ongoing for selection of trainers, trainees and preparation of some teaching aids.

D. Community Participation Planning Framework (CPPF)

1. Objective of CPPF

The higher level objective of this CPPF is to provide the Ministry of Education with the operational framework to improve the stipend and school grants programs to be transparent, fair, participatory and efficient through enhanced community involvement. Specifically, the CPPF aims to ensure that: (i) the poor and vulnerable groups including but not limited to ethnic minorities will benefit from the stipend and school grants programs; and (ii) negative impacts, if any that may arise from the implementation of the programs will be avoided or mitigated. Important to highlight that the basic description of the school grants and stipends programs will not change as a result of the additional financing. MoE will continue to monitor implementation of these programs and introduce annual improvements and upgrades based on the lessons of implementation experience and the findings of evaluations including social assessments. For example, as mentioned above, the school grants schemes are expected to give increasing emphasis to teaching and learning priorities at the school level, as opposed to maintenance and repairs; and the stipends program will be tied more closely to township reporting on access and retention. Improvements to the school grants and stipends programs will continue to be

reflected in annual updates to MoE's program guidelines and to the content of annual training programs including social safeguards.

2. Applicable World Bank Policies

The World Bank's Operational Policy (OP) 4.10, *Indigenous Peoples*, applies to this project because the stipend and school grants programs will be implemented in areas where ethnic minorities that meet the eligibility criteria of the Bank OP 4.10 are present. The OP 4.10 aims to achieve the following objectives:

- a. Affected ethnic groups are afforded meaningful opportunities to participate in planning that affects them;
- b. They are given opportunities to receive culturally appropriate benefits; and
- c. Any project impacts that adversely affect them are avoided or otherwise minimized and mitigated.

The World Bank OP 4.10 provides that indigenous peoples share the following characteristics in varying degrees:

- a) Self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;
- b) Collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the project area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories;
- c) Customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society and culture; and
- d) An indigenous language, often different from the official language of the country.

The World Bank Safeguard policy is in line with the objectives of the programs both of which aim to ensure that the poor and vulnerable including those among ethnic groups living in the project operating areas are informed and able to participate and benefit from the programs, and that any negative issues are avoided or mitigated.

3. Principles of CPPF

The following principles govern the stipend and school grant programs:

- a. The national guidelines were developed for the stipend and school grants programs, separately, in line with this CPPF. The guidelines, after developed, it was widely consulted with key stakeholders in the country including but not limited to ethnic minority communities.
- b. The Departments of Basic Education (DBE) under the Ministry of Education (MoE) will take overall responsibility for the implementation of this CPPF. Regarding the stipend program, DBEs carried out many activities provided under this CPPF in collaboration with Township Education Offices (TEOs) and Township Grant and Stipend Committees (TGSCs)⁶ at the township level, as well as beneficiary schools. DBE will pull together data and inputs collected at the township level and develop, and

⁶ Township Grant and Stipend Committee comprises representatives from township education office and schools and communities.

annually update, the Community Participation Plan (CPP), Detailed implementation arrangement were spelled out in the national stipend program guidelines. Regarding the school grants program, DBE will ensure that all schools will receive grants as per national guidelines for school grants program, and that all schools were treated fairly and transparently in the allocation of school grants.

- c. The Community Participation Plans (CPP) will be developed, and then updated annually as the stipend program rolls out to new townships, in line with the provisions of this CPPF.
- d. As part of the preparation of the CPP, a Social Assessment (SA) was conducted which includes vulnerability assessment to identify groups of people whose socioeconomic standings in local communities may subject them to risk of exclusion from stipend program. Free, prior, and informed consultation had also be conducted as part of SA with potential beneficiary groups of the stipend program leading to their broad community support to the stipend program.
- e. The public in general, and students eligible to the stipend program and their parents in particular, were informed widely of the objective, eligibility criteria and selection procedure of the stipend program.
- f. Selection criteria (schools, was also been refined after the completion of year 1 intervention so that a broad range of poor and vulnerable social groups become eligible to the stipend program.

Mechanisms set up to address grievances accessible to affected people and monitor implementation of this CPPF. The School Program Committee (SGSC) was established which will participate in and monitor the implementation of the stipend program at the school level. SGSC comprised the school headmaster, parents and teachers, and also include representatives from vulnerable groups including but not limited to ethnic minority groups. In principle, SGSC have had equal representation of male and female parent members, one third of the committee at least should be females, and one third of the committee should be from parents. It was observed by all schools. SGSC had been empowered in monitoring and grievance mechanisms to ensure that the stipend and school grants programs were implemented under the support of this program as per provisions of this CPPF.

4. Implementation procedures of CPPF

Detailed, step by step procedures to implement the principles outlined above were fully integrated into the Operational Guidelines for the stipend and school grants programs; but more important this process is linked to the **Stipend program implementation timeline described in Table 2 of the SA (See annex 1)**.. The procedures described below will serve as the basis to develop more detailed procedures that will be described in the guidelines.

Step 1 – Development of National Guidelines for the Stipend Program and School Grants Program

At the beginning of the program implementation, the MoE developed the national guidelines for the stipend program and for the school grant program. The MoE developed the guidelines in line with this CPPF. The national stipend guidelines and the national school grants guidelines, after developed, it was widely consulted with key stakeholders including but not limited to ethnic minority communities for inputs. Regarding the school grants program,

implemented by MoE nationwide and from which all schools are eligible for funding, MoE has been closely monitoring the implementation throughout the program based on the monitoring and grievance mechanisms described below in this CPPF. Regarding the stipend program, it was implemented based on the following procedures.

Operational Guidelines were revised and modified based on the issues and recommendations discussed at the MEWG meetings, TWG meetings and the Steering Committee meetings. The SA form was revised and added more questions to explore the social, cultural and security situations of the communities in the conflict affected areas. These revised SA form was printed in the Stipend Operational Guidelines. CPP for 2016-2017 school year was revised reflecting the SA findings of previous year and the newly revised CPP was included in the Stipend Operational Guidelines.

Step 2 - Development of Institutional Arrangements

Year 1

At the national level, the MOE designated the DEPT to be responsible for an annual update of the community participation plan (CPP) prior to the roll out of the programs in new townships as part of its overall reporting on the development and implementation of the programs. DEPT worked closely with relevant DBEs to implement this CPPF. CPPF focal points were appointed at DEPT and DBEs responsible for the development and implementation of CPP. The Township Program Working Groups (TGSC) and the School Grant and Stipend Committees (SGSC) established, and were responsible for the implementation of the programs at the township level, according to MoE's revised guidelines for the school grants and stipends programs. Representatives of vulnerable groups including ethnic minorities, and female parents, were encouraged to participate in the School Grant and Stipend Committee.

The DEPT and DBE designated officers were working in collaboration with TEOs, TGSCs and SGSCs. Roles and responsibilities of TEOs, TGSCs and SGSCs were clarified in the national guidelines for the stipend program.

Year 2

Since April 2015, MoE was restructured and three DBEs were merged into only one DBE which became the focal department for DFSP and DBE personnel were the main counterparts of the WB and Australia.

Step 3 - Capacity Building of Key Stakeholders

The MOE in collaboration with the World Bank provided trainings for DEPT and DBEs to implement the elements of the CPPF, particularly with regard to basic principles and approaches of vulnerability assessment, specific issues that CPPs should address, and roles of SGSCs in the implementation and monitoring of stipend and school grants programs. The responsible DBE officers further provided appropriate training to TEOs, TGSCs and school headmasters on core CPPF principles. The Bank was continuously helping to ensure the inclusion of CPPF elements in the MoE's training of TEOs, TGSCs and school headmasters, and participated as much as possible in training sessions from time to time. Out of this program 46,977 School Heads (45,451 from DBE and 1526 from Monastic Schools)

received Trainings on School Grant Program. For the Stipend implementation, a total of 2,660 school heads attended the 3-day training. And 140 Computer Staff from 28 TEO offices of pilot stipend township received hands-on training on Stipend Student Payment Management System (SSPMS) using the TEO office computers.

Step 4 – National awareness campaign

In order to help ensure that more eligible students and their parents are aware of the stipend and school grants program, a media campaign was conducted as part of the campaign for the national *Education for All* policy. This campaign involved TV and radio programs and be implemented prior to the beginning of each school year. While the media campaign itself will aim to inform the public about the *Education for All* policy, it will also include the description of the school grants program, eligible expenses and other key information about the program, as well as of the stipend program, eligibility and selection criteria, and the list of townships where the stipend program will be rolled out, and feedback mechanisms. In 2015-16, MoE organized a media campaign along with articles in local newspapers, inviting media persons for interviews with DGs and Directors aired at the TV channels, printing posters and distributing to all schools.

In addition, for the stipend program, a brochure was prepared which described the objectives, eligibility criteria, selection process and other key information about the stipend program. The brochure will also describe the roles of TGSCs and SGSCs, grievance and feedback mechanisms that are available to eligible students and their parents. The brochure used simple Myanmar language. The TEOs distributed them to all schools within their respective townships and school headmasters collaborate with SGSCs to make them available at the schools. For year 3, MoE will try to address the awareness campaign using ethnic FM radio. In adaptation of the widespread of mobile users in country, DBE will try to open a Facebook page about DFSP and reinforce the wide range of poster and pamphlet distribution.

Step 5 - Selection of Townships for the Stipend Program

It is expected that the stipend program will be provided in 40 townships during the Academic Year (AY) 2014-2017. The criteria for the selection of these townships will be provided in the national guidelines for the stipend program, but they will include levels of poverty, remoteness and drop-out rates. In practical, 8 townships were selected in year 1 and 19 townships were selected in year 2 although it was planned to select 12 with the reason that the majority of townships prioritized by States/Regions were small and could not meet the targeted student numbers. In year 3, with the same reason, 28 townships were selected instead of 20 townships. Therefore, altogether 55 townships will be benefiting for stipend program by the end of year 4 (2017-2018).

Step 6 - Social Assessment (SA) for the Stipend Program

The SA will be conducted on an annual basis, and cover those new townships that will be included into the stipend program in the respective year. It will consist of two aspects, namely: vulnerability assessment, and free, prior and informed consultations at selected schools. Results of the SA will help inform the development of the CPP.

Vulnerability assessment: Starting from 2015-16 school year, the respective Township Education Officers of the stipend townships were trained program and carry out a vulnerability assessment together with Township Committees and School Committees. The vulnerability assessment aims to identify those social groups within the townships who are potentially eligible and in particular need of the stipend program. Indicators and eligibility criteria to identify vulnerable groups are under development and will be specified in the national guidelines for the stipend program, but they will at least include the poor, orphans, and ethnic minorities. A simple form that will complement the social assessment form will be developed as part of the national guidelines which will be used by the DBE officers to record basic data on eligible vulnerable groups including their gender and ethnic background. The basic data sheet will include a list of eligible families for the stipend program in the areas. The list will be used by the School Committee to verify the students along with the proposed list from the classroom teachers. The DBE officers may visit some schools to verify the results. The result of the vulnerability assessment will be aggregated and send to DEPT in Nay Pyi Taw to prepare its annual CPP and the update of the CPP for the subsequent years.

Free, prior and informed consultations: Trained TEOs and ATEOs will visit selected schools and carry out consultations with communities, village leaders, religious leaders and CBOs to seek inputs to the design of the stipend program and potential measures to better implement the program. Potential negative impacts of the stipend program and mitigation measures will also be explored. SGSCs will be invited to the consultations and their perspectives on vulnerable social groups who may be excluded from the stipend program will also be solicited and used as inputs to the vulnerability assessment. The SGSCs will make sure that consultations will cover all vulnerable groups potentially eligible for the stipend program in their selected schools. Minutes will be developed and the record of comments provided by participants will be kept by DBEs and the TEOs.

From the second year on, TEOs and TGSCs will take the lead in carrying out the SA and, under the guidance and supervision of DBE, carry out vulnerability assessment and stakeholder consultations. DBE remains responsible for ensuring that SA is done in line with this CPPF, and relevant S/R officials will participate in some of the consultation meetings to be held in townships, however, the implementation of many aspects of SA will be delegated to TEOs and TGSCs in collaboration with SGSCs. The training program to be developed and implemented by DBE develop the capacity of TEOs and TGSCs so they understand SA processes and procedures. Such a delegation of SA responsibilities to the township level is important to ensure that good social development practice will more likely be integrated at the local level. However, DBE will determine the degree of delegation based on the capacity of respective TEOs and TGSCs. The responsible officers at State/Region and DBE will consult the Bank task team for guidance.

Conflict sensitivity approach

Project Steering Committee had made a decision to roll out the stipend expansion to conflict affected areas in year 3, especially Rakhine, Kachin and Shan (North). Being proactive, MEWG decided to do pre-assessment in those areas prior to actual implementation using the Social Assessment form which was revised to explore more elements on conflict and security in the school and local context. A tri-partied group consisted of MEWG members, World Bank, DFAT, Save the Children made field visit to sample townships in Rakhine, Kachin and Shan (North). The process involved the meaningful participation of States Offices and TEO

offices. Three townships were Putao in Kachin, Mong Yai in Shan-N and Rathetaung in Rakhine. The tasks involved in these preassessment visits were:

- Collecting Social Assessment forms filled by school heads,
 - Collecting School Characteristics forms filled by school heads
 - Identification of communities where hard-to-reach and minority lives
 - Field visits to 3 identified communities & Consultation with them
 - Produce Township Report
-
- The findings and recommendations (see below) of the Pre-assessment teams were discussed at the MEWG meeting for DBE's follow-up and forwarded to senior leadership for decision making. The recommendations on implementation were: 1) To conduct conflict Assessment before implementation, and 2) To conduct training on Conflict Awareness and Peace Building strategy to Government staff. The key policy recommendations were: 1) Local governments must have formulated Inclusive Policy in Public Service Delivery, 2) MoE should organize Advocacy meetings with local governments, Parliamentarians, and different key stakeholders with effective use of IEC materials.

In addition to the above mentioned institutional arrangement to explore conflict sensitivity and social mapping, the WB/DFAT hired a consultant to work on "Conflict Sensitivity Analysis" in selected townships (some townships from year 3, some townships from year 2 where conflict has occurred in the past). The consultant visited 10 townships (4 townships from Rakhine State, 1 township each from Kachin State, Shan (E), Shan (N) and Mon States and 2 townships from Kayin State). It was expected that applicable and meaningful recommendations will be integrated into the trainings for implementation and some policy recommendations will be dealt by the MoE leadership.

Step 7 – Development of the Community Participation Plans (CPP)

DBE will update the CPP annually based on the result of SA. Details of what CPP should contain will be described in the national guidelines for the stipend program. CPP will seek to make sure that vulnerable social groups would not be excluded from program benefits, and that negative impacts of the program, if any, will be adequately addressed. CPP will therefore focus primarily on addressing these social exclusion risks and include the following:

- A summary of the vulnerability assessment;
- A summary of the results of the free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected poor and vulnerable groups including ethnic minorities that led to broad community support for the program;
- A framework for community participation in the implementation of stipend program at the school level, most notably the modality of participation of School Program Committee in the administration of stipend program, selection of stipend beneficiaries and monitoring of program implementation. Free, prior, and informed consultations should be conducted as part of the participatory framework with eligible students and their parents including those who belong to vulnerable social groups, in order to ensure that the poor and vulnerable students are indeed able to benefit from the stipend program;
- Description of potential negative impacts ,if any, and measures to address them;

- Description of training program to strengthen the capacity of TEOs, TGSCs, school headmasters and relevant entities such as SGSCs in transparent, fair, participatory and efficient administration of the stipend program;
- Mechanisms and benchmarks for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on the implementation of the CPP. Measures will be identified that will most cost effectively support the participation of beneficiary students and their parents, in particular through SGSC, in the monitoring of program implementation;
- Grievance redress mechanisms; and
- The financing plan for CPP implementation which will be integrated in the annual MOE budget for the programs.

Copies of CPP will be made available to beneficiary schools by integrating it in the Operational Guideline.

Step 8 – Implementation of CPP

In order to ensure that all potentially eligible students and their parents are aware of and can potentially benefit from the stipend program, a brochure describes the objectives, eligibility criteria, selection process and feedback process will be prepared in Myanmar and key ethnic languages. The TEOs will distribute them to all schools within their respective townships and school headmasters will collaborate with SGSCs to make them available at the schools.

DBE will assume an overall responsibility for the implementation of the CPP. The Township Education Officers (TEOs) will be in charge of day-to-day implementation of CPP together with TGSCs, and regularly review the progress of the stipend program. The implementation of CPP will be reported to MoE and the World Bank annually as part of MoE's annually reporting on program implementation.

5. Monitoring and Evaluation of the CPPF

The Ministry of Education empowered SGSC in the monitoring of the stipend and the school grants programs through supporting their oversight roles. For the stipend program, the SGSC met beneficiary students/families and receive feedbacks especially on stipend payments. It happened 2/3 times per year mostly informally. The SGSC was working closely with the classroom teachers on students attendance, if the beneficiary students have irregular school attendance record, parent and teacher members of the SGSC visited to the student and family to gather reasons as well as to identify ways to address the issue and encourage the students to attend school. Record of all visits were discussed at the SGSC meetings at school and noted in the minute book at the school. In addition, the SGSC is the focal point of contact to assist with the annual beneficiary assessment, and school and household surveys. SGSC organize a school assembly to inform the results of these assessment and surveys to the school community. Recommendations from the assembly will be submitted to TGSCs and TEOs to further improve the implementation of the program. SGSC will make sure that the results of the assessment, surveys and their recommendations are displayed at the school notice board.

As for the school grants program, SGSCs provide inputs to develop the school improvement plan and endorse the final school improvement plan. The endorsed school improvement plan was announced at the school assembly and displayed at the school notice board for the public. SGSCs regularly monitored the implementation of the school grants according to the endorsed school improvement plan. The SGSC members have their assigned responsibilities in

implementing the school grants. This is their coordination role in school activities. Townships will report the number and share of schools with school plans to DBEs and DBE report to the Ministry of Education.

In addition, a beneficiary assessment, financed and facilitated by the Bank and its contracting agency, will be conducted on an annual basis which aims to assess, and report to MoE and beneficiary people, the past year's progress with regard to the school stipend and school grants programs including on implementation of CPPF. DEPT, DBEs and TEOs will organize meetings with beneficiary communities and share assessment results. Minutes of the meeting will be submitted to the DBEs.

These monitoring steps in the local areas were complemented by the Bank-executed technical assistant (TA) program which will provide information to help the MoE continuously improve the management and operations of the stipend and school grants programs. The TA program related to enhancing monitoring and evaluation of the program would include the following:

- (i) *Spot-checks* to independently verify the status of the programs, as part of due diligence before payments are disbursed against Disbursement Linked Indicators.
- (ii) *Annual school and household surveys* that will capture detailed information on school instructional and teaching equipment, and on the beneficiaries of the programs. These surveys will aim to be linked to an impact evaluation of the program that will be designed to assess whether the program is reaching its goals.
- (iii) *Process or operational evaluations* to assess implementation of the programs, to identify procedures that do not work well and receive feedbacks from schools and townships.

Assessment of the performance in CPPF implementation were and will be embedded in the M&E TA program so as to swiftly and cost-effectively identify issues that may hamper the adequate implementation of CPPF.

The World Bank conducted missions twice a year to oversee the implementation of the stipend and the school grants program. The implementation of CPP elements will be part of midterm review and end-project evaluation by independent consultants or the ministry personnel themselves.

6. Grievance Redress Mechanisms

The Ministry of Education encourage students and parents with questions or grievances to seek clarifications and solutions through a grievance redress mechanism to be included in its revised guidelines. It is the MoE's intention to manage key complaints/feedbacks at the township level to make key issues public and solve the issues in a transparent manner. DBE and the TEOs also make sure that local populations are informed of these processes and mechanisms. Detailed processes and procedures of feedback/ complaint handlings were developed and included in the MoE's program guidelines for year 3, which consist of the following principles:

1. The MoE will establish a simple procedure to receive and address feedbacks and complaints. An M&E focal point will be appointed at each participating Township Education Office whose job will include the overall monitoring of stipend and school grants programs, including questions, complaints and concerns from local population.

2. Complaints may be submitted through the follow channels:
 - P.O. Box at the Ministry of Education in Nay Pyi Taw;
 - Public complaints at program activities’ meetings; and
 - Directly to the teachers, school headmasters, TEOs, the township administrative officers and the village heads
3. School headmasters will be the first tier of grievance mechanisms to receive, address, and keep record of the complaints and feedbacks. SGSC will be empowered to receive grievances and work with school headmasters to address them.
4. If satisfactory resolutions cannot be found at the school level, the issue will be elevated to the TEOs. If a satisfactory resolution cannot still be found, the complaint may be elevated to the MoE.
5. All local population where stipend and school grants programs are implemented are entitled to provide feedbacks, concerns and questions directly to the MoE through a special P.O. Box established in Nay Pyi Taw.
6. The TEO or the M&E focal point at each participating township will keep the record of complaints received and responses provided, which will be shared with DEPT which will keep a file for review.
7. A program brochure will include the explanation of the feedback/complaint system and provide contact details for complaints; and
8. The programs will continue to use the sanction procedures stipulated in chapter 6 “managing to curb offences” of the MoE administration and inspection.

7. Expenditure for CPP

Expenses of School Grant and Stipend Trainings, printing posters and pamphlets will be spent out of USD 2.5 million allocated for DFSP under Trainings/EGRA heading which consists of the WB/DFAT share USD 1 million and MoE share 1.5 million.

The Social assessment and CPP were part of the MoE training modules for Stipend program so the expenditure of CPP is already included in the MoE’s training budget as following:

Training	Total Participants	Participants		Budget MMK in million
		(State/Region level)	(Township level)	
Year 1	48,133	1,833	46,300	324.5
Year 2	50,092	3,792	46,749	458.5

Annex 1: Stipend program implementation timeline (2015-2016)

Sn.	Activity	2015-16	By Who
1	Revision of School Grant and Stipend Operational Guidelines based on lessons learned, including the social assessment and school characteristics forms	March, April	MEWG, WB, Save the Children
2	Development of separate Ops Guidelines for Monastic Schools Grant implementation	April	MEWG
3	Development of Training Modules for Grant and Stipend	January, Feb, March	MEWG, WB
4	ToT training for School Grant and Stipend trainings in NPT	May	MEWG, WB, Save the Children
5	Social Assessment and school characteristics forms filled at school and township level	May 29	School Heads with inputs of relevant stakeholders
6	Preparing Social mapping utilizing the information from SC and SA forms.	June	TEO teams
7	Field visit to at least 3 schools in a township for Social Assessment	June	TEO teams
8	Conducting Township Consultation workshop and Forming Township Committee	June	TEO teams
9	Preparing school ranking, review and selection	June, July	Township Committees
10	Announcement of the selected schools list	July	Township Committees
11	Receiving feedback and complaints on the selected schools list	July	Township Committees
12	Township Stipend training for the stipend school Heads	July	TEO teams
13	Community announcement and mass meeting for awareness of stipend programme (village level).	July	School heads and School committees
14	Preparing student ranking, review and student selection ★	July/August	School heads, teachers and School committees
15	Announcement of the selected students list within village.	August	School committees
16	Receiving and handling feedback and complaints	August	School committees
17	Getting approval from the TEOs for the selected students.	September	School heads
18	Registration the selected students ★	September	School heads, teachers and School committees
19	First stipend payment to the selected students (for the first 3 months)	October, November	School heads, class teachers

★ In some flood affected townships, student selection and registration was delayed.