



Towards a Ghana Education Coordination Strategy

The Education Sector Coordination Strategy Retreat

April 6-7, 2010

Volta Hotel, Akosombo

Facilitators:

Dr. Leslie Casely-Hayford

Marian Tadefa-Kubabom

Reporters:

Akabzaa Roland

Thomas Quansah

Matilda Hetty

Acronyms

AAA	Accra Agenda for Aid Effectiveness
AESOP	Annual Education Sector Operation Plan
AESR	Annual Education Sector Review
ADEAP	Annual District Education Action Plan
ADEOP	Annual District Operation Plan
BE	Basic Education
BECE	Basic Education Certificate Examination
BESRC	Basic Education School Report Card
ODA	Oversee Development Agency
CBOs	Community Based Organizations
CMS	Central Ministry Support
COTVET	Council for Technical Vocational Education and Training
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
DA	District Assembly
DEO	District Education Office
DEOC	District Education Oversight Committee
DEFATs	District Education for all Teams
DFID	British Department for International Development
DP	Development Partners
EFA	Education for All
EMIS	Education Management Information System
ESP	Education Strategic Plan
EU	European Union
FBOs	Faith Based organization
FOAT	Functional Organizational Assessment Tool
FPMU	Procurement Management Unit

GBS	General Budget Support
GeSCI	Global e-school and Communities Initiative
GES	Ghana Education Service
GER	Gross Enrollment Rate
GHARI	Ghana Accountability and Response Initiative
GNAT	Ghana National Association of Teachers
GNECC	Ghana National Education Coalition
GOG	Government of Ghana
GPRS	Growth Poverty Reduction Strategy
GPI	Gender Parity Index
HIV	Human Immune Virus
INSET	In -Service Training
ISP	Institutional Strengthening Plan
IT	Information Technology
JHS	Junior High School
JICA	Japan International Corporation Agency
KG	Kindergarten
LEAP	Livelihoods Empowerment against Poverty
MA s	Municipal Assemblies
MDBS	Multi Donor Budget Support
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MESW	Ministry of Social Welfare
MLGRD	Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOFEP	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning
NALAP	National Literacy Acceleration Program

NEA	National Education Assessment
NER	Net Enrolment Ratio
NDPC	National Development Planning Commission
NGOs	Non Governmental Organization
PBME	Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring and Evaluation
PBA	Program Budget Approach
PPP	Private Public Partnership
PRESET	Pre- Service Training
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
REOs	Regional Education Offices
SBS	Sector Budget Support
SEA	School Education Assessment
SENs	Special Education Needs
SFL	School for Life
SHS	Senior High School
SMCs	School Management Committees
SWAP	Sector Wide Approach
TLM	Teaching and Learning Materials
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UNESCO	United Nation Education Scientific Organization
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
UN	United Nation
UNICEF	United Nations International Children Emergency Fund
USDOL	United States Department of Labor
UK	United Kingdom
UTTDBE	Untrained Teacher Diploma in Basic Education

WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Program
WP4	White Paper 4
WUSC	World University Service of Canada

Table of Contents

The Executive Summary

1.0 Introduction of the Workshop	17
2.0 The Retreat Day One	18
2.1 Welcome addresses	18
2.1.1 Welcome address by the Minister of Education	18
2.1.2 Welcome address by the Director of Education Office, USAID/Ghana	19
2.1.3 Participant Responses	19
2.2 Introduction and expectations of participants	20
2.2.1 Expectations of Participants	20
2.3 Panel Discussion 1: The context and aid architecture of the education sector	20
2.3.1 Presentation by Mr. Bob Davidson, Director of Education, USAID/Ghana	20
2.3.2 Presentation by UNICEF representative - Hiro Hattori, Chief of Education	21
2.3.3 Presentation by DFID – Dr. Rachel Hinton, Human Development Advisor	22
2.3.4 Presentation by representative at the MDDBS unit of MOFEP- Veronica Sackey	24
2.3.5 Discussion of first panel presentations	25
2.4 Panel Discussion 2: Coordination within the context of decentralization, the new education act and national development	26
2.4.1 Presentation by the Director of Basic Education, GES and civil society representative ..	26
2.4.2 Presentation by the Regional Director of Education	27
2.4.3 Civil Society Discussant of the Panelist presentations	27
2.5 SWOT analysis of sector coordination	28
2.5.1 SWOT Results for Government Participants	29
2.5.2 SWOT results for development partners	31
2.6 Prioritization and Support Gaps within the ESP	34

2.6.1	<i>Group 1: Prioritization of Basic Education</i>	34
2.6.2	<i>Group 2: The Prioritization of Second Cycle Schools (SC)</i>	36
2.6.3	<i>Group 3: TVET prioritization</i>	38
3.0	The Retreat Day Two	40
3.1	Day one lessons learned	40
3.2	The Café Table Discussions	41
3.2.1	<i>Table 1: Developing a Coordination Strategy taking into consideration different aid modalities and the AAA.</i>	41
3.2.2	<i>Table 2: Measuring Success and Outcomes in the education sector (indicators)</i>	45
3.2.3	<i>Table 3: Building a vision for better coordination within the education sector</i>	47
3.2.3	<i>Table 4: Prioritization within the education sector</i>	49
3.2.5	<i>Table 5: Decentralization and Good Governance</i>	51
3.4	The Way Forward: Action Plan	52
4.0	Conclusions and Recommendations	54

Annexes

Annex 1:	Retreat Program	56
Annex 2:	Retreat Participant List.....	62
Annex 3:	Mapping Exercise of DP support, geographic focus and comparative advantage	66
Annex 4:	Development Partner Questionnaire	71
Annex 5:	Participant Expectations.....	74
Annex 6:	Basic Education Group Mapping of DP Funding of AESOP 2010-2012 Activities ...	76
Annex 7:	Prioritization of Second Cycle Priorities based on the AESOP (Day 1/Group 2)	79
Annex 8:	Key M&E Indicators and Means of Verification (Outcomes of Café Table 2).....	81
Annex 9:	Education Sector Principles of Engagement/Code of Conduct (Adjusted based on discussions).....	82

Executive Summary

The Ministry of Education (MOE)/Ghana Education Service (GES) in collaboration with development partners (DPs) working in the education sector are in the process of strengthening the sector wide approach and attaining higher degrees of compliance with the Paris Declaration and Triple A on Aid Effectiveness. The Education Partner Retreat at Akosombo (April 6 and 7th, 2010) organized by the MOE and USAID made significant progress in opening up dialogue on key areas to improve coordination, ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing results and mutual accountability within the sector. The retreat's focus was to take key steps to improve vertical and horizontal coordination within the sector, across various ministries and departments outside of education and among DPs working at national and decentralized levels.

The MOE/GES and DPs were able to formulate and agree on a set of working principles to achieve better coordination, ownership and alignment within the sector. The retreat also enabled development partners to review the key strengths and weaknesses related to better coordination and harmonization. A process tool to identify donor and civil society comparative advantage was introduced using a questionnaire and feedback mechanism.¹ Consultation was also held on prioritization across the basic and post basic educational levels using the Education Strategic Plan (ESP) and Annual Education Operational Plan (AESOP). Discussions were held on ways to strengthen monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems and capacity building processes within the education sector focused on results and performance.

The key findings from the retreat are:

- The education sector has been rated as having some elements of a “sector wide approach” but with **weaknesses in relation to coordination, information-sharing, harmonized reporting and joint monitoring and evaluation.**² The OECD report on Alignment and McCarthy (2008) report on the Division of Labor suggests that Ghana's education sector has developed an overall strategic plan in which most donors are aligned and structures have been put in place. There is an education sector working group which helps to steer the sector and thematic groups within the MOE/GES, with DP participation, which reviews specific aspects of access, quality and education management indicators and activities of the ESP. The MOE also leads performance monitoring on an annual basis, touching on many of the key indicators relevant to DPs.

¹ DP Coordination Office is also called the Donor Funds and Resource Mobilization Office under the Chief Director, MOE.

² OECD-Development Assistance Committee has defined a sector-wide approach as “an approach to providing support which has the following characteristics: a clear sector policy, a formalized process of donor coordination with agreed roles and rules; a medium term expenditure program with matching sources and usage of funds; a results-based monitoring system for all major inputs, outputs and outcomes and to the extent possible, common implementation system (for reporting, disbursing and financial management).

- **Aid Modalities:** The education sector has had a long history of “project” modes of aid delivery, some of which have made significant change during the implementation period but often not sustained thereafter. Eleven out of 13 donors in the education sector are currently using a project mode of delivery; analytical reports within Government suggest that the project mode of assistance has a negative impact on overall implementation, often distorting some ministries’ activities and programs over time³. There is growing evidence within the education sector that the time taken to service and support numerous projects has resulted in limited outcomes and results.⁴ DPs are well aware of the new aid policy by the Government which aims to increase budget support and lower project aid in order to avoid duplication/overlap, limit transaction costs and increase ownership/prioritization by the GOG.
- **Strengths and Weaknesses in Coordination:** The greatest strength of the education sector coordination is MOE/GES’s respective commitment to facilitating better DP coordination at the national and district levels. The MOE/GES have made efforts in the past to establish structures and processes to ensure DP coordination using different approaches such as: DP monthly meetings, sector group meetings, bilateral talks, etc. The MOE has set up a new office for DP coordination to ensure that there is stronger coordination among DPs and between the Government and DP community. The general weaknesses in relation to coordination identified at the Akosombo retreat and based on secondary data include: the lack of transparency and easy access to information concerning DP programs and resourcing; lack of systematic communication among DPs regarding resourcing levels across all AESOP components on a timely basis to conform to annual performance reviews.
- One of the key findings from the conference was the lack of systematic annual information sharing regarding the positioning of DP resourcing within the sector. Although Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring and Evaluation (PBME) Division makes attempts to compile this information, there is no comprehensive listing or process in place to ensure that all DP areas of support/resourcing inputs into the AESOP are released and shared. This would enable DPs and other civil society stakeholders to ascertain how they could better harmonize their efforts with other DPs in specific areas of interest.
- **The lack of MOE/GES leadership to initiate and lead on program design issues within the education sector:** DPs feel that the MOE/GES is not taking the lead on initiating designs and prioritization for programming, which DPs could be supporting.

³ The Division of Labour Study (McCarthy, 2008)

⁴ “Strategies to Promote Girls’ Education in Ghana: A look at their Impact and Effectiveness,” (2009) by SNV/Ibis Ghana.

Reports on aid effectiveness suggest that MOE/GES and their District Education Offices are not sufficiently involved in design missions and DPs are still not fully involving GOG in the design of programs within the sector.⁵ This lack of involvement and collaboration between DPs and MOE/GES at national and decentralized levels particularly at the design stages has resulted in poor implementation and ownership of educational projects and/or programs. The Government of Ghana and DP representatives at the retreat recognized that the District Education Offices have not been adequately engaged in the formulation of the Education Strategic Planning processes and complain of limited participation in contributing to prioritization exercises, resource allocations and policy programming.

- **Usage of Country Systems:** More work is needed to assess the degree to which donors can fully rely on “country systems” to deliver and support projects within the education sector. The DPs recognized that there are several host country challenges to using the budget, procurement and audit/reporting systems of government; despite high ratings of some country systems by the World Bank (WB), very few DPs are currently using these systems. Much more work is needed to ensure that Ghana attains the same standards that DPs are required to use to account to their own populations. One aspect of country systems usage appears to be the increasing interest in using the structures and procedures within the MOE/GES to deliver assistance to achieve a national scale of programming. The number of donors using the MOE/GES structures and technical systems to deliver aid has been increasing, although some DPs (UNICEF, WFP, JICA) have historically relied on these systems. The Ministry of Education/Ghana Education Service’s increased capacity to service and support several donor programs using country systems will need to be monitored, particularly in relation to outcomes and results. The big issue for DPs and Government is to assess the capacity building needs in relation to improving delivery and performance, given the movement towards usage of “country systems” within the education sector.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) for results:** DPs appear to be increasingly interested in testing joint M&E approaches with Government, MOE/GES in order to reduce transaction costs and reliance on internal DP M&E processes. The Akosombo retreat afforded the opportunity to explore and identify the key baseline indicators, which DPs and MOE agree are essential for tracking change over time. Donors were also interested in jointly implementing a GES/MOE-led baseline exercise which would be a starting point to deepen work outlined by ESP’s M&E framework. Participants also recognized the need for earmarked resourcing for M&E to ensure that systems which are

⁵ (McCarthy, 2008)

currently in place are sustained over a period in a timely and effective manner (e.g. EMIS, NEA/SEA).⁶

- **Prioritization:** The Akosombo retreat confirmed that most DPs are still very committed to bringing about improvement in the quality standard of basic education. Some DPs have also increased their interest in supporting Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET). Most DPs are positioned to provide basic needs and social protection support to the education sector (WFP, UNICEF, USAID) which will complement educational improvements across the primary and JSS levels (USAID, DFID, JICA). Priorities within the provision of basic needs and social protection include: emphasis on school feeding, health education and counseling, incentive cash transfers and take home rations to improve girls' retention.
- **Educational Quality Improvement:** Priorities include improving teacher education particularly in math and science education and, literacy attainment at the lower primary (NALAP) levels. Although many DPs (ADB, USAID, JICA) are still investing in infrastructure particularly targeting rural deprived areas, there is a visible shift to ensure quality is addressed. All DPs especially (WB, USAID, DFID, JICA, UNICEF) have prioritized issues of accountability, improved educational performance, and increased decentralized education management and governance as key concerns within the sector. The next step will be to move towards identification of areas of comparative advantage in which one or two DPs may lead or assist with prioritization to improve and achieve results.
- The need to build a **more systematic and sustained support program for capacity building** within the MOE/GES and its decentralized levels of education. There have been several past attempts to support capacity building efforts within the education sector but these have either not been implemented or sustained. The DPs and MOE/GES felt the need to revisit these previous capacity needs assessments within the framework of overall aid effectiveness and put together a short and medium term capacity building plan to ensure that a sector wide approach and more harmonized and coordinated goals are realized within the sector. Capacity building efforts will be particularly needed in: ensuring leadership and team building across and within the education divisions, managing for results and strengthening existing monitoring and evaluation systems related to the ESP and AESOP. Capacity building in relation to project design and implementation is also needed.
- **Some of the gaps** identified at the retreat include: the lack of systematic support to the Special needs sector, a decline in interest in supporting gender equity and girls education,

⁶ Education Management Information Systems, National Education Assessment/School Education Assessment.

safe school programmes, access to education, etc. A rigorous prioritization was carried out across all the sub sectors and is available in the report.

- The **DP Coordination office** performs the functions of channeling DP resources to the appropriate sub sectors of education, and keeps track of agreements between MOE/GES and DPs; the office is also responsible for the reporting, monitoring and evaluation of DP funded projects with continuous feed back to the Chief Director. During the Akosombo retreat, participants outlined ways in which the DP Coordination office could better implement its mandate. The first recommendation made by participants was to ensure more effective information flow and data management within the MOE/GES. This could be attained by developing a comprehensive database (web based) tracking information on DP programming and resourcing in the sector and available to all stakeholders on a timely basis. Another key recommendation was the need for the DP coordination office to ensure the smooth flow of information between various divisions of MOE/GES on a regular basis. The DP coordination office should also ensure effective monitoring of DP program achievements in relation to the AESOP and determine funding gaps against MOE/GES priorities. These gaps should be communicated to DPs for potential support.
- **Common vision:** During the Akosombo retreat a common vision for collective support to the sector emerged with all DPs wanting to achieve greater levels of performance, impact, efficiency and accountability within the education sector. This vision can only be attained through a more harmonized and collective approach. Participants recognized that a coordinated approach within the sector would bring about more effective resource unitization and synergy in solving common problems. The identification of comparative advantage and technical strengths will be vital to increasing coordination along with more effective modes of information sharing particularly in relation to program plans and resource allocations.

Principles of Coordination

The Principles of Engagement/Code of Conduct developed and agreed upon at the retreat:

1. **Ownership by Government** is of the highest priority which means that the MOE/GES must be involved and lead (where possible) in the identification and design of new projects/programs and initiatives. It will also require the empowerment of MOE/GES staff to internalize decisions and translate them into implementation.
2. **Leadership from Within:** leadership should be promoted and requires that key MOE/GES representatives and staff act on issues related to current programming in order to assure their timely implementation. A key focus of leadership should strive to improve performance and accountability within the education sector.

3. There must be full **transparency and accountability** by MOE/GES and Donors in all program related matters... This will require that government and donors collectively present their intended financial support within the framework of the ESP and AESOP in order to achieve greater harmonization.
4. **Alignment of programming** within the **framework of the Education Strategic Plan should be based on the GOG and MOE's prioritization within the sector**: all DP's and civil society partners agree to work and align their programs within the ESP...
5. **Commitments and timely release of resourcing** for program and policy prioritization will be realistic and made known to the Government; these resources will be released on a timely basis in order to avoid challenges in implementation. The identification of triggers should be commonly agreed and accepted by both GOG and DPs on a yearly basis in order to facilitate performance and efficient program implementation.
6. **Internal Capacity Building** of all MOE/GES staff and systems will be a constant focus for MOE/GES and DPs in order to ensure that program delivery is smooth and the goals of the ESP are achieved. Capacity building priorities will be identified by GOG and MOE.
7. Development Partners and MOE/GES will work towards **harmonizing their modes of financial support to the sector**. One approach towards DP resource coordination in the sector could be through a "pooled funding" mechanism which supports the MOE/GES on specific areas.
8. **Annual DP and civil society mapping exercise**: An annual financial and program implementation tracking exercise will be carried out among all the DP's and Key civil society agencies in order to map out their areas of interest areas, comparative advantage and identify areas for increased collaboration among the donors.
9. **Increasing Focus/Capacity for Joint Monitoring and Evaluation**: MOE/GES and DPs will work towards a more rigorous monitoring and evaluation system based on results based approaches (e.g. joint baseline study, joint evaluation exercises).
10. **New development partners and new programs** interested in entering the education sector shall present their plans and interest areas along with background/experience related to their comparative advantage to the "sector group" under MOFEP for vetting. Similarly, new projects and programs by DPs or MOE/GES should be reviewed by the 'sector group.'
11. **Sustained and systematic information sharing, lesson learning and development of institutional memory**: *DPs and MOE agree to build on the lessons learned from development program implementation by ensuring more efficient knowledge management in relation to policy and programming.* All technical/research reports and assessments, evaluations and monitoring reports conducted by MOE/GES and DP's will be posted on a

joint web site in order to ensure that information is stored in an accessible manner over a long term.

12. DPs will commit themselves to the agreed upon coordination principles and code of conduct for the sector.

Steps towards an Education Coordination Strategy

Some of the main recommendations from the Akosombo retreat include:

- Complete the DP mapping exercise within the education sector which systematically identifies DP resourcing, program support and areas of interest at the activity and target levels. This process should be completed by the DP coordination office using the process tool developed at the workshop. The DP mapping can then be compiled and uploaded on a website for all DPs to review.
- Complete and deepen the consultation on comparative advantage among DPs after the program and resource mapping exercise is completed in order to identify areas of potential synergy and collaboration. Potential focus areas of collaboration include: basic needs provision to pupils at primary and JHS levels, teacher in-service training, girls' education, school infrastructure, capacity building, monitoring and evaluation.
- Review previous MOE/GES capacity building assessments and potentially extend this analysis within the context of increased "country systems" usage. All interested DPs should collectively agree upon a capacity building and institutional support plan. The capacity building plan should also consider ongoing/planned DP program initiatives to strengthen the central Ministry and decentralized education offices.
- Hold a joint MOE/GES and DP review process⁷ of the current ESP monitoring and evaluation plan and provide technical support to ensure effective implementation within the MOE/GES. Resourcing needed to implement the ESP M&E plan should be presented to the sector group and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MOFEP) for support through Multi-donor budget support. Lead DPs and relevant departments of the Ministry/GES should carry out biannual performance reviews.

⁷ This could involve a two day focused workshop with M&E officers and key representative from across the donor community and MOE/GES to discuss the M&E plan roll out.

- Hold a joint baseline exercise including key DPs interested in harmonizing their own M&E systems. Develop and pursue preliminary work on existing data sets using the key indicators identified at the Akosombo retreat and contained in the main report, keeping in mind the ongoing systems and efforts (EMIS, NEA/SEA and school card reporting processes). Some of the data gaps have been identified in the report.
- As a matter of urgency develop an effective information dissemination and archival system to monitor results and lessons learned; an interactive website for DPs, civil society and government to strengthen their coordination in the sector and interface with key departments across the Ministry and decentralized levels. Develop and share the DP mapping and basic information sharing tools among the broader stakeholder community with some limited usage for information which is not in the public domain.
- Undertake a review of key roles, responsibilities, and leadership capacity in order to ensure better coordination within the MOE/GES. This may require technical support from DPs to improve management processes and team building within and across the MOE/GES. Implement a coordination process for steering, reviewing and monitoring the efforts of MOE/GES to improve performance and accountability related to the AESOP and ESP goals and strengthen Planning, Budget, Monitoring and Evaluation (PBME) to take up this responsibility.

DP policies are increasingly reflective of their commitment towards the global agreement on aid effectiveness. The use of country systems in the implementation of DP objectives and programs is currently being observed to varying degrees; nevertheless, such levels of effort mark a positive movement towards aid harmonization through the use of national structures. There is general awareness of the practical constraints observed by DPs in fully engaging the country systems, foremost of which are the weak implementation capacities and inadequate systems for accountability. The GOG, through MOFEP, has expressed its resolve to work with development partners in achieving a standard of operations that will be acceptable to all.

DPs are united in expressing the requirements for an accelerated move towards better coordination and harmonization of interventions in the education sector. These requirements include clear communication and dissemination of GOG development priorities and objectives, ownership and leadership in driving this development agenda. On the other hand, the GOG would like to reach a situation where all DPs adhere to the agreements in the Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness. GOG also expects DPs' performance to be conducted with transparency and equally subjected to assessment.

The Akosombo retreat sought to build a collective vision and a continuing process of reflection on how to improve coordination to bring about lasting change within the education sector. The deliberations generated significant milestones towards achieving this vision as well as concrete recommendations for action. Participants jointly identified priority issues that need to be addressed to improve coordination. These are in the areas of strengthening the linkages with and within the decentralized institutional structures, developing an effective information dissemination system, institutional capacity building within MOE and its various departments, clarifying priorities within the ESP and AESOP, exploring alternative modes of aid harmonization such as pooled funding, and designing and implementing a joint baseline assessment.

1.0 Introduction of the Workshop

The Education Sector Coordination Strategy Retreat was hosted by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the Ministry of Education (MOE)/Ghana Education Service (GES) on April 6 and 7 at the Volta Hotel, Akosombo. The retreat brought together key education sector stakeholders to consult on ways of improving coordination within the sector and within the context of aid effectiveness. Participants included Development Partners (DPs) active in the education sector along with key Ministries and Departments including the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MOFEP), the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC) and a few Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).

The *key objectives of the retreat* were:

1. *To improve coordination within the education sector by developing an education sector coordination strategy among and across the MOE/GES, DPs and Civil Society (a sector-wide approach).*
2. *To build a harmonized approach to baseline data collection and indicators which will be used to strengthen the performance monitoring of the Education Strategic Plan; better identify best practices; strengthen host country systems and track outcomes/impact within the sector over the next five to ten years.*
3. *To prioritize areas for support within the sub-sectors (basic, post-basic etc.) and identify gaps within the ESP which need financial support.*
4. *To build a collective vision and establish an ongoing mechanism for reflection on future coordination and how to work closer together to effect lasting change within Ghana's education sector.*

The retreat attracted key DPs including USAID, DFID, UNICEF, World Bank, WFP among others (see Annex 2 for list of participants). Key MOE/GES staff including the Directors of Basic Education, Planning Budgeting Monitoring and Evaluation (PMBE), Regional Directors attended as well participants from MOFEP, NDPC and a few NGOs working in the education sector. Speaking at the retreat, the Minister of Education stressed the importance of the retreat and sector consultation to the Ministry of Education. The retreat was highly interactive and at the end of the workshop participants recommended that it become an annual event in order to strengthen the sector-wide approach.

2.0 Retreat Day One

2.1 Welcome addresses

The host institutions, Ministry of Education, represented by the Minister, Honorable Tettey Enyo, and USAID, represented by Mr Bob Davidson, Director of Education, USAID/Ghana, delivered the welcoming addresses.

2.1.1 Welcome address by the Minister of Education

The Minister was delighted to attend the workshop and share his thoughts with participants on ways to strengthen structures and processes within the education sector. He emphasized that Ghana's evolving education system has made significant strides to make it an example in the sub-region. He referred to the establishment of the Education Strategic Plan and Annual Education Performance Reviews as some of the milestones for achieving synergy within the sector.

The Minister acknowledged development partners' efforts to enhance effective use of public finances and improve aid effectiveness as spelt out in Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness (AAA) through the adoption of common strategies.⁸ He was concerned about activities that continued to promote the non-use of country systems by DPs and emphasized that the use of country systems could ensure efficient use of resources and strengthen local capacity to enhance partnership for development. He was convinced that a structured Development Partner Assistance regime and program of work focused on coordination could generate mutual benefits and deepen partnerships. He was therefore grateful to USAID for funding the workshop and looked forward to the resolutions in this regard.

The Minister expected that the adoption of a Medium Term Strategic Program of work and results framework for promoting better coordination would result from the retreat and consultation; he also expected that a common baseline indicator study in order to ensure results were measured and a projected resource inflow mapping to support educational program. Concluding, he emphasized that consensus building should underpin all decisions and outcomes from at the retreat.

⁸ The Paris Declaration refers to the Paris Declaration for Aid Effectiveness (March 2 2005). The Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness (September 4 2008) aimed to accelerate and deepen the implementation of the Paris Declaration. *Inter alia* AAA sought to promote country ownership, whereby developing country governments will take stronger leadership of their own development policies and use developing country systems and institutions to the maximum extent possible.

2.1.2 Welcome address by the Director of Education Office, USAID/Ghana

Mr Bob Davidson, USAID Director of Education, thanked all participants especially the development partners, civil society organizations, agencies and departments for their keen interest in the workshop. He explained that, in line with the principle of aid effectiveness, USAID has been directed to develop strategies and a baseline study to solve common educational problems. He confirmed that funds have already been allocated for such a project in three countries classified as conflict, post-conflict and transition nations, namely Mindanao in the Philippines, Mozambique and Ghana respectively, all representing diverse stages of economic and educational development.

Mr. Davidson conceded that whilst development partners in Ghana's education sector were contributing to educational efforts using different approaches and modalities, they could collaborate better to solve educational problems. He emphasized the need for DPs and CSOs to coordinate their efforts to provide quality education in Ghana, and was optimistic that successful collaboration and coordination of efforts of all education sector stakeholders could be replicated in other countries. Mr. Davidson welcomed the Ministry of Education seizing this opportunity to bring education stakeholders together in order to attain a common goal. He was hopeful that by the end of the workshop a collective decision would have been reached regarding a coordination strategy and that a preliminary approach to launching the baseline study would have been crafted for the education sector.

2.1.3 Participant Responses

Participants, representing their respective organizations and agencies, supported the concept of contributing to educational delivery in Ghana in a harmonized manner. Stakeholders understood the need to:

- Review the ESP and Annual Education Sector Operation Plan (AESOP) to identify and clarify priorities;
- Critically examine the ESP funding needs to identify funding gaps.
- Assess resource availability, aid effectiveness and ways of collaborating and coordinating educational development in the country.

Participants conceded that lack of coordination had hampered the delivery of assistance in the education sector, and considered a coordination strategy as critical for maximizing available resources to deliver quality education. In this direction, participants stressed the need to critically examine the funding needs of the ESP in order to identify the funding gaps.

2.2 Introduction and expectations of participants

2.2.1. Expectations of Participants

Participants introduced themselves and outlined their expectations from the workshop (See Annex 5 for a comprehensive summary of participants' expectations). Consistent with the theme of the retreat, the majority of participants expected to explore and strategize on ways that the education sector could achieve high degrees of coordination and harmonization to achieve aid effectiveness within the education sector. Participants also hoped that a simple coordination plan, which could be followed by the MOE/GES and DPs, would result from the retreat. Participants expressed some concerns relating to: conflicting priorities within the sector and across the sub-sectors of education, limited government resources, diverse DP funding approaches, the limited information on CSOs' education activities and the growing complexity of education management at the decentralized levels.

Development partners hoped that the deliberations would lead to a coordination strategy which would address the key priorities of the GOG/MOE/GES, explore more effective and efficient approaches to implement the ESP and AESOP, and achieve a more coordinated collective monitoring and evaluation system. The DPs who are relatively new to the sector, came to the retreat with the intent of learning more about the status of education in Ghana and to determine how they can best fit in and address educational needs within that context.

2.3 Panel Discussion 1: The context and aid architecture of the education sector

Panel members included Mr. Bob Davidson, Director of Education, USAID/Ghana, Rachel Hinton, Human Development Advisor, DFID, Veronica Sackey, Head of Multi-Donor Budget Support (MDBS), MOFEP and Hiro Hattori, Chief of Education, UNICEF. Charles Aheto-Tsegah from Planning Budgeting Monitoring and Evaluation (PBME), Ministry of Education chaired the discussion. Each panel member presented their institution's perspective on aid modalities within the education sector and lessons learned in coordination within the sector which was followed by a general discussion by participants.

2.3.1 Presentation by Mr. Bob Davidson, Director of Education, USAID/Ghana

Mr. Davidson described how USAID mainly uses project assistance as the key modality for aid to Ghana's education sector; USAID does not use General Budget Support (GBS) or Sector Budget Support (SBS) due to federal government restrictions. Mr Davidson explained that through consultation with the Ghana government and its agencies, along with research and analysis, USAID identifies existing problem/needs within the sector and explores potential

solutions with GOG counterparts. In most cases, USAID's projects are focused on assisting MOE/GES to attain universal access to education, and improve quality and education management capacity through better governance at district and school levels. He emphasized that USAID's strategy is in consonance with the thrust of the Education Strategic Plan.

As regards implementation, Mr Davidson stated that USAID has been moving towards a new strategy of aid delivery following the Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness. Formerly USAID would often contract non-governmental organizations (NGOs), private voluntary organizations (PVOs) or private companies to implement the proposed projects but this approach has evolved towards using more of a "country systems approach". He explained that project assistance (PA) is labor intensive and expensive because the cost of the project is usually restricted to a specific geographic area with the intention to scale up later. He revealed that it has proved to be very difficult in terms of cost and the need to sustain interest.

Following AAA, USAID revised its delivery process in Ghana seeking a more efficient, sustainable and capacity-oriented approach to aid delivery within a project assistance framework. USAID has a bi-lateral agreement with the GOG in which funds are provided to Government to execute activities. USAID is using "country systems" to provide assistance to Ghana Education Service. This approach encourages ownership and buy-in as well as ensures continuity in delivering project assistance. The project assistance takes two forms; technical assistance, usually best sourced internationally, and project implementation, best effected through GES. Through using country systems, USAID increased its project assistance from 49% in 2008 to 70% in 2009. This has enabled USAID to scale up interventions to a national level at an affordable cost.

Mr. Davidson explained that the country systems approach encourages Government to assume the full responsibilities for implementation and is more sustainable once the donor exits. USAID believes this approach will result in better quality programming and impact. Admittedly, it is not a perfect system and USAID is often criticized, deservedly and undeservedly, for its position on using project assistance as its main aid modality, but they are gradually improving the scale of their programming which has helped to reach 100% of the country, compared to having project impact in only a small portion of the country. USAID have good partners in MOE/GES which are both willing to take the professional risks required to assume increasing responsibility. USAID is providing funds to GES for specific issues which USAID deems important and of high priority. "Project assistance is challenging but professionally rewarding".

2.3.2. Presentation by UNICEF representative - Hiro Hattori, Chief of Education

Mr Hiro Hattori, Chief of Education, UNICEF began his presentation by explaining that UNICEF provides assistance to the GOG and MOE in a similar manner to other UN agencies which also rely on the technical usage of "country systems". There have been efforts to

harmonize the delivery of development assistance within the UN system. UNICEF has a five year development framework from which their country plan (action plan) is crafted on a yearly basis. The plans are prepared in conjunction with GOG and the goals are aligned with the ESP and other government policies. The GOG and UNICEF prepare a one year development plan known as the annual action plan which is signed by both Government and UNICEF. UNICEF uses project support as the primary aid modality within the education sector although they have provided budget support in the past.

UNICEF uses the “country system” in the delivery of development assistance in the education sector by using existing government structures and institutions including GES and the District Education Offices (DEO) to implement program plans. They do not have a separate project implementation unit but work through these decentralized structures. UNICEF often provides funds through the government account with restrictions that it has to be used within a six month period.

Mr. Hattori explained a new approach within the UN system which includes emphasis on social protection of the poorest of the population using cash transfers; the UN agencies, such as UNICEF, WFP and UNDP, have adopted a harmonized approach. UNICEF’s approach to development assistance does not rule out the use of budget support, and in the health sector, budget support is their main mode of aid delivery. Mr. Hattori referred to another approach to aid modalities which is not categorized as either project support or general budget but which can be described as a pooled funding approach among donors to the sector. He concluded his presentation by stating that UNICEF’s country program, which spans 2006 to 2010, has been extended by another year and the next country program will span from 2011 to 2016.

2.3.3 Presentation by DFID – Dr. Rachel Hinton, Human Development Advisor

According to Dr. Hinton, Ghana is not heavily aid dependent country since aid accounts for only 20% of the annual GoG budget. Ghana aims at achieving middle income country status by 2020 and the discovery of oil will help the government in its transition towards attaining middle income status. She explained that the Government perspective on aid effectiveness articulated in “Ghana’s New Aid Policy” considers general budget support (GBS) as the *preferred* option for aid delivery.⁹ This option ensures a more effective “division of labour” and alignment with poverty and social development frameworks (e.g. Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy) as well as harmonisation within the Ghana Joint Assistance Strategy framework.

The United Kingdom derives its influence in Ghana’s development sector from a historical aid relationship with Ghana and size of its aid portfolio. The Netherlands has overtaken the U.K. as the largest bilateral development partner to Ghana. DFID is increasingly working through other

⁹ The New Aid Policy for Ghana suggests that the GOG would like to see at least 60% of aid through this preferred mode of delivery.

donors as it strives to achieve higher levels of aid effectiveness and has five shared advisory arrangements with different donors and puts 90% of their programs in the form of programme budget approach (PBA) which includes budget support and any other program using “country systems” so it can be considered heavily aligned to national priorities and frameworks. Dr. Hinton stated that DFID is providing sector budget support of £100 million and annual disbursement of £15 million. In addition, they are providing technical assistance amounting to £5 million which includes an accountability grant to school for life and an Overseas Development Institute Fellow working in the Ministry of Education.

In 2008, DFID committed £250m over three years but a significant number of funding commitments carry through into the new strategy period. For instance, eight years of sector budget support (SBS) has been provided to Education; five years of SBS has been provided to Health. DFID is striving to ensure aid effectiveness and has tightened administrative costs. They have made trade-offs and choices regarding priorities (roads, agriculture), and now focus on social development sectors since the focus of multilaterals (WB, IMF) is on economic growth. Thus U.K.’s interest is to help Ghana achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), reduce regional disparities and protect vulnerable groups at the same time that development assistance improves GoG’s capacity.

The U.K. government’s immediate priority is to help developing countries deal with the economic downturn and protect the poorest of the population by building social protection systems to help up to 50 million people in 20 priorities countries over the next few years. Given that only five years are left until 2015, there is the “need to change *what* we do, *where* we do it and *how* we work with governments, including commitments to work more in conflict zones and fragile states”. Ms. Hinton said the U.K. has committed to allocating at least 50% of all new bilateral funding to fragile states. Over the coming years the U.K. Government will increasingly focus on Climate Change emphasising that world is at a crossroads and cannot carry on with “business as usual”. The U.K. is also committed to supporting the One Goal campaign and priority to address maternal and newborn health. However, they recognize that U.K. cannot do it alone; consequently they have committed a higher proportion of their resources into multilaterals and strengthen key institutions such as the UN system, European Union and World Bank.

DFID Ghana is currently responding to the global economic crisis through supporting the Livelihood Empowerment against Poverty (LEAP) program, promoting a better business environment through funds such as Business Sector Advocacy Challenge Fund (BUSAC), private sector development and trade programs, maintaining long-term commitments in health and education. DFID Ghana is also promoting a new pooled funding approach to strengthen government accountability and civil society through the Ghana Accountability and Responsiveness Initiative fund (GHARI). The LEAP program (cash transfer program worth £3.3m) will benefit approx. 750,000 people in Ghana over next five years is supported by the

World Bank. DFID is supporting an Institutional Strengthening Plan (ISP) of the Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare.

DFID is supporting Ghana in improving access to quality education. The purpose of their support is to prioritise the MDG targets of: universal access to education by improving retention, completion, gender parity and ensuring the quality of teaching and learning. Steady progress is being made towards the achievement of the MDG targets of universal primary education and gender parity in schools. The next steps will be to ensure that all children in Ghana stay in school by improving quality through a number of factors: ensuring adequate textbooks; infrastructure; more contact hours with teachers etc. The challenging task is to improve the quality of education and to ensure that children who are not in school go back to school. DFID will be supporting Government to revise and fully cost its education strategy.

2.3.4 Presentation by representative at the MDBS unit of MOFEP- Veronica Sackey

Ms. Veronica Sackey of the Ministry of Education explained that the Government of Ghana has high regard for the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Aid effectiveness (AAA). Government is trying to present Ghana as a model, leading other countries in relation to the aid effectiveness agenda. She stated that the Government has developed an aid policy which seeks to deepen GOG ownership and is in line with the tenets of the Paris Declaration and AAA; GOG's aid policy spells out its priorities in relation to the mode and delivery of aid to ensure aid effectiveness.

Ms. Sackey hinted that some of the sector working group were not initially functional and the development partners had been driving the development agenda. However, Government is now trying to ensure that senior government representation is always in place and that the MOFEP chief director participates on various sector working groups as co-chair to the meetings; this has ensured more consistency and regularity of the meetings.

Ms. Sackey stressed that GOG has learned over time that the project mode of aid delivery has some inherent challenges such as: high transaction costs in managing several projects; lack of capacity; delays in disbursement of funds; high cost of resources mobilization; distinct and stringent reporting formats. Consequently Government wants to steer away from the project mode of assistance to general budget support (GBS). Currently GBS is the preferred option for support but only 30% of development partners are channeling their assistance through the general budget. The second option is sector budget support; project assistance may be allowed in cases of huge capital intensive projects.

Ms. Sackey added that the DPs assess Government to make sure government delivers. For the purposes of mutual accountability it would be good for Government also to assess DPs performance in relation to the Paris Declaration and the AAA. GOG will be assessing DP

performance to ensure that DPs are operating in sectors where they have comparative advantage thereby encouraging a division of labor and improving outcomes.

Ms. Sackey stated that Ghana is co-chairing the Aid effectiveness group on “country system” in collaboration with the U.S. Government. She stated that the GOG believes that many of the DPs’ activities can be implemented through the national structures including the budget, procurement and audit services. She also stated that Ghana has been internationally recognized for putting in place systems that engender transparency and accountability. Some of these systems were developed with the DPs e.g. the procurement system, but DPs continue to avoid using this country system without citing specific problems or working with Government to reach a standard that they can feel comfortable to use.

2.3.5 Discussion of first panel presentations

Following the panel discussion the general consensus was that the project mode of assistance is not the best mode for effective aid delivery and that Government least prefers project assistance. Currently 11 out of 13 donors in the education sector are using this mode of delivery. Many of the participants from Government criticized DPs for not adhering to the principles of the Paris Declaration and AAA, and for the persistent use of project assistance and limited use of general budget support. Participants also claimed that many DPs were not using the country systems as dictated by the Paris Declaration and AAA. For in instance, the procurement system was developed with the DPs and they agreed to use it¹⁰.

The participants raised the following issues:

The continued use of project assistance leads to fragmentation and undermines Government ownership of the development agenda which is at variance with the Paris Declaration and the AAA. Project assistance also creates parallel structures/institutions which sometimes use their own indicators and should not be encouraged. An evaluation of the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy II revealed that some of the priority sector programs are not implemented or are still in process of implementation because DPs channeled their resources into non-priority sectors.

There are delays in the release of funds from Government. According to participants, the sector planning is based on the premise that funds will be released from government and donors. If there are delays in the release of funds it affects the sector performance. Sometimes when the government fails to release funds, the sector has to fall back on donor funds to fill the gap which is often inadequate. Some participants also argued that the use of counterpart funds affect results and should be discouraged.

¹⁰ In 2008, the World Bank rated Ghana’s procurement system as performing above average.

The sectors are supposed to set their priorities from the national strategy. Participants emphasized the need to move away from situation where DPs develop their own projects and force it on sectors or Government. They emphasized that government is not prepared to tolerate such practices and that DPs must ally their support with Government as stipulated in the AAA. However others criticized the Government for not being forthcoming with development priority initiatives in some cases. They said this compelled some DPs to develop their own projects but if the Government takes the initiative first with the DPs, that problem would not arise. They advised DPs to channel some of their funds for capacity development to produce local expertise.

DPs at the retreat, asserted that their assistance is in line with Government development strategies and that their assistance also follows the principles of the AAA in terms of alignment, use of country systems and ownership. They suggested that the objectives within the strategy plans should be clearly outlined to enable DPs to readily feed in their support.

Most participants argued that ownership transcends alignment with national development frameworks and that Government needs to provide leadership and coordination within the development sphere. They also agreed that one institution should be tasked to take the leadership role in coordinating support for development. This role can be assumed by either MOFEP or the National Development Planning Commission.

In conclusion participants at the retreat stressed the need for Government to have a comprehensive strategy to drive the development agenda in the country. The DPs proposed to revisit the issues of ownership by both Government and DPs over the course of the retreat.

2.4 Panel Discussion 2: Coordination within the context of decentralization, the new education act and national development

The second panel discussion focused on presentations on the issues of decentralization, the new Education Act and the national development planning process. The panel included the Director of Basic Education, the Regional Directors of Education from Ashanti Region and one civil society representative from World University Service of Canada.

2.4.1 Presentation by the Director of Basic Education, GES and civil society representative

According to the Director of Basic Education (Mr. Stephen Adu), decentralization can be traced back to 1980s but there has not been any clear coherent mechanism to coordinate the different actors at national and district levels. The education sector is said to be decentralized but there is still some confusion regarding the contribution and role of the Municipal Assembly/District Assembly (MA/DA) and the District Education Office. There is also no collective understanding of what decentralization is about with regard to the education sector. Decentralization has advanced to some extent but other aspects such as financial decentralization are still far behind schedule. Mr. Adu proposed engaging with civil society to extend and deepen the process. The

Director of Basic Education explained that the Decentralization Act and the Education Act should be examined in relation to improving harmonization.

He conceded that decentralization is beneficial for the population due to its ability to ensure bottom up accountability and strengthens implementation capacity. From the perspective of the District and Municipal Assemblies, MAs/DAs are already playing a role in education at the district level. The MAs/DAs have representatives on the boards of secondary schools and the school management committees. However many of them do not meet regularly either for lack of interest or capacity.

The Director of Basic Education explained that District Assemblies and Municipal Assemblies are not well equipped for the task of managing education at the decentralized levels. Examples of some of the weaknesses include staff lacking the capacity to manage education at district level, and some districts have financial problems which could affect the performance of education outcomes if they are tasked to manage education.

2.4.2 Presentation by the Regional Director of Education

According to the Regional Director of Education (Mr J.K. Onyina), Regional Education Directorates are supposed to monitor and coordinate the activities at the district level but DPs do not often involve the regions in their programs. The regions often tend to be brought into DP programming as an afterthought. All the DPs decisions are made at the national level, based on the data provided by the districts. For instance, USAID's National Literacy Acceleration program is very well intended and promises good results in enhancing child literacy at lower primary but there was no initial baseline study to measure the literacy levels and proficiency of the children against which to measure the effectiveness of the program in future.

The Regional Director of Education admitted that decentralization is beneficial to the population but raises some challenges. Many of the DAs lack the capacity and the process of decentralization has excluded some key stakeholders. He stressed that many districts have their own specific problems which are not well reflected in national strategies and programs. He argued that the DAs/MAs are already heavily involved in education management and delivery but lack interest and capacity. He also emphasized the need to clearly define the role of the regions in the decentralization process.

2.4.3 Civil Society Discussant of the Panelist presentations

Mr Addae-Boahene, was the civil society representative for the panel discussion and stated that some level of decentralization has been achieved already but more work is needed to fully implement the policy. He stated that there are three aspects of decentralization which include: delegation, deconcentration, and devolution; administrative, financial and devolution of power. He explained that in Ghana there is deconcentration at the administrative level but only partial

financial decentralization has been attained; power and decision making are yet to be fully decentralized. Some participants considered the issue was not so much the capacity of the DAs/MAs but rather that the central administrators are not ready to relinquish power and allow qualified staff from national offices to be transferred to the districts.

Mr Addae Boahene pointed out that coordination may be more challenging at the decentralized level since at the national level there are regular DP meetings and an annual education performance review. There appears to be limited coordination and harmonization at the district level. DPs often design programs for districts without full consultation with the DAs until the program is being implemented; vertical program designs from the national level with little DA input has led to overlap and duplication. For instance, some DPs are designing programs for districts without identifying what other DPs are doing at the district levels. For instance, several teachers training programs on literacy have created confusion for teachers in the education system.

The new Education Act transfers power to the District Education Office level but there are still problems and mistrust between the national actors and district levels actors. (e.g. DEO). “For instance the whole school development gave about ₵100 million (GH₵10,000) to the schools and districts and they were able to manage it. So how can we talk about capacity of the district or school? Decentralization is a process and we need to start and sustain it because there are people who have vested interest in the old way and will resist any change”. The issues of capacity can be addressed. It is not the case that districts have advertised for a certain caliber of personnel and did not attract them; it is therefore premature to conclude that they have no capacity.

Participants agree that there is an urgent need to shift from a deconcentrated mode of decentralization towards devolution of power, but this has political implications. District Education Oversight Committees are set up by DAs but many of them are not functional. Discussants were of the view that education is already in the decentralization mode but that DAs must complete the cycle.

2.5 SWOT analysis of sector coordination

Participants were divided into two groups, one with government representatives and another group containing development partners and NGO representatives. Each group’s task was to identify the strengths and weaknesses in relation to sector coordination at different levels of institutional operation (e.g. national, regional, district). Groups were also asked to identify opportunities and threats in relation to sector coordination if adequate time permitted.

The group presentations revealed that there was consensus on the weaknesses of sectoral coordination. For instance, both government and DPs recognized the need for stronger implementation of plans and greater participation of the District Education Offices in strategic planning exercises in order to ensure ownership and enhance effective implementation. The

government and DP break out groups also saw the need to strengthen the M&E system by revisiting and ensuring that the MOE monitoring and evaluation plan is carried forward.¹¹ Both groups also recognized that there are significant management issues due to lack of regular and effective communication and management meetings within MOE/GES which limits implementation and results being achieved. Groups spoke of the need for capacity building particularly in relation to improved reporting, results-based management and increased levels of resourcing towards M&E in order to ensure that coordination is achieved.

2.5.1 SWOT Results for Government Participants

The government group was tasked to analyze the strengths relating to coordination at national, regional and district levels of education. At the national level the group identified two major strengths in relation to coordination: regular and participatory monthly meetings of key MOE/GES officials/ DPs, and the annual education sector review. Weaknesses in coordination at the national level included inadequate cross-sectoral collaboration and weak monitoring and evaluation systems.

At the regional level the strengths identified included: increased district capacity to implement programs. The weaknesses included: limited local participation in the development of Education Strategic Plans and the varying sets of indicators to monitor district program performance and operations.

MOE/GES Coordination: Strengths

The Government group agreed that the GOG-driven regular and participatory monthly meeting is a good indication of coordination within the education sector. These meetings have a wide range of participation from the MOE and other key stakeholders including the Chief Director as Chair, GES Director General, Financial Controller, GES Directors, MOFEP, DPs, and Ghana National Education Coalition. Decisions are made by consensus and, when necessary, ad hoc task teams are mobilized to explore specific issues. These teams co-opt other stakeholders who have authority to act and respond to identified issues (e.g. Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development for decentralization). Minutes with agreements and decisions are circulated among participants.

Education sector performance and issues of concern are presented during the Annual Education Sector Performance Review (AESR) organized at the district, regional, and national levels. The AESR enables the education sector to have wider and deeper insight into issues emanating from a range of stakeholders.

¹¹ The MOE Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is drawn from the needs of the ESP 2010-2020 and reflects key roles and responsibilities, resourcing and activities in relation to implementing the plan.

Weaknesses:

Efforts towards coordination in the education sector do not always result *in adequate cross-sectoral collaboration* with other critical stakeholders such as the National Development Planning Commission (NDPC), Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development (MLGRD). The National Development Planning Commission (NDPC), for instance, stated that the Commission is not abreast with the MOE/GES programs, making it difficult to integrate education priorities into the national medium-term planning process as well as the guidelines for district planning and prioritization.

Admittedly, the MOE/GES has *weak internal and external reporting systems* due to the lack of commitment and low capacity of education personnel in reporting. Feedback on decisions is not regularly observed resulting in limited internalization of agreed upon policies and actions. Participants also stated that the present M&E system is not efficient and has limited effectiveness due to *inadequate budget allocation*.

Regional/District Level: Strengths

The *delegation of responsibility* and authority to the District Education Directorate for the implementation of district programs and their coordination provides an opportunity for improving local capacity building as well as the ability for education personnel to adjust implementation to the local situation.

Weaknesses

Regional and district level education personnel have *limited participation in planning and decision-making* in relation to national policy-making and programs being designed within the education sector partly due to the limited flow of information. This has resulted in difficulties in program implementation such as low commitment from personnel, inadequate capacity-building for program implementation, and poor activity coordination. Nevertheless, a limited degree of regional and district participation was observed in the planning process for the 2010 ESP and AESOP.

District Directorates are confronted with *varying sets of monitoring indicators for a range of* programs and district operations such as teacher performance and teacher learning material usage; national programs such as school feeding, capitation grant, and other DP projects have a variety of indicators needed for monitoring. There is no harmonized approach to indicator setting or tracking monitoring and evaluation exercises.

Recommended Strategies for Improvement

In order to improve education sector coordination, the government sub-group recommended the following:

- An expansion of representation in all sector working groups to include critical stakeholders within the sector and across all other social and economic sectors

particularly civil society representatives and social development ministries (e.g. Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare);

- Develop realistic M&E plans for the MOE that are useful for all levels of operations. The plan should also include the required budget not only for mobilizing government resources but also facilitate DP funding support to M&E;¹²
- Build the capacity of district personnel to use standardized indicators required by most programs and enable them to select a few indicators that are specific and appropriate to their context. District personnel should also be able to develop an efficient system to monitor the indicators required by various projects and programs.

2.5.2 SWOT results for development partners

The development partners sub-group, assisted by representatives from civil society, was asked to analyze the coordination processes between the MOE and the DPs as well as coordination between the education sector and other sectors across relevant MAs/DAs.

Strengths

The institutionalization of the Education Strategic Plan (ESP) and the annualized format (AESOP) has brought about a systematic and comprehensive direction to sector operations and ***strengthened the planning culture*** within the MOE/GES. The ESP process entails consensus-building around programs and activities, which can result in eventual implementation. Presently, there is high visibility of the ESP, AESOP, and their programs. Despite some shortcomings, this planning framework can be built on for more effective implementation within the sector.

The GOG has maintained an ***open-door policy as far as collaboration*** within the education sector is concerned. A receptive disposition towards potential partnerships made it easy for development partners and other stakeholders (e.g. NGOs) to engage and attain entry into the sector.

The Ghana health sector has developed and made use of a ***Code of Conduct that guides DPs*** and other stakeholders in their operations within the sector wide approach (SWAP). The education sector can learn from this experience to develop its own guidelines.

Weaknesses

There has not been effective communication of critical information between DPs and the MOE which affects decision-making within the Ministry. Communication within the Ministry itself is neither well organised, nor consistently observed and lacks the feedback loop to ensure that all

¹² More work is needed to align M&E activities to the overall ESP monitoring and evaluation plan. Although this plan was distributed at the retreat. Participants were not familiar with its contents and potential for guiding monitoring and evaluation activities.

key personnel have a complete understanding and have internalized information as well as decisions on policy, programs and projects.¹³

The participants stated that an *ineffective communication system* affects the coordination of DPs engaged in the sector. For instance, there is no visibility of some significant programmes (e.g. NALAP), key stakeholders have difficulty seeing the ‘big picture’, implementation delays are experienced, and achievement of program effectiveness is limited. In addition, to the communication problems and lack of information flow within the GES/MOE is the *rate of personnel turn-over* which leads to loss in institutional memory.

Difficulties in coordination and delays in implementation can also be attributed to a *time consuming decision-making process*. Yet despite this, there remains the question of how participation and engagement are being effectively utilized? Also, how does the process ensure consensus at the DP level.

There is *limited technical capacities* within MOE and its agencies/departments at the national and district level, particularly in the handling of multiple activities that characterize sectoral operations. Inefficiencies due to poor implementation capacities means that transaction costs are not clearly identified.

The communication of education issues across all the other sectors has not been effective leading to *weak cross-sectoral coordination*, and disjointed or non-implementation of multi-sectoral efforts that can potentially assist in the achievement of development objectives especially those pertaining to the continuing education of youth and children. Also, there seems to be no common point of contact for development partners when it comes to education issues that cut across sectors and involving multiple ministries.

There are also multiple focal points for DP coordination within the Ministry of Education, but, there is no clarity on what their role will be *vis-a-vis* the new DP Coordination Office. On the other hand, there is no similar DP coordination office within the GES.

There had been *delays in the release of funds* based on agreed DP funding. These delays have necessitated adjustments to implementation, resulting in serious deviation from agreed upon plans that have had adverse effects on development outcomes. The bases for these delays included non-performance by GOG on the agreed upon triggers set out during negotiations on the program/project funding.

A related problem seems to be the lack of collective participation, especially by direct program implementers (e.g. District Education Offices), at the design and targeting stages. This concern should be addressed together with a more participatory approach to design so that ownership for programming and setting of triggers for releases can be made more responsive and relevant.

¹³ It was clear from Retreat activities and discussions that not all key stakeholders had access to the AESOP which was the primary document guiding their work.

Opportunities

Despite the weaknesses cited, the DP group believed that there are certain conditions in the present environment that offer opportunities for progress within the sector. The MOE proactively facilitated the establishment of the Coordination Office for DPs. The DPs also agreed that there are improved consultative/participatory processes between DPs and the MOE/GES. They added that to enhance the opportunities in the sector, MOE/GES can learn lessons from other sectors (including the Ghana health sector or from other countries) in terms of vetting programs and strengthening communication within and across the MOE/GES.

Recommended Strategies for Improvement

In order to improve sectoral coordination, the development partners' sub-group recommended the following:

- Strengthening capacities for coordinating all projects and programs under the MOE and GES particularly at the national and district levels. A coordination unit/team should also be explored.
- Facilitating collective annual information sharing between DPs and Government (MOE/GES/MOFEP) in order to coordinate resource mobilization and usage.¹⁴ Carry out an annual detailed mapping exercise for AESOP projects/programs/activities and their achievements, available human, technical and management capacity and support systems within MOE and the gaps in institutional capacity across MOE/GOG in terms of achieving the deliverables (results and outcomes).
- A collective DP/MOE/GES Institutional Strengthening Plan (ISP) should be developed and revisited with corresponding costs and a clear implementation path. This ISP can be patterned after earlier DFID and World Bank supported ISP plans and needs assessments, but should be better tied to deliverables linked to the ESP and AESOP. The ISP should identify key areas and ways of addressing immediate challenges within MOE and GES with orientation towards strengthening decentralisation. The use of AESR as an opportunity to review progress in relation to the ISP should be considered in order to track outcomes in relation to GOG capacity building.
- Strengthening the thematic working groups (access, quality, education management etc) by ensuring that progress reports from lead MOE/GES sub-agencies report on progress including those that are tasked to track, implement

¹⁴ Currently this is carried out through bilateral discussions between DPs and MOE; the process should also involve a more collective and transparent process to discuss commitments across all the DPs and a mapping exercise to document commitments.

and oversee the ESP (e.g. some selected DEOs). Development partner working meetings and GOG working groups should continue.

- Monthly MOE/GES management meetings should include all MOE/GES Divisions. Meetings should be well documented and follow up on issues and actions should be strengthened. Implementation plan needs to be well communicated. The coordination unit within PBME needs to be strengthened.
- Utilize the M&E Plan of the ESP/AESR to guide the entire education sector M&E process and ensure alignment with the AESOP. Planning Budgeting Monitoring and Evaluation should better coordinate monthly meetings across the thematic groups, MOE/GES divisions and units.

2.6 Prioritization and Support Gaps within the ESP

Retreat participants were divided into three groups to prioritize indicative targets and activities in the Annual Education Sector Operation Plan (AESOP). Participants were asked to identify which of the education sub-sectors they were most committed to and interested in (e.g. Basic, Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET), second cycle or tertiary) and to join the groups of most interest. The vast majority of participants identified the basic education sector with only a few DPs and GOG representatives in the TVET and second cycle sub sectors. Group 1 focused on Basic Education, Group 2 Second Cycle education and Group 3, TVET.

2.6.1 Group 1: Prioritization of Basic Education

The Basic Education Interest Group, consisted of a mix of DPs and GOG representatives, and identified areas within the AESOP supported by each of the DPs. Secondly, the group identified priority areas that should be tackled within the basic education sub-sector.¹⁵ Annex 6 presents a mapping of AESOP activities supported by each of the DPs represented in the workshop. Participants also indicated activities that other DPs are operating and the gaps where no DPs are currently supporting.

The Basic Education sector remains a key sub-sector of focus for most of the DPs in education. They are particularly concerned with improving the quality of education, accountability and performance and ensuring retention and equity across the education sector. Areas which the

¹⁵ The group used the ESP Vol 3.1 - AESOP 2010-2012, Draft March 2010.

donors (UNICEF, USAID, JICA, DFID, and WB) and Government representatives gave high priority to in Basic Education included the following¹⁶:

- Strengthening Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) data to capture equity issues;
- Construction of basic schools across the country;
- Decentralization of Basic Education through Regional and District Education Offices
- Conducting periodic and appropriate school mapping.

The group deliberations focused on identifying priorities for the Basic Education sub-sector using the current AESOP. It was agreed that indicative targets are a better basis for prioritization than the list of activities. The consensus was placing priority on access to schools that can guarantee basic needs for children to stay in school and complete basic education. Emphasis was also placed on increasing the quality of teachers, enhancing the quality of teaching and learning materials, and enhancing child performance in the major assessment programs.

The following indicative targets were identified as priorities:

1. Increase in gross enrolment rate, net enrolment rate and gender parity index, completion rate in KG, Primary, JHS
2. Increase in coverage of school feeding program
3. 100% of basic schools with potable drinking water facility
4. 100% of basic school kids have access to sanitary (toilet) facilities
5. Increase in the percentage of qualified teachers in basic schools
6. Continue to provide all basic schools with teaching and learning materials
7. Increase in the performance of pupils in SEA/NEA
8. Tackle all subjects at JSS and gain an aggregate range of 6-30 for 80% of BECE candidates
9. Improve mathematics and science teaching.

The gaps which remain in relation to the AESOP are that no DPs are taking interest or support for:

- the provision of training of teachers in special needs education
- Less interest in girls' education as Ghana attains the GPI nationally;
- in school governance at the national level of JHS;
- providing adequate safety sanitation and basic health care facilitates particularly for children with disabilities;

¹⁶ This prioritization is partly based on DP consultations as part of the Akosombo workshop and funding which has been earmarked for these various activities.

- training in primary health care to improve teachers' awareness of health issues.

There were very few DPs apart from UNICEF and to some extent USAID, supporting sanitation and basic health facilities for children. Another major gap identified by the group was the lack of support for the untrained teacher diploma in basic education program (UTTDBE) which has proven to be an effective approach in retraining teachers in rural deprived areas of the country. Consultations at the workshop also suggested that there is a lack of coordination of girls' education interventions. There is also a waning interest among the DPs due to the fact that Ghana is on the verge of achieving MDG 2 including gender parity.

In the course of deliberations, the group raised other gaps of concern in the AESOP document that need to be addressed to generate a more comprehensive and useful plan document. For instance, some essential indicators that were part of the previous ESP were not reflected (e.g. increase in JHS graduates, TVET being adequately addressed etc). Also, some on-going activities have not been included such as science and mathematics training for teachers and school feeding. The document also does not reflect the DP exclusively-led programs and only includes GOG activities some of which have DP support. Large scale programming by some DPs is not reflected in the document in order to identify areas with strong support (e.g. NALAP). In terms of format, there is a disconnection between the indicative activities and the target indicators making it difficult to establish the logic of objectives. Clear budget details are also not available with DP resourcing levels to enable objective assessment of funding shortfalls and potential overlaps.

2.6.2 Group 2: The Prioritization of Second Cycle Schools (SC)

Group two prioritized second cycle education and consulted on the socio-humanistic, educational and economic thematic areas using the AESOP. Under the socio-humanistic (access, equity, welfare, etc) thematic area, the group selected the following indicative targets in order of priority:

- 750 public SHS in a ratio of 3 general SHS to 1 Technical (3 general: 1 technical);
- All eligible students with non-severe SEN, integrated into mainstream by 2015;
- A minimum of one female gender counselor per second cycle institution;
- IEC health program in place and on going.

The group felt that in order to achieve the first indicative target there is the need for MOE/GES to continue the construction and refurbishment of SHSs to achieve at least one SHS school per district over the period of the ESP. For the second target to be achieved, second cycle school infrastructure should be designed to meet the needs of pupils/students with special needs. There is also the need to train female counselors to act as focal points for gender issues and establish an

effective guidance and counseling system for second cycle students in order to meet the last two priority targets stated above.

Under the educational thematic area of the AESOP (quality, skills development, etc) the priority indicative targets included; all SHS and Technical Vocational Institutions to be adequately supplied with science and technical teaching labs and equipment; all SC graduates entering higher education or the world of works should be equipped with socially appropriate transferable skills. To achieve this, the group felt that the MOE/GES needs to prioritize the development and distribution of teaching and learning aids to all SC institutions and teachers. There will also be the need to modernize ICT and skills components of the SHS curriculum and school environment by making it more relevant to second cycle leavers and by providing suitable ICT school facilities for second cycle students and their teachers.

There were four main priority indicative targets under the efficiency thematic area which included: functional Boards of Governors (BoG) in each second cycle institution, motivational packages for second cycle teachers ready to work in hardship areas; another major target was for teacher absenteeism to be reduced to 5% by 2015 and improve the financial efficiency of second cycle education.

The group felt that there is the need to revise the BoG policy on second cycle institutions and develop a management handbook for members. Teachers in second cycle should be provided with a deprived area incentive package of 20% to encourage them to go to rural and deprived areas while limiting teacher absenteeism by abolishing study leave, holding INSET during vacations and enhancing SMC monitoring of second cycle schools. To infuse financial efficiency in the second cycle institutions, MOE/GES needs to determine the actual numbers of teachers on district payrolls. The following table outlines the key areas of interest in relation to different aspects of the ESP:

Table 2: Prioritization in Second Cycle

Thematic Areas	Priority Activities
Socio humanistic (access, equity, welfare)	Continue SHS construction and refurbishment to achieve at least one SHS per district over the ESP period; Ensure that Second Cycle infrastructure facilitates pupil access with special needs; Train female counselors to act as focal points for gender issues; Establish effective guidance and counseling systems for Second cycle students;

Educational (quality, skill and development)	Provide teaching and learning aids to all SC institutions and teachers Modernize ICT and skills components making them realistic and relevant to the SC leaders and national needs; Provide suitable ICT and SD school facilities for SC students and their teachers.
Economic (Efficiency, Delivery and Accountability)	Revise and Develop Board of Governors’ policy and Handbook; Provide incentive package of 20% to teachers willing to go to hardship areas; Limit teacher absenteeism during term time by abolishing study leave and holding inset during vacations; SMC monitoring of school/teacher attendance. Determine the actual number of teachers on district payrolls.

There is increasing interest among some DPs in moving their technical assistance and financial support to improving second cycle and tertiary level of education. This is due to significant increases in access and enrolment at the basic education level which is resulting in increased pressure at the second cycle and tertiary level of education. Donor concerns also related to more effective and efficient implementation of cost saving mechanisms to achieve the ESP targets for second cycle and tertiary education such as better targeting subsidies to second cycle and tertiary level students/education. Participants recognized that the ESP demands very strong measures to ensure equity in cost savings arrangement at second cycle and tertiary levels of education which requires difficult policy decisions and implementation.

There remain several **gaps** in relation to second cycle school support, gender and rural equity and improved quality of rural SHS’s around Ghana. Evidence also suggests the need to ensure that there is a quota for entry from JHS to SHS from rural and deprived areas and also ensure financial support to children from these areas to achieve higher levels of education.

2.6.3 Group 3: TVET prioritization

Group three was tasked to prioritize the AESOP activities for TVET. However, the group realized that TVET was embedded under the second cycle *educational* component of the AESOP; many of the targets and activities for TVET were not provided in the AESOP (with many TVET target and activity columns left blank). The TVET interest group developed a list of priority issues which included;

- Separation of TVET from the second cycle section of the AESOP to ensure that it is adequately considered within the operational plan;

- Pursue Public Private Partnerships (PPP) to expand TVET especially in areas of oil and gas;
- Develop a national qualification framework
- Develop a national manpower needs assessment over the next few years;
- Change the negative perception about TVET in the country;
- Provide infrastructure for the development of TVET;
- Make TVET curriculum more relevant to national development;
- Develop better teacher performance monitoring systems in TVET.

3.0 Retreat Day Two

3.1 Day one lessons learned

The participants used the first part of the morning to discuss some of the main findings from Day 1; The following key lessons were highlighted by participants:

- Coordination is very important, both vertical and horizontal, within organizations and between organizations and partners. Therefore data sharing and regular M&E (including external assessment) should be enhanced to further aid coordination within the sector. There is also the need to preserve the institutional memory and data management within MOE/GES to enhance coordination.
- Institutional capacity strengthening plan; there should be a capacity needs assessment and audit to better understand the capacity needs of the various sub sectors within MOE/GES. The DPs should collectively support the education sector in its capacity building effort.
- There was a lot of deliberation on the use of country systems by DPs in day one. Participants discussed the level of usage of country system by DPs and the challenges encountered by both DPs and MOFEP.
- Decentralization was also discussed on the first day; it was clear from participants that the policy is not making the needed progress despite the new educational act which places education delivery and management under the responsibility of the municipal and district assemblies. Participants also raised the issue of limited district staff capacity and inefficiencies in educational management at the district level. The MOE and GES, at the national level, were criticized for not relinquishing power and financial administration to the municipal and district assemblies.
- Participants also discussed the issue of ownership of the development agenda, as espoused in the Paris Declaration and AAA. Participants felt government should take steps to own the develop agenda, lead initiatives and program design activities and not allow DPs to set the development agenda within the education sector. Participants admitted that in the past, DPs were setting the development agenda but government is now keen to take ownership by reviving the sector group meetings, and providing some leadership in the development process. Government representatives also pointed out that the GOG has developed an aid policy which emphasizes general budget support and prefers DPs channel their assistance through the general budget mechanism instead of using project support.

- The issue of pooled funding was also considered important. Participants discussed the challenges of pooled funding considering the different DP needs in reporting, procurement, and audit.

3.2 The Café Table Discussions

The facilitators employed the World Café method to deepen discussion on five main topics:

- Development of a coordination strategy taking in to consideration different aid modalities and AAA (Table 1)
- Measuring success and outcomes within the education sector- global and national targets (Table 2)
- Building a vision for better coordination within the education sector—the role of the new DP coordination office (Table 3)
- Prioritization within the education sector (Table 4)
- Decentralization and good governance particularly at the district level (Table 5)

The café tables were given topic guidelines and specific tasks to achieve during the three rounds of discussion. Each round of discussion on a topic engaged a different set of people. This helped to deepen the discussion on the selected topics with secretaries of the sessions reporting at the end of the afternoon.

3.2.1 Table 1: Developing a Coordination Strategy taking into consideration different aid modalities and the AAA.

Discussion on Principles of Engagement/Code of Conduct

Twelve proposed principles of engagement/code of conduct were drafted based on consultation and outcomes of the first day. These principles were subjected to discussion to attain agreement towards strengthening coordination among DPs and key agencies involved in the education sector. The following are the results of three rounds of deliberations under each proposed principle.¹⁷ In general, most of the participants agreed with the principles as stated providing feedback with some minor suggestions for modification.

¹⁷ Please note that the final outcome of the principles based on the deliberations is contained in the executive summary of this report.

Proposed Principle 1:

Ownership by Government is of the highest priority which means that the MOE/GES must be involved and lead (where possible) in the identification and design of new projects/programs and initiatives.

Participants recommended that the principle on ownership by government should incorporate leadership with a defined vision, translated into policy and strategic direction, such as a prioritized ESP. There should also be ownership that translates into practical financial allocation. Taking these factors into consideration, an alternative statement was proposed: “Ownership by Government is of the highest priority which means that the MOE/GES must lead in the identification and design of new projects/programs and initiatives. Government must define the vision, key strategic policies and direction, expressed through the ESP, with clear priorities”.

Ownership should also extend to program/project implementation levels. Government-led planning and implementation should reach the district levels and the district assemblies should develop plans based on the ESP, expressed through the ADEOP. Consequently, donors should work within these plans/frameworks at the district levels. Finally, key indicators of ownership will be useful to assess the achievement of this principle.

Proposed Principle 2:

Leadership from within: requires that key MOE/GES representatives and staff act on issues related to current programming in order to assure their timely implementation.

The key focus of the leadership principle should be **performance accountability**. The GOG should identify key focal points/units within the education sector, the various sub-sectors and the cross-cutting issues. There should be clearly-defined roles and responsibilities for these focal units, and mechanisms to ensure their accountability. The GOG should build accountability systems within government and take the lead in implementing and monitoring these systems.

Proposed Principle 3:

There must be full transparency and accountability by MOE/GES and donors in all program related matters... This will require that government and donors collectively present their intended financial support within the framework of the ESP and AESOP in order to achieve greater harmonization.

The key focus of this principle should be **financial transparency**. The government should develop plans, priorities and a budget to implement these priorities. The GOG budget must be realistic and should lead to the identification of gaps that are not always appropriate for DP assistance. Development Partners should also assist Government fill some of the gaps.

Proposed Principle 4:

Alignment of programming within the framework of the Education Strategic Plan: all DP’s and civil society partners agree to work and align their programs within the ESP...

An alternative statement was suggested: “Alignment of programming within the framework of a clearly detailed and prioritized ESP. DPs should act within the ESP, responding to priorities.”

Proposed Principle 5:

Commitments of resourcing for program and policy prioritization will be realistic and made known to the Government; these resources will be released on a timely basis in order to avoid challenges in implementation.

Participants recommended that most of the elements of this principle should be integrated with the proposed principle No.3 on financial transparency. Participants also recommended that “with regards to timeliness of fund releases by DPs”, efforts towards identifying practical triggers that were commonly-agreed upon between DPs and the government should be made. There should be firm commitment by DPs to ensure the timely release of funds when the agreed triggers are met.

Proposed Principle 6:

Internal Capacity Building of all MOE/GES staff will be a constant focus for MOE/GES and DPs in order to ensure that program delivery is smooth and the goals of the ESP are achieved.

Participants suggested that the principle should include not only capacity building of staff but also of systems. The GOG should take the lead in the planning and implementation of institutional capacity development and DPs will provide the necessary support within the governments plan.

Proposed Principle 7:

Development Partners and MOE/GES will work towards harmonizing their modes of financial support to the sector by working towards a “pooled funding” approach which supports the MOE/GES and centralize all program/project assistance into one basket.

Participants suggested that this principle should be made more flexible to allow for differing country regulations on funding approaches. Pooled funding, for instance, may not be possible or appropriate for some donors, but may be a valuable approach for donors who can use it.

The focus of the principle should be the harmonization of DP processes using country systems. For instance, DPs should harmonize their planning and reporting systems, including engaging in joint reporting to the government. The DPs should also work towards harmonization of accounting systems, while recognizing the many barriers to such a harmonization. Participants suggested that an alternative statement be added--- “Development partners and MOE/GES will work towards harmonizing their modes of financial support to the sector.”

Proposed Principle 8:

Systematizing working relationships: An annual financial and program implementation tracking exercise will be carried out among all the DP’s and key civil society agencies in order to map out their interest areas and identify areas for increased collaboration among the donors.

Participants suggested that the following heading should be added: “Communication and Mapping” instead of “systematizing working relationships”. In addition to the current statement, the following sentence should follow: “DPs should map out their existing and planned areas of activity as well as budget, and this should be made available for government and DP review in a central database”.

Proposed Principle 9:

Increasing Focus/Capacity for Joint Monitoring and Evaluation: MOE/GES and DPs will work together towards complementing the ongoing Annual Education Sector Review by developing a more rigorous monitoring and evaluation system based on results oriented approaches; this will involve at minimum

- a) Joint (MOE/DP) Baseline exercise with external technical assistance to ensure objectivity;*
- b) Quarterly meetings of the MOE/GES and Government on tracking the progress in the ESP where each key division presents their progress using a template developed by PBME (could use the thematic groups);*
- c) Periodic joint monitoring to the field to assess the implementation of the AESOP.*
- d) External evaluations (every two years) which are jointly designed between the MOE and DP’s will be a regular feature of the ESP performance approach.*

The groups discussed the need for the AESR to be based on government established indicators and targets. The GOG should develop a more cost-effective M&E plan that the DPs could use for their own reporting system. This would restrict duplication in monitoring and strengthen the government’s M&E system. Sector group meetings should be an all-inclusive forum for all stakeholders in the sector. Participants suggested that the MOE/DP Coordination Office can best facilitate Civil Society consultations and participatory mechanisms especially at the decentralized (district) levels.

Proposed Principle 10:

New development partners interested in entering the education sector will be invited to present their plans and interest areas along with background/experience related to their comparative advantage to the “sector group” under MOFEP for vetting.

Participants stated that the DPs should develop a system of joint review/discussion of new partners and plans in the sector. New DPs should commit themselves to the agreed upon coordination principles and the *Code of Conduct* that should be developed and enforced. Similarly, new education projects and programs by DPs and MOE/GES should be reviewed by the “sector group.”

Proposed Principle 11:

New education projects being introduced within the education sector by MOE/GES or DPs will also be discussed at the “sector group” meeting.

This principle should be integrated with proposed principle No. 10, especially in terms of the active role of DPs in reviewing new DP projects/programs.

Proposed Principle 12:

Sustained information sharing, lesson learning and development of institutional memory: All technical/research reports and assessments, evaluations and monitoring reports conducted by MOE/GES and DP's will be posted on a joint web site in order to ensure that information is stored in an accessible manner over a long term.

The principle should also emphasize effective information dissemination, for better understanding and internalization, especially within the GOG structure. The DP Coordination Office should be able to utilize a model database (such as the Cambodia ODE model database for DPs), wherein DPs and NGOs can be encouraged to post summaries and abstracts of their project documents.

One of the key questions which arose from the retreat was that “If four or more development partners are running large scale programs country wide using MOE/GES “country systems” How can we better use country systems in a holistic and harmonized fashion?” Participants stated that country systems can best be used by DPs if the MOE can lead in the establishment of basic reporting systems that consider the various common requirements of DPs. These systems will also use a common set of indicators. To support the GOG effort, DPs should initiate a review of areas for harmonization in reporting requirements for the GOG, common indicators and common auditing needs, to the extent possible.

3.2.2 Table 2: Measuring Success and Outcomes in the education sector (indicators)

This café table was tasked to select the most important monitoring and evaluation indicators for the basic education sector and develop a strategy for joint monitoring using key MDDBS, MDG and ESP targets; baseline indicators were also discussed which could be used by education stakeholders (MOE, DPs, CSOs, etc) to jointly monitor and track the ESP targets. The café table discussion groups deliberated on key performance indicators and the design of a better monitoring and evaluation system to track implementation. The outcomes of the table are contained in Annex 8.

Indicators: Access, Quality and Management

The indicators were categorized into three thematic areas; access, quality and management. Under access the participants at the table identified the following indicators;

- Gender Parity Index
- Gross Enrolment Ratio
- Net Enrolment Rate
- Admission rate
- Transition Rate (P6/JHS 1)

- Survival Rate
- Completion Rate
- Government Education Expenditure in respect of group of people (Household survey data could be used to identify family background)

Under quality of education, indicators included the P3 and P6 results from the National Education Assessment (NEA), the School Education Assessment (SEA), and BECE pass rate/achievement rates. The participants at the café emphasized the need for an expanded sample size and the inclusion of science in the NEA. Participants recommended that the sample size be increased from 2% to 5% of the population and focused on attaining this sample size within each district. Others indicators such as the percentage of qualified teachers, pupil teacher ratio and pupil trained teacher ratio were also identified. The participants suggested that these indicators be disaggregated by rural and urban along with deprived and non deprived criteria in order to track equity issues in the education sector.

The participants felt that efficient and effective resource utilization was critical to educational delivery. The key indicators for tracking education management included: teacher time-on-task (teacher absenteeism), actual expenditure per pupil/student, timely delivery of budget releases and the execution rate of national budget by item at district and national level. These indicators were considered priority given the unfolding issues on teacher absenteeism, lateness, and education system inefficiencies.

Baseline study

The participants were of the opinion that there are several data sets already available from different institutions such as the Ghana Living Standard Survey (GLSS), EMIS data, and demographic Health Survey which can be used in combination to set up baselines for the measurement of the ESP performance. Participants proposed that a task team should be established to study existing data sets and identify gaps. The data gap analysis would then reveal the additional data needed that could be incorporated in a baseline exercise for measurement of the performance of the ESP. Participants recommended that the team should examine the indicators, refine them and set indicative targets and benchmarks.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Participants at this café table shared the view that a strong sector-wide monitoring and evaluation (M&E) is critical for policy making. Participants stated that many DP and GOG programs which are well intended have failed to yield desirable outcomes as a result of weak M&E systems. High quality monitoring and evaluation could guarantee achievement of planned targets and strengthen educational policies. Participants acknowledged the existence of a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the education sector which clearly identifies roles and responsibilities, and benchmark indicators linked to the ESP (2010-2020) in order to better monitor and evaluate the ESP performance. Café participants spoke of the lack of capacity at the regional and district

levels to carry out effective M&E. Participants also agreed that a key limitation was the lack of funds to support M&E which has stifled the implementation of the MOE's M&E plan.

Participants proposed increased funding for M&E in the education sector by raising support to about 1% to 2% of the education discretionary budget from MOFEP for strict usage for monitoring and evaluation activities. Participants also suggested that a clear budget line be established for monitoring and evaluation and that allocations should be ring-fenced. In addition they advocated for the institutionalization of the Annual Education Performance Review by PBME and proposed a biennial Joint DP and Government review of sectoral performance. There should be quality data and reporting at all levels. Data should be analyzed at district level to inform the planning of AESOP and ADEOP process. Participants also proposed that the sector should allocate resources to build capacity of officers engaged in monitoring and evaluation at all levels. As part of these recommendations, specific vehicles should be earmarked for monitoring and evaluation activities at all levels. The group admitted that the establishment of National Inspectorate Board would strengthen the monitoring and evaluation system but resources should be earmarked to enable it to perform its role effectively.

3.2.3 Table 3: Building a vision for better coordination within the education sector

This Café Table was expected to define a vision of a well-coordinated Ghana education sector and define the roles of the various stakeholders in relation to higher levels of coordination. The table was also tasked to consider comparative advantage among the DP community working in the education sector and where technical leadership on specific activities could be made. Particular focus was given to the role and responsibilities of the new MOE/DP Coordination Office and various measures that could be employed to enhance coordination within the sector.

Discussions at this Café Table were preceded by a brief historical background of the Coordination Office. A DP coordination office in Ghana has been in existence since February 1992, with the broad function of coordinating Development Partners (DPS) on their resourcing, programming and activities. The function of this unit was later transferred to the MOE Funds and Procurement Management Unit (FPMU) and, subsequently, to the MOE Planning, Budgeting, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PBME). The need to revamp and strengthen the DP coordination office was highlighted again at the onset of the new aid effectiveness policy, resulting in the establishment of the current MOE/DP Coordination Office.

Presently, the functions of the Coordination Office have been defined as follows to:

- 1) Channel resources to the appropriate sectors;
- 2) Keep track of agreements between Government of Ghana (GoG), and DPs and to report back to the Chief Director;
- 3) Monitor and evaluate donor funded projects and submit reports to the Chief Director

The discussion at the café table also clarified the function of the PBME, in contrast to the Coordination Office. PBME is part of the main civil service structure that plans, monitors and evaluates the activities of agencies and departments of the MOE including the Ghana Education Service (GES). It also manages GoG resources for education, the global resource envelop, as well as Multi Donor Budget Support (MDBS). PBME is also responsible for organizing the joint sector monthly meetings. Some of the following measures were recommended by participants to ensure the effective implementation of the DP coordination office:

The timely review and approval of policies by key decision makers in MOE/GES is needed along with a *more efficient decision making process*. Integral to this would be the conduct of regular meetings and briefing between decision makers, staff, development partners, and other relevant stakeholders. There should also be a more effective flow of information between the Coordination office, PBME and other divisions within the MOE/GES a system of procedures for information flow along with a project data based should be put in place.

The Coordination Office should ensure *proper documentation* of all activities in relevant areas, up to the district level. Reporting procedures should be streamlined. The feedback system should also be well-defined and implemented to ensure full understanding and commitment from all MOE units and divisions, from the DPs, and other stakeholders.

Effective Management of Database and Resource Centre

A database on all DP programs and project activities should be developed and maintained through regular collation and updating of DP reports on all levels of engagement, from the national to the district levels. Program and project information should include qualitative data and lessons learning related to project implementation in the education sector. This would allow an exchange of lesson learning among key stakeholders and help programs building on implementation processes in future.

The Office needs to have a dedicated IT staff to manage data and information flows, ensuring that there is easy access and sharing of information in an efficient manner (e.g. web based). Finally the Coordination Office must serve as a resource center where DPs, civil society groups and all other stakeholders can obtain information, whether through the website or office database systems.

Monitoring of DP Program Achievements

As part of its role to facilitate information flow and good coordination, the Coordination Office should be able to collate the results of all DP programs and compare these to set targets to determine the extent of achievement and assess impact.

Determination of Funding Gaps vis a vis MOE Priorities

A critical role of the Coordination Office is the mobilization and channeling of resources to appropriate divisions and units within the GES/MOE. To do this, the Office should have a full understanding of MOE priorities as well as a good knowledge of interest areas of various DPs. The Coordination Office should be able to identify the real cost requirements of the ESP and the Annual Education Sector Operation Plan (AESOP). The resulting funding gaps can then be communicated to the DP sector group for potential support. The Office can also consider securing pooled funding which could be channeled for a common target (i.e. Institutional Strengthening Plans etc). As part of its coordination function, the Office should be able to identify and map out the funding and program interests of all DPs and MOE divisions on a yearly basis to be provided at the AESR. It is crucial that the Office encourages all stakeholders (GoG and DPs) to observe transparency and accountability by sharing work plans, reports, etc.

Strengthen Staff Capacity

The office has two permanent staff and engages national service personnel from time to time. However, this may not be adequate considering the DP coordination office mandate and extent of responsibility.

3.2.3 Table 4: Prioritization within the education sector

This table was tasked to prioritize the indicative targets for basic education and TVET in the AESOP. After three round of prioritization, the participants came to a final conclusion on the key priorities within the Basic Education and first four priority targets under each thematic area. However, participants realized that not much had been done in the areas of TVET in the AESOP. The indicative targets were not clear and therefore the table developed a list of priority issues for TVET. The table below presents the prioritization of the basic education and TVET.

Thematic Area	Priority Ranking	Priority Indicative Targets identified from the AESOP	Remarks
Socio-humanistic (access, equity and welfare)	1 st	BEA 3: Junior high school GAR to JHS1 at age 12years 99.9% (female 99.9%)	Many donors are already in this area e.g. USAID, DFID, WFP, etc
	2 nd	BEA 9: Gender parity in BE enrolment, attendance and completion Primary GPI- 1.0 JHS- 1.0 SHS- 1.0	Ghana has invested a lot in this areas but more effort is needed. DPs in the area include UNICEF, WFP, WWC, etc
	3 rd	BEA 7: Increase intake of pupils in deprived district	The last 5% of children in hard to reach children will

Thematic Area	Priority Ranking	Priority Indicative Targets identified from the AESOP	Remarks
			cost ---it is better to focus on the deprived areas
	4 th	BEA 15: All BE schools rehabilitated in terms of safety, sanitation, health and first-aid facilities	The provision of portable water in BE (90% of BE in 3-5 years) is critical but could come under sanitation
Educational (quality, skills & skills development)	1 st	BEB8: Literate and numerate BE leavers(literate in English and a Ghanaian Language)	
	2 nd	BEB 9: self-managing schools through functional SMCs and trained head teachers	
	3 rd	Core textbook (per child) Primary – 4:1 JHS- 6: 1	There are enough textbooks but the problem is the distribution of the book from the district to the schools ¹⁸ .
	4 th	BEB 10: All JHS completers have appropriate skills for further study and the workplace	
Economic (efficiency/effec tiveness, delivery & accountability and teacher supply & deployment)	1 st	BEC 7: Teacher absenteeism reduced to 5% by 2015 (i.e. only those who are ill or have legitimate reasons)	
	2 nd	BEC2: Motivational Package fro BE teacher to go hardship areas (remote, urban slum)	
	3 rd	BEC 18: Supervisors and inspectors trained in using instruments: 1 st phase by end of 2011, ongoing thereafter	
	4 th	BEC 14: BE school report card (BERC) system in place to enable performance monitoring (by SMCs/parents to DEOs)	
TVET		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TVET operation plan should be separate from second cycle in AESOP • Pursue Public private Partners (PPP) to enhance the expansion of TVET • The technical institution plan should be completed • Update and review the curriculum of TIs and reconsider the authority of TI manager to manage the changes that will emerge 	The session realized that not much had been defined the areas of TVET in the AESOP. The indicative targets are not clear and precise.

¹⁸ Some districts complain of lack of funds or fuel to distribute the books to the schools but enough books have reached all the districts.

3.2.5 Table 5: Decentralization and Good Governance

This Café Table was expected to discuss the mechanism for strengthening the DEOC and other government structures that engage with civil society, and other civil society groups such as the District Education for All Teams (DEFATs) and PTA/SMC. The focus was on strengthening coordination among all the stakeholders in the sector.

Participants discussed some of the challenges within the sector stating that planning for district education is not participatory and programs are mostly planned and approved at national level even though some activities are initiated at the regional levels. There is lack of coordination at the districts level; there is no collaboration and coordination between the DAs and other stakeholders such as NGOs and DPs. The DAs have their own priorities and plans which some times are not documented for dissemination and most of the time NGOs have their own plans and activities to carry out.

The participants at the table discussed how the district also faces challenges in delays in the release of funds by the central government which affects the implementation of education activities. Quarterly releases of funds from MOE/GES are also inconsistent. There is no clear understanding and agreement on funding responsibilities between the district Education offices and the DAs. As a result, many of the district education offices depend on donor program funding. The ability of the DEO's to confront these challenges is also constrained by weak leadership in some DEOs. There is a growing need to strengthen the coordination capacity at the district level. The following suggestions were made:

Institution of Reward and Sanction System

GES headquarters should develop comprehensive criteria for rewards and sanctions based on performance. For instance, rewards should be given to district education offices that are able to design transparent and participatory plans and implement them. On the other hand, sanctions (possible removal) should be imposed on poor performing individuals at the district level. District report cards should include management, performance and achievement ratings. Education performance agreements and reviews should be strengthened and education should be included in the FOAT assessment.

Improved Allocation of Responsibilities and Resources

The decentralization policy has placed the DA in charge of social development of the district level including the responsibility to ensure effective educational service delivery. However, the education management mandate has not been fully decentralized as MOE and GES still have overall control of government resources allocated to education. Measures to enhance the coordination of education activities and efficient allocation of resources between DAs and DEOs

have become more necessary. DAs should provide effective leadership in the design, implementation and monitoring of education programs, as well as mobilization of funds. DEOs should be involved in the planning and monitoring of district education activities. Finally, MOFEP and GES Management should be held responsible and accountable for the timely release of education budget allocations.

Strengthen Role of CSOs

Planning and reporting processes within the sector should involve all stakeholders including CSOs, the District Education Oversight Committee SMCs/ PTAs, area councils, NGOs, CBOs, FBOs, Associations and groups. CSOs should be responsible for advocacy and conduct performance appraisal of the DEO/DAs. SMC/PTAs should conduct SPAM at the community, circuit and district level.

Enhance Capacities

Clarity of roles in education management will help in strengthening coordination, but, there is still the need to build capacities and competencies in the performance of all stakeholders including DEOs, DAs, and CSOs/CBOs. Special capacity building should focus on resource poor districts to ensure equity and in order for education to be a vehicle for district development and growth.

3.4 The Way Forward: Action Plan

The Retreat participants gathered significant insight into how coordination in the education sector could be promoted and achieved to facilitate the design of a strategic coordination plan. The last session, therefore, focused on the identification of concrete action to achieve a higher degree of coordination within the sector. The following section outlines the key ideas discussed at the retreat on the last day.

Decentralization

There is the need to strengthen the linkages between the Regional Education Offices and the District Education Offices. The participants suggested that improved coordination at the decentralized levels (DEO) would require an assessment of the weaknesses which would develop into implementable plans, and an M&E plan structured to ensure that the coordination measures are successfully followed up¹⁹. The coordination strategy should also consider current efforts

¹⁹ JICA has been undertaking a study on decentralization within the education sector.

within GES led by Mr. M. Watson and a study on Basic Education Coordination and Decentralization sponsored by JICA.

Close consultation should also be promoted among MOE/GES, MLGRD and NPDC. The medium-term district development planning process, guided by the NDPC, should strongly integrate the requirements and planning guidelines of MOE/GES to ensure the harmonization of priorities, programs and projects. The MOE should immediately explore the possibility of signing a Memorandum of Understanding with MLGRD to accelerate the decentralization process. The DP sector group on decentralization should provide inputs to the MOU with MLGRD.

Information sharing and strengthening institutional memory

The MOE/GES should plan to develop a central repository / documentation centres in order to building institutional memory and strengthen program learning within the sector. A significant amount of information is being generated across the sector but information sharing has not been effectively implemented to benefit coordination. UNESCO is supporting MOE to some extent, but more resources are needed to build this central repository of information. The strengthening of the MOE website is to be supported by a USAID- GESci project. The ODA database used in Cambodia can be reviewed for possible adoption by MOE and its sector group.

Participants proposed that all DPs should meet and discuss how they can assist in ensuring that a central repository of information and an education website can be developed to facilitate information sharing within the sector. DFID, USAID and the British Council could be asked for support in this area. MOE/GES should aim at enhanced information sharing by strengthening interconnectivity.

Institutional capacity building

Efforts on needs and capacity assessment of MOE/GES have been made in the past by DfID and the World Bank (2006). Information from these projects should be utilized and updated for purposes of capacity building, particularly for improving sector coordination. The exercise should also review the Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare institutional assessment and strengthening model of joint collaboration. DFID has allocated 5 million pounds (for a five year period) for capacity development in the education sector and USAID has planned interventions on institutional strengthening through the PAGE project and the Central Ministry Support-CMS (MOE/MLGRD) project can be explored for capacity development in the education sector. MOFEP budget guidelines also support institutional capacity building for MOE/GES.

Prioritization and Mapping of DP Comparative Advantage

The MOE will finalize the AESOP by the end of May 2010. It shall include the details of all DP education programs/projects, individual program/project budget, on-going activities, mathematics/science teaching, TVET and other priorities identified in the retreat. Participants recognized that the TVET/ skills development subsection of AESOP needs to be separated from the second cycle education sub-section of the plan. A prioritization exercise should be a key component of annual education review processes and budgeting. MOE should collaborate with GNECC to track the activities of NGOs and CSOs in the education sector.

DPs and key stakeholders should explore the option of pooled funding to strengthen synergy within the sector. Participants recommended that a pooled funding approach be piloted on a specific sub-sector level such as support for the Girl Education Unit and special education areas which do not attract enough funds. Participants recommended that a clear framework that will guide the participating DPs be developed as part of the process. MOFEP representatives also reminded participants that MOFEP is in charge of managing the impact of any foreign direct inflows on the macro-economy, and needs to be informed of any funds coming into the education sector.

Monitoring Success and Identifying Data Gaps

The key monitoring and evaluation indicators identified during the retreats café round table should be consolidated after the conference (see annex 8). Data gaps within the current M&E plan should be identified and a strategy should be developed to collect data and verify. A joint baseline assessment by the MOE, GES, DPs, and other stakeholders should be planned and conducted to fill the data gaps in the AESOP and not available through other means. An intermediary step will be the establishment of an independent baseline process, which compares the results with similar baseline indicators used by EMIS, MICS or GLSS. Participants recommended that there should be a 1% budget allocation for implementing M&E within MOE.

4.0 Conclusions and recommendations

DP policies increasingly reflect their commitment towards the global agreement on aid effectiveness. The use of country systems in the implementation of DP objectives and programs is currently being observed at varying degrees but, nevertheless, such levels of effort mark a positive movement towards aid harmonization through the use of national structures. There is general awareness of the practical constraints observed by DPs in fully engaging with country systems due to weak implementation capacities and inadequate systems for accountability. The GOG, through MoFEP, has expressed its resolve to work with development partners in achieving a standard of operations that will be acceptable to all.

DPs identified the need to move towards better coordination and harmonization of interventions in the education sector which would include GOG communicating its development priorities and

objectives more effectively and ensuring leadership in driving this development agenda. On the other hand, the GOG would like to ensure that all DPs adhere to the agreements in the AAA on Aid Effectiveness. GOG also expects that there is increased performance review and transparency for DPs in the sector.

The Education Sector Retreat sought to build a collective vision and reflection process on how to improve coordination to achieve higher performance and strengthened accountability within the education sector. The deliberations have generated clear steps needed to achieve this vision as well as concrete recommendations for action. Participants collectively identified priority issues that need to be addressed to improve coordination within the sector. They also identified areas of strength and limitations which include: weak linkages within the decentralized institutional structures, the need for more effective information dissemination systems and institutional capacity building within MOE and its various divisions. Emphasis was placed on clarifying the priorities within the ESP and AESOP and exploring alternative modes of aid harmonization such as pooled funding, joint design and implementation of baseline assessment. The principles of engagement will provide the basis for the sector to move forward with a few key actions needed to ensure increased levels of harmonization:

- A yearly mapping exercise of all DP programs, and resources;
- Bi yearly meetings to review progress against key targets in the sector;
- Joint monitoring and evaluation activities including a baseline study;
- A yearly prioritization exercise to ensure that resourcing is focused on the sector
- An institutional strengthening plan aimed at the empowerment of staff within GES/MOE to take on increased leadership roles in the sector;
- Information generation, storage and sharing to enhance interconnectivity;

One of the achievements of the Retreat is an enhanced understanding of the role of the office of coordination, the identification of weaknesses and strengths in coordination and consensus around the principles of engagement. The retreat outputs provide the building blocks for a strategic coordination plan that can guide the GOG, DPs, and other stakeholders in the education sector. The MOE should pursue the development of this coordination plan with the aid of other DPs using the same participatory approach and review process on a yearly basis. The coordination plan should be strongly linked with the current ESP and AESOP that are expected to be improved based on the prioritization, integration of all DP activities, and budget/gap analysis. Finally, the coordination plan should also be accompanied by a monitoring and evaluation plan which will ensure that the principles, processes and activities of coordination are carried out.

Annex 1: Retreat Program

Ghana Education Sector Coordination Strategy Development Retreat

April 6-7, 2010, Volta Hotel, Akosombo

Objectives of the Retreat:

1. *To develop an education sector coordination plan to improve coordination within the education sector among and across the MOE/GES, DPs and Civil Society.*
2. *To build a harmonized approach to baseline data collection and indicators which can be used to strengthen the performance monitoring of the ESP, better identify best practices, strengthen host country systems and track outcomes/impact within the sector over the next five to ten years.*
3. *To help prioritize areas for support within the sub sectors (basic, post basic) and identify gaps within the ESP which need financial support.*
4. *To build a collective vision and ongoing process of reflection on future coordination and how to work closer together to bring about lasting change within Ghana’s Education Sector.*

Day 1: Looking at the Education sector within the Ghanaian development context—where is education positioned for meeting the global, DP and country targets, where are we in terms of coordination, and integration...what are our priorities within the sector and why.

Timing	Activity/	Facilitators /Resource People
8:30	Opening Prayer Welcome address by MOE/GES Welcome by DP Coordinator Outlining the objectives of the retreat; Welcome address by hosting DP: USAID (outlining the purpose of the Coordination Strategy Development Retreat)	Chief Director/Director General DP Coordinator; Charles Aheto-Tsegah Bob Davidson
9:00	Introduction of participants Expectations of Participants	Leslie/Marian
10:00	Panel Discussion 1: The Context and Aid Architecture of the education sector <i>(perspectives of development partners and Government on lessons learned in relation to coordination, outcomes etc)</i>	Chair: Charles Aheto-Tsegah, Donor Coordinator

Timing	Activity/	Facilitators /Resource People
	<p>---Sector Swap process (World Bank) ---Budget support and MDDBS (DFID representative) --- Project assistance (USAID and UNICEF)</p> <p>Discussant: explores the comments in light of Ghana’s new aid policy, and AAA (Representative from the Ministry of Finance:)—10 minutes</p> <p>Open Discussion: 15 minutes</p>	
11:00 to 11:20	Tea/Cocoa Break	
11:20	<p>Coordination within the context of Decentralization, the new Education Act and the National Development Plan</p> <p>Panel Discussion with key government representatives:</p> <p>--- Implications of the New Education Act in relation to better coordination at the district levels (Perspective of senior MOE representative) ---Perspective of the Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development on Decentralization and the Education Sectors development coordination. --- Perspectives of Regional and District/Municipal Education Directors... --- Strengthening accountability systems at district level within the education and governance sector (civil Society perspective---)</p> <p>Discussants: USAID and UNICEF (10 min). Open Discussion</p>	<p>Chair: Director General of GES</p> <p>Panelists (7 minutes each):</p> <p>---MOE Representative ---MLGRD rep ---Regional and District education directors --- Civil society representative</p>
12:20	<p>SWOT analysis of the Sector Coordination (at national and district levels), and sector integration into bigger picture (i.e. Government overall development plans, donor plans)</p> <p>--- consider issues of different aid modalities at work in the sector; the new aid policy --- relations between DP’s, Civil society and government --- usage of country systems --- sharing information, coordinating monitoring and evaluation mechanisms</p>	<p>Leslie and Marian break up into two larger groups --- government people ---development partners</p>

Timing	Activity/	Facilitators /Resource People
1:30	Lunch	
2:15	Feedback on the SWOT by representatives of each group	
2:45	Prioritization within the Education Strategic Plan (Government presentation on key areas of priority based on AESOP)	Presentation by Charles Tsegah of the key areas of prioritization within the ESP for each sub sector: --- Basic --- Post Basic --- Tertiary ---Special needs
3:15	Prioritization discussions in smaller break out groups; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic Education • Post Basic/SHS • TVET and youth transition to the world of work • Tertiary • Teacher Education <p><u>Break out groups discuss:</u> areas of prioritization and potential best practices <u>Cross cutting</u> issues including: inclusive and equity issues, education management and decentralization The types of frameworks which are driving the prioritization (MDGs, Bilateral interests etc)</p>	Small groups will select a reporter and facilitators will come from the MOE. ---Ghana Education Service ---Teacher Education Division ---Basic Education Division
4:00	Smaller group Feedback to the larger groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full group takes note of what are the gaps in the ESP which this prioritization may cause? 	Leslie /Marian With small group reporters
5:00	Close of Day and home work for the next day	

Day 2: Reaching Consensus on Prioritization, Monitoring and coordination mechanisms within the country context... fulfilling development partner needs and global agenda's strategically and in a harmonized mode.

Timing	Activity	Facilitator or resource people
--------	----------	--------------------------------

Timing	Activity	Facilitator or resource people
8:30	Morning Prayer Morning address/Reflections on Day 1 ---Government of Ghana Representative (Chief Director) ---development partner Representative (UNICEF)	Marian
9:00	What did we learn as a group --- Key gleanings from day 1 from participants --- Reporters synopsis of day 1	Leslie
World Café	9:30 to 12:30	Rotation every 45 minutes; there will be 3 rotations
Café Table 1	Development of a Coordination Strategy taking into consideration different aid modalities and AAA ---within the sector (at national, regional and district levels) ---between development partners working in the sector (MDBS engaged on budget/off budget, DPs in Program/project mode etc) ---between the education sector and bigger government plans (MDBS, NDP etc)—cross sectorally --- Lessons learned and better coordination with the usage of host country systems --- challenges with financial management systems	Facilitator: Marian
Café Table 2	Measuring success and outcomes within the sector—globally and nationally hitting the targets: ----MDBS triggers --- MDG indicators ----ESP indicators ----Other <i>This café table will focus on attempting to plan out how education sector stakeholders (DP's etc can work together in using the prioritization to develop baseline indicators and a strategy to develop a joint baseline process to support the ESP, identify best practices and track learning outcomes;</i>	Facilitator: William Osafo
Café Table 3	Building a vision for better coordination within the education sector: ----Strengthening linkages/synergy between development partners and their programs at national level and district levels with similar	Facilitator: Charles Aheto-Tsegah

Timing	Activity	Facilitator or resource people
	<p>focuses (Decentralization, governance etc) ---Strengthening engagement between civil society, government and development partners.</p> <p><i>The group will also consider key milestones for tracking progress in coordination over the next five years. They will also undertake the mapping exercise for DP's to identify their main content and geographic areas of focus.</i></p>	
Café Table 4	<p>Prioritization within the sector: -----The Basic and post basic dilemma -----transition of children to JSS ----increasing unemployed youth from JSS ---transition to the world of work</p> <p><i>This table will consider the main findings of the first day in terms of prioritization within the ESP sub sectors and identify the gaps which this prioritization may bring about.</i></p>	Facilitator: Rolland Akabzaa
Café table 5	<p>Decentralization and monitoring coordination at the district levels ----Coordination at the district levels ---- implications of the new education act ----strengthening civil society coordination (e.g. PTA's and SMC's and the voice of parents)</p> <p><i>This table will also consider the baseline indicators most appropriate for the coordination strategy? And how is the coordination strategy going to be monitored at national and district levels?</i></p>	Emmanuel Mensah-Ackman
12:30 Lunch		
1:30 to 3:00	<p>World Café Report Backs --- each group has their reports on a flip chart so people can go around and read the main findings (20 minutes) --- each secretary for the group comes up to give the report on the café tables 1, 2 to 5 for each session...</p>	Leslie and Marian

Timing	Activity	Facilitator or resource people
3:00 to 3:30	Tea break	
3:30 to 4:30	<p>The way forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set up of strategic planning coordination team for MOE • Conclusions and recommendations on coordination of the sector • Prioritization • Monitoring indicators to be adopted 	Charles Aheto-Tsegah
4:30 to 5:30	<p>Closing remarks</p> <p>Ministry of Education Development Partner Representative Civil Society representative USAID</p>	Chair: Chief Director/ Director General

Annex 2: Retreat Participant List

Organization	Name	Contact	E-Mail
USAID	Luis Tolley (Education Advisor)	0244311931	ltolley@usaid.gov
	Meredith Fox (Education Officer)	021741573	mfox@usaid.gov
	William Osafo	0244329956	wosafo@usaid.gov
	Bob Davidson	0244313540	rdavi37741@gol.com
	Edwin Afari	0243262827	
DFID	Rachel Hinton	0244321534	r-hinton@dfid.gov.uk
UNICEF	Hiro Hattori (Chief Education Officer)	0203634522	hhattori@unicef.org
UNESCO	Kwasi Asare Odoi-Anim	0277416191/ 021740840	ka.odoi-anim @ unesco.org
	Tirso Dos Santos	0543202952	
WFP	Nguyen Duc Hoang	0244313772	nguyenduc.hoang@wfp.org
USDOL	Samantha Schasberger		schasbeges.samantha@dol.gov
JICA	Mama Owusu	0242712676	MamaOwusu.GN@jica.go.jp
Peace Corps	Mary Noorah	0244318678/	mnoorah@gh.peacecorps.gov

Organization	Name	Contact	E-Mail
		0241919986	
World Bank	Peter Darvas (Senior Education Economist)	0246643142	pdarvas@worldbank.org
MOFEP	Louis Amo	0266387238	louisamo77@hotmail.com
	Jocelyn Awah	0244088975	jawuah@mofep.gov.gh
	Veronica Sackey	0204644761	
MOE	Charles Aheto-Tsegah		
	Kwame Agyapong Apiadu-Agyea	0244519507	
	Denise Clarke (GESCI/MOE)	0242367311	denise.clarke@gesci.org
	Michel Savini	0241500057	
MESW	Mawutor Able	0208164216	
GES	Christian Koramoah	0204343020	yawkriss@yahoo.com
	S. Agyeman-Duah (DIR./CRDD)	0208188482	sagduah@yahoo.com
	Emmanuel Kwashee Ketteku (Regional Director, Ho)	0244839119	emmaketteku@yahoo.co.eku

Organization	Name	Contact	E-Mail
	D. Baffour-Awah (Ex. Dir. COTVET)	0244965487	danawauh@yahoo.com
	J.K. Onyinah	0208158635	
	Stephen Adu	0244256976	
World University Service of Canada (WUSC)	Akwesi Addae-Boahene (Country Director)	0244413184	akwasi@vnilerra.org
Associates for Change (AfC)	Leslie Casely-Hayford	0244255170	comdev9@yahoo.com
	Marian Tadeffa- Kubabom	0244651277	
	Thomas Quansah	0208890755	
	Rolland Akabzaa	0208417446	rakabs@hotmail.com
	Matilda Hettey	0243939883	mhetey@yahoo.com
Ghana National Association of Teachers (GNAT)	Benjamin Kobina Osei	0244519291	
NDPC	Capt. P. Donkor	0244138971	

Annex 3: Mapping Exercise of DP support, geographic focus and comparative advantage

Comparative Advantage and Geographic Focus table

Organization	Sub Sector Interest	Mode of Financing	Geographic Areas of Current Support	Number of operational districts	Comparative advantage in terms of experience, and technical expertise.	Total Financial envelop (timeframe)
JICA	Basic Education TVET	Project Assistance (PA)	Nationwide	Nation Wide for most activities/ programs except for school infrastructure which is focused in 6 districts	Science and Math education Teacher Education/Inset Access/School Construction Decentralization and education management TVET	USD \$ 19.16 million <i>(2005-2012)</i>
UNICEF	Basic	Project Assistance (PA)	National Policy support 5 focus regions (NR, UE, UW, CR and ER) 30 priority districts	30 priority districts attempting to cover all the districts in the five regions	Participatory Planning at district education office level; Gender and equity issues in education	USD \$ 4 million per year for five years <i>(2006-2011)</i>
WFP	Basic	PA	3 Northern	All 38 districts	Food Assistance (take home	million per

Organization	Sub Sector Interest	Mode of Financing	Geographic Areas of Current Support	Number of operational districts	Comparative advantage in terms of experience, and technical expertise.	Total Financial envelop (timeframe)
			Regions	with some level of support across the three northern regions 200 schools (4 per district)— with school feeding; Take home ration across 18 districts	ration to encourage enrolment and retention of girls, school feeding and safety net programming) using vulnerability/food security targeting;	year
UNESCO	TVET	Project Assistance	Targeted to some areas of the country		Literacy/Culture/School Libraries Gender HIV/AIDs and education	
USAID	Basic Education	PA (over 8 large scale programs planned and currently being implemented:	Country wide	Some programs reaching national scale and a few programs in focal districts	Learning outcomes, assessment and standards... Literacy and curriculum development;	Over \$US 52 million US \$15 million (pending

Organization	Sub Sector Interest	Mode of Financing	Geographic Areas of Current Support	Number of operational districts	Comparative advantage in terms of experience, and technical expertise.	Total Financial envelop (timeframe)
		EQUALL, GRAIL, PAGE, NALAP, CMS, TAP, SSVP)		(GRAIL—23 districts; EQUALL in districts; PAGE intended to reach 46 districts);	Governance, education management and decentralization Community involvement and Accountability in Education (Teachers and school management) Infrastructure and Social Safety net programming EMIS. M and E strengthening; ICT	awards) US\$ 31.2 (under negotiation)
DFID	Basic Ed	Sector Budget Support and General Budget Support	Country wide	All districts	Institutional Strengthening Financial tracking Teacher education Capacity building of MOE/GES	15 million pounds per year and an additional 5m for capacity building.
World Bank	Basic Education TVET Tertiary	General budget support	61 disadvantaged districts		Institutional strengthening EMIS	EdSEP (US \$ 80m Loan to

Organization	Sub Sector Interest	Mode of Financing	Geographic Areas of Current Support	Number of operational districts	Comparative advantage in terms of experience, and technical expertise.	Total Financial envelop (timeframe)
					TVET	GOG <i>(five year program 2005-2010)</i>
African Development Bank	Second Cycle (senior high school)	General budget support (loans)		Construction of 25 SHS's across the country	Infrastructure Science Technology and innovation Skills Development /TVET	
US Dept of Labor	Basic Ed TVET	PA		Cocoa Growing areas of Ghana (western and Ashanti regions)	Child labor	
Peace Corps	Second Cycle (SHS)	PA			Teacher mentoring Gender equity	
MIDA	Tertiary	PA	33 districts		Infrastructure	
World University Service of Canada	Basic	PA	Country wide		Gender equity SMC/PTA strengthening Technical Assistance	
GESci	TVET	PA	GES/MOE		ICTs in Education	US\$

Organization	Sub Sector Interest	Mode of Financing	Geographic Areas of Current Support	Number of operational districts	Comparative advantage in terms of experience, and technical expertise.	Total Financial envelop (timeframe)
	SHS TVET Special Needs		headquarters (CRDD/GES		Inclusive Education TVET/Skills Development Curriculum Development Technical Assistance	100,000
Ghana National Association of Teachers	Basic Education Teachers	PA			Teacher training/support	
Min of Employment and Social Welfare	Basic Education		Country Wide		Safety net programming (LEAP etc)	

Annex 4: Development Partner Questionnaire

DEVELOPMENT PARTNER PROGRAM MAPPING

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of Organization: _____

2. Name of Education Program / Project : _____

3. Period Covered : _____

4. Approx. Program/Project Budget: _____

5. Geographic Coverage (Specify Regions, Districts): _____

6. Kindly tick which focal area(s) of the Education Strategy Plan your program / project is addressing.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Education (BE) | <input type="checkbox"/> Inclusive and Special Education (IS) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Second Cycle Education (SC) | <input type="checkbox"/> Tertiary Education (TE) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Formal Education (NF) | <input type="checkbox"/> Education Management (EM) |

6b Why has your agency/institution decided to focus on this area of the education in Ghana?

7a. Is the program or project using financial arrangements with the Ghana Government described below:

- Budget Support through the Ministry of Finance (earmarked or MDBS or other)_____
- Direct support to the Ministry of Education_____
- Direct support to the Ghana Education Service_____
- Financial support to the District Assemblies_____
- Financial Support to the District Education Offices_____
- Other (Please specify)_____

Briefly describe the following from 7b to 9

7b. Program / Project Goal(s): _____

8. Program / Project Objectives(s) : _____

9. Program / Project Strategy(ies) : _____

10. Program / Project Major Activities : _____

11. Expected Program / Project Target Outputs / Indicators : _____

12. Program / Project Target Outcomes / Key Indicators : _____

13. Who are the implementing partners (MDAs, District Education offices, Civil society, community based organizations, other) of the program / project?

14. What is the added value of this program to the Education Sector Plans and programs of the sector?

15. What are the organizational challenges and implementation constraints experienced with this program / project?

16. What could be done to address these?

17. What are some of the gaps you see remaining in relation to the Education sector?

Annex 5: Participant Expectations

Organization	Expectations
MoE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify ways for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MoE to coordinate within and across sectors, harmonize diverse issues and DP approaches - Harmonize local educational groups including CSOs and CBOs to ensure better outcomes. - Ensure that support to Regional and District offices produce better outcomes. - Ensure effective flow and application of resources. - Identify comparative advantage and mutual accountability of all stakeholders and to ensure aid coordination. - Support MoE in the area of accountability and coordination. • That there should be a global ICT initiative to develop a proper database for MOE. • Better Understand the Educational plans (AESOP, ESP)
GES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well defined coordination strategy towards total development of the Ghanaian child
COTVET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vocational Skills Training to be well fitted into the Coordination Strategy • Identify coordination within the context of working within Ministries and Municipal Education Offices
Ministry of Employment and Social Welfare (MoESW)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy to better coordinate and harmonize interventions across MoE and MESW, especially at the regional and district levels. This can be in terms of a common targeting mechanism, common database on the vulnerable in the society
MoFEP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify ways to ensure a better coordination • Identify better ways to effectively utilize resources allocated to education • Define the standards for performance and accountability to ensure aid effectiveness • Identify clear steps that would indicate how MoE would flow with the change in aid effectiveness (i.e. MoE to derive an agenda)
NDPC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify clear linkages between Plan, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) • Understand how MoE derived policies from National Mid-Term Policies Understand how MoE has taken effective steps to generate Annual Progress Reports (within all Departments and Agencies) • Identify key indicators on how educational policies are producing expected out comes

GNAT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine how coordination could help in teacher attraction and retention and improve government efficiency
USAID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most effective coordination strategy • Better understand coordination and how it would look like on the roadmap to the five year cycle • Identify ways for better coordination amongst most of the United State Government Organizations. • Identify key indicators to measure progress and also to track performance. • Identify ways to increase outcomes based on National Education Assessment (NEA). • Discussions should be holistic and the translation of the plans that will be developed to good School System results (indicators). • Understand DPs plans on how to push GoG Educational Plan forward.
DFID	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand what was meant by coordination and harmonization in the context of education • Clarity on the comparative advantage needed and available to support GoG Plan
JICA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better sense of Government of Ghana (GoG) priorities
UNESCO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better understanding of the education sector and how UNESCO could be better placed in the sector • Better coordination environment between stakeholders • Come out with a Sector Support Plan.
UNICEF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Retreat to further lead to follow-up forums
World Food Program (WFP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better coordination between the various stakeholders to make the AESOP a better plan especially across the WFP geographic focus
US Department of Labor (USDOL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learn more about the existing Educational Framework and how USDOL could fit in.
Peace Corps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand how the education financial envelope is allocated and how it could better compliment Peace Corps organizational resources for education.
WUSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify ways for coordination to provide the basis for SWAP • Identify a Coordination Strategy that would be able to provide the platform for collective monitoring

Annex 6: Basic Education Group Mapping of DP Funding of AESOP 2010-2012 Activities

Indicative Activities	Development Partner
<p><i>Socio-Humanistic Goals: Access, Equity, Welfare</i> <i>BE1: Provide fee free child-friendly basic education through District Assemblies, the Private Sector, CBOs, NGOs and FBOs</i> <i>BE2: Facilitate access for KG and Lower Primary (P1 - P3) infants who live over 3 km from school</i> <i>BE3: Provide equitable educational opportunities at BE level</i> <i>BE4: Ensure that no child is excluded from BE by virtue of disadvantage</i> <i>BE5: Ensure that girl-friendly guidance and counseling systems are in place centrally and in Districts</i> <i>BE6 Expand and improve BE school health, sanitation and safety systems</i> <i>BE8 Provide for STD/HIV&AIDS prevention, care and support within BE</i> <i>BE9 Improve pupil welfare through feeding and school uniform programs</i></p>	
1) Develop child-friendly school standards and guidelines	UNICEF, WUSC
2) Conduct periodic and appropriate school mapping	UNICEF, USAID, WUSC
3) Distribute guidelines on KG staffing, materials and infrastructure to public primary schools, DAs, private sector and appropriate CBOs, NGOs, FBOs	UNICEF
4) Decentralize delivery of basic education through REOs, DEOs	UNICEF, JICA, USAID
5) Construct, refurbish, maintain KG, Primary, JHS as necessary (including phased abolition of JHS)	USAID, JICA
6) Conduct feasibility study on KG, Primary and JHS building program	
7) Construct basic schools as planned	UNICEF, USAID, JICA
8) Rehabilitate basic school buildings	USAID
9) Monitor school feeding program under WFP, extending where feasible	WFP
10) Abolish all forms of levy and 'extra fees	
11) EMIS to capture all forms of disadvantage (sex, hard to reach, out-of-school, children with SENs)	DFID, USAID, UNESCO, WB
11) Enforce policies on non-repetition, except in cases of prolonged illness or other exceptional circumstances	
12) Support hard-to-reach children and current complementary education programs (e.g. SFL)	DFID, UNICEF
13) Provide specialized training in multi-grade teaching for rural areas and reward teachers accordingly (+20% allowance on basic salary)	UNICEF
14) Provide training for all teachers in SENs	
15) Ensure that school infrastructure facilitates the accommodation of pupils/students with special needs	USAID
16) Organize survey to determine participation of girls in school governance at the national level in JHS	

Indicative Activities	Development Partner
17) Maintain and support Girls' clubs in JHS and the deployment of female role models in schools and communities	USAID
18) Revise and distribute national guidelines on minimum standards for health, sanitation and safety for BE institutions at all levels	UNICEF
19) Ensure implementation of the 3 pillars of the HIV Alert School Model in 10 regions	UNICEF
20) Provide adequate safety, sanitation and basic health care facilities and access for children with disabilities, in accordance with national guidelines	
21) Establish effective guidance and counseling systems for BE pupil/student welfare at all levels	UNICEF
22) Ensure each BE institution has a designated school health officer trained in basic first aid with access to a well-maintained First Aid kit	UNICEF
23) Incorporate basic rudimentary training in Primary Health care into CoE courses to improve mainstream teachers' awareness of health issues	
24) Ensure that there is potable water within 250 m of BE school sites and that there are adequate sanitation facilities on site (especially for girls and female teachers/SMC members) at all institutions	USAID, UNICEF
<p><i>Educational Goals: Quality, Skills Development</i></p> <p><i>BE10 Ensure that BE pupils have access to relevant up-to-date teaching and learning materials</i></p> <p><i>BE11 Ensure that the national curriculum is relevant to personal and national development</i></p> <p><i>BE12 Develop a literate numerate society</i></p> <p><i>BE13 Promote self-management of resources relevant to each BE school's needs</i></p> <p><i>BE14 Ensure that BE completers have appropriate skills for future study and work</i></p>	
1) Develop modules for untrained teachers program (UTDTBE)	
2) Train selected pre-school teachers in the integration of ICT in teaching and learning	
3) Provide specialized INSET training in multi-grade teaching for teachers in rural areas	UNICEF
4) Use ODL approaches to upgrade untrained teachers (UTDTBE Program)	USAID
5) Gradually rationalize teacher supply, transferring teachers to rural areas, merging small schools and introducing multi-grade teaching	
6) Teachers redeployed according to teacher requirements identified by Districts	
7) Strengthen in-school monitoring and supervision of BE literacy and numeracy teaching (head teachers and SMCs)	USAID
8) Provide at least one specialist teacher in literacy, one in numeracy to serve a cluster of primary schools	
9) Review textbooks and other TL materials in English and Ghanaian Languages in line with Language Policy	USAID, DFID
10) Distribute recommended textbooks and guides for Ghanaian Languages	USAID
11) Revise Ghanaian languages syllabus at CoEs to focus on the teaching of literacy and numeracy	USAID, DFID

Indicative Activities	Development Partner
12) Develop and implement effective methodologies for teaching in local languages (“L1”) particularly in P1 to P3	USAID, UNICEF
13) Develop and implement an effective methodology for the use of English (“L2”) as a medium for teaching and learning, particularly in P4 to P6	USAID
14) Increase time allocation for the teaching of literacy and numeracy in English and Ghanaian Languages	USAID
15) Organize and conduct regular NEA/MLA tests to measure literacy and numeracy standards in P3 and P6 according to agreed MNS	USAID
16) Head teacher training	USAID, UNICEF
17) Targeted inspection & cluster training of teachers in JHS English and mathematics	
18) Review BE curricula at all levels in collaboration with key stakeholders to ensure relevance to national needs, skills development and social norms	
19) Print syllabus updates and distribute to BE schools	
20) Develop and up-grade teacher training program to train teachers and head teachers in the new curricula at all levels (KG, Primary, JSS)	
21) Conduct BECE examinations based on new curricula	

Annex 7: Prioritization of Second Cycle Priorities based on the AESOP (Day 1/Group 2)

Thematic Area	Indicative Target	Activities	Priority	Reason
Socio-Humanistic (Access, Equity, Welfare)	750 public SHS (in ratio 3 general: 1 technical)	Continue SHS construction and refurbishment to achieve at least one SHS school per district over the period of the ESP.	A	There is an increase in number of prospective JHS products legible for admissions to SHS
	All eligible students with non-severe SEN, integrated into mainstream by 2015	Ensure that SC infrastructure facilitate pupils/students with special needs	A	Little attention has been paid to children with disability at the Basic and SHS levels
	Minimum of 1 female gender counselor per SC institution	Train female counselors to act as a focus for gender issues	A	The current policy encourages enrolment of girls in schools
	IEC health program in place and on going	Establish effective guidance and counseling system for SC students welfare	A	Provision of quality education to promote actualization of potentials of students
Educational (Quality, Skill Development)	All SHS and TV1 adequately supplied with science and technical teaching labs and equipment	Provide teaching and learning aids to all SC institutions and teachers	A	To prepare students for world of work
	All SC graduate enter higher education or the world of work equipped with socially appropriate transferable skills	- Modernize ICT and skills components making them realistic and relevant to SC leavers and national needs - Provide suitable ICT and SD school facility for SC students and their teachers	A	- Promote teaching of science education and ICT which current policy on education emphasis - To prepare student for world of work
Economic	Functional Boards	-Revise and develop BoG	A	To improve governance

Thematic Area	Indicative Target	Activities	Priority	Reason
(Efficiency, Delivery, Accountability)	of Governors (BoG) in each second cycle institution	policy and BoG management handbook -Undertake training in BoG policy and handbook		
	Motivational packages for SC teachers to go to hardship areas	Provide deprived area incentive package of 20%	A	For equity in teacher supply to all districts
	Teacher absenteeism reduced to 5% by 2015	Limit teacher absence during term time by abolishing study leave and holding inset during vacations and SMC monitoring of school attendance	A	Maximize teacher utilization
	Financially efficient second cycle	Determine actual numbers of teachers on district payrolls	A	Have been struggling with the problems of ghost names and so the need to reduce the salary budget which is often bloated due to ghost names.

Annex 8: Key M&E Indicators and Means of Verification (Outcomes of Café Table 2)

	Key Indicators	Means of Verification
Access	Gross/Net Enrolment rate Admission rates Completion rate (Primary and JHS) Gender Parity Index at basic, JHS and SHS Survival rate Transition rate (%) Disaggregation: Location, gender, income Education Expenditure of GoG wrt to sections of the population - quintile/HH survey data	DP/MOE Baseline Study NEA/SEA GLSS 5 Household Survey EMIS
Quality	NEA and SEA (Expand the NEA to include science). Achievement/pass rates of BECE by deprivation and districts ranking (compare private and public schools); PTR – deprived, national Pupil to Trained Teacher ratio (disaggregate by gender/deprivation) Time on task/ Teacher absenteeism % of qualified (trained) teachers. Deprived, national (gender disaggregate)	NEA/SEA EMIS GLSS 5 School Report cards BECE results SSCE results
Management	PTR - variance across schools Time on task/ Teacher absenteeism Execution rate by item, district/regional. Actual expenditure per pupil/student % of budget implemented...(budget release in relation to time it takes to get to the student) Timeliness and amount of delivery releases/grants and Variance in money expected (allocation and provided)	Public Expenditure Tracking survey (PETS)
	Sector performance reports should be based on MOE M&E Plan	

Annex 9: Education Sector Principles of Engagement/Code of Conduct (Adjusted based on discussions)

The **Principles of Engagement/Code of Conduct** developed and agreed upon at the retreat:

1. **Ownership by Government** is of the highest priority which means that the MOE/GES must be involved and lead (where possible) in the identification and design of new projects/programs and initiatives. It will also require the empowerment of MOE/GES staff to internalize decisions and translate them into implementation.
2. **Leadership from Within:** leadership should be promoted and requires that key MOE/GES representatives and staff act on issues related to current programming in order to assure their timely implementation. A key focus of leadership should strive to improve performance and accountability within the education sector.
3. There must be full **transparency and accountability** by MOE/GES and Donors in all program related matters... This will require that government and donors collectively present their intended financial support within the framework of the ESP and AESOP in order to achieve greater harmonization.
4. **Alignment of programming within the framework of the Education Strategic Plan should be based on the GOG and MOE's prioritization within the sector:** all DP's and civil society partners agree to work and align their programs within the ESP...
5. **Commitments and timely release of resourcing** for program and policy prioritization will be realistic and made known to the Government; these resources will be released on a timely basis in order to avoid challenges in implementation. The identification of triggers should be commonly agreed by GOG and DPs on a yearly basis in order to facilitate performance and efficient program implementation.
6. **Internal Capacity Building** of all MOE/GES staff and systems will be a constant focus for MOE/GES and DPs in order to ensure that program delivery is smooth and the goals of the ESP are achieved. Capacity building priorities will be identified by GOG and MOE.
7. Development Partners and MOE/GES will work towards **harmonizing their modes of financial support to the sector.** One approach towards DP resource coordination in the sector could be through a "pooled funding" mechanism which supports the MOE/GES on specific areas.
8. **Annual DP and civil society mapping exercise:** An annual financial and implementation tracking exercise will be carried out among all the DP's and Key civil society agencies in order to map out their interest areas and identify areas for increased collaboration among the donors.

- 9. Increasing Focus/Capacity for Joint Monitoring and Evaluation:** MOE/GES and DPs will work towards a more rigorous monitoring and evaluation system based on results based approaches (e.g. joint baseline study, joint evaluation exercises).
- 10. New development partners and new programs** interested in entering the education sector shall present their plans and interest areas along with background/experience related to their comparative advantage to the “sector group” under MOFEP for vetting. New projects and programs by DPs or MOE/GES will be reviewed by the sector group.
- 11. Sustained and systematic information sharing, lesson learning and development of institutional memory:** *DPs and MOE agree to build on the lessons learned from development program implementation by ensuring more efficient knowledge management in relation to policy and programming. All technical/research reports and assessments, evaluations and monitoring reports conducted by MOE/GES and DP’s will be posted on a joint web site in order to ensure that information is stored in an accessible manner over a long term. –internalization and better understanding of decisions taken*
- 12.** DPs will commit themselves to the agreed coordination principles and code of ethics for the sector.