



Australian Government

AusAID

Quality at Entry Report for Australian Support for Basic & Secondary Education in PNG (2010 – 2014)

Steve Passingham, 29/09/10

Description

1. Description of the Initiative/ Activity	<p>The Australian Support for Basic and Secondary Education is built on three years of consultations and analysis. The support will be coordinated by the GoPNG and guided by the GoPNG-Australia Partnership for Development (P4D). The delivery strategy represents a grounded partnership approach to development. Australian support will focus on six areas: teacher education, educational materials, infrastructure, education standards, grants to education institutions and education management. The strategy will put greater emphasis with over 60% of the total \$410 million targeting educational materials, school infrastructure and grants. This is in line with the GoPNG priorities.</p> <p>The support will be delivered through a mixture of modalities. These will ensure a strict accountability of the Australian funds while also ensuring greater GoPNG ownership and a strengthening of the government systems. The modalities are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Direct Financial Support (DFS): funds disbursement and accountability relying on Department of Education (DoE) financial management and reporting systems with safeguards to ensure accountability. The DFS will be used for the disbursement of school grants and agreed support to teacher education, education standards and management. The support could potentially include support to provincial administrations and church education agencies. b) Specialised Services Provision (SSP): providing support for the design, contracting and construction of basic and secondary education facilities (classrooms, teacher houses, dormitories and other facilities). Includes the procurement and distribution of teaching and learning resources to schools and other institutions. c) Capacity Development Facility (CDF): providing capacity building support, as prioritised by DOE and provincial administrations at the national and sub-national levels.
2. Objectives Summary	<p>The delivery strategy has the following key objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Increasing net enrolment rate at elementary, primary and secondary level; b) Maximum class size at elementary, primary and lower secondary schools of 45 and upper secondary of 35; c) Improved performance by students completing grade eight and grade 12; d) The percentage of primary, elementary and secondary school pupils who are female increases towards the target of gender equality, e) Improved management capacity at all levels of the education system. <p>The key objectives align with the National Education Plan (NEP) 2005-2014, the PNG Universal Basic Education (UBE) Plan 2010-2019 and the PNG Development Strategic Plan 2010 – 2030 (DSP).</p>

Australian Aid – Rated Quality Criteria *(no more than 300 words per cell)*

Criteria	Assessment	Rating (1-6)	Required Actions (if needed) ‡
3. Relevance	<p>The approach provides a clear rationale for the proposed support and modalities, and is highly relevant to both PNG's education and broader development objectives. The high level objectives are clear and fully aligned with and supportive of PNG objectives as reflected key documents, such as GoPNG's National Education Plan and Universal Basic Education Plan, and the PNG-Australia Partnership for Development.</p>	<p>6</p>	

4. Analysis and learning	<p>The approach draws upon a wide range of analysis, including by ANAO, AusAID ODE and PNG team, joint AusAID/DP and GoPNG and PNG NRI. The approach reflects key findings by supporting a strategy to overcome critical demand and supply side constraints, such as providing grants to eliminate school fees, and addressing inadequate facilities (eg classrooms, teacher houses and sanitation) and the paucity of teaching and learning materials.</p> <p>The approach prioritises improved data collection and analysis (eg by strengthening EMIS). This will provide a better understanding of demand and supply side dynamics, and of community perceptions and priorities. This in turn will be the basis for improvements in access, quality and equity.</p>	5	
5. Effectiveness	<p>The performance assessment and monitoring and evaluation frameworks elaborate clear, measurable and attainable objectives. The proposed priorities for Australian assistance are clearly articulated and fully supportive of the broader range of GoPNG objectives. They will provide a sound basis for any contribution analysis element in the assessment of the effectiveness of Australian support.</p>	5	
6. Efficiency	<p>The approach provides for a number of measures to ensure support is cost-effective, delivered in a timely manner and appropriate to intended outcomes. These include i) capping TA at 15% of total funding and ensuring more effective and appropriate management, including of performance; and ii) appointing specialist organisations (eg for procurement and capacity building) under the Specialised Services Provision. The former will address the risk of development ineffectiveness. While aiming to work, where possible, with partner systems, the latter will act as a safeguard against fiduciary risk.</p>	5	
7. Monitoring & Evaluation	<p>The approach sensibly bases the tracking of progress on key performance indicators in GoPNG's performance assessment framework. It includes a monitoring and evaluation framework with specific measurable outputs for Australia's contribution, in line with the DoE PAF. This alignment with GoPNG own approach to monitoring and evaluation will reinforce the establishing of baselines, the collection and analysis of data, and its use to inform improvements in the approach and implementation arrangements.</p>	5	
8. Sustainability	<p>The approach to sustainability is soundly based on clear and durable improvements in access, quality and equity; greater stakeholder involvement and ownership; and ongoing dialogue on longer-term financing and systems quality assurance and improvement, and on longer-term financing (including overall GoPNG funding for education and sub-sectoral allocations). The intended Australian engagement in post-secondary education, combined with this approach to basic and secondary education, will inform policy dialogue on the current imbalance between GoPNG funding of basic and tertiary education. Similarly, increasing working with GoPNG systems will inform discussions and actions to strengthen those where this is not currently possible.</p>	5	

Criteria	Assessment	Rating (1-6)	Required Actions (if needed) ‡
9. Gender Equality	The approach includes specific measures to help PNG address gender parity and equality concerns and to track progress based on the performance assessment framework. The engagement of a gender and disability adviser in NDoE will support GoPNG's gender equality objectives and build on progress that has been made in recent years. This support will apply across a wide range of areas including i) policy, planning and financing; ii) education governance and system management, including school leadership/management and community engagement; iii) teacher education and management; iv) teaching and learning materials; v) infrastructure and facilities; and vi) EMIS and further analytical work. While gender inequity is rooted in broader and often intractable cultural and economic factors, the approach will support PNG to make measurable improvements. For example, one measure will be to reduce girls drop out (particularly as they begin their adolescent years) by providing separate and safe sanitation facilities.	4	

* **Rating:** Provide ratings for each of the quality principles using the questions on the next page to assist you, and the following rating scale:

Satisfactory rating (4, 5 and 6)

- 6 Very high quality; needs ongoing management & monitoring only
 5 Good quality; needs minor work to improve in some areas
 4 Adequate quality; needs some work to improve

Less than satisfactory rating (1, 2 and 3)

- 3 Less than adequate quality; needs to be improved in core areas
 2 Poor quality; needs major work to improve
 1 Very poor quality; needs major overhaul

‡ **Required actions (if needed):** These boxes should be used wherever the rating is less than 5, to identify actions needed to raise the rating to the next level, and to fully satisfactory (5). The text can note recommended or ongoing actions.

Safeguards and Commitments *(completed by peer reviewer/appraiser) (new!)*

Answer the following questions relevant to potential impacts of the activity:		
10. Environment	Have the environmental marker questions been answered and adequately addressed by the design document in line with legal requirements under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act?	Yes/No
11. Child Protection	Does the design meet the requirements of AusAID's Child Protection Policy?	Yes/No/ N/a

Other comments or issues

-
-

Quality Criteria - Consider these questions when assessing:**Relevance – “Why are we doing this?”**

- Is the specific role of Australian aid (aid objectives) in contributing to a Partner's priority development outcomes clearly articulated?
- Does the activity contribute to higher level objectives of the Australian aid program as outlined in a Partnership for Development, and/or relevant country, regional and thematic strategy?
- Does the activity target priority needs not addressed by other development partners, and/or how is Australia otherwise seeking to harmonise its assistance?
- If working with/through another partner (e.g. UN, WB, PIFS), consider *both* the clarity and relevance of Australian *objectives for the partnership*, (why we chose to work this way) and the partner's aid objective(s) *vis a vis* the development context, partner priorities and beneficiaries' needs.
- Is the design relevant to the context specific analysis and lessons? i.e. does contextual analysis clearly inform:
 - the proposed approach to addressing the identified development issues?
 - the modality and financing arrangements selected?

Analysis and Learning – “How well have we thought this through?”

- Does analysis takes into account (as appropriate) political, institutional, economic, financial, organisational and human resource issues?
- Are lessons from previous experience in the sector and/or country taken into account?
- Does sufficient analysis underpin the theory of change?
- Does the analysis appropriately address and integrate other agency commitments and safeguards including gender equality, disability, environment, anti-corruption and child protection?
- Does the analysis take into account which partnerships are going to be critical in achieving the objectives and why?

Effectiveness – “Will it work?”

- Are the objectives for this activity (aid objectives), clear, measurable and achievable within the stated timeframe?
- Is it clear how we think change will occur (theory of change) i.e.:
 - are the relationships linking analysis, objectives and our approach clear and plausible?
 - are the underlying assumptions clearly outlined?
- Are main risks and plans to prevent or mitigate them identified?
- Does the design identify key partnerships which may contribute to achieving objectives?

Efficiency – “How will we do it?”

- Are proposed technical solutions and associated implementation arrangements high quality, appropriate to the context and good value for money?
- Where appropriate, are implementation arrangements harmonised with other donors and aligned with partner government systems?
- Are roles and responsibilities of all development partners and all actors involved in activity implementation clearly identified?

- Is the activity adequately and appropriately resourced to achieve the desired objectives?

Monitoring and Evaluation – “How will we know?”

- Will proposed monitoring and evaluation help us to know how it is all working? Do proposed arrangements clearly support management, accountability and lessons-learning needs (including ongoing quality and performance reporting)?
 - is it focused on priority information needs and not overly complex?
 - is it clear what will be assessed, by whom, when and how (including baselines where appropriate)?
 - can this also inform analysis and judgement of contribution to/achievement against higher level objectives of the program?
- Will data be gender-disaggregated to measure impact on men and women, boys and girls?
- Will monitoring and evaluation arrangements use or contribute to strengthening local monitoring and evaluation systems and/or capacity? If strengthening the capacity of partner performance management is an *objective of the activity*, will this be tracked and managed accordingly? (Note this would then need to be identified in the Objectives summary and assessed against “Effectiveness”.)
- Is monitoring and evaluation adequately resourced?
- Where we are jointly implementing with other partners and/or funders, are there *AusAID specific objectives* for engagement in the activity/partnership, and do monitoring and evaluation arrangements address this?

Sustainability – “Have we planned for benefits to last?”

- Is it clear what sustainable benefits/change the activity aims to generate? Is sustainability in fact an aim of, or reasonably achievable by, the activity? Benefits may be assessed in terms of either or both:
 - objectives/outcomes – what the activity itself is aiming to achieve (Australian aid objectives), and what would result for that in terms of immediate or longer-term shared development outcomes; and
 - processes – how the activity will operate.
- Have specific constraints to sustainability, in the context of the proposed activity, been identified and addressed?
 - this should include consideration of financial, human resource and political constraints
- Are the strategies for achieving sustainability explicit?
 - are they integral to the activity objectives, approaches and monitoring and evaluation?
- How likely are beneficiaries and/or partner country stakeholders to have sufficient ownership, capacity and resources to maintain desired activity outcomes after Australian Government funding has ceased?
- How well are any **emerging environmental, climate and disaster challenges** (e.g. extreme weather events, resource degradation, pollution, disasters and climate change related impacts) or opportunities (e.g. for Disaster Risk Reduction or adaptation) being addressed in activity design?
- Does the activity aim to build resilience to cope with changing conditions and future uncertainties?
- How is the design ensuring no significant negative environmental impacts are likely (including complying with the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act) and does it pursue opportunities to enhance the environment?

How will monitoring and evaluation be used to assess and report on environmental sustainability of the activity?

Gender equality – “How are we going to achieve it?”

- How will the activity contribute to advancing gender equality or support women's and men's equal engagement in, and benefit from, the activity?
- How well does the design integrate gender equality into objectives and the consideration of risks and sustainability?
- Does the design identify how the activity will work to develop capacity on gender equality objectives of program staff, counterparts, development partners, and/or the broader community?
- Is the monitoring and evaluation framework able to assess and report on progress towards gender equality results?
- Does the design propose gender expertise be accessed during implementation?
- Does the design provide for gender equality considerations and impacts at the policy level and with counterparts at the program level?
- Will the monitoring and evaluation assess and report on progress towards desired gender equality objectives, outcomes and impact?

Safeguards and Commitments

As part of activity design and implementation, attention is typically given to the risk **posed to** the success or effectiveness of an activity, and less often on the risk of potential harm **caused by** an activity. Policies and procedures that address the potential risk of harm that can result from an aid activity are known as **safeguards**. Cross-cutting policies and procedures aim to improve aid quality and effectiveness, while safeguards policies and procedures aim to "do no harm". Cross-cutting issues often have "safeguard" implications, but not all safeguard issues will be cross-cutting issues. In AusAID, the following areas have both cross-cutting and safeguard implications. This section will be progressively added to as further guidance on safeguards issues is developed along with corresponding questions that must be addressed before commencing an initiative in AidWorks.

Environment (see the Guideline, [Integrating Environment into Activity Design](#))

If there are environmental impacts that need to be considered, appropriate action needs to be taken from the very beginning in the design. Assess whether the design has answered and addressed the following questions:

1. Is the activity in an environmentally sensitive location or sector?
2. Is there potential for the activity to have an impact on the environment?
3. Is the explicit, or implicit, aim of the activity to have a positive environmental impact?
4. Is the activity relevant to multilateral environmental agreements?
5. Could the activity have significant negative environmental impacts?

Consider both the impact of the design and implementation phases, and of the ongoing activity, and what, if any, action is required to comply with the EPBC Act.

For additional information see [AusAID's Environmental Management Guide for Australia's Aid Program](#) or contact the Sustainable Development Group on +61 2 6206 4174.

Child Protection - AusAID's Child Protection Policy provides a clear framework for managing and reducing risks of child abuse by persons engaged in delivering Australian aid program activities. This policy applies to all AusAID staff, including those based overseas, and to all contractors and non-government organisations funded by AusAID. See guidance, [Child Protection Procedure Manual](#) (page 4), and the [Child Protection Policy](#).

Choose **N/A** if the activity does not involve working with children or if the activity is to be implemented by one of the following:

1. Partner Government
2. An Australian Whole of Government Partner
3. Multilateral organisations
4. Donor governments

For additional information contact the Child Protection Officer on +61 2 6206 4184 or email CPO@ausaid.gov.au