

Samoa Education Sector Independent Verification Report

Final

Fred Brooker
Jane von Dadelszen
Visesio Pongi

7 April, 2017

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....3
Section 1. Introduction / Background.....4
Section 2. Methodology.....5
Section 3. Recommendations9
Section 4. Summary21

Annex 1. ESP Key Performance Indicators for 2015 / 2016

Acknowledgments

1. The Team would like to thank the Government of Samoa, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia for their support and cooperation during this exercise.
2. Senior staff from the Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture, the Samoa Qualifications Authority and the National University of Samoa gave much of their valuable time and insights and documentation to the team.
3. Finally, our thanks go to the Education Sector Coordination Division led by the Coordinator. In particular, we want to express our gratitude to Verutina Leinati Isaia Iosia for providing documentation and support when needed.

Section 1. Introduction / Background

4. The ESSP disbursements consist of **Sector Budget support** based on process indicators and **Performance-linked contributions**, subject to achievement of mutually determined performance indicators. The budget support is un-earmarked financing in support of key operational areas identified in the Samoa Education Sector Plan 2013-18 and will total 70% of the total allocation based on GOS self-assessment of achievement of fixed process indicators. The allocation for the performance linked contributions will be released based on GOS's tracking towards nine pre-determined Key Performance Indicators. This represents 30% of the total allocation and will be subject to an independent assessment.
5. The **Independent Verification Process (IVP)** for the Education Sector Support Program (ESSP) will enable the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia (DFAT) and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand (MFAT) to release agreed funding (30%) through a performance-linked mechanism based on Government of Samoa's (GoS) achievement of agreed Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) in the Education Sector.
6. The performance-linked contributions are subject to achievement of mutually determined performance indicators. The financing will be released based on GoS's tracking towards nine pre-determined KPIs and subject to an independent assessment of a minimum trend of 1 percentage point toward the Plan's 2019 targets. If not all Key Performance Indicators have been met, a proportion of the 30 percent will be paid. The formula will be 11.1% of the total allocation for each of the 9 KPIs.
7. The KPIs are distributed across the education sector and the following three agencies responsible for implementation:
 - a) The **Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture (MESC)** is mandated to provide education for primary and secondary education with support provided for early childhood and special schools.
 - b) The **Samoa Qualifications Authority (SQA)** is mandated to become the overarching body to coordinate, quality assure and regulate the post school education and training sub-sector in Samoa.
 - c) The **National University of Samoa (NUS)** is responsible for the provision of tertiary education and training, including academic, technical and vocational training and continuing education.
8. The objectives of the Independent Verification Process are:
 - a) Review the approved ESP Annual Review Report and supporting documentation (sources of verification) to assess the achievement of the KPIs;

- b) Provide recommendations to Australia and New Zealand on the release of the performance-linked contribution of the 9 (nine) KPIs; and,
- c) Provide recommendations to the Education Sector Agencies on improving the quality of the indicators and means of measurement in line with internationally recognized standards for the following years. This will be in a separate report.

Section 2. Methodology

9. A three-person team of independent consultants was engaged by DP's to carry out the independent verification and provide recommendations to Australia and New Zealand on the disbursement of performance-linked contributions. The team was led by the ESSP Education Quality Adviser, Fred Brooker, currently under contract by Australia and New Zealand. Visessio Pongi was engaged as the Education Assessment Expert and Jane von Dadelszen was engaged for the PSET indicators.

10. The Team Leader provided quality assurance of all outputs and deliverables, ensuring all specified requirements and performance standards were met in a timely manner. The TL compiled the final IVP report and the other two consultants were jointly responsible for a separate report on recommendations to revise and improve the KPIs for the following year.

Education Quality Adviser – Team Leader (Fred Brooker)

11. The Team Leader will be responsible for reviewing and reporting on the following three (3) Indicators:

- a) Percentage of children commencing Year 1 Primary and completing Year 8 by gender (Primary Completion Rate)
- b) Percentage of children with disability enrolled in mainstream government schools
- c) Percentage of teachers meeting teacher performance standards

Education Assessment Expert (Visessio Pongi)

12. The Assessment Expert will be responsible for reviewing and reporting on the following three (3) Indicators:

- a) Year 4 & 6 primary school children at risk in literacy (English & Samoan)
- b) Year 4 & 6 primary school children at risk in numeracy
- c) Number of schools meeting minimum service standards related to literacy and numeracy

Post-Secondary Education and Training Expert (Jane von Dadelszen)

13. The PSET Expert will be responsible for reviewing and reporting on the following three (3) Indicators:

- a) Percentage of PSET graduates finding employment within 6 months
- b) Transition rate from Year 13 to formal PSET
- c) Number of accredited courses provided by PSET providers

14. The work was carried out over a 3-week period from 6 March – 31 March 2017. The first phase included a desk-based review of all documentation provided by the education sector agencies through the Australian and New Zealand High Commissions.

15. A one-week field mission was carried out from 20 – 24 March. All three consultants participated in the field mission.

16. The methodology for carrying included verification, review and validation of the KPIs. The definitions of the indicators and methods of calculation were reviewed and included comparison with international standards.

17. The following steps were carried out for the IVP in June 2016.

Steps	Responsible	Timeframe
1. ESAC / ESCD provides all documentation to the DPs in electronic format and provide names, title and contact details of responsible officers for reporting / data from MESC, SQA and NUS.	ESCD	6 March, 2017
2. DPs validated all documentation from the year of reporting and other reports ¹ and provide to the IVP Team for review.	DPs	Within 1 week of receiving documentation from ESCD
3. IVP Team top carry out desk-based review of the Annual Report and all documentation (sources of verification). Consultation with education sector agencies was done through e-mail.	IVP Team	Within 10 days of receiving documentation
4. IVP Team carry out in-country mission to validate preliminary findings and verify data and analysis.	IVP Team	20 – 24 March during in-country mission
5. Draft of IVP report produced for presentation to stakeholders. Meeting held with MoF representatives, heads of sector agencies, ESAC Chair and DPs to discuss draft report	IVP Team / DPs	20 – 24 March
6. IVP Team prepared report with recommendations to revise / improve the KPIs for the following year. Report was submitted to DPs and GoS for inclusion in April ESAC	IVP Team	3 April, 2017
7. Finalisation of IVP Report for submission to DFAT and MFAT	IVP Team TL	3 April, 2017

¹ Documentation will include: Annual Review Report 2015 / 2016; MESC and SQA Statistical Bulletins (2014, 2015, 2016); SQA Tracer Report; SPELL Report; IVP Report 2016, MTR Report; Previous Annual Review Reports (2013/2014 & 2014/2015); previous 3 years of annual reports (financial and technical) from MESC. NUS and SQA

Steps	Responsible	Timeframe
8. IVP Report with recommendation on disbursement of performance-linked tranche submitted to ESAC through ESWG for approval	DPs	July , 2017 ESAC
9. Recommendation Report to revise / improve KPIs for following year submitted to ESAC through ESWG for approval	ESCD	July ESAC

18. The IVP guidelines defined the following protocols:

- a) The exercise can only be carried out once the Annual Review Report has been finalized and approved by the ESAC;
- b) The Annual Review Report includes analysis of mutually determined Key Performance Indicators including trends from the previous year(s);
- c) All sources of information / verification of the selected indicators must be official documents (statistical bulletins, official reports) and publicly available;
- d) The documentation must be provided in electronic format before the IVP will take place;
- e) The relevant staff from the Education Sector agencies will be available during the in-country mission for meetings and validation of the indicators; and,
- f) The preliminary findings will be presented to the development partners and GoS officials.

19. All of the KPIs were tested against international best practices where relevant, including a comparison of definitions and methods of calculations used in international publications.

20. The following issues were noted during the IVP:

- a) The exercise did not meet all of the agreed protocols. The Annual Review Report was not approved (point a. in paragraph 18) at the start of the exercise or by the end of the field mission.
- b) Definitions and methods of calculation – the documentation provided by the agencies included a definition and method of calculation for all 9 indicators.
- c) Sub-indicators - all of the indicators were disaggregated by gender or level (where appropriate) and as such represented sub-indicators. This led to a situation where KPIs could be partially achieved if, for example, the percent of females reached the target but males did not.
- d) Baselines – all of the KPIs had fully compliant baselines established.
- e) Official sources of data – the documentation included statistical digests and bulletins which were published and publically available. In addition, official quarterly and annual

reports of the agencies were considered if they met the criteria of being officially approved and available on a government website.

21. In view of the points noted in paragraph 17, the IVP team recommended that:
 - a) partial achievement be accepted by the DPs which would allow disbursement of 50% of the allocation for a given KPI (i.e. 50% of the 11.1%) if the sector showed compliance and an agreed, but not full, achievement of the results.
 - b) conditional recommendations against achievement of the KPIs be provided until a date as when the final versions of the core documentation is provided. The Development Partners and the Ministry of Finance agreed that the final IVP must be submitted and endorsed by 7 April 2017.
 - c) Results from approved (final) Sector Agency Annual Reports can be accepted as verification for the achievement / non-achievement of the KPIs.
22. The IVP team was able to meet with all the relevant staff during the field mission. This included an initial briefing with the senior staff from the three agencies, Ministry of Finance and the development partners. The education sector agency staff fully cooperated by giving their time for meetings and discussions and provided all possible data and reports.
23. The ESCD team facilitated the in-country visit and provided additional data and other information as needed. Separate meetings were held with the focal points for each of the KPIs. The meetings included a review of definitions and methods of calculation; presentation of available data against both the baselines and the results; and, a discussion over any challenges.
24. A final briefing was provided to the ESAC Chair, Heads of the agencies, Ministry of Finance staff, Development Partners, and selected senior staff from the education agencies. The preliminary findings and recommendations were provided and clarifications were made where appropriate. In addition, the preliminary recommendations for improving the KPIs in the future years were also presented and discussed.
25. The following section presents each of the 9 KPIs showing the definition; method of calculation; original baseline and target; reported from the Annual Review Report 2015/16; data sources; achievement of the KPI; justification; recommendation to the development partners; and, technical notes.

Section 3. Recommendations

Indicator:	1. Year 4 & 6 primary school children 'at risk' in Literacy (English & Samoan)		
Definition:	Year 4 and Year 6 students who have not yet demonstrated any of the knowledge and skills expected for literacy (in English and Samoan) at the level they are at. Their level of knowledge and skills are comparable to those expected in the year level below and are not ready to proceed to the next level above.		
Method of calculation:	Percentage (%) of students completing Year 4 or Year 6 (desegregated by gender) who achieved L4 or L5 in Literacy (English, Samoan) at the end of Years 4 and 6 (based on the 2015 SPELL 1 and 2 literacy equated test results), and added together for each year level.		
Baseline (2012):	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>2012 Baseline</u></p> <p><u>Year 4 English Literacy</u> Boys: 35%, Girls: 18%</p> <p><u>Year 6 English Literacy</u> Boys: 55%, Girls: 32%</p> <p><u>Year 4 Samoan Literacy</u> Boys: 21%, Girls: 12%</p> <p><u>Year 6 Samoan Literacy</u> Boys: 22%, Girls: 12%</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Intermediate Target (2015)</u></p> <p><u>Year 4 English Literacy</u> Boys: 17%, Girls: 10%</p> <p><u>Year 6 English Literacy</u> Boys: 32%, Girls: 19%</p> <p><u>Year 4 Samoan Literacy</u> Boys: 14%, Girls: 7%</p> <p><u>Year 6 Samoan Literacy</u> Boys: 14%, Girls: 7%</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>2019 Target</u></p> <p><u>Year 4 English Literacy</u> Boys:23%, Girls:6%</p> <p><u>Year 6 English Literacy</u> Boys:43%, Girls:20%</p> <p><u>Year 4 Samoan Literacy</u> Boys:9%, Girls:1%</p> <p><u>Year 6 Samoan Literacy</u> Boys:16%, Girls:1%</p>
Data source(s):	MESC Education Statistical Digest, 2016; MESC SPELL 2015/16 Report.		
Reported - actual: 2015 SPELL (equated to 2012 SPELL)	<p><u>Year 4 English Literacy:</u> Boys: 42%, Girls: 33%</p> <p><u>Year 4 Samoan Literacy:</u> Boys: 8%, Girls:15%</p>	<p><u>Year 6 English Literacy:</u> Boys: 45%, Girls 42%</p> <p><u>Year 6 Samoan Literacy:</u> Boys: 19%, Girls: 6%</p>	
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The achievements for the KPI have been verified against the data in the MESC Education Statistical Digest 2016 as well as the 2015 MESC SPELL report. The result is that half (4) of the 8 sub-indicators for literacy (English and Samoan) have met the 1% improvement target in the 2015/16 Financial Year. As such, the KPI is partially achieved.		
Recommendation:	It is recommended that the Development Partners disburse 50% of the 11.1% allocation		
Technical notes:	1. Reported achievements for Literacy (English and Samoan) in the latest version of the 2015/16 ARR have been verified against actual achievements		

	<p>reported in the 2016 Education Statistical Digest.</p> <p>2. Reported Actual has been verified against data in Education Statistical Digest 2016. It should be noted however, that based on queries raised on data in earlier version of the ARR, the data on the latest ARR were revised to match those in the Education Statistical Digest 2016.</p>
--	---

Indicator:	2. Year 4 & 6 primary school children 'at risk' in numeracy		
Definition:	Year 4 and Year 6 students who have not yet demonstrated any of the knowledge and skills expected for numeracy at the level they are at. Their level of knowledge and skills are comparable to those expected in the year level below and are not ready to proceed to the next level above.		
Method of calculation:	Percentage (%) of students completing Year 4 or Year 6 (desegregated by gender) who achieved L4 or L5 in Numeracy at the end of Years 4 and 6 (based on the 2015 SPELL 1 and 2 Numeracy equated test results), and added together for each year level.		
Baseline (year):	<u>2012 Baseline</u>	<u>Intermediate Target (2015)</u>	<u>2019 Target</u>
	<u>Year 4 Numeracy</u> Boys: 32%, Girls: 23%	<u>Year 4 Numeracy</u> Boys: 23%, Girls: 18%	<u>Year 4 Numeracy</u> Boys: 10%, Girls: 5%
	<u>Year 6 Numeracy</u> Boys: 62%, Girls: 50%	<u>Year 6 Numeracy</u> Boys: 39%, Girls: 30%	<u>Year 6 Numeracy</u> Boys; 50%, Girls: 38%
Data source(s):	MESC Education Statistical Digest, 2016; MESC SPELL 2015/16 Report.		
Reported - actual:	<u>Year 4 Numeracy</u> Boys: 35%, Girls: 25%		
	<u>Year 6 Numeracy</u> Boys: 64%, Girls: 54%		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The achievements for the KPI have been verified against the data in the MESC Education Statistical Digest 2016 as well as the 2015 MESC SPELL report. The result is that both Year 4 and Year 6 Numeracy achievements for 2015 did not meet the target of 1% improvement in the "at risk" level. As such, the KPI is not achieved.		
Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reported achievements for Numeracy in the latest version of the 2015/16 ARR have been verified against actual achievements reported in the 2016 Education Statistical Digest and SPELL Report 2015. 2. Reported Actual has been verified against data in Education Statistical Digest 2016. It should be noted however, that based on queries raised on data in earlier version of the ARR, the data on the latest ARR were revised to match those in the Education Statistical Digest 2016. 		

Indicator:	3. Percentage of PSET graduates finding employment within 6 months		
Definition:	Percentage of PSET graduates finding paid employment within 6 months divided by total respondents in tracer study (SQA draft Tracer Study report 2016)		
Method of calculation:	Percentage of PSET graduates finding paid employment within 6 months divided by total respondents in tracer study		
Baseline (2012):	Males 71.6% Females 50.3%	Target: (2018)	Average:70% Not determined by gender
Data source(s):	SQA Tracer Study of 2012,2013, and 2014 Graduates from Formal PSET Providers in Samoa, Draft report December 2016 and unpublished disaggregated data.		
Reported - actual:	2014 graduating cohort Males 47.1%, Females, 37.8%		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The KPI was verified through disaggregated data from the draft SQA Tracer Study 2016 report. The transition rate decreased from Male 48.2%%, Female 47.8%% in 2013 to Male 47.1%, Female 37.8% in 2014.		
Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The numbers are not in the PSET Statistical Bulletin. 2. The 2016 tracer study includes all PSET and cannot therefore be compared to the previous study that only included TVET. TVET has higher rates of employment within 6 months than “all of PSET” does. 3. The 2016 Tracer study includes 3 cohorts, graduates from 2012, 2013, and 2014 4. Disaggregated data for each cohort and for each gender has been provided to update the PCET Statistical Bulletin and the ARR 5. 49.5% of respondents (52.9% female, 47.1% male) in tracer study found jobs within 6 months of graduation (2016 Tracer study p18 &19) The figures quoted about are combined data from 2012, 2013 and 2014 graduating cohorts. 6. The tracer study of 2012, 2013 and 2014 graduates from formal Post School Education and Training (PSET) providers in Samoa was conducted from November 2015 to May 2016. It achieved a 68.3 percent response rate of 4,695 graduates who were targeted. Few responses were received from those working overseas, so most of the graduates the paper reports on are those residing in Samoa. (SQA Tracer study draft report 2016) 7. Graduates of APTC were not included as they were doing their own study. 8. APTC and NUS and possibly other providers do their own tracer studies and have annual data. 		

	9. As there will not be another tracer study next year the annual data from APTC and NUS and any others could provide a proxy for 2015 graduates.
--	---

Indicator:	4. Percentage of children commencing Year 1 Primary and completing Year 8 by gender - Primary Cohort Completion Rate (PCCR)		
Definition:	The number of graduates from primary education in a given year by the difference between enrolment in the last year level in the same year and repeaters in the last year level in the following year, and multiply the result by the retention rate to the last year level of primary education in the given year and by 100.		
Method of calculation:	See above.		
Baseline (2012):	Male = 75% Female = 85%	Target:	Male: 90% (2018) Female: 90% (2018)
Data source(s):	MESC Statistical Digest 2016		
Reported - actual:	Male = 80% Female = 81%		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The KPI was verified in MESC Statistical Digest. The completion rate for male students obtained the minimum required achievement (from 75% in 2014 to 80% in 2015) while for female students the completion rate declined (from 85% in 2014 to 81% in 2015) from the previous year. The KPI is partially achieved.		
Recommendation:	It is recommended that the Development Partners disburse 50% of the 11.1% allocation.		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Statistical Bulletin 2016 now includes the correct definition as well as statistics from 2012 to 2015 for this indicator. UNESCO worked with the PPRD and provided the definition and method of calculation. 2. Baseline from 2012 is now indicated in the MESC Statistical Bulletin 2016. 3. The baseline reported in the draft ARR does not match the MESC Statistical Bulletin 2016 baseline from 2012. It is not clear where the baseline used in the draft ARR was obtained (M=86%; F=85%). 		

Indicator:	5. Transition rate from Year 13 to formal PSET		
Definition:	The number of students admitted in the first year level of a higher level of education in a given year, expressed as a percentage of the number of students enrolled in the final year level of the lower level of education in the previous year.		
Method of calculation:	See above. Method used for provisional result (and confirmed as basis of calculation by SQA) is percentage of 2014 year 13 males and females who enroll in foundation programmes at NUS in 2015		
Baseline (2012):	Male: 37% Female: 63%	Target (2019):	Male: 50% Female: 70%
Data source(s):	Not reflected in any of the data sources		
Reported - actual:	2014 year 13 enrolled in foundation in year 2015 Male 37.7% Female 66.6%		
Achievement:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The KPI was verified in the MESC statistical digest (year 13 enrolments 2014) p73 and the NUS Annual Report 2016 (Foundation enrolments at NUS 2015) p12. The transition rate increased from Male 27.3%, Female 42.4% in 2014 to Male 37.7%, Female 66.6% in 2015.		
Recommendation:	It is recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The figures for 2014 calculated in the 2016 IVP are 36%, 27% for males, and 42% for females. The total for 2015 is 48% (38% Males, 65% Females) and therefore the target for this year is met from NUS data alone without data from other PSET providers. 2. MESC statistical digest page 51(not disaggregated and attributed to a different year to that based on calculation above) 2015 42% 2016 48% 3. The MESC Statistical bulletin reports the figure for 2015 as 48% but it is not disaggregated by gender 4. Year 13 cohorts with numbers by gender in are reported in the MESC Statistical Digest 5. Foundation enrolment data is reported in the NUS annual report page12 6. There is no data on foundation enrolments in PSET in SQA PSET statistical bulletin or in the SQA annual report. 		

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ol style="list-style-type: none">7. Revised numbers are expected to be reflected in the draft 2016 PSET Statistical Bulletin and the final ARR8. The figures for 2014 calculated in the 2016 IVP are 36%, 27% for males, and 42% for females. The total for 2015 is 48% (38% Males, 65% Females) and therefore the target for this year is met from NUS data alone without data from other PSET providers. |
|--|--|

Indicator:	6. Number of students with disability enrolled in Primary schools by gender		
Definition:	The term includes impairment of body structure and function and the experience of activity limitation and participation restriction for an individual. The term disability includes the impairment, and the activity limitations and participation restrictions that require significant education adjustments for an individual student (Inclusive Education Policy).		
Method of calculation:	Number of students by gender reported in the school census.		
Baseline (2014):	Male = 77 Female = 56	Target (2018):	Male = 130 Female = 116 (Interim)
Data source(s):	MESC Statistical Digest 2016		
Reported - actual:	Male = 95 Female = 71		
Achievement:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The achievement of the KPI has been verified in the MESC Statistical Digest (pg 12). There has been an increase in numbers for both males and females with disability from 2014 to 2015.		
Recommendation:	It is recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The figures are presented in the IVP and verified in the MESC Statistical Digest. 2. The Annual Review Report presented in its narrative the prioritization of inclusion of students with disabilities and related progress and challenges, including data collection, raising awareness, implementation of the IE policy, and launching of indicators. 3. The ARR includes disability in Table 7 as one of the KPIs. However, it does not include progress for this year. 4. Not clear what is the difference between the interim and permanent. Except that there are targets for the next two years, one of which is not disaggregated and the other does not add up. Note that the Digest does not need to provide targets – this is defined in the Annual Reports. 5. Totals in Stat Digest do not add up for the target year but this does not affect the verification for 2015/2016. 		

Indicator:	7. Percentage of teachers meeting teacher performance standards		
Definition:	The percentage of teachers who meet the professional teacher standards		
Method of calculation:	The number of teachers who met the professional teacher standards divided by the total number of teachers employed in the same year		
Baseline (2014):	Male = 8% Female = 22% (Interim)	Target:	Male = 50% Female = 50% (Interim)
Data source(s):	MESC Statistical Digest 2016		
Reported - actual:	Male = 14% Female = 32%		
Achievement:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The achievement of the KPI has been verified in the MESC Statistical Digest (pgs 96-97). There has been an increase in numbers of both male and female teachers who have met the standards from 2014 to 2015.		
Recommendation:	It is recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation.		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The IVP report 2016 recommended establishing interim and permanent KPIs. For the former only the number of teachers would be recorded while for the permanent the number of teachers who did not meet the standards and were reappraised and passed. The Stat Digest has followed this recommendation but it is not reflected in the ARR. 2. It is reported in the ARR using the baselines or years. Figures taken from MESC Statistical Bulletin 3. Statistical Bulletin 2016 and Annual Review Report cite statistics from different years but this does not affect verification for 2015/21016. 4. Only numbers for primary teachers are reported as a percentage in the main sections of the Statistical Bulletin 2016. The rest are stated as numbers. The accurate data is found in the annexes of the MESC Stat Digest on pages 96-97. 5. The appraisal system is in place. The Annual Review Report recognises the need for a more focused support programme to improve and upgrade professional capacity of teachers. 6. The ARR includes teacher performance standards in Table 7 as one of the KPIs. However, it does not include progress for this year. 		

Indicator:	8. Number of schools meeting minimum service standards related to literacy and numeracy		
Definition:	The basic expectations of those conditions in a school that will achieve a quality education for the learners.		
Method of calculation:	None available in documentation provided		
Baseline (2013):	<u>Baseline (2013):</u> 11	<u>2015 Achievement</u> 46	<u>2019 Target</u> 80
Data source(s):	MESC Statistical Digest 2016; MSS for Primary and Secondary Schools 2016		
Reported - actual:	46		
Achievement:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The data has been verified in the MESC Statistical Digest 2016 and shows an increase in the number of schools meeting the MSS.		
Recommendation:	It is recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation.		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ARR for FY 2015/16 contains the information on achievement / progress in this indicator. Information on baseline, targets are available in the 2016 Education Statistical Digest and has been verified. Information in the 2016 Statistical Digest indicates that target of 1% improvement has been met. 		

Indicator:	9. Number of accredited courses provided by PSET providers		
Definition:	Increase in the number of programmes accredited per year (p22 SQA annual report)		
Method of calculation:	Recorded accredited programmes on the SQA register of accredited qualifications (need to confirm title of this)		
Baseline (2012):	Number: 6 (2012)	Target:	Number: 20
Data source(s):	SQA Qualifications Register spreadsheets. These record accreditation progress and when they are signed off by the SQA Board.		
Reported - actual:	17 total programmes accredited by end of 2015/2016 financial year		
Achievement:	<input type="checkbox"/> Achieved	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially Achieved	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Achieved
Justification:	The KPI is not reported in the 2015/16 accurately by showing the progress from the previous year. The KPI was verified in the SQA Qualification register. The accreditations increased from 8 accreditations by end of 2014/2015 to 17 by end of 2015/16 financial year.		
Recommendation:	It is not recommended that the Development Partners disburse the 11.1% allocation.		
Technical notes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The KPI is reported in Table 7 of the ARR but does not include the results from the previous year which make it impossible to show progress. 2. The PSET statistical bulletin does not include this measure but it is being added to the 2016 statistical bulletin that is still in draft. 3. The 9 reported in the SQA annual report p10 is the number of programmes approved in 2015/2016. 4. The NUS Annual report 2015/2016 p9 reports 8 of their programmes accredited during the period. Their programme data reports a total of 17 accreditations up until 30 June 2016. 5. The MTR reports 15. 6. The target for this year has been met but incorrect numbers are currently in the draft ARR and not yet recorded in the draft 2016 PSET Statistical Bulletin 		

Section 4. Summary

26. The IVP Team recommends that the DPs disburse full funding against 4 of the KPIs and partial (50%) against 2 of the KPIs. The recommendations are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. IVP Team findings and recommendations

	Independently Verified				Recommendation
	Baseline	Definition	Calculation	Reported	
1 Year 4 Literacy / Numeracy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
2 Year 6 Literacy / Numeracy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
3 PSET Grads / Employment	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
4 Completion Rate	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
5 Transition / Year 13	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
6 Students with Disability	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7 Teacher Standards	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
8 School MSS	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
9 Accredited Programs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

27. The final results are a significant improvement over the previous year and all the sector agencies should be commended for improving their collection and recording of data. However, the quality of the Annual Review Report for 2015/2016 was poor and did not reflect the progress made by the agencies.

28. The following are key findings that the team found during the IVP:

- a) 2 KPIs were verified in all documentation
- b) 3 KPIs have been conditionally verified pending inclusion in all required documentation
- c) 4 KPIs are not presented in official sources

29. The updated KPI table presented in the approved ARR does not include all the data and should be updated and approved by ESAC before the next IVP.

Annex 1. Key Performance Indicators for 2015 / 2016

The updated KPI Table presented in Table 7 does not include all the necessary data.