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Foreword

Education—the acquisition of knowledge and skills—plays a fundamental role in poverty alleviation and economic growth. Over the past two decades, primary school enrollment and completion rates have risen and gender differentials in enrollment have narrowed in low-income countries, buoyed by the Education for All movement and commitments to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. Expansion of post-primary education has been more modest and mainly has occurred in middle-income countries.

From 2001 through 2010, the World Bank made $23 billion in new commitments to education in developing countries, with a doubling of annual new commitments over the decade. Its corporate strategy has evolved from a focus on basic education to a dual focus on universal primary completion and post-primary “education for the knowledge economy.” The Education Sector has updated its strategy for the next decade, focusing on Learning for All.

This review of the World Bank’s education lending portfolio aims to inform the new Bank Education Strategy and to serve as an input into the Independent Evaluation Group’s planned evaluation of post-primary education in 2012. For the period covering the last decade, the review asks, “What have World Bank–supported education projects sought to achieve, what have they achieved, and what has contributed to success?” It covers project managed by the Education Sector as well as those with substantial education commitments that were managed by other sectors.

The performance of recently closed education projects has dropped substantially compared with the beginning of the decade and is now below the performance of projects in other sectors. Bank support has been most successful at helping increase education access and improve equity. Fewer than half of projects have succeeded in achieving education quality, labor force, management, learning, or efficiency objectives. The review finds that support to improve the quality of education inputs has not necessarily improved learning outcomes and that the evidence that investments in vocational and higher training have contributed to meeting labor market demands is thin. Gaining a better understanding of the links between education inputs and learning outcomes and of how to strengthen the labor market relevance of post-primary education will be important challenges for the development community.

The focus of the new Education Strategy on Learning for All is highly relevant. However, there is a risk that by focusing on “all,” the poor will be the last to benefit. Ensuring that the poor take part in the benefits of government education programs will continue to be a priority for the Bank. The knowledge database proposed by the Education Strategy will benefit from many recently launched impact evaluations, but the potential contribution of stronger monitoring and evaluation of government programs supported by the Bank should not be overlooked. Understanding the factors contributing to the variation in results for learning and labor force outcomes will be critical to delivering results.

Vinod Thomas
Director-General, Evaluation
Executive Summary

Education—the acquisition of knowledge and skills—plays a fundamental role in poverty alleviation and economic growth. This review aims to inform the new World Bank strategy and to serve as an input into the Independent Evaluation Group’s (IEG) planned evaluation of post-primary education in 2012. Covering the last decade, the review asks, “What have World Bank-supported education projects sought to achieve, what have they actually achieved, and what has contributed to success?”

From fiscal 2001–10, new World Bank commitments to education totaled $23 billion and commitments on an annual basis had doubled by the end of the period. The Bank’s corporate strategy has evolved from a focus on basic education to a dual focus on universal primary completion and post-primary “education for the knowledge economy.”

The performance of recently closed education projects has dropped substantially over the decade and is now below the performance of projects in other sectors. Bank support has been most successful at increasing access and improving the equity of education, while fewer than half of projects have succeeded in achieving education quality, labor force, management, learning, or efficiency objectives. Improving the quality of education inputs has not necessarily improved learning. Support to post-primary education has expanded, but the share of projects with labor market objectives has not, suggesting possible issues in the labor market relevance of post-primary efforts.

The focus of the new Education Strategy on Learning for All is highly relevant. However, both learning and labor force outcomes have been difficult to achieve, and there is a risk that by focusing on “all” the poor will be the last to benefit. The Strategy’s proposed knowledge database will benefit from many recently launched impact evaluations, but the potential contribution of stronger monitoring and evaluation of government programs supported by the Bank should not be overlooked. Understanding the factors that contribute to the variation in results for learning and labor force outcomes will be critical to improving them.

Increased World Bank Education Commitments and the Evolution of Education Strategy over the Decade

From fiscal years 2001–10, the World Bank committed about $23 billion to education programs in developing countries. About two-thirds of that amount was managed by Education Sector staff, and the remainder comprised education components of projects managed by other sectors. Three-quarters was in the form of investment operations, and the balance was in the form of development policy operations.

New education commitments more than doubled on an annual basis over the period, rising from about $1 billion annually through fiscal 2006, then doubling to $2 billion annually in fiscal 2007–08, and reaching an unprecedented $5 billion in fiscal year 2010 during the international financial crisis.
Important new international education initiatives have also been launched over the past decade, to which the World Bank was party—the 2000 Dakar World Education Forum on Education for All, the commitment to achieving the Millennium Development Goals that same year, and the launching of the Education for All Fast Track Initiative (FTI) in 2002 to help low-income countries reach the Millennium Development Goals. Since the FTI’s inception, the World Bank has hosted its Secretariat, serving as Trustee and Supervising Entity for the Catalytic Fund and the Education Program Development Fund. By mid-2010, 36 International Development Association recipient countries had received a total of $1.85 billion in Catalytic Fund grants to support primary education.

The World Bank’s corporate education strategy also evolved over the decade, from one focusing on basic education to one focusing on the two objectives of universal primary completion and post-primary “education for the knowledge economy.” The new strategy, covering the next 10 years, focuses on Learning for All as the basis for promoting development.

**Scope of the Review**

The aim of this desk review is to inform the new strategy and to serve as an input into IEG’s planned evaluation of post-primary education in 2012. Specifically, for the period covering the last decade the review asks, “What have the World Bank’s education projects sought to achieve, what have they actually achieved, and what has contributed to success?” It covers the 10-year period from fiscal 2001 to 2010.

The evidence presented draws on analysis of the Bank’s main internal database that tracks the lending portfolio; a desk review of the design documents and completion reports for all projects managed by the Education Sector that were approved from fiscal year 2001–09 and projects managed by other sectors that have large education components; and findings from past IEG evaluations.

**Findings of Previous IEG Education Evaluations**

Previous IEG evaluations of the Bank’s support to education pointed to widespread and successful expansion of primary school enrollment and a shift in project activities from infrastructure to support of policy and management reforms. But themes such as learning outcomes, the linkage of secondary and tertiary education to the labor market and economic growth, and private sector involvement were found to be less common, and monitoring and evaluation were found to be weak. IEG’s evaluation of World Bank support to primary education—*From Increased Access to Learning Outcomes: An Unfinished Agenda* (IEG 2006a)—recommended that efforts focus on improving learning outcomes, particularly of the poor and other disadvantaged children, and on improving the performance of sector management in support of learning outcomes.

**Evolving Objectives and Funding in Education Sector Projects**

From fiscal 2001 to 2010, the World Bank sharply increased its commitments to education in projects managed by the Education Sector, accounting for $15.8 billion in 223 projects. Over the first seven years of the decade, the sector approved about 24 new operations each year—the same average as the previous decade—while building new commitments up from
historically low levels. Each year, on average, about $1.2 billion in new resources was committed to education in new Education Sector projects.

However, in fiscal 2009–10, education commitments rose dramatically during the economic crisis through a combination of additional financing of ongoing projects and approval of large projects in Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, and Pakistan. As a result, in fiscal 2010, new commitments managed by the Education Sector rose to an unprecedented $3.7 billion, while the number of new projects dropped to below the trend (17). Although the share of development policy operations has increased over time, investment lending and grants remain dominant.

The Latin America and the Caribbean Region and the Africa Region each accounted for about a quarter of all new Education Sector projects over the decade, and the South Asia Region accounted for a third of new education commitments. The top five countries receiving Education Sector support were India, Mexico, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Bangladesh; together they accounted for more than a third of all children of school age in low- and middle-income countries.

Commitments increased for most education subsectors, with the largest amount for primary education. However, the share of projects addressing tertiary and technical/vocational education has increased sharply; the share for primary education has declined somewhat and the share addressing secondary education has risen slightly. The lending portfolio has become more complex, with the share of projects covering three or more subsectors rising from 14 to 34 percent.

Education Sector projects most often aimed to improve the quality of education inputs, increase access to schooling, and improve the equity and efficiency of education. One in five Education Sector projects had an explicit objective to improve learning outcomes. There was no clear increase in learning outcome objectives, although projects have increasingly financed development or implementation of learning assessments over the decade. An equal share of Education Sector projects had an objective related to the labor market—generating employment, creating human capital, or increasing the market relevance of education. These objectives were more common in post-primary than in primary education projects.

Low-income countries gave priority to increasing enrollments and gender equity objectives, whereas those in middle-income countries gave priority to learning outcomes and labor market/employment objectives.

Almost all projects included activities to build management capacity at some level, and 80 percent or more had activities related to teachers (teacher training or reform of teacher management), curriculum, methods, textbooks, and budget/finance. Three-quarters included activities related to sector governance or decentralization, supply or infrastructure, or assessments. Over the decade, there were important increases in the share of projects financing assessments, monitoring and evaluation capacity, and school-level governance.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Performance and Results of the Education Sector Lending Portfolio

Three-quarters of Education Sector projects that closed since fiscal 2001 had satisfactory outcomes. At closing, projects are rated both by managing Regions and by IEG on their outcome, defined as the extent to which they achieved their relevant objectives efficiently. Historically, projects managed by the Education Sector have had better results than projects in other sectors.

However, over the decade there has been a substantial decline in the performance of exiting Education Sector projects, both absolutely and in relation to projects in other sectors. Performance ratings in the satisfactory range have dropped from 82 to 69 percent. This decline does not seem to be strongly related to any relative change in the composition of exiting projects in the Education Sector relative to other sectors. However, a small relative increase in the share of International Development Association (IDA) projects and a large number of poor-performing Learning and Innovation Loans that exited in the past five years may have contributed to the slide.

Projects in middle-income countries and development policy operations tend to have better performance, as do those in Latin America and the Caribbean, South Asia, and East Asia and Pacific. Projects focusing on primary education and those with access and equity objectives have performed better than those focusing on post-primary education—particularly among low-income countries—and on learning and employment outcomes.

Addressing important issues in project preparation and supervision could contribute to a reversal of the downward trend in performance. However, the ongoing changes in the composition of the portfolio are likely to pose challenges. Objectives to improve learning outcomes and employment or other labor market outcomes have been more difficult to achieve than have objectives to increase access to education. Expansion of post-primary education will not be as easy to implement quickly, compared with expansion of primary education, and it promises to increase the complexity of investments, particularly in low-income countries.

A closer look at projects aiming to increase learning and employment outcomes shows that improving the quality of education inputs does not necessarily improve learning outcomes; the evidence that investments in vocational and higher training have contributed to meeting labor market demands is thin.

The increasing focus on outcomes and impacts in these two areas underscores the importance of a solid conceptual framework that focuses not just on inputs and outputs but on outcomes and other factors likely to affect them. For example, investments in measuring learning outcomes have increased. However, the factors actually affecting these outcomes in a given context and their distribution are still poorly understood; there are indications that projects and governments are not collecting sufficient information to understand what is and is not working. Although there appears to be greater interest in impact assessments and some improvement in evaluation design over the decade, the quality of monitoring and evaluation remains unacceptably low, with only a quarter of projects receiving monitoring and evaluation quality ratings of substantial or high.
Objectives and Performance of Education Components Managed by Other Sectors

About a third of new World Bank education commitments from fiscal 2001–10—$7.5 billion in 378 projects—was managed by sectors other than education. Sixteen percent of projects managed by other sectors had education commitments, and for about half that number (7 percent) the share of education commitments was substantial -- at least 20 percent of total commitments.

Certain types of operations were more likely to have education commitments. Nearly 80 percent of operations managed by the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Sector included some education commitments, but in no case did they exceed 30 percent of total commitments. The Social Protection Sector was the most prominent in managing operations with substantial education commitments. Development policy operations managed by other sectors were more likely than were investment projects to have education commitments, but projects with the highest education commitments were more likely to be investment projects.

The most common project types among projects with substantial education commitments were poverty reduction projects, social sector service delivery or reform projects, social fund/community-driven development projects, safety net/employment projects, and emergency/disaster projects.

Poverty Reduction Support Operations (PRSOs)—multisectoral development policy credits or grants, usually in a series and managed by the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Sector—were common among projects with education components comprising at least 20 but not more than 30 percent of total commitments. About two-thirds of the PRSOs were implemented in parallel with education sector operations and the remaining third was the only education sector lending at the time.

Nearly 60 percent of projects in other sectors with substantial education commitments had an education objective, whereas for most of the rest of the projects education was an input into achievement of some other objective. However, one in five of these projects did not mention education in the results framework at all—not as an objective, output, or outcome. All of the latter were social fund/community-driven development projects.

World Bank Education Sector staff participated in the preparation or supervision of about half of the operations with substantial education commitments, more so in projects with education objectives, greater education commitment levels, and reform content, and for social sector projects. However, there is no information on the total input of Education Sector staff and consultant education specialists for the education components of projects managed by other sectors.

Assessing the efficacy of projects managed by other sectors in achieving education objectives is difficult because they tend to be multisectoral and the extent of reporting and detail are not as great as the projects managed by the Education Sector. The objectives of projects with education components comprising at least 30 percent of commitments were generally similar to those of Education Sector projects, except that fewer had equity or quality objectives and none had an explicit learning outcome objective. Improved access
was the most common objective, and seven of the nine closed projects with an access objective were judged to have achieved it.

The most common education objectives addressed by PRSOs were to improve access, quality, and efficiency of education. It is difficult to assess achievement of the education objectives of the PRSOs because the education results chain and monitoring were weak and they were so often implemented in parallel with other operations. IEG’s evaluation of PRSOs concluded that they play a strong “supporting role” to sector investment lending but are more limited as a sole instrument for sector lending. It recommended that PRSO sector content focus on cross-sectoral or central ministry issues critical to facilitating key sector reforms and strengthening sector budget processes.

Conclusions

Learning for All

The Education Sector’s goal of Learning for All is highly relevant. The new strategy cites dramatic examples of the large share of primary graduates in low-income countries who still have difficulty with reading and basic calculations. The Bank’s focus on the learning agenda will complement and improve the relevance of other international education initiatives that have focused mostly on primary school completion and gender equity. About one in five projects in the Education Sector lending portfolio already explicitly aims to improve learning outcomes. This has not changed much over the decade, although an increasing share of projects finance achievement tests and learning assessments.

Achieving Learning for All will involve substantial challenges. Only about a third of the recently closed projects with learning outcome objectives substantially achieved them. Even where there have been improvements, average learning outcomes are still relatively low. However, the results suggest that building projects that have conceptually stronger results frameworks, based on a clearer understanding of the binding constraints to better learning and that track intermediate as well as final outcomes, are important.

The variability in results suggests that understanding “what works” in improving learning is context-specific, highlighting the need for more experimentation and better monitoring and evaluation. Although major impact evaluation initiatives have been launched across the Bank, including many on education, the monitoring and evaluation record for projects and learning from within projects remain quite weak. The share of projects that aimed to test pilot interventions dropped by half.

Learning for All implicitly includes the poor, but it does not ensure that the poor will be targeted or will be the first to benefit. Although the poorest children are least likely to be enrolled and have lower learning outcomes, few education projects explicitly targeted learning among the poor and even fewer track those outcomes. The review highlights several cases where learning outcomes among the poor have been tracked and learning improved, but these are the exception. Targeting the poorest and most disadvantaged children will be critical in raising overall learning outcomes. Tracking outcomes among the poor is important for understanding whether learning is actually improving in that group, and for interpreting trends in average learning outcomes when enrollments are rapidly expanding, bringing in more children from disadvantaged backgrounds.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Labor Force Relevance of Post-Primary Education
Given the large increase in support for post-primary education in the past decade, it is somewhat surprising that the share of education projects with objectives related to the labor force relevance of education has not increased. The share of Education Sector projects financing tertiary education rose from 18 to 40 percent and for vocational education from 18 to 33 percent over the past decade, yet the share of education projects with objectives related to labor market relevance or employment has hardly budged. This disconnect suggests a lack of attention to the links between post-primary education and the labor market and the risk of low relevance of Bank support.

Labor market-related objectives of education projects have also been difficult to achieve, and attribution of labor market outcomes to education support has been problematic. In fact, the results frameworks linking post-primary education to labor force outcomes have been particularly weak. Only five of the nine recently completed projects with labor market objectives had identified any related outcome indicator. When data were provided, they tended to be from two points in time, and labor market variables clearly can fluctuate a great deal. Simple indicators like the employment rate do not reveal anything about the type of occupation, the sector of employment, earnings, opportunities, or the duration and stability of the employment of graduates.

All the projects that reported labor market outcomes found positive results, but for the most part they were unable to convincingly attribute results to the education support. Weaknesses in the conceptual framework may reveal a lack of prior analysis or understanding of the links between the education system and the labor market, something that warrants further investigation.

Labor market-related education objectives are also relatively prominent in education projects managed by other sectors, particularly those managed by the Social Protection Sector. This review found that Education Staff do participate in preparation and supervision of a substantial share of projects managed by other sectors when there are explicit education objectives. The review was not able to look into the extent to which projects managed by the Education Sector are benefitting from cross support and other expertise from other sectors when it comes to improving the market relevance of post-primary education.

Reversing Slippage in Sector Performance
The Education Sector will face additional challenges in turning around the recent decline in project performance. The share of Education Sector projects with satisfactory performance declined in the past decade, from 82 to 69 percent. The cause of the decline is not easy to pinpoint; increasing the number of projects with multiple subsectors, expanding support to post-primary education in low-income countries, and the learning outcome agenda will increase the complexity of the portfolio and provide additional challenges.

This review points to key factors in project design and preparation that continue to play a role in the performance of recently closed operations and suggest avenues for improvement: realism with respect to the time frame for results and the level of political commitment; the degree of complexity of project design in relation to the borrower’s capacity; the adequacy of ex ante risk assessment and mitigation plans; and a well-thought-
through results framework with clear objectives and indicators linking outputs to outcomes and impacts—in both the short and long term.

**Knowledge Database**
Finally, although the knowledge database anticipated by the new Education Strategy will benefit from many recently launched impact evaluations, the potential contribution of stronger monitoring and evaluation of government programs supported by the Bank should not be overlooked. Much could be learned— and with greater relevance to the local context—by ensuring better project monitoring and evaluation. Understanding the factors contributing to the variation in results for learning and labor force outcomes will be key to improving performance.
Chapter 1
Introduction

Education—the acquisition of knowledge and skills—plays a fundamental role in poverty alleviation and economic and social growth (Hanushek and Woessmann 2008). It expands the range of opportunities available to individuals and equips them with the tools to make better-informed choices. It increases an individual’s earning potential, opens avenues for social mobility, improves personal and family health and nutrition, and enables women to control their fertility (Schultz 1993). At a societal level, education raises labor productivity, drives innovation, and contributes to the smooth functioning of democratic institutions (Bloom, Hartley, and Rosovsky 2006).

Education indicators in developing countries have improved substantially over the two decades leading up to the most recent economic crisis, particularly among primary age children in low-income countries. Overall, the share of children completing primary education rose from 78 percent in 1991 to 85 percent in 2007,1 and gender parity in primary and secondary education enrollment rose from 83 to 95 percent (World Bank 2010a).2 Most of this improvement was due to increased enrollment of children in low-income countries (figure 1.1a). Between 2002 and 2007, the number of children out of school at the primary level fell from an estimated 115 million to 72 million, despite a growing population of young people (World Bank 2010a). The economic crisis of the past two years has slowed progress, though the full impact has yet to be felt (World Bank 2010a).

Increased primary enrollments have generated additional demand for secondary and tertiary education, which have grown at somewhat slower rates. Growth in the secondary enrollment ratio was modest and confined primarily to lower-middle-income and low-income countries, whereas at the tertiary levels increases were primarily among upper-middle-income countries (figures 1.1b and 1.1c). There have been substantial improvements in gender parity in both secondary and tertiary education in lower-middle-income countries, with girls’ enrollment rates reaching 93–94 percent of boys’ rates, but in low-income countries there has been little progress in gender parity in either secondary or tertiary education (with ratios of 84 percent and 64 percent, respectively).3

Main Messages

- Since 2001, the World Bank has committed about $23 billion for education, two-thirds of it managed by Education Sector staff and one third by staff from other sectors.
- The Education Sector is developing a new strategy for 2010–20.
- This note contributes to the evidence base for the strategy and informs IEG’s forthcoming post-primary education evaluation planned for 2012.
Figure 1.1 Trends in Gross Enrollment Ratios by Country Income

*Source:* World Development Indicators.
World Bank Support for Education

From 2001 through mid-2010, the World Bank committed about $23 billion to finance education programs in developing countries. About two-thirds of that amount ($15.8 billion) was managed by Education Sector staff; the remaining third ($7.5 billion) financed education inputs and programs managed by other sectors. Three-quarters of the total was in the form of investment lending and the balance in the form of development policy operations (DPOs). Nearly half (48 percent) was in the form of concessional lending or grants from the International Development Association (IDA).

Over the past decade, annual World Bank education commitments have more than doubled. Following the increase in lending during the financial crisis in the late 1990s, new education commitments dropped to a historical low by 2000 (figure 1.2). Since then and leading up to the most recent financial crisis, new commitments to education doubled, from about $1 billion annually at the beginning of the decade to $2 billion annually by 2007–08. In the past two fiscal years (2009–10), new education commitments surged during the financial crisis—to $3.8 billion in fiscal 2009 and $5 billion in fiscal 2010. These unprecedented increases in education spending were partly achieved by expanding commitments to ongoing operations: of

![Figure 1.2 New World Bank Commitments to Education, 1990–2010 ($ millions)](image-url)

Source: World Bank data.
Note: Financial commitments for the part of projects that represents education are attributed to the year of approval. Additional financing is attributed to the year that the additional financing was approved. Figures are in nominal US dollars.
the $8.9 billion in new commitments to education in fiscal 2009–10, $1.6 billion was in the form of additional or supplemental financing of ongoing projects, with most of it (88 percent) added to ongoing projects managed by the Education Sector.

**Important new international education initiatives have also been launched.** A decade after the 1990 Jomtien World Declaration on Education for All, the 2000 Dakar World Education Forum proposed a Framework for Action to achieve Education for All goals and targets by 2015 and the international community committed to achieving the Millennium Development Goals by 2015—among them a commitment to universal completion of primary education and gender parity in enrollments. In 2002, the World Bank and other development partners launched the Education for All Fast Track Initiative (FTI) to help low-income countries meet the education Millennium Development Goals and the Education for All goal of universal primary education by 2015 (box 1.1).

The World Bank’s corporate education strategy has evolved from one focusing on basic education to one that has a dual focus—one on universal primary completion and post-primary “education for a knowledge economy.” The 1999 World Bank *Education Sector Strategy* was published just before the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals. It focused on four global priority areas to be addressed, as appropriate, according to country conditions: support for basic education; early interventions; innovative delivery mechanisms; and selected areas of system reform. The strategy also proposed certain operating principles for staff: focus on the client; analyze comprehensively but act selectively; use knowledge well; concentrate on development impact; and work with others in productive partnerships.

In November 2005, the Bank issued an *Education Sector Strategy Update*, with the objective of helping client countries “maximize the impact of education on economic growth and poverty reduction” (World Bank 2005). The two pillars of the updated strategy were Education for All and Education for the Knowledge Economy; these pillars increased the attention given to post-basic education. Its primary cross-cutting themes were (i) integrating education into a countrywide perspective; (ii) broadening the strategic agenda through a system-wide approach; and (iii) focusing on results.

The World Bank Education Sector has updated its strategy for the next 10 years, through 2020. The strategy, “Learning for All: Investing in People’s Knowledge and Skills to Promote Development” (World Bank 2011), notes that despite increases in enrollments and primary completion, large numbers of children nevertheless have low learning outcomes. It focuses on acquisition of knowledge and skills as the
outcome relevant to development results and highlights not only the contribution of school-based programs but determinants outside of school (such as health and nutrition), second-chance and remedial programs, and greater participation by the private sector. The three main strategies that the sector plans to pursue to achieve this goal are support of reforms to strengthen education systems’ capacity to achieve learning goals, building a high-quality knowledge base, and increasing the effectiveness of government resources and aid for education.6

Box 1.1 The Education for All Fast Track Initiative

The Education for All Fast Track Initiative (FTI) is a global partnership between more than 30 bilateral donors, international agencies, and development banks to support achievement of universal completion of primary school by boys and girls. Through the FTI compact, low-income countries commit to design and implement sound education plans, and donor partners commit to align and harmonize additional support around these plans. Participating countries benefit from increased and better coordinated aid from existing and potential new donors.

Funding is channeled through existing bilateral and multilateral channels and also through two FTI Funds: the Catalytic Fund and the Education Program Development Fund.

- The **Catalytic Fund** provides transitional financial assistance to IDA countries that have completed a Poverty Reduction Strategy and whose education sector plans have been endorsed by donors through the FTI review process, but that have difficulty mobilizing additional external funding at the country level because of a relatively limited donor presence. The Catalytic Fund provides three-year grants to support the scaling up of national education strategies. By June 2010, the Catalytic Fund had allocated a total of $1.85 billion to 36 countries; $790 million of that amount had been disbursed.

- The **Education Program Development Fund** supports technical assistance in the design of national strategies and capacity building for countries to design a sound plan that can be supported by FTI. Between November 2004—when the fund was launched—and the end of 2009, the fund had allocated $95 million for country-specific and regional programs in 60 countries.

Since the inception of the FTI, the World Bank has hosted the FTI Secretariat, serving as Trustee and Supervising Entity for the Catalytic Fund and the Education Program Development Fund.

Findings of Previous IEG Evaluations of Bank Support for Education

Since 2000, the Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) has completed a major evaluation of World Bank support for primary education (IEG 2006a), building on a number of portfolio reviews and field-based case studies, reviews of the education lending portfolios in secondary (2004) and tertiary (2002) education, impact evaluations of Bank support for basic education in Ghana (IEG 2004b) and of a girls’ secondary school stipend program supported by the Bank in Pakistan (IEG 2010a), and numerous field-based project performance assessments of education projects. Among the findings from these evaluations:

- There has been widespread success in expanding primary enrollments, including among girls, but there is less evidence of improved learning outcomes, either on average or among the poorest and least advantaged (IEG 2006a).
- There has been a shift over time from supporting hardware (buildings, textbooks, equipment) to supporting software (training, management, assessments), but attempts to improve sector efficiency, financing, planning, and management were far less successful than attempts to improve access or education quality (IEG 2006a).
- Evidence that investments in secondary and tertiary education have contributed to improved productivity and labor market outcomes, economic growth, or poverty reduction is thin (Berk 2002; Perkins 2004).
- Objectives to enhance private sector involvement in secondary and tertiary education did not feature prominently in the portfolio (Berk 2002; Perkins 2004).
- Results appear to have varied substantially according to country economic and institutional conditions and also with respect to their scope within the sector (sectorwide, as opposed to subsectors such as primary, secondary, tertiary, adult literacy, and early childhood development).

Beyond these findings, IEG evaluations have pointed frequently to the inadequacy of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of education support.

Objectives, Scope, and Methods of the Portfolio Note

The objective of this portfolio note is to inform the new Education Sector Strategy and the 2012 IEG evaluation of post-primary education on: (i) the characteristics and performance of the portfolio of projects supporting education and approved from fiscal 2001 to
fiscal 2009; and (ii) the progress on key issues identified in World Bank strategic documents and in earlier IEG evaluations.

QUESTIONS

Specifically, this note addresses the following questions:

- **What have World Bank-supported education projects sought to achieve?** What are their main objectives? How do these vary by region, country conditions, or lending instrument? What changes have occurred since the early 2000s? Is there evidence of stronger focus on learning outcomes and distributional impacts?

- **What have the projects achieved and what factors have contributed to success?** What has happened to overall project outcomes? Which objectives have been achieved and in what contexts? Following on previous evaluations by IEG, what have been the results for projects that aimed to improve learning and labor market outcomes?

- **What has been the contribution of education components of projects managed by sectors other than the Education Sector?**

SCOPE AND METHODS

The evidence base comprises (i) information from the World Bank’s internal data management system for projects approved from fiscal years 2001 to 2010 and (ii) a detailed desk review of projects approved from fiscal years 2001 to 2009 that were managed by the Education Sector and of projects with education components managed by other sector units of the Bank. The review also draws on findings from recent IEG evaluations of education projects and thematic evaluations of lending in other sectors with high education content (for example, the evaluation of Poverty Reduction Support Credits).

**Education Sector projects.** The detailed desk review of the lending portfolio includes all 206 projects managed by the Education Sector that were approved during fiscal 2001–09, comprising 189 investment projects and 17 DPOs and totaling $12.1 billion in education commitments. Of these, 65 projects had closed and been rated by IEG as of November 2010.

Datasets were established for these projects, incorporating Bank data and key variables drawn from a systematic review of project design documents (Project Appraisal Documents [PADs] and Program Documents) and Implementation Completion and Results Reports (ICRs), to identify project objectives, design elements, and achievements. Key emerging themes were investigated in greater depth, drawing also on IEG’s field-based Project Performance
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Assessment Reports, to shed more light on the factors contributing to success of specific objectives in different country conditions.

Projects managed by other sectors. In addition to the lending managed by the Education Sector, 345 projects were approved from fiscal 2001–09 that were managed by sectors other than education and included some commitments to education. A desk review was conducted of the subset of these projects for which at least 20 percent of commitments were coded with education content, to identify (i) the extent to which they have explicit education objectives and what they sought to achieve; and (ii) their reported performance in achieving education objectives.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

The next chapter describes the portfolio of approved projects managed by the Education Sector—the financial commitments and what the projects have sought to achieve—in terms of levels, distribution, and trends. Chapter 3 reviews the performance of Education Sector projects that have closed—their project performance ratings, the extent to which specific objectives have been achieved, and the achievements of projects that address learning and labor market outcomes; these issues are of particular relevance to the new Education Sector Strategy and the forthcoming IEG post-primary education evaluation. Chapter 4 reviews the objectives, characteristics, and performance of education lending managed by other sectors. The final chapter summarizes the issues raised by the review and areas for further development in IEG’s planned assessment of post-primary education.
Chapter 2
Evolution and Objectives of the Portfolio Managed by the Education Sector

Since 2001, the World Bank has committed $15.8 billion in new credits, loans, and grants for education through 223 projects managed by the Education Sector. This chapter reviews the trends, composition, objectives, and activities of that portfolio. Evidence is drawn from the Bank’s internal portfolio tracking system for projects approved from fiscal 2001-10 and an in-depth desk review of the 206 projects managed by the Education Sector that were approved during the fiscal 2001–09 period.

Trends in the Level and Composition of the Education Sector Portfolio

Over the first seven years of the decade, the Education Sector maintained the average number of new operations per year from the previous decade while building new commitments up from historically low levels following the financial crisis at the end of the 1990s. From fiscal 2001 through 2007, the average number of new projects managed by the sector was the same as in the previous decade—about 24 projects per year (figure 2.1). However, this was a portfolio of smaller projects: annual new commitments climbed steadily from a historic low of only $530 million in fiscal 2000 to $1.5 billion in fiscal 2007. As a result, even though the number of projects was stable, during the first seven years of the decade, average annual education commitments ($1.2 billion) were lower than during the 1990s ($1.4 billion annually).

During the most recent financial crisis, education commitments rose dramatically through a combination of additional financing and approval of large projects in Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico, and Pakistan. New education commitments managed by the Education Sector jumped to $2.3 billion in fiscal 2009 and an unprecedented $3.7 billion in fiscal 2010, whereas the annual number of new projects dropped far below the trend to only 17. The increase in education commitments in fiscal 2009 can be explained by three large investment projects in Indonesia and Pakistan, totaling $1.25 billion.1

Main Messages

- From 2001 through 2010, the World Bank committed $15.8 billion in new lending in 223 projects managed by the Education Sector.
- Commitments for most education subsectors increased dramatically over the decade; the largest share of commitments remains for primary education.
- The share of projects addressing tertiary and technical or vocational education increased sharply, whereas the share for secondary education has been constant and the share for primary education has declined.
- The most common objectives of Education Sector projects were to raise the quality of education, increase access to schooling, and improve equity and efficiency.
- One in five projects had an objective to improve learning outcomes or a labor force objective; an increasing share of projects is financing learning assessments.
Additional financing of ongoing projects that year amounted to only $27 million for three projects.

**Figure 2.1 Evolution of New Education Commitments and Projects Managed by the Education Sector**

![Graph showing evolution of commitments and projects](image)

Source: World Bank data.

The enormous increase in commitments in fiscal 2010 was funded primarily through additional resources to ongoing projects. Of the $3.7 billion in fiscal 2010 education commitments, $1.375 billion was in the form of additional financing of 10 ongoing projects. The main recipients were education projects in India ($750 million) and Indonesia ($500 million). This was augmented by a large DPO offering $700 million in budget support to Mexico (Upper Secondary Education Development Policy Loan). This strategy is in contrast to the response to the crisis in the late 1990s: the increase in commitments in fiscal 1998 to nearly $2.5 billion can be largely accounted for by an increase in the number of projects (figure 2.1).

Investment operations were the dominant lending instrument over the decade, accounting for 91 percent of the Education Sector’s operations since fiscal 2001, but the share of lending financed by DPOs increased, from 4 percent of projects approved for fiscal 2001–05 to 15 percent for fiscal 2006–10. The other notable development in lending instruments was the disappearance of Learning and Innovation Loans (LILs) from the portfolio. This instrument—a type
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of investment operation—was designed to test new approaches in small ($5 million or less) projects before taking them to scale. LILs accounted for 6 percent of all Education Sector projects approved since fiscal 2001; 13 were approved in fiscal 2001–04 and none thereafter.

**Distribution by Region**

The Latin America and the Caribbean Region and the Africa Region each accounted for about a quarter of all new projects over the decade, and the South Asia Region accounted for a third of new education commitments (table 2.1). The South Asia Region accounted for only 18 percent of projects but 33 percent of education commitments. It was also the Region most likely to use development policy lending (24 percent of projects), as opposed to investment lending.

The Middle East and North Africa Region had the smallest share of projects (only 1 in 10 education projects) and commitments (5 percent of all commitments). The average size of projects was smaller in the Eastern Europe and Central Asia, Africa, and the Middle East and North Africa Regions than in other Regions.

**Table 2.1 Distribution of Education Projects and Commitments by Region, Fiscal 2001–10 Approvals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of projects</th>
<th>AFR</th>
<th>EAP</th>
<th>ECA</th>
<th>LCR</th>
<th>MNA</th>
<th>SAR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution (percent)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal 2001–05 (percent; total projects = 115)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal 2006–10 (percent; total projects = 108)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of projects that are DPOs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of commitments</th>
<th>Commitments ($ millions)</th>
<th>AFR</th>
<th>EAP</th>
<th>ECA</th>
<th>LCR</th>
<th>MNA</th>
<th>SAR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distribution (percent)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal 2001–05 (percent, total commitments = $5.56 billion)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal 2006–10 (percent, total commitments = $10.24 billion)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank data.

Note: The number and distribution of projects is based on the number of new projects; additional financing is considered for the purposes of this table as a continuation of previously approved projects. Commitments include both commitments for new lending and for additional financing. The amounts are attributed to the year in which the commitments were made. **Regions**: AFR = Africa; EAP = East Asia and Pacific; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; LCR = Latin America and the Caribbean; MNA = Middle East and North Africa; SAR = South Asia.
Over the course of the decade, absolute levels of education commitments roughly tripled in the East Asia and Pacific and South Asia Regions. Education commitments Bank-wide increased, as did commitments in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean Regions, despite their declining share of the total. However, new education commitments to the Europe and Central Asia and Middle East and North Africa Regions dropped in absolute terms: in the former, the number of projects dropped by nearly half and the commitments by two-thirds; in the latter, the number of projects was similar but project size declined modestly, with total commitments declining by a quarter.

The top five countries receiving Education Sector support were India, Mexico, Indonesia, Pakistan, and Bangladesh (figure 2.2). These five countries, all populous, together account for $7.8 billion, or roughly half (49 percent) of all of the education commitments managed by the Education Sector since fiscal 2001 and more than a third (36 percent) of the school-aged population in low and middle-income countries. The level of commitments for a given country reflects a number of factors: the country’s size; its income; the priority attached to education relative to other needs by the government; and other sources of finance, domestic and international. For example, although India received the most support over the decade, it ranked 71st in terms of Education Sector support per school-aged child; Pakistan was 35th and Bangladesh 44th. Eritrea—a low-income country with fewer children of school age and great need but few donors other than the World Bank—received far less than the countries in figure 2.2 ($64 million) but ranked 18th in support per school-aged child.

Support for Education Subsectors

The largest share of education commitments managed by the Education Sector since fiscal 2001 was for primary education ($6.1 billion), followed by secondary ($3.7 billion) and tertiary ($2.99 billion) education (figure 2.3). The other major subsectors (vocational and technical education, early childhood education, and adult literacy and skills projects) received less than $800 million each.
Figure 2.2 Top 10 Recipients of World Bank Education Sector Support, Fiscal 2001–10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Education commitments (US$ millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank data.
Note: These 10 countries account for about 46 percent of the school-aged population of low- and middle-income countries; the top 5 countries count for 36 percent. See footnote 5.

However, these and other figures based on subsector coding of commitments in the Bank’s database should be interpreted with caution. The coding of commitments by subsector and the use of these codes has changed over time and may not be consistently applied. A total of $1 billion was identified as for the “general education” subsector, which is not well defined and may in fact represent spending on other subsectors or combinations of them.\(^6\) The code for “education administration,” to which $442 million in commitments is attributed from fiscal 2009–10, was introduced in fiscal 2009; prior to that year a share of education projects was coded as general public administration and not included in education commitments.\(^7\)

The subsector coding is done by the World Bank’s project task team leaders at project appraisal and this coding is reviewed centrally for consistency and corrected by the Operations Policy and Country Services (OPCS) group, which may have different views.\(^8\) The coding is not updated at project closing to reflect actual allocations. Despite the two levels of coding review, there are projects managed by the Education Sector with education objectives for which none of the commitments are counted against education.\(^9\) Beyond these issues, it is important to note that any assignment of subsector codes to DPOs, which finance general budget support, are purely notional and often based on the share of prior conditions that are for education; they do not represent any earmarked transfer of resources to the education sector.
sector or any particular subsector. DPOs account for 14 percent of education commitments managed by the Education Sector.

**Figure 2.3 Distribution of Education Commitments by Subsector, Fiscal 2001–10**

![Distribution of Education Commitments by Subsector, Fiscal 2001–10](image)

Source: World Bank data.

**In light of the large increase in commitments to education over the decade, it is not surprising that the commitments to most subsectors increased.** Commitments for five of the seven subsectors increased since fiscal 2001: primary, secondary, tertiary, vocational and technical, and the less-specific “general education” category (figure 2.4). Commitments for primary and tertiary education actually dropped in the first half of the decade and recovered to levels of the 1990s, whereas secondary education commitments—always lower than primary and tertiary—moved upward to historic levels, surpassing spending on tertiary education. Commitments for “general education” and technical and vocational training roughly doubled over the decade, but there appears to have been no increase in commitments for early childhood education or adult literacy, despite the large increase in overall education commitments.
According to the Bank’s internal database, the share of secondary education commitments rose and the share of primary education commitments fell (though the share of primary was still larger). The trend shows that primary education maintained its historically large share (43 percent) of total education commitments until the last five years of the period, dropping during that period to 36 percent (table 2.2). Tertiary education was steady at about 19 percent of commitments, down from a one-third share in the late 1990s.

In contrast, the share of commitments to secondary education rose steadily over the past 20 years, including the recent decade, and now comprises a quarter of education commitments. The share of commitments for vocational training remained at less than half the share in the early 1990s, and commitments for adult/nonformal and early childhood education remain very small shares of the portfolio. However, the growing use of the “general education” code and the recently introduced “education administration” code confound the interpretation of the results by share.
Table 2.2 Distribution of Education Commitments Managed by the Education Sector by Subsector and Fiscal Year of Approval (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult/nonformal</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary/higher education</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education administration</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: World Bank data.

Note: Financial commitments are attributed to the year of approval. Additional financing for projects that were already approved is attributed to the year that the additional financing was approved. The sum of the shares may exceed 100 because of rounding.

The detailed desk review of the 206 projects approved for fiscal 2001–09 conducted for this note tells a different story about the changing subsector emphasis of the Bank’s education lending. As part of IEG’s review, all the approved projects were coded according to which of the main subsectors—early child education, primary, secondary, tertiary, vocational, or adult/nonformal—were financed or (in the case of DPOs) influenced, based on the objectives and components elaborated in the PAD. This gives a more consistent view of changes in sector composition of the portfolio over time. However, IEG did not attempt to estimate the resources committed to each subsector in each project.

The share of projects addressing higher, technical and vocational, adult literacy/nonformal, and early childhood education rose substantially over the decade (table 2.3).11 The share of projects addressing higher education more than doubled (from 18 to 40 percent), as did the share addressing early childhood education (from 9 to 20 percent). The share of projects with technical/vocational and adult/nonformal education nearly doubled. However, the share of projects addressing secondary education remained constant, at slightly less than half. The share of projects concerned with primary education dropped from two-thirds to 58 percent, but this is still the most common subsector. It seems that the level of commitments to primary education in FTI countries has not declined, and that IDA commitments overall to FTI countries have also increased (box 2.1).
Table 2.3 Share of Projects Covering Each Education Subsector, Fiscal 2001–05 and 2006–09 (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsector</th>
<th>Fiscal 2001–05 (n = 115)</th>
<th>Fiscal 2006–09 (n = 91)</th>
<th>Total, 2001–09 (n = 206)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary/basic</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and vocational</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonformal/adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG portfolio review.

Note: The categories are not mutually exclusive, as more than one subsector may present itself in a single project. In addition, 7 percent of the projects overall had commitment codes for other sectors.

The portfolio has become more complex, with more subsectors in each project. Although the share of projects with a single subsector and even two subsectors has declined, the share with three or more subsectors has more than doubled to a third of all projects (figure 2.5). Further, the share of multisectoral projects managed by the Education Sector, incorporating components from sectors such as health, social protection, or private sector development, grew from 5 to 10 percent of the Education Sector portfolio. This would also be expected to increase complexity.

Figure 2.5 Trend in the Distribution of Projects by the Number of Subsectors (percent)

Source: IEG portfolio review.
Box 2.1 Has the World Bank Reduced Its Lending for Primary Education in FTI Countries?

Since 2003, commitments to education from the Catalytic Fund of the FTI to 36 participating low-income countries ($1.85 billion) have surpassed IDA primary education commitments to those same countries ($890 million). Examining the trends in aggregate IDA commitments to all 36 countries before and after the launching of FTI suggests year-to-year variability, but that levels of IDA support for primary education are on a par with levels from before the FTI, which first disbursed funds in 2004 (see the dark bars in the figure below). Although IDA support for primary education in the aggregate seems to have been relatively constant, overall IDA education commitments to FTI countries have risen (the line in the figure), indicating that IDA financing for other education subsectors in FTI countries has increased.

New Annual Education Commitments by IDA and the FTI Catalytic Fund in 36 Countries Supported by the Catalytic Fund, Fiscal 2003–10

Source: World Bank data for IDA commitments; FTI Secretariat for FTI commitments.

a. IDA commitments include those managed by the Education Sector and by other sectors. As of the end of 2009, $838 million, or 56 percent of total FTI funds committed until that date, had been disbursed.

b. This does not preclude the possibility of substitution of IDA primary education funding for FTI funding in individual countries.
Project Objectives and Activities

Projects managed by the Education Sector had many and diverse objectives. There is no internal World Bank database that tracks the objectives of the Bank’s lending portfolio, for any sector. For the purpose of this review, IEG coded the statement of objectives and planned activities or actions for each of the 206 projects approved from fiscal 2001 to 2009 and managed by the Education Sector, as described in design documents (appendix A). Table 2.4 presents trends in the prevalence of specific objectives and broad groupings of objectives over time. The results point to variations in country conditions as well as some shifts in objectives and activities over the period.

OBJECTIVES

The most common project objectives were to improve the quality of education (63 percent of projects) and to increase access or enrollments (47 percent, table 2.4). About a third of the projects each had objectives to improve the equity or efficiency of education services or outcomes or to strengthen management, governance, or finance and sustainability. Equity objectives included nonspecific statements to improve the equity of education (28 percent), as well as specific objectives to improve the education of disadvantaged groups (9 percent)—such as scheduled tribes or castes, disabled children, or those with special needs—or of girls (8 percent). Efficiency objectives included improving the efficient use of resources in the sector (21 percent) and improving the internal efficiency of the education system (that is, reducing repetition and drop-outs, 16 percent).

Among projects that sought to improve management, governance, and finance, the largest share aimed to strengthen sector management or build capacity (22 percent). Far fewer projects had objectives to strengthen or reform sector governance (8 percent), improve accountability or transparency (3 percent), or improve sector finance or sustainability (7 percent).

In contrast, only about one in five projects had objectives to improve learning outcomes/achievement or labor market outcomes. Labor market objectives included objectives to raise employment, productivity, or human capital (13 percent) and to improve the labor market relevance of education—usually post-primary education (10 percent). Only 6 percent of projects had a piloting objective. A quarter of projects had other less easily grouped objectives. Some of these were nonspecific objectives to improve service delivery or improve education outcomes. Others included
subjects related to the quality and relevance of research, increasing innovation or competitiveness, introducing information communications technology, facilitating donor coordination, increasing school-readiness of preschool children, and promoting public-private partnerships.

### Table 2.4 Prevalence of Project Objectives (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>2001–05 (n = 115)</th>
<th>2006–09 (n = 91)</th>
<th>2001–09 (n = 206)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of education, inputs, services</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/enrollments</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity, of which</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (nonspecific)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged groups*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency, of which</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use efficiency*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal efficiency</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/ governance/ finance, of which</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/capacity</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector governance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector finance/sustainability**</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability/transparency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes/achievement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor market, of which</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/human capital</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting***</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other***</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Percent of projects targeted to the poor

**Source:** IEG portfolio review of PADs.

**Note:** n=the number of projects. Trend is statistically significant at: *** p<=.01; ** p<=.05; * p<=.10. These categories are not mutually exclusive; most projects had several objectives.

Finally, a number of projects committed to improving services or education outcomes for the poor in their objectives (15 percent). About half of these had objectives that were geographically targeted to rural or poor urban areas; the others intended to target poor children or communities. Only two projects had explicit objectives to improve learning outcomes among the poor. It is important to note that these figures do not include projects that target poor or rural areas, even when their objectives do not explicitly target the poor.
There has been some evolution in objectives among approved projects over the past decade (table 2.4). The share of projects seeking to improve sector finance or sustainability rose from 3 to 12 percent of projects, as did the share addressing sector governance (from 5 to 11 percent), although only the first trend is statistically significant. The share of projects with “other” less conventional or more general objectives roughly doubled. However, there also has been a decline in the importance of objectives to strengthen management or capacity (from 26 to 15 percent) and to improve the efficiency of resource use (from 24 to 15 percent), though this last change is just short of statistical significance. Learning or piloting objectives all but disappeared—from 11 percent of projects in fiscal 2001–05 to nil in fiscal 2006–09.

There are important differences in the prevalence of objectives across Regions (table 2.5). Projects in the South Asia and East Asia and Pacific Regions are most likely to have objectives to improve education quality; those in Africa and the Middle East and North Africa are the least likely. South Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean are more likely to have projects with objectives to improve access—half to two-thirds of projects in those Regions seek to do so.

South Asia is the Region most likely to have equity objectives (nearly two-thirds of projects have them overall) and the most likely to explicitly address disparities of gender and other disadvantage; equity objectives are least common in East Asia, Europe and Central Asia, and Africa. More than half of projects in Europe and Central Asia address efficiency and learning outcomes; this is significantly higher than the share for other Regions. To the extent that the objectives were to pilot or test interventions, it was almost exclusively an objective in East Asia, Africa, and the Middle East and North Africa Regions. Finally, more than a quarter of projects in Latin America and the Caribbean explicitly targeted services and outcomes of the poor, the highest share of any Region.
Many of the differences in objectives by Region might be explained by country income level. The most common objectives in low-income countries are quality, access, and equity, whereas for middle-income countries quality, access, and efficiency are most prominent (table 2.6). The share of projects with nonspecific equity objectives rises with country income, but low-income countries are far more likely to explicitly target disadvantaged groups and girls in their objectives. There is a strong positive correlation between objectives of efficiency in resource use and country income—that objective is three times more likely in upper-middle-income countries than in low-income countries. The objective to strengthen management and build capacity
in the sector also rises with income, but this is not statistically significant.

Both of these findings are somewhat surprising, as one might expect that financial resources and institutional capacity would be weaker in low-income countries. Objectives to improve learning outcomes were least common in lower-middle-income countries. Piloting and learning objectives were confined to projects in low- and lower-middle-income countries; there were no such objectives in projects in upper-middle-income countries.

Table 2.6 Prevalence of Objectives by Country Income Level, Projects Approved in Fiscal 2001–09 (percent of projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Income level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (n = 99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of inputs/services</td>
<td>59 69 62 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/enrollments</td>
<td>52 38 50 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity, of which</td>
<td>37 34 43 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (nonspecific)</td>
<td>23 29 38 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged groups</td>
<td>12 6 7 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender***</td>
<td>16 2 0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency, of which</td>
<td>27 38 45 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use efficiency***</td>
<td>11 26 36 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal efficiency</td>
<td>18 14 12 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/governance/finance, of which</td>
<td>30 34 33 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/capacity</td>
<td>21 20 29 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector governance</td>
<td>9 6 10 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability/transparency</td>
<td>2 6 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector finance/sustainability</td>
<td>9 6 5 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes/achievement</td>
<td>22 14 29 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor market, of which</td>
<td>18 26 19 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/human capital</td>
<td>14 11 14 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>7 17 7 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting</td>
<td>8 8 0 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21 26 29 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Percent targeted to the poor</td>
<td>13 17 17 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG portfolio review.
Note: Difference across income groups is statistically significant at: *** p<=.01. These categories are not mutually exclusive; most projects had several objectives.
DPOs, which provide budget support, are significantly more likely than investment operations to support objectives of access, equity, efficiency, and finance. There were only 17 Education Sector DPOs approved from fiscal 2001 to 2009, but they were significantly more likely than the 189 investment projects to support certain objectives (appendix table B.1). Three-quarters of the DPOs had objectives to improve access, compared with 44 percent of investment operations. Two-thirds of DPOs had objectives to improve equity and efficiency, compared with only a third of investment operations. About a quarter of the DPOs supported objectives to improve finance/sustainability or sector governance, compared with only 6 percent of investment projects. However, investment operations were more likely (22 percent) to have labor force objectives than DPOs (6 percent, p = 0.11). None of the DPOs had piloting or labor force relevance objectives.14

Among projects focusing on a single education subsector, there were differences in objectives between projects supporting primary and post-primary education. Between fiscal 2001 and 2009, 45 projects supporting only primary education and 29 supporting only secondary or tertiary education were approved. Primary education projects were more likely than were post-primary education projects to support objectives to ensure access (71 percent versus 55 percent, respectively) and to improve internal efficiency (29 percent versus 7 percent, respectively, appendix table B.1). Primary education projects are also more likely to target the education of disadvantaged groups and girls.

In contrast, post-primary education projects are more likely to have objectives to improve management/governance/finance (52 versus 31 percent), and specifically to improve sector governance (21 versus 9 percent). Nearly a third of post-primary projects had objectives related to the labor market (31 percent), and a fifth included an objective to improve the market relevance of secondary or tertiary education. None of the single-sector primary education projects had these objectives.

**PROJECT ACTIVITIES OR ACTIONS**

The majority of projects incorporated a common broad range of actions and activities in pursuit of their objectives. Figure 2.6 shows the percentage of all projects undertaking each type of activity by broad grouping, based on a review of PADs and Program Documents; the disaggregated prevalence of activities within each category is presented in appendix table B.2.15

Almost all projects (98 percent) included activities to build management capacity at some level, with the strongest emphasis on capacity at the central and school levels. Within this category were
the four of every five projects that supported activities to build capacity in planning and/or M&E.

**Eighty percent or more of projects have activities in the broad categories related to teachers (teacher training or reform of teacher management); curriculum, methods, and/or textbooks; and budget/finance.** Among this last category, the most common activities were the introduction of or support to new funding mechanisms for schools/institutions or local governments, such as formula funding, block grants, and competitive or innovation funds, as well as the promotion of performance-based incentives in various areas.

**Figure 2.6 Types of Activities Supported by Education Sector Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percent of Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demand-side interventions</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessments</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply/Infrastructure</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/decentralization</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget/finance</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/methods/books</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training or reform</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/capacity building</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: IEG portfolio review.*

**Roughly three-quarters of projects included activities related to sector governance or decentralization, supply or infrastructure, or assessment.** Within the sector governance category, more than half of projects supported efforts to increase autonomy or responsibility at the level of the school, college, or university, and about a third included activities to increase or change the role of communities, local governments, or private or nongovernment organizations within the sector, or measures for reform of central government institutions. Within the supply/infrastructure category, construction and equipment activities were mentioned in 61 percent of all projects. Assessments included reforms of the assessment system (65 percent of projects), student assessment (48 percent), and assessment of schools (32 percent).
Demand-side interventions were found in fewer than half of the projects. These types of interventions included awareness and communications campaigns (33 percent) and conditional cash transfers or other targeted incentives (22 percent).

There were important increases in the share of projects that financed assessments, M&E, capacity, and school-level governance; the share financing infrastructure and equipment declined. The increase in projects financing reform of the assessment system and student and school assessments (figure 2.7) indicates that although the share of projects with learning outcome objectives remained stable there nevertheless was an increased focus on learning outcomes in the portfolio. The share of projects addressing school-based governance activities also increased considerably, from about half to nearly two-thirds. The most notable decline in activities was of school construction and provision of equipment, from two-thirds to 54 percent of projects (not shown). Other shifts over time are shown in appendix table B.2.

Figure 2.7 Support for Assessments, School-Level Governance, and Planning and M&E Capacity

Nearly half of projects (46 percent) financed significant information communication technology (ICT) activities, including ICT for the Education Management Information System. The most notable shift over the decade was a decline in support for ICT for learning (distance learning or learning enhancement), from 29 to 18 percent of projects.
Summary

Since 2001 the World Bank has sharply increased its commitments to education in projects managed by the Education Sector. Commitments increased for most education subsectors, with the largest amount for primary education. However, the share for tertiary and technical/vocational education has increased sharply, and the share for primary education has declined somewhat. Most of the projects aimed to improve the quality of education, increase access to schooling, and enhance the equity of services and outcomes.

Overall, one in five education projects had an explicit objective to improve learning outcomes and there has been an increase in financing learning assessments over the decade. An equal share of projects aimed to increase employment or human capital or improve the labor market relevance of education, and these objectives were most common in post-primary education projects.
Chapter 3
Achievements and Performance of the Education Sector Portfolio

This report now turns from analysis of the composition of the portfolio managed by the Education Sector to performance of the portfolio of closed projects, the determinants of performance, and achievements in some priority areas.

This chapter examines three measures of performance: the projects’ performance ratings, as assessed by IEG; evidence of the extent to which the projects achieved specific objectives; and the results or impacts of projects with objectives to improve learning or employment/labor force outcomes. It also reviews selected evidence on the performance of M&E in the Education Sector portfolio.

The analysis draws on data from two groups of projects: the performance ratings and characteristics from the Bank internal database of all 226 Education Sector projects that closed in fiscal 2001–09, irrespective of when the projects were approved,¹ and results from an in-depth review of appraisal and completion reports for 65 Education Sector projects approved from fiscal 2001–09 that had closed and been reviewed by IEG (that is, the most recently approved projects that have closed).

Project Performance

Both IEG’s and the World Bank’s operational units rate projects’ performance after they have closed, using the same criteria. The “outcome” rating measures the extent to which an operation’s major relevant objectives have been achieved or are expected to be achieved, efficiently. Thus, the rating is contingent on the operation’s stated objectives (it is “objectives based”) and on three criteria: the relevance of the objectives and design; the extent to which the objectives were achieved (efficacy); and the efficient use of project resources. The rating’s six-point scale runs from highly satisfactory to highly unsatisfactory.² The Bank’s operational units assign a rating in the projects’ ICRs, and IEG issues a rating independently, based on either a desk review of the ICR or a field evaluation. All performance ratings referred to in this section are IEG’s ratings.

About three-quarters of all Education Sector operations that closed from fiscal 2001 to 2009 were rated moderately satisfactory or higher

Main Messages

- Three-quarters of Education Sector projects closing since 2001 had satisfactory performance, but performance declined over the decade.
- Projects focusing on primary education performed better than those focusing on post-primary education, especially in low-income countries.
- Access and equity objectives are most likely to be achieved; learning and employment outcomes are among the least likely.
- The most common strategy for raising learning was to improve the quality of classroom inputs, but this was not always successful.
- Support to improve learning and employment outcomes suffered from weak results frameworks, lack of trend data, weak links between investments and outcomes, and inadequate attention to other factors affecting results.
- Support for evaluating new approaches in LILs has declined; about half of projects conducted an evaluation of the impact of part or all of the project.
by IEG; this is similar to the performance of projects from other sectors. A total of 226 operations managed by the Education Sector closed during fiscal 2001–09 and have been rated by IEG; for 77 percent, performance was moderately satisfactory or higher. This compares favorably with the results from the 1,902 projects in other sectors (irrespective of their education content) that exited over the same period—76 percent were rated moderately satisfactory or higher.

However, over the past decade the performance of exiting Education Sector projects has declined both absolutely and in relation to projects in other sectors. Until the mid-2000s, education projects performed consistently above the average for all other sectors (figure 3.1). However, among projects exiting in fiscal 2006–09, the position has reversed; 69 percent of Education Sector projects were rated in the satisfactory range, compared with an average of 79 percent of projects in other sectors. This decline in Education Sector performance relative to other sectors remains, even when the ratings are weighted by project commitments (see appendix figure B.2).

Figure 3.1 Trend in Performance of Education Projects and Projects in Other Sectors, by Fiscal Year of Exit, 1991–2009

Source: World Bank data.
Note: The decline in Education Sector performance between 2001–05 and 2006–09 is statistically significant at $p = 0.02$. 
Bank and borrower performance for Education Sector operations has also slipped slightly relative to operations in other sectors since fiscal 2001–05. Bank performance of Education Sector projects also shows a drop over the decade and is now lower than for existing projects in other sectors (78 versus 82 percent, respectively, in the satisfactory range) (see appendix figure B.3). Disaggregation of the Bank performance rating into components on quality at entry and quality of supervision reveals that the slippage is due to a decline in quality at entry; there is no divergence in quality of supervision between Education Sector projects and projects in other sectors. Borrower performance in the Education Sector for projects exiting in fiscal 2001-05 was much higher than for projects in other sectors (81 versus 73 percent, respectively, in the satisfactory range), but they have now converged (see appendix figure B.4).

The decline in project performance since fiscal 2001–05 does not seem to be strongly related to relative changes in the composition of exiting projects in education and other sectors. A change in the relative composition of the two groups of projects—the regional composition, the type of instrument, or in terms of country income—could contribute to divergence of trends if these different groupings tended to perform differently. There were some small shifts, but the compositional changes were in the same direction for both Education Sector projects and projects in other sectors. For example, the share of exiting projects that were DPOs (as opposed to investment lending) increased in both groups, whereas the share of exiting projects from the Africa Region declined in both.

A relative increase in the share of IDA projects and the poor performance of LILs in the Education Sector may have contributed to the decline in the sector’s performance. The share of IDA-funded exiting projects (all in low-income countries) did increase by relatively more in the Education Sector: in fiscal 2001–05, roughly half of both groups of exiting projects were funded by IDA; by fiscal 2006–09 the share of the exiting Education Sector portfolio financed by IDA had risen to 60 percent, compared with a rise to only 54 percent in other sectors. The poor performance of recently closed LILs in the Education Sector appears to be a contributing factor: if LILs are excluded, the performance of the Education Sector falls by less (from 83 to 73 percent in the satisfactory range over the two recent periods), and the performance of other sectors is unchanged.

Comparison of the performance of all projects exiting in fiscal 2001–09 (irrespective of the year that they were approved) with the subset that was approved since 2001 confirms the downward trend. About three-quarters (77 percent) of all Education Sector projects that exited
in fiscal 2001–09 performed in the satisfactory range, and this includes projects approved as far back as the early 1990s. If one looks at the ratings of the 65 projects that were approved since fiscal 2001 that have exited the portfolio, only two-thirds (66 percent) were in the moderately satisfactory range.6

Correlates of Education Project Performance

REGION, COUNTRY INCOME, AND LENDING INSTRUMENT

Among the larger set of education projects that exited from fiscal 2001 to 2009, irrespective of the year of approval, there are clear patterns in performance by Region, country income, and lending instrument (figure 3.2, panel A). The Regions with the highest performance—80 percent or more of projects in the satisfactory range—include Latin America and the Caribbean (86 percent), South Asia (85 percent), and East Asia and Pacific (82 percent). In contrast, only 62 percent of Education Sector projects in the Africa Region performed in the satisfactory range.

Some of this regional variation can be explained by different levels of country income: the performance of Education Sector projects rises with country income. However, country income cannot explain all the variation, because both South Asia (with higher ratings) and Africa (with lower ratings) are predominantly low income. A higher share of DPOs received ratings in the satisfactory range than did investment operations, though there were very few of the former in the Education Sector portfolio.

There are important differences in the level and patterns of performance among the 65 closed projects that were approved more recently (since fiscal 2001; figure 3.2, panel B), compared with all projects that exited in fiscal 2001–09 (figure 3.2, panel A). The average performance for these more recently approved projects (66 percent in the satisfactory range) is lower than for all projects that exited in fiscal 2001–09 (77 percent), and this is true for most subgroups. But the rank order of Regional performance is also quite different in the more recently approved projects: South Asia and East Asia and Pacific are still in the top tier, but the ranking of Latin America and the Caribbean and the Middle East and North Africa drops to the bottom half. The results for middle-income countries in this more recent group are below the results for low-income countries.7 The ranking of DPOs and investment projects is not changed. Within the category of investment projects, only three of the nine LILs that closed were rated moderately satisfactory or better (not shown).
Figure 3.2 Performance of Education Sector Operations by Region, Country Income, and Lending Instrument

Panel A. Education Projects Exiting Fiscal 2001–09 and Approved in any Fiscal Year (n = 226)

Panel B. All Education Projects Approved in Fiscal 2001–09 (n = 65)

Source: World Bank data.
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The results for the projects approved since fiscal 2001 are based on a small number of projects in each category that have closed and may differ from the performance that the rest of the projects approved from fiscal 2001 to 2009 eventually receive when all have closed. However, these results do describe the performance of the recent part of the portfolio on which IEG conducted a detailed desk review of factors affecting performance.

EDUCATION SUBSECTORS AND PROJECT COMPLEXITY

In low-income countries, projects focusing on primary/basic education performed better than those in post-primary subsectors. Analysis of results by subsector is based on IEG’s review of the 65 projects approved since fiscal 2001 that have closed. Thirty-nine of the projects focused on a single subsector that was primary/basic, secondary, tertiary, or vocational. Overall, three-quarters of the projects focusing exclusively on primary/basic education (74 percent) had satisfactory performance, compared with about two-thirds of those focusing on secondary, higher, or vocational education (63 percent, figure 3.3). This is primarily because of the much better performance of primary/basic education projects than post-primary projects in low-income countries (86 versus 60 percent in the satisfactory range).

Figure 3.3 Share of Projects Performing Moderately Satisfactory or Better, by Subsector and Country Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsector</th>
<th>Low Income Country (n=14)</th>
<th>Middle Income Country (n=9)</th>
<th>All Countries (n=23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary/Basic</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Primary/ Vocational</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG portfolio review.
Note: The results for primary versus post-primary for low-income countries—although large—are not statistically significant at conventional levels (p = 0.15). The difference in performance for primary education projects between low- and middle-income countries is of borderline statistical significance (p = 0.108).

The number of education subsectors covered by a project can contribute to project complexity. One relatively straightforward
indicator of project complexity is the number of subsectors covered—early childhood education, primary education, secondary education, technical and vocational education, higher education, and non-formal education. Roughly two-thirds of projects that included only one or two subsectors performed in the satisfactory range, compared with only half of those with three or more subsectors (not shown). However, the number of projects with three or more subsectors (only 6 of the 65 closed projects) is too small to render this comparison conclusive. As seen in chapter 2, the share of projects in the portfolio with more than one subsector is on the rise, potentially increasing the complexity of operations, particularly in low-income countries.

**FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO LOW PERFORMANCE**

Insights into some of the factors contributing to low performance can be derived by comparing the frequency with which various factors are mentioned in the ICRs of projects with satisfactory performance compared to projects with unsatisfactory performance. Table 3.1 compares the prevalence of different factors in project design and supervision/implementation. Two factors were mentioned only in projects that were rated in the unsatisfactory range—lack of responsiveness or proactivity in supervision (a third of projects with unsatisfactory performance) and overestimation of the strength of political commitment (a quarter of projects). Overambition in relation to the time frame of the project is 11 times more likely to be cited for projects with unsatisfactory performance than for those with satisfactory performance. This is followed by inadequate readiness for implementation, cited seven times more frequently. Excessive complexity in relation to country capacity, technical design issues, and external factors beyond the control of the project were both cited five times more frequently in projects with unsatisfactory performance.

In several cases, the relative risk for unsatisfactory performance was small because the prevalence of the factor was high in both unsatisfactory and satisfactory projects. For example, the relative risk due to weakness in the results framework or lack of clarity of the objectives or indicators was only 1.7. However, it was cited as an issue in 42 percent of projects with satisfactory performance, in addition to 71 percent of projects with unsatisfactory performance. Weak M&E implementation was cited in two-thirds of unsatisfactory projects and more than half of those with satisfactory performance.
### Table 3.1 Factors Contributing to Unsatisfactory Project Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percent of projects with risk among projects rated…</th>
<th>Relative risk unsatisfactory: satisfactory projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (n = 21)</td>
<td>Satisfactory or highly satisfactory (n = 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overambition in relation to strength of political commitment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overambition in relation to the time period</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate readiness for implementation</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaknesses in technical design, including inadequate prior analytical work</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overambition or excessive complexity in relation to country institutional or implementing capacity</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overambition or excessive complexity in any form</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate risk assessment</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness in results framework, clarity of objectives, or indicators</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation/supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of responsiveness or proactivity in supervision</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External factors (for example, political or economic crisis)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political change, loss of champion, turnover of borrower personnel</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in operating through decentralized education management/administration</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover of task team leaders</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak project management and/or fiduciary issues</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak M&amp;E implementation, lack of evidence of outputs or outcomes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG portfolio review.

These results suggest that there is substantial room for improvement, even in projects with satisfactory performance. It also suggests that there are ways of mitigating some risks: although nearly three-quarters of unsatisfactory projects cited political change or turnover of borrower personnel, this problem was also cited in 29 percent of projects that received satisfactory ratings. Thus, these risks do not inevitably result in poor performance.

### Achievement of Objectives

Because projects differ in terms of the number and types of objectives, comparison of performance ratings yields little insight into what was actually achieved. Project outcome ratings are basically a measure of performance relative to stated project
objectives, taking into account the relevance of the objectives and design, the efficacy of the project in achieving its objectives, and the efficiency of the project in achieving those objectives.

As noted in chapter 2, there is currently no systematic institutional tracking of project objectives at the World Bank; there is also no systematic monitoring of the extent to which specific objectives are achieved. However, in reviewing ICRs, IEG does comment on the extent to which the specific objectives of each project have been achieved. Table 3.2 presents the extent to which the 65 closed projects substantially achieved specific objectives, based on review of the ICRs and, where applicable, IEG’s independent project performance assessments in the field. The objectives are not mutually exclusive; projects usually include more than one.

**Education access and equity objectives were the most likely to be achieved.** At least 20 of the 65 closed projects had objectives to improve access/enrollments, equity, quality, and/or efficiency (table 3.2). More than four-fifths of the closed projects that had an objective to increase access to education or raise enrollments (82 percent) substantially achieved it. This was true for nearly two-thirds of the projects with an equity objective (61 percent).

### Table 3.2 Extent to Which Projects Substantially Achieved Specific Education Objectives (percent of projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Percenta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access/enrollments (n = 33)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (n = 28)b</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of education (n = 42)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/labor force (n = 9)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency (n = 23)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes (n = 14)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting (n = 9)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/ capacity (n = 17)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: IEG review of ICRs and Project Performance Assessment Reports.*

*Note: Achievement of individual objectives is assessed on a four-point scale: negligible, modest, substantial, or high. This table shows the percent rated substantial or high. Most projects had more than one objective.*

a. Percent of projects for which achievement of the objective was substantial or high.

b. Includes projects with nonspecific equity objectives, gender equity objectives, and objectives that targeted specific disadvantaged groups.

Among the subset of projects with an explicit objective to improve gender equity, 88 percent achieved it, but the number of projects with that objective was small (only eight; not shown). Consistent with those findings, a recent IEG impact evaluation of a girls’ school stipend program in Pakistan supported by the Bank (IEG 2010a)
found sustained impacts on girls’ human development outcomes four years after the launch of the program (box 3.1).

**Fewer than half of the other types of objectives were substantially achieved.** Objectives to improve the quality of education were found in two-thirds of the projects but were substantially achieved in about half of them (45 percent). Efficiency of resource use or internal efficiency objectives were present in about a third of the projects; only 39 percent of the projects with those objectives substantially achieved them.

Fewer than 20 of the 65 closed projects had employment/labor force, learning outcomes, piloting, or management/capacity objectives, so the results should be interpreted with caution. Roughly between a third and a half of the projects with these objectives substantially achieved them. The principal factor behind the low performance of projects with piloting objectives—all of them LILs—was the failure to evaluate the results in a methodologically credible way.

**The objectives that are central to the success of the new Education Strategy—with its focus on Learning for All and education systems—have been the least likely to be achieved.** Improving the quality of education is one of several factors influencing the acquisition of knowledge and skills; translating these into employment, labor productivity, and the economic benefits of education requires that the knowledge and skills received be relevant to the labor market. Management and efficiency objectives are likely to figure prominently in the education systems approach. Although the success rate for these more complex objectives has not been as great as for those of access and equity, a closer look at a subset of the completed projects—on improving learning and labor force outcomes—reveals opportunities for better performance.
**Box 3.1 Secondary School Stipends in Pakistan Raise Human Development Outcomes for Girls**

The Female School Stipend Program in Pakistan, an intervention supported by the Bank and others under the Punjab Education Sector Reform Program, was designed to improve educational attainment among girls and decrease gender inequities, especially at the middle school level. It was implemented in 15 of the lowest literacy districts in Punjab in late 2003.

Educational indicators in these districts were weak, with education levels especially low for girls, both in absolute and relative terms. In 2001, urban women achieved, on average, 1.4 years less schooling than their male counterparts, and rural women achieved, on average, 3.2 years less schooling than their male counterparts. Further, school enrollment, especially at the middle school level, was heavily constrained by the scarcity of schools.

To address these disadvantages, the Stipend Program provided quarterly subsidies of PKR 600 (approximately $10) to the families of girls enrolled in middle school with the condition that they attend at least 80 percent of classes. In 2006, the stipend was extended to girls enrolled in high school (grades 9 and 10). By 2007, 245,000 girls enrolled in middle school were covered by the program.

In 2010, IEG evaluated the impact of the program among girls who had been in the program for up to four years. The evaluation relied on secondary data and quasi-experimental techniques to estimate the effects of the program relative to a counterfactual of no program. The evaluation found the following:

- All cohorts of girls between 2003 and 2004 and 2009 and 2010 showed a significant increase in the number of girls enrolled in middle school, ranging from 11 to 32 percent. Girls in stipend districts were 3–6 percentage points more likely to complete middle school than girls in non-stipend districts.
- Labor force participation of adolescent girls in stipend districts fell by 4–5 percentage points relative to nonstipend areas, which is equivalent to nearly half of the participation at baseline.
- Girls age 15–19 years in stipend districts married 1.4 years later than their nonstipend counterparts.
- Girls living in urban areas with parents who had at least primary schooling were more likely to complete middle school than their rural counterparts and those with less-educated parents. However, girls from urban areas with more educated parents reduced their labor force participation less than girls from rural areas with parents with low/no education.

The Female School Stipend Program had no indirect effects on the educational outcomes of boys residing in the same household as participating girls. However, there is evidence to suggest the program results in diverting boys to private schools at the primary level.

**Source:** IEG 2010a.

a. The impact of the program was first evaluated shortly after it was launched (Chaudhury and Parajuli 2010); the IEG evaluation assessed the impact of the program several years out.
Improving Learning Outcomes

The achievement of learning outcome objectives is especially relevant, given the emphasis of the new sector strategy on Learning for All and links to labor market outcomes. The contribution of education to growth and poverty reduction depends on acquisition of basic knowledge and skills, not years of completed education (Boissiere 2004; Hanushek and Woessman 2008; IEG 2006a). Increased attention to learning outcomes (in addition to primary school completion) was one of the recommendations of the 2006 IEG evaluation and is the overarching objective of the new Education Sector Strategy. This section takes a closer look at the results of closed projects with learning outcome objectives.

**Thirteen of the closed and rated projects approved since fiscal 2001 had an explicit objective to improve learning outcomes.** Of these, three were in Africa, five in Eastern Europe, two in India, two in Brazil (Phases I and II of an Adaptable Program Loan in Bahia State), and one in the Caribbean (St. Lucia); none were in East Asia and Pacific or the Middle East and North Africa.

Objectives to improve learning outcomes were mostly confined to primary and secondary education projects: three were primary education projects (in India and Kenya); three were secondary education projects (in St. Lucia, the Russian Federation, and Tanzania); and six included both primary and secondary (in Brazil, Georgia, Lithuania, Mali, and Serbia). Only one included primary, secondary, and tertiary education (in Bulgaria); none of the closed projects focusing on early childhood education, adult literacy, or technical/vocational education had explicit objectives to improve learning outcomes. The Russian E-Learning Support Project focused on competency in ICT, whereas the other 12 projects covered learning outcomes in multiple subject areas, most often in language and math. The detailed results chain and achievements for these projects are in appendix C.

The main strategy to improve learning outcomes was to improve the quality of the classroom experience, in terms of textbooks, teacher training, instructional or learning aids, and infrastructure. In fact, 7 of the 13 projects also had an explicit objective of improving the quality of educational inputs, whereas most of the other 6 invested heavily in quality improvements to raise learning achievement. The Brazil Bahia Education Projects (Phase I and II), for example, aimed to improve learning outcomes by ensuring that all schools in the poorest 100 municipalities of the state were upgraded to meet “minimum operational standards” for physical facilities (box 3.2). Other
Box 3.2 Ensuring “Minimum Operational Standards” in Bahia State, Brazil

Bahia State’s Basic Education Project, Phases I and II, which took place from 2000 to 2007, aimed to improve student performance on standardized tests and to decrease dropout and raise promotion rates by ensuring that fundamental schools (covering grades 1–8) in the 100 poorest municipalities achieved “minimum operational standards” for physical facilities. This approach was described in the PAD:

“A school operating at the minimum operational standards is one that is considered minimally capable of proving satisfactory conditions for student learning. The model assumes that a school must have all of the minimum inputs and services in order to meet the standard. A school unable to offer these essential factors simply cannot provide an adequate opportunity for children to learn. In determining the minimum standard level, the state is adapting the FUNDESCOLA concept with special attention to the following criteria:

- The school staff and community are familiar with the minimum operational standards model and checklist, and understand the equity considerations associated with this model;
- All students have access to basic textbooks and reading books, and all teachers have access to teaching guides;
- All classrooms have a minimum set of furniture and equipment;
- All classrooms have access to basic teaching materials;
- The school offers the minimum physical conditions to permit it to receive or maintain inputs and services indicated above” (World Bank 2000, p. 35).

The two projects greatly exceeded their targets in terms of upgrading schools to the minimum operational standards. Although the ICR for the Phase I project cites studies that found that promotion rates were significantly higher in schools that had attained the minimum operational standards, by the end of the Phase II project, in the aggregate the promotion rate to secondary school declined by 3 percent overall and by 4 percent in the poorest municipalities. The dropout rate in the fundamental cycle did decline, from 6 to 5.3 percent, but aggregate learning outcomes fluctuated over the period 1999–2007 and did not improve. A number of factors may have contributed (see the text and table 3.3).


strategies included building new classrooms or rehabilitating and maintaining existing ones, offering special classes for over-age or poorly performing students, and investing in school libraries. Many encouraged greater parental participation and school-based management, supported by school or teacher grants or by financing of school improvement plans.
Nine of the projects financed development of new assessment tools for tracking progress in learning outcomes. The Russia E-Learning Project developed competency tests for ICT. In Brazil, the two Bahia education projects developed and implemented a school-level standardized continuous assessment tool. However, most of the projects that supported new learning assessments were not able to apply them more than once during the project, making it difficult to track trends in learning.

For example, the India Elementary Education Project developed assessments for multiple grades in language and math and successfully collected one round of results, but was only able to conduct a second assessment for fifth graders. In Georgia, Serbia, and Kenya achievement tests were developed but applied only once during the course of the project, and in Bulgaria and Mali the key assessments were either not developed or not implemented during the life of the project.

In countries without such assessments, the projects used trends in scores or pass rates for key examinations as a proxy for changes in learning outcomes—for example, the Certificate of Primary Education mean score in Kenya, the Form 4 examination pass rate in Tanzania, and the pass rate on the secondary school leaving exam in St. Lucia.

Nevertheless, the results for about a third of the support for learning outcomes are unknown because of inadequate or nonexistent learning outcome indicators (table 3.3, panel B). No information is available on results for learning outcomes for projects in Bulgaria, Georgia, Serbia, or Mali, even though this was an explicit objective of the project.

Among the nine projects that provided data, learning outcome indicators improved in five—in India, Kenya, Lithuania, and Russia. The completion reports for most them expressed caution in interpreting the results, either because of known/suspected weaknesses in the assessment instruments or because of other contemporaneous factors that likely affected learning. The attribution of the results to the government program supported by the Bank may be difficult to assert, and there was little discussion of the
### Table 3.3 Learning Outcome Results, 13 Closed Projects

#### Panel A: Projects with Learning Outcome Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Learning indicator</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Rajasthan District Primary Education</td>
<td>2001–08</td>
<td>Achievement tests in language and math, grades 2 and 5, overall, by gender and for scheduled castes</td>
<td>Increases, often substantial, in all groups except for grade 5, scheduled castes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Education Improvement (covering grades 5–10)</td>
<td>2002–06</td>
<td>Achievement test, eighth graders</td>
<td>2%–4% increase by 2005.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>E-Learning Support (secondary education)</td>
<td>2004–08</td>
<td>Competency test, the percent not in the low competency group (those in the medium or high groups)</td>
<td>2005–06: 48% 2006–07: 54% 2007–08: 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline or no improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Bahia Basic Education (Phases I &amp; II, fundamental and secondary education)</td>
<td>2001–07</td>
<td>National achievement tests in math and Portuguese, 4th, 8th, and 11th grade</td>
<td>Decline from 1999–2001 (preproject), improvement from 2001–03, decline in 2003–05.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>Education Development (secondary education)</td>
<td>2002–08</td>
<td>Percent of students passing at least five subjects (including math and English) in secondary school leaving exam</td>
<td>2000: 27% (preproject) 2002: 40.6% 2007: 36.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Panel B: Projects with Unknown Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Reason for unknown result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>Education Modernization (primary, secondary, tertiary)</td>
<td>2002–04</td>
<td>New exams delayed, no trend data; most project activities not implementedc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Education Sector Expenditure Program (Phase I) (primary and secondary)</td>
<td>2000–06</td>
<td>Planned reading fluency instrument and standardized tests in French, math, science not developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Education System Realignment and Strengthening (Phase I) (primary and secondary)</td>
<td>2001–08</td>
<td>National sample-based assessment for 4th graders conducted only once for math and language. Conducted twice for ninth graders, but one year apart (2002–03), results not reported in ICR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Education Improvement (primary and secondary)</td>
<td>2002–07</td>
<td>Only a single round of the assessment was implemented before the end of the project. Results for two rounds each of TIMMS and PISA were not reported in the ICR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG; see appendix C.

Note: PISA = Program for International Student Assessment; TIMSS = Trends in International Math and Science Study.

a. Absolute scores are not presented in the ICR.
b. Achievement tests were developed but implemented only once before the end of the project.
c. Results released following project closure showed a sharp decline in the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) math scores in Bulgaria from 1999 to 2003 and again from 2003 to 2007. As of 2010, a national standardized test that could measure the impact of education reforms on learning outcomes still does not exist (World Bank 2010c).
counterfactual in these four cases. In many cases there was evidence of an improving trend before the project.

With those caveats, there were improvements in learning outcomes documented in five projects (table 3.3, panel A). The improvements occurred over relatively short time periods, so they were generally small. An exception is the case of the IndiaRajasthan District Primary Education Project (2001–08). That project recorded substantial improvements in both language and math for both girls and boys and for scheduled castes and tribes in grades II and V, over eight years. Language scores for grade V, for example, rose from 30 to 67 percent, and for math from 41 to 59 percent. Even with these improvements, the level of achievement remains low.

However, in Bahia State of Brazil, Tanzania, and St. Lucia, improved quality of inputs was not associated with better learning outcomes, on average. Despite the large investments in and high coverage of minimum operational standards for schools in Bahia, learning achievement declined, then rose, then declined again. In both St. Lucia and Tanzania, secondary school exam pass rates declined.

Explanations for the variability in results in improving learning outcomes center around three factors: (i) the ability to maintain quality standards in the face of an expansion in enrollments; (ii) the higher share of children from disadvantaged backgrounds in the student population; and (iii) the inherent efficacy of the programs and interventions as implemented. The reasons for the halving of the Form 4 pass rate in Tanzania are not a mystery: secondary school enrollments were allowed to expand at a much faster pace than planned and resources were inadequate to maintain the quality of classroom inputs (box 3.3). Declining quality of instruction is likely to be at least partially responsible. This is in contrast to Tanzania’s more positive experience for primary education: pass rates improved despite climbing enrollments (IEG 2010f).

The results frameworks of most projects and the types of information collected are inadequate to distinguish between competing explanations. To test the hypothesis that changes in the background of the student population account for slow growth in learning outcomes, it would be important to understand the distribution of program inputs and learning outcomes. In principle, learning outcomes can improve in subgroups but decline on average. However, only projects in India and Kenya provided disaggregated results in learning outcomes for disadvantaged or low-income students, showing important improvements.
Box 3.3 Success and Challenges in Raising Learning Outcomes while Expanding Access to Schooling in Tanzania

Tanzania managed to raise both primary school enrollment and school quality, resulting in improved pass rates, but this proved much more difficult for secondary than for primary education, according to IEG’s 2010 field assessment.

The Tanzania Primary Education Development Program (2001–04), supported by $200 million from IDA and the Netherlands, aimed to improve the quality of primary education, expand access, and increase the school retention rate. It provided budget support to institutionalize capitation and development grants to schools. Primary school fees were eliminated and the government provided a capitation grant of about $10 per student for books and learning materials. Development grants were made to schools for construction and rehabilitation of infrastructure. Double-shifting was instituted to prevent overcrowding.

Enrollment rose from 4.9 to 7.1 million. The net primary enrollment rate rose from 59 to 91 percent. The pupil:textbook ratio dropped from 20:1 to 3:1, and the pupil to teacher ratio rose slightly (from 46 to 54). The pass rate on the Primary School Leaving Examination doubled, from 22 to 49 percent between 2000 and 2004. Although the leaving examination is not an ideal proxy for learning outcomes and there are still some major fluctuations in the exam results that are difficult to explain, these results suggest that Tanzania succeeded in expanding primary education while improving the quality of inputs and raising learning outcomes.

This was not the case for secondary education, however. The Secondary Education Development Program (2004–08), supported by $150 million in IDA credits and grants, aimed to increase the secondary school completion rate, improve learning outcomes—especially of girls—and improve the management of secondary education. The plan was to reduce tuition in government secondary schools by half (to Tshs 20,000) and to finance capitation grants of Tshs 25,000 per pupil for quality inputs. Scholarship grants were offered to schools for poor families. A new curriculum was introduced (though late in the project), private publishers were allowed to compete for textbook provision, and a package of incentives was offered to attract teachers to underserved areas. To maintain quality and ensure affordability, expansion of secondary education was to be gradual.

In response to public demand, the number of government-supported secondary schools rose from 828 in 2004 to 3,039 in 2008; almost all the new schools were community-built schools. Secondary enrollment nearly tripled, with the lower secondary gross enrollment ratio rising from 10 to 31 percent in four years. Capitation grants were reduced to Tshs 16,400 per pupil, leading to shortages in teaching inputs. The number of teachers could not be increased so quickly: the pupil:teacher ratio rose from 22:1 in 2004 to 50:1 in 2007. Although the number of secondary graduates increased, the Form 4 pass rate necessary to continue study declined from 38 to 18 percent over 2003–09, and the large gender gap in outcomes persisted.

Tanzania’s experience points to three lessons in attempting to both expand and improve the quality of secondary education to raise learning outcomes. First, secondary education is more expensive to provide; expansion must take into account fiscal constraints and the needs of other subsectors. Second, secondary education is more complex and thus difficult to expand rapidly, involving higher teacher qualification and specialization in different subject matter; coordination of curriculum, textbooks, and examinations; and inherent management challenges. Finally, rapid expansion of relatively low-quality secondary schools risks creating a pool of unemployed graduates—who are less likely to contribute to poverty reduction and economic growth.

Source: IEG 2010f.
The changing composition of the student body was a plausible explanation for the decline in secondary school leaving exam pass rates in St. Lucia. The net secondary enrollment rate rose from 64 to 76 percent, and the primary to secondary transition rate rose from 69 to 88 percent, following targeted efforts to enroll the poorest students. The evidence suggests that quality inputs were maintained or improved, but average performance declined. Unfortunately, the project did not collect disaggregated input or outcome data for poor and nonpoor areas.

Few projects included sufficient M&E of the effectiveness of program activities to identify how well the program interventions were being implemented, what part of the intervention worked, and other factors that may have affected learning outcomes. Has improved quality of inputs translated into better teaching? Teachers may have been trained in new curricula, teaching methods, or use of learning materials, but the extent to which this training actually resulted in better classroom instruction is usually unknown. Even if the quality of classroom instruction improves, teacher and student absenteeism can reduce the impact, and quality inputs may make no difference. The Brazil Bahia project’s Phase II completion report (World Bank 2007) noted that evaluations had found a correlation between the minimum operational standards and promotion rates, but the schools that adopt the standards may be systematically different from those that do not. The evaluations do not shed light on what part of this intervention is actually working.

Only one of the 13 projects specifically targeted learning outcomes among the poor, and only two tracked learning outcomes for the poor or disadvantaged. The India Rajasthan District Primary Education Project (2001–08) was explicitly targeted to socially and economically disadvantaged groups in its objectives and was implemented in nine low-literacy districts, although the objectives on learning applied to the entire “primary cohort.” Nevertheless, it did measure results among the scheduled castes and tribes. The St. Lucia Education Development Project (2002–08) targeted schools in the poorest areas and programs that supported disadvantaged children, but this was not explicitly stated in the objectives and results were not shown for poor relative to nonpoor children or schools. The India Elementary Education Project (2004–07) also did not explicitly target the poorest children, but it included targets for enrollment of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes.

In summary, the extent to which the Bank’s education investments result in improving learning outcomes is particularly relevant, given the emphasis of the sector on education results and links to the labor market. Most of the 13 closed projects that attempted to improve
learning outcomes were in primary and secondary education, and the main strategy was to improve the quality of inputs. For a third of the projects, changes in learning outcomes could not be assessed because of inadequate or noncomparable data. For the remainder, the results were variable, with improvements in four countries but no change or a decline in three.

Unfortunately, the M&E of program activities was inadequate to understand the drivers of success or lack of it—whether results had to do with the failure of the intervention, poor implementation of what might otherwise be an effective intervention, changes in the composition of the student body associated with expansion in enrollments, or other factors that could affect learning outcomes.

Experience in Tanzania shows that it is particularly difficult to maintain quality standards with rapid expansion of secondary education; student performance there dropped. During an expansion with shifting composition of the student body, average test scores can be stagnant, even while they improve for subgroups. However, only two projects tracked learning outcomes among the poor or disadvantaged.

**Objectives to Raise Employment or Stimulate the Economy**

This review takes a closer look at projects with employment, labor force, or economy-wide objectives, in light of the increased investment in post-primary education over the past decade and IEG’s forthcoming evaluation of post-primary education. The extent to which Learning for All translates into increased labor productivity, poverty, and economic growth is likely to depend in part on the market relevance of the acquired knowledge and basic skills.

Nine of the closed projects in IEG’s in-depth portfolio review explicitly sought either to improve employment outcomes for program participants or to enhance labor-market or economy-wide outcomes. The projects were located in Bangladesh, Chile, Colombia, Georgia, India (two projects), Russia (two projects), and Zambia. Five projects had vocational education components, two were exclusively higher education, one covered primary and general secondary education, and one was exclusively nonformal education.

Bangladesh’s Post-Literacy and Continuing Education Project, for example, provided educational programs to neoliterates to improve the functional application of their literacy skills. In the latter category, Chile’s Science for the Knowledge Economy Project aimed to make Chile a knowledge economy through the development of an effective
innovation system based on wide-ranging changes in science, technology, and innovation programs. Only two of these projects—India’s Third Technician Education Project and Colombia’s Higher Education-Improving Access Project—explicitly targeted labor market outcomes for the poor.

Although all nine projects contained explicit labor market outcomes as objectives, only five included indicators that reflect employment/economy outcomes. Table 3.4 lists the projects, their indicators linked to employment/economy, and the extent to which each indicator was achieved. Four projects—Bangladesh’s Post-Literacy Project, Russia’s E-Learning Project, Chile’s Science for the Knowledge Economy Project, and Georgia’s Education System Realignment and Strengthening Project—had no employment or labor market outcome indicator. Bangladesh collected data on employment and income changes before and after the program.

All five projects that reported results of an employment/economy outcome demonstrated an improvement over baseline. In many cases, the increases are substantial: in India’s Third Technician Education Project the employment rate of graduates increased from 8 to 78 percent in one state (Andaman and Nicobar), with more modest increases in other states. Similarly, in the case of Colombia’s Higher Education–Improving Access Project, the employment rate of graduates increased from 67 percent in 2004 to 83 percent in 2008.

However, a number of factors limit our ability to conclude that the projects per se were responsible for these improvements: weak causal frameworks, inadequate outcome indicators, the failure to collect trend data, and low-quality data.

First, although nearly all the projects aimed to improve employment outcomes, none was able to demonstrate conceptually how or why project inputs would lead to achievement of labor market objective(s). For example, although the Colombia Project reported an increase in employment, the evaluation framework does not link the employment outcomes to program features, as opposed to a generally positive economic environment. In the case of Georgia’s Education System Realignment and Strengthening Project, no link is made between the educational interventions planned in the three phases of the Adaptable Program Credit and the expected economy/employment changes, even though the overall three-phase program has economy-strengthening elements.
### Table 3.4 Achievement of Employment Outcomes, 13 Closed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project (date)</th>
<th>Employment/economy outcome indicator</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Third Technician Education (2001–07)</td>
<td>Percent of polytechnic graduates employed in field of training within one year of graduation</td>
<td>Increase over baseline in all five project states where such data exist. In some cases, such as Andaman and Nicobar, the increase is substantial (from 8 to 78%). Three states missed the target of 65%, though the two for which baseline data exist show an improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>Education Reform (2001–07)</td>
<td>Number of resource center graduates employed</td>
<td>Increase graduates employed from 1,580 to 2,155, surpassing the target of 2,100. Data exist for only one of the three project regions, because resource centers in the other two became fully operational only at the end of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Post Literacy and Continuing Education for Human Development (2001–08)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>The ICR notes a 6% increase in employment and a 10% increase in average household income (not a formal indicator).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Education and Training Development Program Support (2001–09)</td>
<td>Percent of graduates gaining employment within six months of course completion</td>
<td>55.1% of graduates were employed within six months of graduation and 90% were employed within a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 percent of employers surveyed express satisfaction with training.</td>
<td>98% of employers surveyed felt the training was relevant and 81% were satisfied with the quality of graduates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Science for the Knowledge Economy (2003–07)</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>The number of researchers inserted into industry went from 0 to 55. The target was 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Technical/Engineering Education Quality Improvement (2003–09)</td>
<td>Percent of graduates employed within one year of graduation</td>
<td>Percent of graduates employed within a year increased from 41 to 89%, exceeding the target of 85%. Although substantial, the increase in employment rates of post-graduates from 25 to 66% fell short of the target of 85%. There was also a near doubling of income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Higher Education-Improving Access (2003–09)</td>
<td>Increase in employment rate for graduates</td>
<td>Employment rate increased from 66.9% to 82.9%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Employer satisfaction with preparedness of graduates</td>
<td>A survey of 407 employers reported an increase in satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Implementation Completion and Results Reports for the projects.
The weak conceptual link between inputs and outcomes is observed for all the projects, yet some have tried harder than others to establish the link. For instance, India’s Third Technician Education Project attempted to compare project states with comparable nonproject states as well as the all-India average on a range of indicators. Though not a rigorous impact evaluation of the intervention, it nevertheless goes one step further than other projects by thinking in terms of a counterfactual. Across all projects, the absence of a clear causal or theoretical framework at the start of the project limits clarity regarding the impact of project investments. Moreover, the quality of the data used for the indicators appears suspect.

Second, the lack of a conceptual framework linking project investments to employment outcomes appears to have led the projects to employ inadequate indicators to track success. The majority of projects list “increase in employment” as the main indicator for achieving labor market outcomes. In some cases, such as Russia’s Education Reform Project, the data came only from one region, although the project was implemented in more. Several projects failed to specify clear targets (Colombia Higher Education–Improving Access; Russia Education Reform), and although other projects did specify targets (India Technician Education III), in the absence of a causal framework, the basis for setting the targets is unclear.

Furthermore, the aggregate increase in employment used by most of the projects provides a narrow view of whether a project has achieved key labor market goals. Two projects, Colombia’s Higher Education–Improving Access Project and Zambia’s Technical and Vocational Education and Training Development Program, also conducted surveys among employers to understand whether graduates of the intervention program were better prepared. A more complete set of indicators would indicate the duration and stability of employment, the type of occupation and sector of employment, earnings patterns, the extent of preparation for the job market, and the range of opportunities for employment.13

An important reason for the observed weak conceptual framework and low-quality employment indicators is the limited analytical work undertaken to understand the labor market issues in these countries, relative to understanding the educational system. For instance, Georgia’s Education System Realignment and Strengthening Project provides an in-depth analysis of problems with the educational system, drawing on several sector studies, but it fails to engage conceptually with the labor market issues it hopes to address with an improved educational system.
Third, none of the projects provided trend data covering each year of the project period, as would be necessary to understand the pattern of change. With the exception of Zambia, which had very little baseline data, all the projects provided baseline and endline data, with nothing in between. Further, without trend data from prior to the project, it is difficult to understand how much of the change in the indicators is due to the project and how much to a general trend.

Finally, many of the projects suffered from lack of proper infrastructure for data collection and management, which reduces the authenticity and quality of data. For instance, although India’s Third Technician Education Project provided data on a range of education and employment indicators, the data from polytechnics were self-reported. Data on the ties between polytechnics and industry were self-reported. Zambia’s Technical and Vocational Education and Training Development Support Program encountered problems with the survey agency contracted to aid with M&E; because of the difficulties, no data were available at the end of the project to evaluate social and economic impacts.

Bangladesh’s Post-Literacy and Continuing Education for Human Development Project relied extensively on external consultants for tracer studies and evaluation, but it is not clear whether there was in-house capacity to interpret and meaningfully use the information generated. Even when such data collection and monitoring infrastructure was part of the project plan, as with Colombia’s Labor Market Observatory, data were not collected annually.

In summary, although employment outcome indicators improved in the projects that considered them, there is no clear way of knowing how much of this was due to the projects. Thus, when examined closely, the evidence of a link between the projects’ activities and labor force outcomes was weak, resulting in doubts in most cases as to whether the objectives had been achieved. A large part of the problem stems from an inadequate conceptual framework, which in turn led to inadequate indicators—including intermediate outcome indicators—and collection of low-quality data.

M&E Performance

As is evident from in-depth analysis of the results of projects that explicitly aimed to improve learning and labor market outcomes, even when programs have been executed well, it has been difficult to assess whether they have had the intended impact because of weaknesses in M&E. The problem starts with conceptual weaknesses in the results framework that should link the activities or policies to
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intermediate and final outcomes, problems identifying reasonable indicators to measure all parts of the chain for both short- and long-term outcomes, and the failure to track other factors that could positively or negatively affect outcomes. In implementation, there is a strong emphasis on monitoring; evaluation—which would consider the counterfactual—has been greatly neglected.

This brief review focuses on four aspects of M&E: the M&E design of projects with objectives to measure learning outcomes; the M&E design of pilot projects; planned and actual impact evaluations or evaluation of pilot activities; and the overall M&E performance of closed projects.

M&E DESIGN IN PROJECTS TO IMPROVE LEARNING OUTCOMES

Though a fairly high share of projects with objectives to improve learning outcomes included learning outcomes as a Key Performance Indicator, fewer than two-thirds had baseline measures at appraisal. Among the 206 Education Sector projects approved from 2001 to 2009, 41 had an explicit objective to improve learning outcomes. Eighty-five percent of the 41 projects included learning outcome indicators in their results frameworks as Key Performance Indicators, measured by national and/or international assessment examinations at various grade levels. However, only 61 percent of the projects with learning outcome objectives reported baseline information on learning outcomes in PADs.

Over the decade there was some improvement in terms of collecting baseline learning data—only half of the projects approved in fiscal 2001–05 with learning outcome objectives had baseline learning data, compared with nearly three-quarters of those approved in fiscal 2006–09. In the absence of baseline data, coupled with some understanding of the underlying determinants of learning outcomes, it can be difficult to set realistic targets or to identify the activities most likely to have an impact.

Projects with learning objectives in the South Asia Region were most likely to include a learning outcome indicator among the Key Performance Indicators and to have baseline data in the PAD. In that Region, all the projects that explicitly aimed to improve learning outcomes included appropriate indicators and collected baseline data (figure 3.4). Similar performance is observed in the Latin America and the Caribbean Region. In Africa, the Middle East and North Africa, and East Asia and Pacific Regions, half or fewer of the projects with learning outcome objectives had baseline information included in the PAD.
A shortcoming in projects with learning outcome objectives and indicators is the failure to collect disaggregated learning results by gender. A recent IEG working paper on adult literacy projects found that all five projects delivering adult literacy services (free-standing or components) that closed over the period 2002–09 had a strong focus on improving the literacy and skills of women (Monchuk 2010). However, only the Bangladesh Post-Literacy and Continuing Education for Human Development Project tracked the literacy results for men and women separately.

**Figure 3.4 Learning Outcome Indicators and Baseline Data in Projects with Explicit Learning Outcome Objectives, by Region**

![Bar chart showing learning outcomes and baseline data by region](chart)

**Source:** IEG portfolio review.

**Note:** n = number of projects with learning outcomes. SAR = South Africa; EAP = East Asia and Pacific; LCR = Latin America and the Caribbean; AFR = Africa; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; MNA = Middle East and North Africa.

**M&E Design in Pilot Projects**

The share of approved projects that featured pilot components or that were financed by LILs has dropped by nearly half since 2001. Thirty-four projects (17 percent) of the approved Education Sector portfolio from 2001–09 either included a pilot component (21 projects) or were financed by LILs (13 projects). However, the share of projects that sought to pilot or test interventions dropped sharply, from 21 percent of all approvals in 2001–05 to only 11 percent in 2006–09. The drop can be accounted for by the disappearance of LILs in the second period; all 13 LILs were approved from 2001–04. The share of
approved projects with pilot components that were not financed by LILs was roughly constant (10–11 percent of projects each period).

Articulation of the evaluation design in the projects that aimed to test a pilot intervention is much lower than expected. Fewer than half of these projects (41 percent)—which one might expect to have the most rigorous monitoring and evaluation plans—planned an impact evaluation and only 38 percent had a detailed evaluation design in the PAD that included information on performance indicators, data, and methods of evaluation (figure 3.5). Only a quarter presented baseline data in the PAD and 15 percent discussed a control group or how a counterfactual would be constructed.

Planned evaluations were better explained in projects with pilot components than in those financed by LILs. On every dimension of evaluation design in figure 3.5, projects with pilot components came out ahead of LILs, even though the latter are financed explicitly to test new approaches.

Figure 3.5 LILs Had Weaker Evaluation Design than Other Programs with Pilot Components

![Evaluation Design Comparison]

Source: IEG portfolio review.

Note: LIL = Learning and Innovation Loan.

There was some improvement in evaluation design for pilot projects over the decade. The share of projects with pilot interventions that planned an impact evaluation and that clearly stated the scope of the evaluation in the PAD roughly doubled (from 33 to 60 percent and from 29 to 60 percent, respectively). The share that included baseline information in the PAD rose from 16 to 40 percent, and the share with a defined control group/counterfactual
rose from 8 to 30 percent. Although encouraging, these trends are calculated off of small samples—24 projects in the first period and 10 in the second period—and are not statistically significant.

**PLANNED AND ACTUAL IMPACT EVALUATIONS**

Among the 65 closed projects in IEG’s in-depth review, 57 percent indicated in the PAD plans to carry out an impact evaluation or to assess the impact of the project. The PADs generally provided very little detailed information on the planned impact evaluation/assessment. This made it impossible to determine the rigor of the planned evaluation and whether the evaluation design included construction of a counterfactual. Therefore, the evidence presented here on “impact evaluations” is based on a mere mention of the term in the PAD and could include anything from before-and-after comparison of the beneficiaries to satisfaction surveys and rigorous evaluations with proper identification of the counterfactual.

About half of the planned evaluations were actually implemented, but a significant share of unplanned impact evaluations also took place. Overall, nearly half of the closed projects (45 percent) conducted an impact evaluation. Among the 37 projects that had planned to do an impact evaluation, 54 percent reported conducting the evaluation in the ICR, compared with about a third of the 28 projects that had not planned an impact evaluation.

**Figure 3.6 Planned and Actual Impact Evaluations in Closed Projects, by Region**

![Bar chart showing planned and actual impact evaluations in closed projects by region.](chart)

Source: IEG portfolio review.

Note: Regions: SAR = South Africa; EAP = East Asia and Pacific; LCR = Latin America and the Caribbean; AFR = Africa; ECA = Europe and Central Asia; MNA = Middle East and North Africa.
QUALITY OF M&E OF CLOSED PROJECTS

Only a quarter of closed Education Sector projects were rated substantial or high on the quality of M&E. Since July 1, 2006, IEG has rated the quality of M&E in all closed projects, based on both the M&E design and implementation and the use of the data. Fifty-seven of the 65 projects in IEG’s in-depth portfolio review had been rated on M&E quality; only a quarter received ratings of substantial or high. The Education Sector’s M&E quality ratings are below the Bank average, which is nonetheless very low—only 36 percent substantial or high.

Among the nine closed LILs—the projects expected to have the most rigorous M&E—none was rated substantial or high on M&E quality. This is consistent with the very low outcome ratings for LILs noted earlier; for projects with an explicit objective to test a new approach, sound monitoring and a rigorous evaluation design would be essential to achieving that objective.

Summary

Three-quarters of Education Sector projects that closed since 2001 had satisfactory performance, but there has been a decline in performance over the decade. Projects focusing on primary education and those with access and equity objectives have performed better than those focusing on post-primary education, learning, efficiency, and employment outcomes. Trends in the composition of the portfolio are likely to pose challenges for improving performance. Expansion of support for post-primary education will increase the complexity of investments, especially in low-income countries. Addressing important issues in project preparation and supervision could help reverse the downward trend.

The results for projects aiming to increase learning and employment outcomes are mixed. Raising the quality of inputs does not necessarily improve learning outcomes, and the evidence that investments in vocational and higher training have contributed to meeting labor market demands is thin. However, there are ample opportunities for improving performance. The increasing focus not just on education outputs but on intermediate outcomes and impacts underscores the importance of a solid conceptual framework focusing on the complete results chain as well as on other nonproject and noneducation factors likely to affect results.

Investments in measuring learning outcomes have increased. However, the factors actually affecting these outcomes in a given context and their distribution are still poorly understood. Although there appears to be greater interest in measuring the impact of Bank-
supported government education programs, the average quality of project evaluation remains unacceptably low.
Chapter 4
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From fiscal 2001 to 2010, a third of new World Bank commitments for education—$7.5 billion, in 378 approved projects—was managed by staff working in sectors other than education. This chapter reviews the types of projects with education components, how education fits into their results frameworks, the extent to which they involved Education Sector staff, and their objectives and achievements. Evidence is drawn from two sources—the Bank’s internal portfolio tracking database and a more in-depth desk review of a sample of projects with education components and managed by other sectors, approved from fiscal 2001 to 2009.

Trends in Education Components and Commitments

The number of projects with education components approved annually climbed steadily through 2002, after which there was a large jump in approvals (figure 4.1). The large increase from 2003 to 2005 can be explained by the combination of a growing number of Poverty Reduction Support Operations (PRSOs)1 with education content (peaking with 15 approved in fiscal 2005) and higher than expected approvals of emergency/disaster operations with education components in 2003 and 2006 (six operations each of those years). Until the economic crisis at the end of the decade, about 38 projects with education components were approved per year, with an average $575 million in education commitments managed by other sectors. 2

During the economic crisis (fiscal 2009–10), annual education commitments managed by other sectors doubled, but the number of projects with education components did not. A total of 71 projects with education components managed by other sectors was approved in those two years, committing $2.86 billion for education. This increase in resources was not the result of additional financing (which accounted for only $183 million of that total), but larger average components; the number of projects with education components increased only modestly (figure 4.1).

Main Messages
- About a third of new World Bank education commitments since 2001—$7.5 billion in 378 projects—was managed by other sectors.
- One in six of these projects had education commitments; those with the most are managed by the Social Protection Sector.
- Substantial education content is most likely in social sector, social fund, safety net/employment, and emergency/disaster relief projects.
- About half of projects with substantial education commitments have an education objective; for the others, education is an input into achieving other objectives.
- Education Sector staff participate in about half of the projects with substantial education, especially when there is an education objective.
- Poverty Reduction Support Operations have played a supporting role for Education Sector lending.
- Improved access was the most common objective of operations with substantial education content, achieved by seven of the nine projects with that objective.
Figure 4.1 Evolution of Education Commitments Managed by Other Sectors, 1990–2010

Prevalence, Size, and Sector Distribution of Education Components

Projects with education components represent a relatively small share of the lending portfolio managed by other sectors. Only 16 percent of the 2,305 operations managed by other sectors that were approved from fiscal 2001 to 2010 had any commitments attributed to education (figure 4.2). Education components are generally small in relation to the size of the overall operation: only 2.3 percent of the projects managed by other sectors committed as much as 30 percent of the operation for education.

Source: World Bank data.
The Africa Region was most likely to have operations with education components managed by other sectors. A quarter of all operations in other sectors in Africa had education commitments, and 1 in 10 of those operations had education commitments comprising 20 percent or more of the operation (figure 4.3). Latin America and the Caribbean Region had the largest share of projects managed by other sectors with education accounting for at least 30 percent of total commitments.

Nearly 80 percent of operations managed by the Poverty Reduction Sector included some education activity; however, none of these operations had more than 30 percent of the total project amount committed for education (figure 4.4). In contrast, more than half of operations managed by the Social Protection Sector had education commitments, and 15 percent of operations committed 30 percent or more for education.
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Figure 4.3 Percent of Operations with Any Education Commitments, by Region (approved fiscal 2001–10)

Source: World Bank data.

Figure 4.4 Percent of Operations with Any Education Commitments, by Managing Sector (approved fiscal 2001–10)

Source: World Bank data.

Note: Fewer than 5 percent of projects in the following sectors had any education commitments: energy/mining, transport, environment, water.
DPOs were considerably more likely than investment projects to include any education activity. More than a third of DPOs managed by other sectors (35 percent) had any education commitments, compared with only 11 percent of investment projects. Of the 171 DPOs with any education commitments, 44 percent were PRSOs. However, DPOs were less likely than investment operations to have education commitments exceeding 30 percent of the total (6 versus 19 percent, respectively).

The Social Protection Sector was the most likely to manage projects with significant levels of education commitments (table 4.1). Among the 159 operations approved from fiscal 2001 to 2010 with at least 20 percent of total commitments for education, Social Protection managed more than a third. Although the Economic Policy and Poverty Reduction Sectors managed sizeable shares of the projects, with 20–29 percent of commitments for education, they were nearly absent in managing operations with greater commitments.

Table 4.1 Distribution of Operations by Share of Education Commitments and Sector (percent of projects approved fiscal 2001–10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Share of education commitments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20–29 percent</td>
<td>&gt;30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Protection</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Policy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector Governance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Reduction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Nutrition, and Population</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Private Sector Development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Mining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Number of projects                     | 159          |
| Percent of operations that are DPOs    | 42           |

Source: World Bank data.
Note: Totals may not add to 100 because of rounding.

Among the projects with the largest shares of education commitments (30 percent or more), the key managing sectors were Social Protection (48 percent); Urban Development (13 percent); and Health, Nutrition, and Population (10 percent). More than half of the projects with 20–29 percent of commitments for education were DPOs (52 percent),
compared with only 19 percent of those with larger education commitments.

Most of the operations with significant education commitments can be classified into a handful of project types (table 4.2). The most common type was poverty reduction projects, such as programmatic PRSOs in low-income countries, other multisectoral poverty reduction DPOs in middle-income countries, and investment projects with poverty reduction objectives that have expenditures on education, usually for infrastructure but sometimes for training.

The second most common type was the multisectoral human development/social sector service delivery or reform projects, many of them including both education and health—for example, the Philippines Second Social Expenditure Management Project and the Uruguay Public Services and Social Services Sector Adjustment Loan. This is the most common type of project among those with 30 percent or more of commitments flagged for education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project type</th>
<th>Share of education commitment</th>
<th>Total &gt;20 percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20–29 percent</td>
<td>&gt;30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sector service delivery/reform</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social fund/community development/community-driven development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural adjustment/economic management/economic reform</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency reconstruction/disaster response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force/employment/safety net</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of projects</strong></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG review of project design documents.
Note: The projects have been classified by type based on their overall purpose, but they may have similarities across type. Some of the emergency reconstruction/disaster response projects, for example, include funding of social fund or community-driven development components. Total may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

Social funds, community development, and community-driven development projects that provide funds to local communities for demand-driven infrastructure and other investments—for example, the Angola Social Action Fund and the Guinea-Bissau Community-Driven Development Project—were the third most common type. Many
communities elect to build, furnish, or rehabilitate schools in these types of projects, among other types of investments.

The fourth most common type, found exclusively among projects with less than 30 percent of commitments for education, was *structural adjustment/economic management/economic reform* projects—for example, the Sindh Structural Adjustment Credit and the Turkey Restoring Equitable Growth and Employment Programmatic DPO I.

The fifth most common type—*labor force/employment/safety net projects*—generally has strong training components with an eye to improving worker productivity or employment or strengthening the skills of the economy. Examples include the Mexico Innovation for Competitiveness Project, the Romania Knowledge Economy Project, and the Dominican Republic Youth Development Project.

*Emergency reconstruction or disaster response projects* provide resources for reconstruction of infrastructure of all types, including schools—for example, the Jamaica Hurricane Dean Project and the Maldives Post-Tsunami Emergency Project.

*About a fifth of these projects were not as easily grouped.* Four were LILs—on global distance learning models (two projects, in Sri Lanka and Malawi), conservation of medicinal plants (housed in an institution of higher learning in Ethiopia), and enhancing the role of traditional authorities in Ghana. One was a freestanding conditional cash transfer safety net project in Macedonia that offered financial incentives to low-income families so they could send their children to secondary school.3 The Armenia Urban Heat Project aimed to provide energy efficient heat to urban schools and apartment buildings.

**Education in the Results Framework**

The variation in the share of education commitments, managing sectors, and project types suggest that many of these projects may not have education objectives per se, but that education inputs or outputs may feature in the results chain for achievement of other objectives. IEG conducted a desk review of the design documents for a sample of 100 of the 145 operations approved from fiscal 2001–09 managed by other sectors that had at least 20 percent of total commitments attributed to education. Two-thirds of the sample comprised investment operations, and slightly more than a third have at least 30 percent of commitments allocated for education (table 4.3). The purpose of the deeper desk review was to understand where education was featured in the results frameworks and to analyze the
extent to which Education Sector staff participated in preparation and supervision of projects managed by other sectors.

Table 4.3 Sample of Operations Managed by Other Sectors, Share of Education Commitments, and Lending Instrument (number of projects, approved in fiscal 2001–09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lending instrument</th>
<th>Share of education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20–29 percent</td>
<td>≥30 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Policy Operation</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment operation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: IEG.*

**Education in the Results Frameworks**

More than half of the operations had an education objective, and this likelihood increased with the share of education commitments. Each project’s results framework was reviewed with respect to development objectives, outputs, and outcomes. Nearly 60 percent of the sample had an education objective (table 4.4). About a fifth of the projects had no education objective, but an education output or outcome was part of the results chain. Surprisingly, in 22 percent of the operations, education was not reflected in any way in the operation’s results framework. All of these were social fund/community-driven development-type projects. In these projects it is often not known ex ante what infrastructure communities will choose to finance, and the stated objectives are often to empower communities.

The higher was the share of education commitments, the more complete was the education results framework (table 4.4). Projects with a higher share of funds for education were more likely to have an education objective, whereas those with a lower share for education were more likely to include only education output indicators. About a quarter of projects with relatively less education spending had no mention of education in the results chain, compared with only a sixth of projects with more education spending. The majority of operations with education objectives had indicators that were relevant to those objectives. However, a higher share of investment loans than DPOs had relevant indicators (90 percent versus 70 percent, not shown).
Table 4.4 Distribution of Operations Managed by Other Sectors, According to the Representation of Education in Results Frameworks (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where in the results framework</th>
<th>Share of education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20–29 percent (n = 63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the development objective</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And outputs, and outcomes</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And outputs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in the development objective</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes and outputs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes only</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs only</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowhere in the results framework</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Share with a learning indicator | 16 | 24 | 19 |

Source: IEG review of PADs.

The extent to which education was represented in the results framework varied across the type of operation. Only 14 percent of the community-driven development/social fund operations had an education objective, and 61 percent of them did not mention education anywhere in the results chain. In contrast, three-quarters of social sector operations included education in the objectives and outcome measures, as did about half of those in the natural disaster and “other” categories.

**Education Objectives**

Access to schooling was by far the most common objective in education projects managed by other sectors. Among the 100 projects in the sample, 59 had education objectives. Nearly two-thirds of the projects with objectives cited access to education or increased enrollments as an objective (table 4.5). The next most common objective was the quality of education inputs, in about a quarter of the projects. Fewer than one in five projects had objectives pertaining to equity, accountability/transparency, education efficiency, labor, and the other objectives. Only three projects had an explicit learning outcome objective. About a quarter had other types of objectives, including general statements about “improved service delivery,” where it was not possible to infer from the objectives statement the meaning. About half of the projects with objectives were investment operations and half were DPOs.
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Table 4.5 Education Objectives of Operations Managed by Other Sectors with Education Components Comprising at Least 20 Percent of Commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main education objective</th>
<th>Number of operations</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access/enrollments</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of inputs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability/transparency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor market/employment/human capital</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, sector governance, reform</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG review of project documents.
Note: n = 59 projects approved from fiscal 2001–09.

PARTICIPATION OF EDUCATION SECTOR STAFF IN PREPARATION AND SUPERVISION

The full extent to which these operations drew on the expertise of education professionals—staff, consultants, or government counterparts—in their design or supervision is unknown. By definition, multisectoral education operations that are managed by other sectors are not managed by Education Sector staff. However, depending on the types of activities and focus areas covered by the operation, the task team leader for the project may enlist specialists from among Education Sector staff or consultants. IEG was able to identify operations in which a World Bank Education Sector staff member contributed to project preparation or supervision, but not for how long. It was not possible to identify inputs from education consultants.

Other sectors frequently drew on Education Sector staff in the preparation and supervision of education components. In the sample of operations with education components, Education Sector staff participated in the preparation and supervision in about 38 percent of operations, with 20–29 percent of commitments allocated for education and in the preparation of nearly two-thirds of projects with 30 percent or more of commitments for education (figure 4.5). The participation of Education Sector staff rises with the share of commitments for education and primarily involves senior or lead specialists. There has been no shift over time in the share of components that drew on Education Sector staff during preparation (about half of operations) or supervision (about 40 percent of operations).
Figure 4.5 Participation of Education Staff in Education Components Managed by Other Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Senior or Lead</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Education Staff - Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects with 20-29% for Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with 30% or more for Ed.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG review of project documents.
Note: n=number of projects in the sample with education commitments comprising at least 20 percent of commitments, approved from fiscal 2001 to 2009.

Participation of Education Sector staff was greatest for social sector projects and those having to do with structural adjustment or economic reforms. Education staff participated in the preparation of about 80 percent of economic management/reform projects, and three-quarters of social sector projects (table 4.6). More than half of poverty reduction and labor/employment projects involved Education Sector staff in their preparation and supervision. In contrast, Education staff participated least in community development/community-driven development/social fund-type projects and those responding to natural disasters or other emergencies.
### Table 4.6 Participation of Education Sector Staff by Focus of the Operation (projects approved in fiscal 2001–09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus of the operation</th>
<th>Percent of projects with Education Sector staff participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic management/reform (n = 5)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sectors (n = 16)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor/employment (n = 10)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty reduction (n = 16)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural disasters (n = 12)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community development/CDD/Social fund (n = 21)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (n = 21)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> (n = 100)</td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG review of project documents.

**Note:** CDD = community-driven development.

Education Sector staff are much more likely to be involved when the operation has an education objective. They participate in the preparation and supervision of about 60 percent of projects managed by other sectors that have an explicit education objective (and at least 20 percent of commitments for education; figure 4.6). In contrast, when there is no education objective, fewer than a third of projects involve Education Sector staff in preparation, and only one in eight projects in supervision.

### Figure 4.6 Participation of Education Staff in Preparation and Supervision of Projects with Education Components Comprising at Least 20 Percent of Commitments (fiscal 2001–09)

Source: IEG review of project documents.
Achievement of Education Objectives

Assessing the achievement of specific education objectives in projects managed by other sectors is not straightforward. In many cases the education objectives are implicit, not explicit. For example, in community-driven development/social fund projects, although there may be major educational investments made by communities (which can be inferred to improve access to education), the explicit objective is often community development or empowerment. Disaster response/emergency projects may rebuild schools, but their main objective is to respond rapidly to an emergency and rebuild many types of infrastructure.

The reporting of results often comingles education with other social sector service delivery objectives, and when there are many sectors, much of the detail on achievements can be lost in the completion reports. Generally speaking, the less that is spent on a component or sector in a multisectoral project, the less detail is available in the ICR.


One in five operations approved from fiscal 2001 to 2010 with any amount of education commitments managed by other sectors was a Poverty Reduction Support Credit or Grant. These PRSOs are multisectoral DPOs that form part of a programmatic series, usually managed by the Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Sector. Unlike the other types of multisectoral projects, PRSOs often contain major policy actions with respect to the Education Sector.

IEG concluded an evaluation of PRSOs in 2010 and reviewed the results of PRSO support for the social sectors, including education (IEG 2010e). That evaluation’s portfolio review identified 69 operations approved from fiscal 2001 to 2007 that had education objectives or actions in their policy matrices (Haq forthcoming). Only 20 of these operations had at least 20–29 percent of total commitments attributed to education and coincide with operations reviewed in the current Education Portfolio Note. The results for these 20 PRSOs with at least 20 percent of commitments for education are reviewed below.

Two-thirds of the PRSOs with major education commitments were in countries with parallel education sector lending (Albania, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Guyana, Madagascar, Pakistan, and Rwanda). The remaining third of the operations were the sole source of support to the education sector at the time they were implemented—PRSOs in Benin, Cape Verde, Moldova, and Uganda.
The most frequent education objectives or issues addressed were education access (80 percent of the operations), quality (75 percent), and efficiency (50 percent). About a quarter aimed to improve financial management and increase resources or accountability, or to increase primary completion. Only three operations (15 percent) mentioned an intent to improve learning outcomes, although about a third of the operations monitored learning outcomes.

Despite the overall focus on poverty reduction, education objectives and monitoring in these PRSOs usually did not target the poor. Only 15 percent of the operations had equity objectives or targeted improved education quality to the poor; 30 percent targeted the poor for increased access. Only a third monitored access among the poor and a quarter monitored education outcomes among the poor.

The education results of these operations are difficult to isolate. Sixty percent of the operations had baseline data for at least some of the education indicators, but weak monitoring and results frameworks, coupled with the presence of parallel sector financing, make it difficult to pinpoint the extent to which education sector results can be attributed to PRSOs. The IEG evaluation nevertheless found that, although these operations are generally not adequate as the sole source of education support, they have provided an important supportive role in countries with parallel education sector operations. Thus, they often help address policy issues that were beyond the reach of sector operations and the concerned line agency alone (box 4.1).

Achievements of Operations with Education Components Comprising at Least 30 Percent of Commitments

This section presents the education objectives and achievements of all 44 projects approved from fiscal 2001 to 2009 managed by other sectors for which at least 30 percent of total commitments were flagged for education. These projects comprised only 2.3 percent of all operations managed by other sectors; 18 had closed and been rated by IEG.

Three-quarters of the 44 projects had an education objective; the remainder had activities that were flagged with education content, but in the service of some other objective. A little more than half of the 34 projects with education objectives were managed by the Social Protection Sector and 12 percent (four projects) were managed by the Urban Development Sector. The remainder were managed by the Finance and Private Sector, Health, Population and Nutrition Sector, and Public Sector Governance Sector (three projects each); and by the Agriculture and Rural Development Sector (two projects). Nearly half
Box 4.1 The Supportive Role of PRSOs to Education Sector Lending

PRSOs (credits and grants) provide budget support to IDA countries and are anchored in country-owned development strategies. They provide broad-based programmatic support with an emphasis on poverty-reducing growth and pro-poor service delivery, including education. IEG’s 2010 evaluation found that almost all PRSOs had education objectives or actions in their policy matrix.a

It was initially expected that PRSOs would eventually become the primary vehicle for some sector lending. PRSO programs in six countries (Benin, Cape Verde, Madagascar, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Uganda) initially intended to replace education sector lending with the PRSO. The idea was that countries would eventually make their own budget allocation decisions and the need for parallel sector investment projects would wane. The right preconditions would have to exist for this to occur: a costed sector strategy; ownership of the Ministry of Education of the reform process, and the capacity to carry out reforms using country systems.

However, as of 2008, Education Sector lending had been replaced only in Cape Verde. Most of the countries that experimented with doing education only through PRSOs eventually went back to launching parallel investment projects. PRSOs only temporarily replaced education sector lending in Benin, Madagascar, and Uganda; in Mozambique and Tanzania education sector lending was never replaced. More than three-quarters of the PRSOs with education (78 percent) coexisted with Education Sector lending.

The evaluation found that PRSOs have played a strong “supporting role” to sector investment lending but are limited as an instrument to replace sector lending. They have strengthened the dialogue between central ministries and sector agencies and been able to promote high-level actions that were sometimes difficult to pursue within the sector. They also have usefully raised cross-cutting issues and brought attention to sector budgets.

However, surveys of PRSO and sector operations staff suggest the depth of the engagement and dialogue may have been limited and that they are not a good instrument for tackling sector details. Further, efforts to streamline conditionality across all sectors imply that some areas of importance to the education sector are not highlighted.

The evaluation recommended that PRSO sector content focus on cross-sectoral or central ministry issues critical to facilitating key sector reforms and strengthening sector budget processes. Complementary parallel sector lending remains important to address detailed technical issues and facilitate program ownership by line ministries.

Sources: IEG 2010e; Haq forthcoming.

a. The evaluation reviewed 72 operations approved from fiscal 2001 to 2007; 96 percent had education objectives.
were in the Latin America and the Caribbean Region, followed by the Africa Region (21 percent) and Europe and Central Asia (12 percent), with the remaining 7 projects distributed across the other three Regions. Three-quarters were investment loans, and a quarter were DPOs. More than a third were social sector projects, 18 percent were social funds/CDD projects, and 15 percent each were emergency/disaster projects, labor/employment projects, or other types of project.

The objectives of projects managed by other sectors with education components that accounted for more than 30 percent of commitments were similar to those of projects managed by the Education Sector. A higher share of projects managed by other sectors than the projects managed by the Education Sector sought to improve access to education (65 percent and 47 percent, respectively; figure 4.7 and chapter 2). The second most common objective was to improve the transparency or accountability of education (29 percent), also more common than in Education Sector projects.

![Figure 4.7 Education Objectives in Operations with Education Components Comprising at Least 30 Percent of Commitments](image)

Source: IEG review of PADs.
Note: n = 34. Operations approved fiscal 2001–09 with an education objective.

About one in four projects with an education objective sought to enhance efficiency or improve labor force/employment outcomes, and one in seven had an objective to promote sustainability, similar to the shares in Education Sector projects. However, projects managed by other sectors were less likely to have an equity objective (18 percent) or a quality objective (26 percent) than were projects managed by the Education Sector (36 percent and 62 percent, respectively). About a quarter of the projects with an education
objective targeted the poor in their statement of objectives—a higher rate than among Education Sector projects.

Eighteen projects with education components approved since fiscal 2001 had closed and been rated by IEG, of which 16 had an education objective. In terms of the types of projects with an education objective, five were multisectoral social sector projects, four were social fund/community infrastructure projects, three (all in Colombia) were social protection/labor force projects, two were emergency reconstruction projects, and two were LILs. Half were managed by the Social Protection Sector, three by the Public Sector Governance Sector, two by the Urban Development Sector, and one each by the Agriculture, Health, Nutrition and Population, and the Financial and Private Sector Development Sectors. More than half (10 of the 16) were in Latin America and the Caribbean, three were in Africa, and one project was in each of three other Regions.

The predominant education-related objective in these closed projects was to improve access to education. About 60 percent of the closed projects with an education objective sought to improve access, 30 percent had an objective to improve education efficiency, about one in four had an equity or accountability objective, and only 18 percent had an objective to improve quality of educational inputs or labor force outcomes. The education objectives of about a third of the projects (29 percent) were targeted to the poor. None of the projects had an objective to improve learning outcomes, although in three (the series in Colombia) the ICR noted that student and teacher assessments were introduced as an activity in the program.

Seven of the nine projects that had an objective to improve access to education achieved it. This result is similar to those for Education Sector projects with access objectives. The only other specific objective for which there were at least five projects was to improve the efficiency of education: three of five projects were judged to have substantially achieved that objective.

The three projects with labor force objectives were all in Colombia—the first, second, and third Programmatic Labor Reform and Social Development Policy loans. As was the case with projects managed by the Education Sector, the evidence on achievement of labor force objectives was thin regarding labor force outcomes. In this case, the ICR reported the increase in the apprentice pool from 33,000 annually in the base year to 79,400 by the end of the third operation, and an increase in graduates from the public training institute from 900,000 to 4.1 million annually. National employment rose and the
unemployment rate fell, but it was impossible to estimate how much was due to the labor reforms the series launched.7

Summary

About a third of new World Bank education commitments from fiscal 2001 to 2010 were managed by other sectors. Sixteen percent of projects managed by other sectors had education commitments, and in most cases they were a small share of the total. Among projects for which at least 20 percent was committed for education, the largest share was managed by the Social Protection Sector. The projects with large education components tended to be social sector service delivery or reform projects, social fund/community-driven development projects, safety net/employment projects, and emergency/disaster projects.

About half of projects with substantial education commitments had an education objective; for the rest of the projects, education was an input into achievement of some other objective. Education staff participated in the preparation or supervision of about half of the operations with more than 20 percent education commitments, more so in projects with education objectives and with higher education commitment levels. However, there is no information on the extent of input from consultant education specialists for the projects managed by other sectors.

The objectives of projects with education components comprising at least 30 percent of commitments were generally similar to those of Education Sector projects, except that fewer had equity or quality objectives and none had an explicit learning outcome objective. Improved access was the most common objective, and seven of the nine closed projects with that objective were judged to have achieved it.

PRSOs were common among projects managed by other sectors with 20–29 percent of commitments for education. About two-thirds were implemented in parallel with education sector operations. The most common education objectives were to improve access, quality, and efficiency of education. IEG's 2010 evaluation concluded that PRSOs play a strong supporting role to sector investment lending but are more limited as a sole instrument for sector lending (IEG 2010e). It recommended that PRSO sector content, including education, focus on cross-sectoral or central ministry issues critical to facilitating key sector reforms and strengthening sector budget processes.
Chapter 5
Conclusions

Education—specifically, the acquisition of knowledge and skills—plays a fundamental role in poverty alleviation and economic growth. Over the past two decades, education indicators in developing countries have improved substantially, especially at the primary level, buoyed by the Education for All movement and the international commitment to achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Primary school enrollment and completion rates have risen, and gender differentials in enrollment have narrowed in low-income countries; expansion of post-primary education has been more modest and has primarily been achieved in middle-income countries.

Annual World Bank commitments to education totaled $23 billion over the decade and more than doubled on an annual basis since 2001. The Bank’s corporate strategy has evolved from one that focuses on basic education to one with a dual focus on universal primary completion and post-primary “education for the knowledge economy.” The Education Sector has updated its strategy, focusing on Learning for All. This focus on learning is consistent with one of the main findings and recommendations of IEG’s 2006 evaluation of primary education and the results of research: it is not the level of completed schooling per se that conveys benefits for poverty reduction and economic growth, but rather the acquisition of knowledge and skills.

**LEARNING FOR ALL**

The Education Sector’s goal of Learning for All is highly relevant. The Education for All movement and the Millennium Development Goals have focused mainly on primary school completion and gender equity. However, this will not be sufficient to ensure that children are equipped with the basic knowledge and skills that are necessary to realize the benefits of education.

The new strategy cites dramatic numbers concerning the large share of primary graduates in low-income countries who still have difficulty with reading and basic calculations. The Bank’s focus on the learning agenda will complement and improve the relevance of the other international education initiatives. About one in five projects in the Education Sector portfolio already explicitly aims to improve learning outcomes. This has not changed much over the decade, although an increasing share of projects finance achievement tests and learning assessments.
This review suggests that achieving the goal of Learning for All will involve substantial challenges. Only about a third of the recently closed projects with learning outcome objectives substantially achieved them, and even where there have been improvements, average learning outcomes are still relatively low.

However, the findings suggest two things: first, building projects with conceptually stronger results frameworks, based on a clearer understanding on the binding constraints to better learning is important; and second, tracking intermediate as well as final outcomes is also important. Understanding “what works” in raising learning outcomes is likely to be context specific, highlighting the need for more experimentation and better monitoring and evaluation. Yet even though major impact evaluation initiatives have been launched across the Bank, including many on education, the M&E record on project evaluation and on learning from within projects appears to be quite weak.

Learning for All implicitly includes the poor, but it does not ensure that the poor will be brought in first. Although it is the poorest children who are least likely to be enrolled and the most likely to have lower learning levels, few education projects explicitly target outcomes among the poor, and even fewer track those outcomes. The review highlighted a number of cases where these outcomes have been tracked successfully, but these cases are the exception. Learning for the poorest and most disadvantaged children is where the “heavy lifting” will be required in raising overall learning outcomes. Tracking learning among the poor is also important for understanding whether learning is improving among different segments of the student population, in an environment of rapidly expanding enrollments among children from disadvantaged backgrounds.

The Labor Market Relevance of Post-Primary Education

Given the large increase in support for post-primary education in the past decade, it is somewhat surprising that the share of education projects with objectives related to the relevance of education to the labor force has not increased. Learning at the post-primary level must be relevant to the needs of the labor market if it is to contribute to the employment potential for graduates and have economy-wide impacts. Although the share of Education Sector projects financing tertiary education rose from 18 to 40 percent and vocational education from 18 to 33 percent over the past decade, the share of projects with objectives related to labor market relevance or employment has hardly budged. Labor-related objectives are even more common among projects with substantial education components managed by other sectors. This disconnect suggests a lack of attention to the links between post-primary education and the
labor market and the risk of low relevance of Bank support for post-
primary education.

**Labor market-related objectives of education projects have also been difficult to achieve, and attribution of labor market outcomes to education support has been problematic.** In fact, the results frameworks linking post-primary education to the labor force have been particularly weak. Only five of the nine recently completed projects with labor market-related objectives had even identified relevant outcome indicators, and when data were provided they tended to be in two points in time; labor market variables clearly can fluctuate a great deal. Too often, inadequate results frameworks result in inadequate indicators. Simple indicators such as the employment rate do not reveal anything about the type of occupation, the sector of employment, earnings, opportunities, or the duration and stability of the employment of graduates.

All the projects with labor marked-related objectives that reported on outcomes found positive results, but for the most part they were unable to convincingly attribute results to the education support. Weaknesses in the conceptual framework may reveal a lack of prior analysis or understanding of the links between the education system and the labor market—something that warrants further investigation.

**Labor market-related education objectives are also relatively prominent in education projects managed by other sectors, particularly projects with a large share of education commitments and managed by the Social Protection Sector.** This review found that education staff participate in preparation and supervision of a substantial share of projects managed by other sectors when there are explicit education objectives. The review was not able to look into the extent to which projects managed by the Education Sector are benefitting from cross support and other expertise when it comes to improving the market relevance of post-primary education or the extent of collaboration between the social protection and education groups.

**Improving the Performance of the Education Portfolio**

The Education Sector will face additional challenges in reversing the recent decline in project performance. The review points to a decline in the performance of Education Sector projects exiting in the past five years, compared with the previous five years, from 82 to 69 percent in the satisfactory range. The cause of the decline was not easy to pinpoint; increasing the number of projects with multiple subsectors, expanding support to post-primary education in low-
income countries, and the learning outcome agenda will increase the complexity of the portfolio and provide additional challenges.

**Key factors in project design and preparation continue to play a key role in the performance of recently closed operations and suggest avenues for improvement:** realism with respect to the time frame for results and the level of political commitment; the degree of complexity of project design in relation to the borrower’s capacity; the adequacy of ex ante risk assessment and mitigation plans; and a well thought-through results framework with clear objectives and indicators linking outputs to outcomes and impacts—in both the short and long term.

**Education Knowledge Database**

Finally, although the knowledge database anticipated by the new Education Strategy will benefit from many recently launched impact evaluations, the potential contribution of stronger M&E of government programs supported by the Bank should not be overlooked. Much could be learned—and with greater relevance to the local context—by ensuring better project M&E. Understanding the factors contributing to the variation in results for learning and labor force outcomes will be key to improving performance.
Appendix A: Coding of Objectives and Activities

Coding of Objectives

The objectives of each project were coded according to the statement of project development objectives in the project appraisal document (PAD). Objectives were taken as stated and were not inferred from proposed components and activities: for example, if a project had a major component geared to building management capacity or reforming finance but did not mention this in its stated objectives, then it was not recorded as having this main objective. The main categories of objectives included the following:

- Expansion of access/enrollments.
- Equity, including equity (of access, learning conditions, or opportunity), gender, and disadvantaged groups
- Quality of education inputs or services
- Efficiency, including internal efficiency and efficiency in resource/input management in the sector
- Management and Institutional Capacity Building—This category included objectives such as planning or management capacity, sector governance, building institutional capacity, and accountability and transparency
- Sector finance and sustainability
- Learning outcomes
- Labor market, including projects aiming to improve labor market relevance, raise employment of graduates, raise labor productivity, and increase human capital
- Pilot: Test effectiveness/sustainability of new/alternative educational approaches/institutions
- Other objectives. This was a residual of other objectives that could not be easily classified, including sometimes broad or nonspecific objectives to “improve education services.”

The objectives of projects managed by other sectors were classified in the same way, but they were often less specific with respect to education. To be coded as an education objective, the statement of objectives had to refer to an objective that was explicitly related to education or to improvement in “social services,” one of which is flagged as education. In the case of social investment funds/community-driven development projects, those with the
sole objectives of empowering communities to plan and invest in community infrastructure were not considered to have an education objective. However, in the event that there was a separate, associated objective to improve access to public services, these projects would be considered to have an education objective.

Coding of Activities and Actions

From the project description in the PAD (or actions in the program document or Memorandum of the President), each project was coded according to the planned actions or activities it would support. The main categories were the following:

- **Supply access—facilities**: (i) Construction, rehabilitation, and equipment; (ii) reform of practices/institutions for provision of and/or standards for buildings and equipment; school mapping; consolidation; rationalization of the criteria for size, structure, and location of schools; double shifting; (iii) promotion of private education
- **Demand-side access interventions**: (i) Provide conditional cash transfers or other targeted incentives; (ii) promote community/parent participation, consultation, public information/awareness campaigns, communications strategy.
- **Curriculum and methods**: (i) Develop or introduce new curricula/pedagogical methods, delivery modes, and/or supply textbooks and learning materials; (ii) reform processes or institutions for ongoing curriculum developments and/or textbook supply.
- **Teachers**: (i) Train teachers or head teachers; (ii) reform practices/processes for teacher management, teacher or head teacher qualification and recruitment and/or rationalize teacher deployment, pupil-teacher ratio, and so forth.
- **Quality assessment**: (i) Carry out student assessment; (ii) assess schools or programs; (iii) introduce or reform processes or institutions for student assessment, examinations, school inspection, quality assurance, accreditation of institutions.
- **Management capacity building**: At the level of (i) school/college/university, (ii) community, (iii) local government, (iv) private sector or nongovernmental organizations, (v) central institutions, or (vi) build capacity for education planning, information management, monitoring and evaluation.
- **Governance reform/decentralization**: (i) Increase autonomy at the school/institution level; (ii) increase/change the role of parents/community, employers or the private sector, or local government; or (iii) reform institutions at the central level.
- **Budget/finance**: (i) Change education budget principles/processes; fiduciary reform; expenditure tracking; (ii) change sources or uses of funds (fees, cost recovery, community or local government finance, student loans or scholarships; (iii) introduce new financing mechanisms for schools/institutions or local governments (formula funding, block grants, competitive/responsive/innovation funds); new mechanisms for financing specific inputs, performance-based incentives.
Appendix B: Additional Tables and Figures

Figure B.1 Total Finance to Education through Investment Projects and Development Policy Lending, 1990–2009 ($ millions)

Source: World Bank data.
Note: Financial commitments for the entire operation or part of it that represents education (for those managed by other sectors) are attributed to the year of approval. Additional financing for ongoing projects is attributed to the year that the additional financing was approved.
Table B.1 Prevalence of Objectives by Type of Operation and Level of Education (percent of projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Type of operation</th>
<th>Level of education*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Investment (n = 189)</td>
<td>DPO (n = 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of education, inputs, services</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/enrollments</td>
<td>44***</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity, of which:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (nonspecific)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged groups</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>7**</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>33***</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use efficiency</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal efficiency</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/governance/finance, of which:</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management/capacity</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector governance</td>
<td>6***</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability/transparency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector finance/sustainability</td>
<td>6***</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes/achievement</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Market, of which:</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/human capital</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Percent targeted to the poor]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IEG portfolio review.

Note: Difference between the two groups is statistically significant at *** p<=.01; ** p<=.05; * p<=.10. DPO = development policy operation

a. Single-sector primary education projects and single-sector secondary or tertiary projects.
## Table B.2 Share of Projects with Each Type of Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Action/Activity</th>
<th>Fiscal 2001–05 (n = 115)</th>
<th>Fiscal 2006–09 (n = 91)</th>
<th>All projects, fiscal 2001-09 (n = 206)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management capacity building</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/M&amp;E</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central government institutions</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government level</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community level</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/NGO</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher management reform</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/methods/books</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/materials supply/development</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform of curriculum/textbooks/ institutions</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget/finance</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New funding mechanisms</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget principles/process/fiduciary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost recovery/subsidy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance/decentralization</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community level</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private/NGO</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government level</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform central government institutions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply/Infrastructure</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/equipment</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform institutions for construction/equipment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private provision of schooling</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assessment</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform assessment system</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess students</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess schools</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand-side interventions</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness/communication strategy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional cash transfers/ Other targeted incentives</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** IEG portfolio review.

**Note:** M&E = monitoring and evaluation; NGO = nongovernmental organization. Trend in the share of projects between fiscal 2001-05 and 2006-09 is statistically significant at *** p<=.01; ** p<=.05; * p<=.10.
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Figure B.2 Trend in Performance of Education Projects Compared with Projects in Other Sectors, Weighted by Project Commitments, by Fiscal Year of Exit (1990–2009)

![Graph showing trend in performance](image)

Source: World Bank data.

Figure B.3 Trend in Bank Performance for Education Projects Compared with Projects in Other Sectors, by Fiscal Year of Exit (1991–2009)

![Graph showing trend in bank performance](image)

Source: World Bank data.
Figure B.4 Trend in Borrower Performance for Education Projects Compared with Projects in Other Sectors, by Fiscal Year of Exit (1991–2009)

Source: World Bank data.
### Appendix C: Learning Outcome Results

#### Table C.1 Results Achieved by Closed Education Projects with Explicit Objectives to Improve Learning Outcomes (approved fiscal 2001–09)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulgaria</strong></td>
<td>Education Modernization Project, 2000–04</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Primary, secondary, tertiary</td>
<td>Yes. Planned on developing an assessment and evaluation system for primary and secondary levels and testing 12th graders once.</td>
<td>The project planned to create a student assessment and evaluation system, develop a new standards-based curriculum, and a demand-driven in-service teacher training system (at the primary and secondary levels) and to establish a competitive teaching and management system for higher education. Most of these were not implemented. No curriculum development took place for primary or secondary education and the new examination system was greatly delayed. Teacher training reached only 60% of the grade 1–12 teachers. The center responsible for managing training for professors at the tertiary was set up and functioning, however.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown and unlikely, since most interventions were not implemented and data were not collected. Subsequent to the project closing, results from the TIMSS showed a sharp decline in math performance in Bulgaria from 1999 to 2003 and 2003 to 2007. The decline was also evident in the results for the PISA for 2000 to 2006 (World Bank 2010c).</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mali</strong></td>
<td>Education Sector Expenditure Program Adaptable Program Loan, Phase I 2000–06</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Primary, secondary</td>
<td>Yes. A reading fluency test was supposed to be developed, as well as standardized tests in French, math, science, and the national language. All were to be implemented.</td>
<td>Availability of textbooks improved (from 1.4 to 2 books per primary student, from 2 to 2.3 per middle-school student). The student-teacher ratio in primary declined from 56 to 53, despite expansion of enrollments. Curriculum reform was not completed but showed some progress. Pre-service teacher training was expanded (12 teacher training institutes functional by</td>
<td>No. Neither the reading fluency instrument nor the other assessments were developed during the project.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bulgaria Education Modernization Project, 2000–04 (P055158)

Mali Education Sector Expenditure Program Adaptable Program Loan, Phase I 2000–06 (P040650)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning outcomes</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India Rajasthan District Primary Education Project, 2001–08 (P055455)</td>
<td>To ensure that all children in the Project Districts, especially children from socially and economically disadvantage groups, have access to a five-year primary education cycle of appropriate quality. It is expected to result in greater learning and higher completion rates of the primary cohort.</td>
<td>Targeted to nine low-literacy districts, also to socially and economically disadvantaged groups</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Yes. Planned to do learning assessments at mid-term and end of project, to compare with the baseline conducted in all nine districts during project preparation. Target was a 25% gain in learning achievement of all children in language and math.</td>
<td>The student-teacher ratio was reduced from 48 to 40. Additional regular and “para” teachers were hired. Block and cluster resource centers were set up to support and supervise schools (though their capacity to support teachers was modest). 929 alternative schools were built for out-of-school children; extensive teacher training (including distance learning) was given on improving instructional methods and using learning materials. School libraries were established. “Child-centered” methods were used to make classrooms attractive and encourage attendance. Attribution issue: There was a large influx of students— as a result of enrolling almost all of the poorest children, the gross enrollment ratio rose from 95 to 117% (2001–08) and the dropout rate decreased from 60% in 2006 to end of project). Funds allocated for secondary school scholarships were reallocated to quality inputs (computers in classrooms, science kits, in-service teacher training, pedagogical supervision missions). Weekly hours taught by middle school teachers rose from 15 to 24. However, the “Reading First” campaign was not implemented, and there is no evidence that national languages were added as a medium of instruction, as planned in lower primary.</td>
<td>Yes. At baseline, mid-term, and end-of-project, in language and math, for 2nd and 5th graders.</td>
<td>Yes, except for Grade V for scheduled castes. All children: Grade II: Language: 2000: 66% 2008: 78% Math: 2000: 69% 2008: 83% Grade V: Language: 2000: 30% 2008: 67% Math: 2000: 41% 2008: 59% Girls: Grade II: Language: 2000: 65% 2008: 78% Math: 2000: 67% 2008: 83% Grade V:</td>
<td>Yes. Scheduled Castes: Grade II: Language: 2000: 66% 2008: 78% Math: 2000: 69% 2008: 83% Grade V: Language: 2000: 51% 2008: 67% Math: 2000: 40% 2008: 59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning outcomes</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India Rajasthan District Primary Education Project, 2001–08 (P055455)</td>
<td>To ensure that all children in the Project Districts, especially children from socially and economically disadvantage groups, have access to a five-year primary education cycle of appropriate quality. It is expected to result in greater learning and higher completion rates of the primary cohort.</td>
<td>Targeted to nine low-literacy districts, also to socially and economically disadvantaged groups</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Yes. Planned to do learning assessments at mid-term and end of project, to compare with the baseline conducted in all nine districts during project preparation. Target was a 25% gain in learning achievement of all children in language and math.</td>
<td>The student-teacher ratio was reduced from 48 to 40. Additional regular and “para” teachers were hired. Block and cluster resource centers were set up to support and supervise schools (though their capacity to support teachers was modest). 929 alternative schools were built for out-of-school children; extensive teacher training (including distance learning) was given on improving instructional methods and using learning materials. School libraries were established. “Child-centered” methods were used to make classrooms attractive and encourage attendance. Attribution issue: There was a large influx of students— as a result of enrolling almost all of the poorest children, the gross enrollment ratio rose from 95 to 117% (2001–08) and the dropout rate decreased from 60% in 2006 to end of project). Funds allocated for secondary school scholarships were reallocated to quality inputs (computers in classrooms, science kits, in-service teacher training, pedagogical supervision missions). Weekly hours taught by middle school teachers rose from 15 to 24. However, the “Reading First” campaign was not implemented, and there is no evidence that national languages were added as a medium of instruction, as planned in lower primary.</td>
<td>Yes. At baseline, mid-term, and end-of-project, in language and math, for 2nd and 5th graders.</td>
<td>Yes, except for Grade V for scheduled castes. All children: Grade II: Language: 2000: 66% 2008: 78% Math: 2000: 69% 2008: 83% Grade V: Language: 2000: 30% 2008: 67% Math: 2000: 41% 2008: 59% Girls: Grade II: Language: 2000: 65% 2008: 78% Math: 2000: 67% 2008: 83% Grade V:</td>
<td>Yes. Scheduled Castes: Grade II: Language: 2000: 66% 2008: 78% Math: 2000: 69% 2008: 83% Grade V: Language: 2000: 51% 2008: 67% Math: 2000: 40% 2008: 59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX C: RESULTS ON LEARNING OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Education System Realignment &amp; Strengthening Program Adaptable Program Loan, Phase I, 2001–08 (P055173)</td>
<td>The 12-year program seeks to improve the quality and relevance of primary and general secondary students learning outcomes to better prepare them to meet the demands of a market economy and a democratic society. Phase I begins to develop the policy and institutional framework for realignment of the system, develop capacity to meet those new objectives and manage the physical, financial, and</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Primary and secondary</td>
<td>Yes. A project output was supposed to be development of a national assessment and examination system, for grades 4, 6, 9, and the end of secondary school. A trigger for moving to Phase II was a reliable assessment of 4th and 9th grades in math and Georgian conducted at least once, with results analyzed and disseminated.</td>
<td>The ICR reported that the new curriculum was being implemented in grades 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, and 11. The extent to which teachers and directors were actually incorporating the curriculum was not documented. Many still needed training on the new grading associated with the assessment system. The textbook rental scheme was piloted but government decided to allow each school administration to decide which scheme to implement. All schools received already available learning materials in the first round; 1,243 schools (mostly in rural areas) received library packages. 30% of teachers (21,769) were trained as part of curriculum implementation; 213 school learning grants were awarded.</td>
<td>Yes. The national sample-based assessment of 4th graders in the Georgian language was conducted in September 2003 and in Math in May 2004. 9th grade examinations in Math, Georgian Language, and Foreign Language were conducted twice, in 2002 and 2003.</td>
<td>Unknown. The tests for 4th graders were conducted only once; the tests for 9th graders were conducted twice, potentially allowing measurement of a trend. However, they were only a year apart and the ICR does not report the scores. It is unclear whether the government continued administering and using the assessments after the end of the project.</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27% in 2008. This would normally be expected to lower average learning outcomes. Over the period, the share of enrollment in private schools rose from 26 to 33%.

| Language: | 2000: 51% | 2008: 67% |
| Math: | 2000: 40% | 2008: 58% |

Low attendance rates (65%) limited impact.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brazil Bahia Basic Education, Project, Phase I, 2000–03 (P059565)</strong></td>
<td>The program objective was to improve fundamental and secondary school outcomes, as measured by improvements in dropout and promotion rates and student performance on standardized tests.</td>
<td>No, not in the objectives. However, the improvements in quality of fundamental schools were targeted geographically to the 100 poorest municipalities.</td>
<td>Fundamental (1st–8th grades) and Secondary (9th–11th grades)</td>
<td>Yes. The results were to be tracked using the National System for Evaluation of Basic Education (SAEB) achievement tests, conducted in 2001 and 2003. The learning outcome target for the program was an increase in average performance of fundamental and secondary cycle students, in Portuguese and Math by 5%. Also, according to the PAD, the Phase I project was supposed to implement the first round of a SAEB-type student assessment in state and targeted municipal schools.</td>
<td>In Bahia’s poorest municipalities, 4,330 basic schools were upgraded to meet defined minimum operational standards for physical facilities (MOS); studies found that promotion rates were significantly higher in schools that had attained MOS. More than 400,000 pupils benefitted from accelerated classes for over-age pupils; school-level standardized continuous assessment tool was developed and implemented in urban municipal schools. School development plans and school improvement projects were financed. 119,000 new places created in secondary school, through construction and reorganization. Net secondary enrollment rate rose from 15 to 20%. Dropout rates increased from 16 to 20% in fundamental schools but declined in secondary schools from 22 to 19%; promotion rates in fundamental schools for students in the poorest municipalities were stagnant at 68–69%.</td>
<td>No. The SAEB test from 2003 was not available at the time of the ICR to compare with 2001. The SAEB-type learning and achievement assessments were implemented in about 275 schools, multiple times. However, this was to be used as a school-based tool and it had not been used in a systematic way to evaluation programs.</td>
<td>Yes. There were no results in the ICR, as the 2003 SAEB had not been implemented. Results from the ICR for the second Phase project (below) suggest an improvement in results from 2001–03 in all grades and subjects except 11th grade math. Fourth and 8th grade scores just prior to the project (1999–2001) declined on average, in both Portuguese and Math.</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brazil Bahia Basic</strong></td>
<td>The program objective was to improve fundamental and secondary school outcomes, as measured by improvements in dropout and promotion rates and student performance on standardized tests.</td>
<td>No, not in the objectives. However, the improvements in quality of fundamental schools were targeted geographically to the 100 poorest municipalities.</td>
<td>Fundamental (1st-8th grades)</td>
<td>Yes. To be tracked using the national Ensuring minimal operational standards for 7,188 schools (more</td>
<td>Ensuring minimal operational standards for 7,188 schools (more</td>
<td>Yes. SAEB results for 2001,</td>
<td>No. Taking into account results from</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: RESULTS ON LEARNING OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Project, Phase II, 2003–07 (P070827)</td>
<td>to improve fundamental and secondary school outcomes, as measured by improvements in dropout and promotion rates and student performance on standardized tests.</td>
<td>objectives. See the caveat in the Phase I project.</td>
<td>grades) and secondary (9th-11th grades)</td>
<td>test (SAEB). Also to use the instruments described in Phase I. The target was an increase average performance of secondary and fundamental cycle students, in Portuguese and Math by 5%.</td>
<td>than 3 times the target; implementation of school development plans in 3,337 schools, more than 22,000 accelerated classes; teacher training for 6,331 schools. Construction of 130 secondary school classrooms. Performance assessment in more than 2,800 schools. The dropout rate for fundamental cycle dropped from 6% to 5.3%, for the secondary cycle from 3 to 1.5%. The promotion rate in the fundamental cycle declined by 3.3% and in the 100 poorest municipalities it declined by 4.4%. In the secondary cycle the promotion rate declined by 1.5%. However, the net secondary enrollment rate rose by 11 points.</td>
<td>2003, and 2005 (though the test changed in 2003, making it not comparable with previous years; adjustments were made). Also, state achievement tests developed by the project for certain years and grades.</td>
<td>2001–05, for both 4th and 8th grade in both Portuguese and math, achievement rose from 2001-2003, and then dropped in 2005. For the 11th grade Portuguese the pattern is the same, while for math there was a slight decline over the whole period. (These results are only until 2005, and the project closed in 2007.) However, impact evaluations show that project inputs were associated with higher achievements in specific schools. The fluctuation in results from 1999-2005 may have been influenced by other factors: comparability of the tests; enduring impacts of the 2000 economic crisis; the effect of rapid expansion of secondary education; the diminishing impact of project outputs. There were several contemporaneous government education initiatives that also may have affected results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and dates</td>
<td>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</td>
<td>Targeted to the poor?</td>
<td>Subsector?</td>
<td>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</td>
<td>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning</td>
<td>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</td>
<td>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</td>
<td>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania Education Improvement Project, 2002–06 (P070112)</td>
<td>To improve student achievement in basic education (grades 5–10).</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Basic education (Grades 5–10)</td>
<td>Yes. The percentage of students attaining minimum standard in Lithuanian, Math, Science and Social Studies was to increase by 10 percentage points by the end of academic year 2006.</td>
<td>9,000 teachers were trained in active teaching-learning methods, student assessment and ICT use; 403 schools have access to the internet and new teaching materials; communities of learners were set up and functioning in 200 schools to facilitate active learning method. <strong>Attribution issue:</strong> Over the same period, the net enrollment rate rose from 88 to 96%. The percent of 18-year olds completing 10th grade rose from 85 to 80%.</td>
<td>Yes. Exams conducted in grades 4, 6, 8, 10 every two years.</td>
<td>Yes. Exams conducted in grades 4, 6, 8, 10 every two years.</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia Education Improvement Project, 2002–07 (P075189)</td>
<td>Improving teaching and learning in schools and empowering local communities to take responsibility for their schools.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Primary, secondary</td>
<td>Yes. Performance data on student achievement were to be produced and made available to the public. Specific grades and timing of the sample-based national assessment were not specified. Tests were to be developed during the project.</td>
<td>All primary and secondary schools made school development plans; about half received school grants; outcomes of the grants are not explained in ICR. Extensive teacher training in information technology and instructional methods took place. 50 model schools were set up. National assessment of student achievement was developed and implemented for 3rd and 4th grade, but not at the end of the compulsory grade.</td>
<td>Yes. Student achievement was assessed nationally at the end of Grades 3 and 4 on a small but representative sample of 5% and 7% of students, respectively, at the end of the project period. Serbia also participated in PISA (2003 and 2006) and TIMSS (2003 and 2007).</td>
<td>Yes. Student achievement was assessed nationally at the end of Grades 3 and 4 on a small but representative sample of 5% and 7% of students, respectively, at the end of the project period. Serbia also participated in PISA (2003 and 2006) and TIMSS (2003 and 2007).</td>
<td>Unknown. It seems that only a single round of the assessment was accomplished before the end of the project. Results for PISA and TIMMS were not reported in the ICR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucia Education Development Project, 2002–08 (P077712)</td>
<td>Improving the quality of teaching and the learning process</td>
<td>Yes, though not in the objectives. Rehabilitation and expansion</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Yes. The percent of students passing at least five subjects (including math and English) in the secondary</td>
<td>Two schools were constructed in underserved, poor areas. Gross enrollment in catchment areas rose from 35 to 68% in one area, and 0 to 53% in the other. These schools got better-trained teachers – the ratio of graduate-level teachers in</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No. Percent of students passing at least five subjects (including Math and English) in the secondary school leaving exam:</td>
<td>Results for the poor/non-poor and for disadvantaged students not measured.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Free Primary Education Support, 2003–07 (P082378)</td>
<td>To improve pupil performance and retention through ensuring an adequate supply and better use of instructional materials.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Yes. The project was to raise by June 2006 the proportion of children reaching desired standards of achievement (in English, Kiswahili, Mathematics and Science, in standards 2, 4 and 6), disaggregated by province,</td>
<td>Improved quality inputs at the classroom level, primarily classroom materials, were financed by school grants: All schools obtained textbooks that were lent out to students rather than relying on parents to buy them. About 80% of standard one to eight pupils gained access to them. However, student-to-textbook ratios remained high (2-6 students/book in lower primary, 2-4 students/book in upper primary). 36,000 resource teachers</td>
<td>Yes. Survey on Learning Achievement (only one round) and the Kenya KCPE.</td>
<td>Yes and unknown. KCPE scores nationally rose from 233 in 2000 (before the project) to 244 in 2003 (at project start) to 249 in 2006. However, only one round of data (the baseline) was collected from the Survey on Learning Achievement (undated): <strong>Standard 2</strong> Boys: 59.4; Girls: 61.8</td>
<td>Yes. KCPE scores of children from schools in the poorest districts increased by 1.75% and middle-income districts by 1.2% between 2003 and 2005. In better-off districts, there was a 0.5% increase. In the ICR this result is attributed to bringing into the system/retaining an influx of children with wide-ranging performance, bringing down mean achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation E-Learning Support Project (Phase I of the Education Modernization Program Adaptable Program Loan), 2004–08 (P075387)</td>
<td>Improve the accessibility, quality, and relevance of Russia’s general and first level vocational education, to the benefit of learning outcomes (improvement in school-leavers’ ability)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9th grade</td>
<td>Yes. 9th grade graduates demonstrating ICT competency, administered annually</td>
<td>Training of teachers in the use of ICT and in inter-school resource centers to use e-learning materials; formation of educator’s basic educational ICT competence; internet support of educator’s professional growth; training of new teachers; internet-aided instruction of school students at the streamed level; and development of educational institutions providing distance instruction to school students. More than 75,000 digital education resources were made available.</td>
<td>Yes. An ICT competence test, administered each of the three years of the project to 9th grade graduates in project regions.</td>
<td>Yes. Results of the competence test classified students into high, medium, and low competence level. Percent in the medium or high groups (not in the low group): 2005–06: 48% 2006–07: 54% 2007–08: 63%. (There was no baseline) Results for teachers: 2006–07: 79% 2007–08: 86%</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results were trained through multimedia distance learning methodologies. 84% of teachers use the textbooks in their lessons. There was a modest reduction in repetition rate of children in the poorest households, from 9.2% in 2002 to 7.7% in 2005, and reduction of the dropout rate from 2% in 2003 to 1.5% in 2006. (However, this trend was evident before the start of the project.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India Elementary Education Project, 2004-2007 (P055459)</td>
<td>To enhance the quality of education of all elementary school students so that learning will be improved and transition rates from primary education (Grades 1–5) to upper primary education (Grades 6–8) will increase.</td>
<td>No. However, there were targets for enrollment of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Yes. National Achievement surveys in language and mathematics in Grades 3, 5 and 7/8 were to be introduced; preliminary grade 5 data were available during project preparation.</td>
<td>Innovative teaching and learning materials produced for 100% of the regions participating in the project. 68% of schools introduced new generation teaching and learning materials into the curriculum.</td>
<td>Yes. Relied on data from the NCERT sample surveys. Baseline data: Grade 3 (2004-05): Math 58%, Language 63% Grade 5 (2002-03): Math 47%, Language 59% Grade 7/8 (2003-04): Math 30/38%, Language 52/52%.</td>
<td>Yes. Trend available for NCERT data only for Grade 5 (average score, 2002/3–2006/7): Math: 46 to 48.5% Lang.: 58.9 to 60.3%. Less reliable data on school exam pass rates children passing with 60% or above marks (2002/03 to 2005/06): Grade 5: Boys: 44.2% to 47.8% Girls: 44.8% to 48.5% Both: 36.6% to 40.5% Grade 8: Both: 30.2% to 33%</td>
<td>Yes, but not for learning outcomes. Primary completion rates rose faster among the poorest children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C: RESULTS ON LEARNING OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania Secondary Education Development Program, 2004–08 (P083080)</td>
<td>Improve learning outcomes of students, especially among girls.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reduction in tuition fees for government secondary schools from Tshs 40,000 to Tshs 20,000, with planned capitation grants of Tshs 25,000/pupil to replace the lost revenue and finance quality inputs. Scholarship grants were awarded to schools for poor families who couldn’t afford even the reduced tuition. New curriculum was introduced late in project. Private sector publishers were allowed to compete for textbook provision and the government monopoly was ended; a package of incentives was offered to attract teachers to underserved areas. The success of the plan to reduce fees and finance capitation grants (to ensure quality of teachers and classroom inputs) depended on a controlled expansion of secondary education, a “medium” scenario. However, following announcement of the Prime Minister of government’s willingness to support a secondary school in every ward, the number of government secondary schools rose from 828 in 2004 to 3,039 in 2008, almost all of the increase built by the communities with the expectation of support from government for the teachers and</td>
<td>Yes. National achievement tests not available, so pass rate for Form 4 examinations was used as a proxy.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No, it declined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

rose from 75 to 83%, the retention rate in primary school rose from 53 to 71%. Enrollment of children with special needs rose from 0.5 to 2.18 million.
## APPENDIX C: RESULTS ON LEARNING OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and dates</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve learning outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Subsector?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Activities implemented that would be expected to have an impact on learning outcomes</th>
<th>Collected data on trends in learning outcomes?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement in learning outcomes on average</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other inputs. Enrollment doubled from 430,000 to 1.2 million, more than the “high growth” scenario. The lower secondary GER rose from 10% to 30.5% from 2003 to 2007. The number of Form 4 completers rose by a factor of more than 4. The capitation grants could not be fully financed (Tshs 16,400/pupil instead of the planned Tshs 25,000/pupil), which led to shortages in inputs, especially staff shortages and delayed construction and equipment of science and computer labs and libraries. The pupil-teacher ratio rose from 22:1 in 2004 to 50:1 in 2007. The number of scholarships rose to 42,211 in 2008, and then declined to 11,895 in 2009.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project Appraisal Documents (for objectives, targeting, subsectors, planned indicators) and Implementation Completion and Results Reports (for activities implemented and results). Results for the Tanzania Secondary Education Development Project are from an IEG field assessment (IEG 2010f).

Appendix D. Labor/Employment/Economy Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, project name, dates, and project ID</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve labor market/employment outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Education Sub-sector(s)</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on employment outcomes?</th>
<th>Components implemented that would be expected to have an impact on labor market/employment outcomes</th>
<th>Collected data on trends?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement?</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrated among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russia Education Reform Project, 2001–07, (P050474)</td>
<td>To improve the flexibility and market-relevance of initial vocational education.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Training and retraining; courses for new professions and teaching and learning materials for work-related core skills were developed; initial vocational schools were modernized and the market relevance of vocational education was reportedly improved by design of course material for three training programs which included 13 books, with over 15,000 copies disseminated across the country. However, it was not clear what about the course content made it more relevant to the labor-market than alternatives. 27 TVET centers were established; 3 independent mechanisms were set up to monitor quality. 328 experts were trained in education, economics, sociology, and policy. However, it is not clear who these experts were and what their training did to improve the labor market relevance of the programs. The ICR did not report whether in-service training of vocational teachers was conducted or how many benefited.</td>
<td>Yes. Tracked employment of graduates and intermediate outcomes. Information was collected on whether the trainees were employed. (Data are available for 2002, 2005, and 2006.) However, there was no tracking of cohorts.</td>
<td>Yes. Data on employment were available only for one of the three regions. The number of resource center graduates employed increased from 1,580 in 2002 to 2,155 in 2006. It is not clear what percent of graduates this represents. Between 2000 and 2005, the percent of Initial Vocational education graduates employed in their area of specialization increased from 53% to 71%. The number of students who found employment and the number of graduates from improved retraining courses for unemployed who found employment were not measured. Intermediate outcomes were positive. The share of students sponsored by industries increased from 43% in 2003 to 70% in 2006, and the share of students employed according to the agreements with employers increased, between 2003 and 2006, from 11% to 25%. This made a significant impact on improving flexibility and market relevance of Initial Vocational Education</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D: Labor/Employment/Economy Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, project name, dates, and project ID</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve labor market/employment outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on employment outcomes?</th>
<th>Components implemented that would be expected to have an impact on labor market/employment outcomes</th>
<th>Collected data on trends?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement?</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrate among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangladesh</strong> Post-literacy and Continuing Education for Human Development Project, 2001–08 (P050752)</td>
<td>To increase the functional application of literacy skills. The project aimed to improve the provision of post-literacy and continuing education to neoliterates so that they can use literacy skills to increase their incomes, improve their family's welfare.</td>
<td>Yes. The PAD argues that the project’s focus on neoliterates means that benefits are naturally targeted toward the poorest segment of the population</td>
<td>Yes. Tracer studies, stakeholder surveys, and other sources on increased chances of better employment and on productivity gains.</td>
<td>Final draft of Post Literacy Continuing Education Models prepared and approved in 2002; 6,900 village Continuing Education Centers established and 6,900 Center Management Committees Organized; Upazila Nonformal Education Committees were organized in 205 Upazilas and District Nonformal Education Committees were organized in 32 Districts. 972,900 learners had completed Post Literacy and Continuing Education programs (against a target of 1.36 million) The training was made more flexible and geared toward learners' interests. The courses most in demand were in tailoring, cattle fattening, goat rearing, poultry rearing and milk cow rearing. These helped learners acquire a trade and become self-employed.</td>
<td>Yes. Tracer studies in 2005 and 2007. Information was collected on whether the trainees were employed.</td>
<td>Yes. The extent of increase in employment was 6% and average income of households that graduated increased by 10%. (There was no information in the ICR on the absolute levels.)</td>
<td>Yes, to the extent that learners were among the poorest people in Bangladesh, as assumed in the PAD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong> Third Technician Education Project, 2001–07 (P050658)</td>
<td>To improve the quality and efficiency of technician (polytechnic) education to meet the specific economic needs of each state.</td>
<td>Yes. Targets youth from urban and rural poor families</td>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Developing/expanding the capacity of the technician education system; enhancing the quality of technician education; improving the efficiency of the technician education system. The number of polytechnics increased from 0 to 9 (150% of target). 60 new diploma programs and 5,503 additional student places were created The number of programs for industry and community increased from 124 to 5,143. 143 labs and workshops were upgraded; 221</td>
<td>Yes. The percent of polytechnic graduates employed/ self-employed in their field of training within one year of graduation</td>
<td>Yes. The increase in the percent of trainees self-employed/ employed from the baseline in 2000 to the endline in 2007 ranges, from an increase from 8% to 78% in one region to an increase from 60% to 70% in another region. Overall achievement for all nine beneficiary regions is 108% of the target. It is not possible to estimate the overall change, since in some states baseline data were not available. The state-wise break-up of the</td>
<td>Yes. Between 20% and 40% of the student population came from poor families. The ICR maintains that at least 5% to 18% escaped poverty as a consequence of the project. No comparison is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D: Labor/Employment/Economy Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, project name, dates, and project ID</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve labor market/employment outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Education Sub-sector(s)</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on employment outcomes?</th>
<th>Components implemented that would be expected to have an impact on labor market/employment outcomes</th>
<th>Collected data on trends?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement?</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrate among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zambia TEVET Development Program Support Project, 2001–09 (P057167)</td>
<td>To improve skills for both the formal and informal sectors of the economy through creating a high-quality, sustainable, demand-driven, and equitable training system.</td>
<td>Yes. The target was to increase the share of TEVET graduates from poor and socially disadvantaged groups by 10%.</td>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Yes. Data were to be collected on the employer’s attitude and the trainee’s employment status six months after graduation.</td>
<td>A total of 62 registered training institutions (23% of the total) benefitted from the TVET Fund to finance demand-led training (against a target of 50%). National awareness on the new system, review and implement policies and build capacity in line ministries and training providers; training systems, trade testing and examinations; entrepreneurship development. And informal sector training; human resources; information systems; infrastructure and equipment; HIV and other cross cutting issues. 98% of employers surveyed perceived the training to be relevant and 81% rated the quality as satisfactory. The bursary scheme targeted students from poor and disadvantaged groups. The program supported at least 1,500 students who otherwise would not have had the opportunity to enter the system. Management improvements in individual training institutions were</td>
<td>Yes. Tracer studies were carried out in 2004 (baseline) and 2008.</td>
<td>Yes. The graduate tracer study found that about 60% of the graduates start looking for a job months after graduation. 55.1% of the graduates were employed within six months (a decline from 73% mid-project) and 90% within a year.</td>
<td>Yes. The share of TVET graduates from the lowest socioeconomic groups rose by 34% (against a target of 10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country, project name, dates, and project ID</td>
<td>Explicit objective to improve labor market/employment outcomes</td>
<td>Targeted to the poor?</td>
<td>Planned to collect data on employment outcomes?</td>
<td>Components implemented that would be expected to have an impact on labor market/employment outcomes</td>
<td>Collected data on trends?</td>
<td>Demonstrated improvement?</td>
<td>Improvements demonstrate d among the poor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>India</strong> Technical/Engineering Education Quality Improvement Project 2003–09 (P072123)</td>
<td>To support the production of high quality technical professionals through reforms in the technical/engineering education system in order to raise productivity and competitiveness of the Indian economy.</td>
<td>Yes. The project aimed to improve the access of disadvantaged groups (Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes, minorities, and poor urban and rural students) to engineering education and ensure their ability to perform well, complete the education successfully and secure employment.</td>
<td>TVET and higher education</td>
<td>Yes. Tracer and labor market surveys to collect data on graduate employment and improvement in earnings.</td>
<td>Promotion of academic excellence (programs accredited); autonomy and governance; institutional reforms; improvements in curricular practices; faculty and staff development; enhancement in postgraduate education and research, and consultancy activities; enhanced interaction with industry; increased attention to equity issues; networking of institutions; services to community and economy; system management capacity improvement. More specifically, 91% of programs applied for accreditation, and 56% received it. 60% of institutes received full academic autonomy; 84% full financial autonomy; 80% full managerial autonomy; and 88% full administrative autonomy. More than 90% of eligible programs underwent restructuring. 76% of vacant faculty positions were filled. 33,158 faculty and 13,708 staff were trained. There was a 46% increase in the number of students graduating with masters’ degrees (baseline = 7,218) and a 71% increase in the number graduating with a PhD (baseline = 342). On average, each institute undertook six to seven activities per year to increase networking with industry.</td>
<td>Yes – graduate employment rates and earnings. Number of networking and joint activities, R&amp;D, publications, and others.</td>
<td>Yes. The employment rate (90% of the target was achieved) has been measured by campus employment, which is an underestimate of the overall employment rate. The average annual salary has nearly doubled. Average annual salary of those employed through campus placements increased 74% in nominal terms for graduates and 88% for post-grads. In real terms, the increases were 40% and 51%, respectively</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country, project name, dates, and project ID</td>
<td>Explicit objective to improve labor market/employment outcomes</td>
<td>Targeted to the poor?</td>
<td>Planned to collect data on employment outcomes?</td>
<td>Components implemented that would be expected to have an impact on labor market/employment outcomes</td>
<td>Collected data on trends?</td>
<td>Demonstrated improvement?</td>
<td>Improvements demonstrate impact among the poor?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia Higher Education – Improving Access Project 2003–09, (P074138)</td>
<td>To improve the quality and equity of the Tertiary Education system through the subsector's response to society's needs for high quality human capital that will enhance Colombia's competitiveness in the global market. The project was to make the Colombian tertiary education system more responsive to demand and promote greater equity and quality in the preparation of tertiary education graduates.</td>
<td>Yes. The Student Aid component was to allow meritorious students from the poorest background to receive a mix of grants (25 percent) and non-subsidized loans (75 percent) for studying at the tertiary level.</td>
<td>Yes. The Labor Market Observatory was to track graduates and market needs, focusing on unemployment rates and wages by discipline area.</td>
<td>Student financial assistance; support for doctoral programs; institutional strengthening (Labor Market Observatory). According to the ICR, the project gave priority to the poorest and to those wishing to follow vocational-technical and technological courses of study. If a student required aid to pay for tuition fees, the project covered up to 100% for students in technical and technological courses, and up to 75% for university students. Between 2003 and 2008, loans were provided to 147,410 students who could not afford to pay for tertiary education. Of these 74% belonged to strata 1 and 2, 21% to strata 3 and 5% to strata 4, 5, and 6. Forgivable loans for PhDs were given to 534 students. The target number of beneficiaries from strata 1, 2 and 3 was 100,000 and the actual was 129,148. No curricular component was implemented in the project. The Labor Market Observatory was created in 2005, but no data were collected until 2008.</td>
<td>Yes. Employment rates for graduates in 2004 and 2008. Data were made available for different categories (technical, technological, regular, etc) and at the national level</td>
<td>Yes. Employment for graduates increased from 66.9% in 2004 to 82.9% in 2008 (nationally)</td>
<td>Not clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia E-learning Support Adaptable Program Loan Phase 1, 2004–08 (P075387)</td>
<td>To improve labor-market outcomes (improvement in school-leavers ability to find well-paid jobs in new occupations).</td>
<td>Yes. Targeting the poor is not an explicit objective but the desire to target the poor</td>
<td>No. The project aimed to collect data on skills development level only (ICT competency)</td>
<td>Teaching and learning materials; teacher training in ICT use; teaching modules; internet support and e-learning; development of institutions providing distance learning to school students; creating network of interschool resource centers. Training of teachers in use of ICT and in interschool resource</td>
<td>No. ICT competency was shown to increase between 2005 and 2008, but data were not collected on employment or earnings.</td>
<td>Unknown because not measured</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country, project name, dates, and project ID</td>
<td>Explicit objective to improve labor market/employment outcomes</td>
<td>Targeted to the poor?</td>
<td>Education Sub-sector(s)</td>
<td>Planned to collect data on employment outcomes?</td>
<td>Components implemented that would be expected to have an impact on labor market/employment outcomes</td>
<td>Collected data on trends?</td>
<td>Demonstrated improvement?</td>
<td>Improvements demonstrate among the poor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile Science for the Knowledge Economy 2003–07 (P077282)</td>
<td>To improve the stock of human capital in the science and technology sector.</td>
<td>No. Higher education</td>
<td>Not clear. The project also aimed to measure private sector demand for improved human capital via the stock of researchers and enrollment in post-graduate programs in hard sciences.</td>
<td>Science Technology and Innovation Management and Policy course and awareness seminars; PhD scholarships; larger grants to consolidated research groups; industry placements, promoting private sector linkages.</td>
<td>Yes. The private sector share of R&amp;D expenditure increased from 34.4% (2003) to 48.1% (December 2004); 55 researchers were inserted in industry.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Education System Realignmment and Strengthening</td>
<td>The overall program seeks to improve the quality and relevance of primary and secondary education</td>
<td>No, not specifically targeted to the poor. Because it was a primary and general secondary program.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Program components were mainly geared towards improving inputs in the educational system. One would have to assume these inputs were successful in preparing students</td>
<td>No data on employment variables collected.</td>
<td>Unknown. No information collected on labor market outcomes.</td>
<td>Not measured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D: LABOR/EMPLOYMENT/ECONOMY RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country, project name, dates, and project ID</th>
<th>Explicit objective to improve labor market/employment outcomes</th>
<th>Targeted to the poor?</th>
<th>Education Subsector(s)</th>
<th>Planned to collect data on employment outcomes?</th>
<th>Components implemented that would be expected to have an impact on labor market/employment outcomes</th>
<th>Collected data on trends?</th>
<th>Demonstrated improvement?</th>
<th>Improvements demonstrate among the poor?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APC (First Phase) 2001–08 (P055173)</td>
<td>general secondary students learning outcomes to better prepare them to meet the demands of a market economy and a democratic society. Phase I begins to develop the policy and institutional framework for a realignment of the system, develop its capacity to meet those new objectives and manage its physical, financial and human resources equitably, efficiently and effectively.</td>
<td>system-wide intervention, the poor would be covered to the extent they were already in a primary or secondary school setting.</td>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td>better and that better-prepared students were better for the economy. Assuming this, the program components of relevance to labor market outcomes were: New National Curriculum Framework for grades 1 to 12 finalized and officially approved; piloting in schools syllabi for grades 1, 2, 7, 8 and 10. Approximately 30% of teachers (21,769) were trained in using the new curriculum. Over 400 school learning grants were awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project Appraisal Documents (for objectives, targeting, subsector, and planned collection of employment outcome data) and Implementation Completion and Results Reports (for the implemented components, whether data were collected on trends, demonstrated improvements on average and among the poor).

Note: The results for all projects in this table are as reported in the projects’ Implementation Completion and Results Reports. As of the date of this report, these results had not been verified by an IEG field assessment. ICR = Implementation Completion and Results Report; PAD = Project Appraisal Document; TEVET = Technical Education Vocational and Entrepreneurship Training (Rep. of Zambia); TVET = technical and vocational education and training.
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Endnotes

Chapter 1

1 Primary completion rates in South Asia rose from 62 to 80 percent and in Sub-Saharan Africa from 51 to 60 percent, but both Regions still lag substantially behind other developing Regions (World Bank 2010a).

2 The number of girls enrolled as a percent of the number of boys enrolled.

3 Source is World Development Indicators. Statistics are for 2008, except for tertiary gender parity for low-income countries, which is for 2006.

4 Education commitments are defined as commitments assigned the following codes: BN (public administration-education), EC (preprimary education), EL (adult literacy/nonformal), EP (primary education), ES (secondary education), ET (tertiary education), EV (vocational training), and EZ (general education).

5 Investment operations finance goods, works, and services in support of specific economic and social development objectives in a broad range of sectors. There are several types of investment instruments—adaptable program loans, emergency recovery loans, financial intermediary loans, learning and innovation loans, specific investment loans, sector investment and maintenance loans, and technical assistance loans. The term development policy operations (DPO) is used in this report to refer broadly to all forms of loans, credits or grants that provide general government budget support. This includes structural adjustment operations made under Operational Directive 8.60 of December 1992 as well as development policy lending as described in Operational Policy/Bank Procedure 8.60 of August 2004. Although most education commitments are in the form of investment operations, the share of commitments in investment lending since 2000 (74 percent) was substantially lower than in the 1990s (94 percent). There was a discrete jump in education commitments through DPOs in 2001, the year that the first Poverty Reduction Support Credits were approved. The latter are multisectoral DPOs to low-income countries that typically have substantial shares of spending flagged for human development, including education.

6 The need to focus on acquisition of knowledge and skills (as opposed to enrollment and completion rates) and to strengthen education management for learning were both major messages of IEG’s evaluation of primary education, From Access to Learning Outcomes: An Unfinished Agenda (IEG 2006a).


8 In the short time frame for this note, it was not possible to review Bank-supported economic and sector work or technical assistance.

9 A DPO provides non-earmarked general budget support that is subject to the borrower’s own implementation processes and systems, to help a borrower address development financing requirements. It aims to help the borrower achieve sustainable reforms through a program of policy and institutional actions, for example, strengthening public financial management, improving the investment climate, addressing bottlenecks to improve service delivery, and diversifying the economy.

10 ICRs are prepared by the responsible operational unit following project closure with input from the Borrower; they are the primary document for self-evaluation by the World Bank.

Chapter 2

1 Two projects in Pakistan amounted to commitments of $650 million (Punjab Education Sector Project, $350 million, and Sindh Education Sector Project, $300 million), and $600 million was
committed for the Indonesia School Operational Assistance Knowledge Improvement for Transparency and Accountability Project.

2 In fact, the additional financing of $500 million to Indonesia was for the $600 million investment project approved 19 months earlier (the Indonesia School Operational Assistance Knowledge Improvement for Transparency and Accountability Project—see previous endnote). The additional financing in India was for the Second Elementary Education Project.

3 A large DPO was also approved for Rio State of Brazil (Fiscal Sustainability, Human Development, and Competitiveness Development Policy Loan to Rio State, $485 million). However, this was a multisectoral operation managed by the Education Sector, of which only $107 million was notionally assigned to education. The fiscal 2010 approvals altogether—including new projects and commitments of additional finance—provided the largest amount of resources to India and Mexico: India received a total of $1.05 billion through $300 million for a Second Technical/Engineering Education Quality Improvement Project and the $750 million in additional financing for the Second Elementary Education Project; Mexico received $1.02 billion, including $700 million for the Upper Secondary Education Development Policy Loan, $100 million for the Compensatory Education Project, and $220 million for the Phase II Adaptable Program Loan for School-Based Management.

4 There was only one instance of additional financing in fiscal 1998, for about $5 million.

5 Figure 2.2 and the rankings of countries per school-age child are based on commitments managed by the Education Sector. Commitments per school-aged child were computed using UNESCO data for the school-age population (kindergarten through secondary school); the school-age information was not available for Kosovo. These summary statistics on the commitments per country or per school-age child are purely descriptive; they are not sufficient for determining whether the level or content of the support was appropriate or whether the resources were effectively used.

6 According to the Education Sector hub, the General Education sector code “is used only if no other Education sector is appropriate or for activities that involve more than five sectors.” The Bank’s internal portfolio database allows the coding of a maximum of five sector codes. Thus, for projects that are mostly about education, there is an opportunity to flag commitments for sub-sectors. However, the limit of five sector codes poses a problem for coding education subsectors in multisectoral operations. If, for example, an operation finances five different sectors, one of which is education, it would not be possible to record the subsectors within education that are supported. Thus, it is likely that the General Education code is being used by Education Sector projects to flag education commitments for which “no other Education sector is appropriate,” whereas for projects managed by other sectors, which are by definition multisectoral, the code is likely being used to flag education commitments in any of the education subsectors. The growing use of this code—by the Education Sector and to a much greater extent by other sectors—and its lack of specificity will pose increasing challenges for the Education Sector in tracking resources by subsector.

7 Thus, a part of the increase in education commitments between fiscal 2008 and 2009 was due to a change in the way that the Bank internally codes the commitments for public administration.

8 According to Education Sector calculations, the sector coding in the PAD differed from the OPCS sector coding in 21 of the 27 Education Sector projects approved in fiscal 2010 (World Bank Education Sector, FY2009–10 Education Retrospective, forthcoming).

9 For example, the objective of the Pakistan National Education Assessment Project was to design and administer a national educational learning assessment system. However, three-quarters of the commitments were assigned to “central government administration” and one-quarter to “sub-national government administration.” None of the commitments was flagged as education, even though the objective and all commitments were clearly intended to improve education. This project and others like it are excluded from the estimates of World Bank commitments for education.
However, all projects managed by the Education Sector (irrespective of commitments) are covered in the discussion of objectives and results for the Education Sector in this and the next chapter.

10 Of course, to the extent that the DPO increases the overall level of government spending, Education Sector expenditures may increase.

11 If one uses instead the percent of projects with any commitment code in each of the subsectors based on the internal Bank database, the results are quite different from table 2.3: there is no change in early child development; a modest increase in secondary, tertiary, and technical/vocational education; and a drop in adult literacy/nonformal education. This underscores issues in the accuracy and consistency of coding in the Bank’s central system.

12 Objectives to improve access may also improve equity, though with no specific targeting or accountability for reducing disparities in enrollment across disadvantaged or low-income groups. Achievement of access objectives is generally measured by an average enrollment rate or an increase in the number of children enrolled, rather than a reduction in disparity or the distribution of enrollments.

13 This is similar to the share of primary education projects with learning outcomes found in IEG’s 2006 evaluation, although in the present case it includes all levels of education.

14 It is important to note that these DPOs managed by the Education Sector generally have objectives that are exclusively about education, whereas for the multisectoral DPOs managed by other sectors, the objectives cover education as well as many other sectors (see chapter 4).

15 One of the difficulties in coding activities is that the PADs and Program Documents differ in the level of detail provided. Thus, appendix table B.2 likely understates the share of projects with different planned activities.

Chapter 3

A total of 229 Education Sector projects closed in fiscal 2001–09 and have been reviewed by IEG, but in three cases the operations were cancelled and the project outcome could not be rated. This leaves 226 for analysis.

3 The six-point scale for the performance (“outcome”) rating includes highly satisfactory, satisfactory, moderately satisfactory, moderately unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory, and highly unsatisfactory. Guidelines from World Bank operations in formulating projects’ objectives advocate that they be outcome oriented and not simply reflect delivery of outputs or implementation of activities.

4 The difference between the share of education and other sector projects with performance in the satisfactory range in both periods is statistically significant at p <= 0.05, as is the downward trend in Education Sector performance ratings between fiscal 2001–05 and 2006–09. Because of the lag between project closing and posting of IEG ratings, not all projects exiting in fiscal 2008–09 have been rated.

5 The Bank’s Quality Assurance Group, in its 2009 review of the quality of the lending portfolio, also identified particular issues for education projects in quality at entry. For projects in mid-implementation, the Group found that education projects lagged behind other sectors in the likelihood of achieving their development objectives (World Bank Quality Assurance Group 2009).

6 The share of DPOs increased from 3 to 7 percent in the Education Sector and from 17 to 19 percent in other sectors; the share of Africa Region projects declined from 22 to 21 percent in the Education Sector and from 26 to 23 percent in other sectors.

7 Three-quarters of the projects approved since 2001 that have closed and been rated by IEG were approved before 2004, and 92 percent before 2006.
However, the pattern in the Country Policy and Institutional Assessment index (not shown) was the reverse—projects in countries with a low index performed worse than those with a high index (56 percent versus 70 percent, respectively).

Only one of the six projects with three or more subsectors was a DPO. Ideally, one would want to compare the results for projects with three or more subsectors in low- and middle-income countries, but there are too few closed projects in each group to make sensible comparisons.

IEG evaluators rate the achievement of each objective on a four-point scale (negligible, modest, substantial, or high). Table 3.2 presents the percent of projects for which achievement of each objective was rated substantial or higher.

This excludes both projects with vague quality objectives that may have implicitly targeted learning outcomes and LILs whose main objective was to test an approach. Many projects without explicit objectives to raise learning outcomes may also collect data on student achievement. However, because of time constraints, this review has focused on those with explicit learning outcomes, for which the projects are accountable.

As noted in the previous chapter, there are other active and closed projects that invested in learning assessments, but this review is restricted to those that had objectives to improve learning outcomes.

According to a recent World Bank study (2010d), Bulgaria launched decentralization reforms of the education system in 2007 (the same year it joined the European Union) to promote greater school autonomy and more efficient spending. As part of this reform, a transparent mechanism was introduced for the calculation and allocation of subsidies across municipalities and resources were passed on to schools, with increased delegation of decision-making to school principals. The reforms improved efficiency, allowing education sector wages to rise by 46 percent from 2006–08, yet the study concludes that “up to 2006, there is no correlation evidence that the school-based management reforms—greater autonomy and local participation in … school decisions—improve learning outcomes” (World Bank 2010c, p. vii). The reforms resulted in the closing of many small schools, which on average had lower test scores, but the smaller schools were more likely to be attended by lower-performing linguistic minority students; the study notes that linguistic minority students tend to do better in small than large schools, and the impact of the consolidation on their learning outcomes is of concern. The study also notes that as of 2010, a national standardized test that could measure the impacts of reforms on learning outcomes still does not exist.

Colombia’s project also collected data on the increase in average nominal monthly income by area and discipline.

Three other projects supported strengthening of adult literacy initiatives without directly delivering literacy services, and two did not implement planned activities. Among the five projects delivering literacy services, monitoring of outcomes was weak overall. Four of the projects measured adult literacy outcomes at least once, and three measured a change in literacy from before and after the program. Only one measured a trend disaggregated by gender.

This decline seems particularly surprising, given the interest in recent years in increasing the use of impact evaluations.

Available information suggests that these impact evaluations were not, for the most part, part of the Development Impact Evaluation Initiative. Of the 65 projects, only four could be linked to an education impact evaluation associated with that initiative. Two of those four projects claimed to have implemented their impact evaluation, but it wasn’t clear whether the project-sponsored evaluations were the same as those sponsored by the Development Impact Evaluation Initiative. In the other two projects, the ICR or IEG’s Project Performance Assessment Report noted that an impact
evaluation had not taken place, even though an impact evaluation associated with the initiative was linked to the project.

Chapter 4

1 DPOs in IDA-eligible countries that support the implementation of a Poverty Reduction Strategy are called PRSOs (credits or grants).

2 The concept of “education commitments” managed by other sectors, particularly in the context of DPOs, requires some elaboration. When task team leaders initiate a new project in the system, they code and assign a notional percentage of the total project amount to different sectors and subsectors that are expected to be targeted through the project. These percentages are estimates and are usually not revised during implementation or at project closure to reflect actual allocations of project funds. Thus, the amount flagged as commitments may not be dedicated to or spent on the sector to which it is coded. For DPOs in particular, all funding is general budget support and a notional allocation to education simply means that the operation contains some policy measures related to education; none of the funding from DPOs is directly transferred to the education sector.

3 The Macedonia project was the only freestanding conditional cash transfer project; there were five other projects that financed conditional cash transfer components and that were classified in other categories—social sector projects (Peru Programmatic Social Reform Loan II, Ecuador First Programmatic Human Development Reform, El Salvador Public Finance and Social Sector DPL); social fund projects (Nicaragua Poverty Reduction and Local Development FISE), and poverty projects (Pakistan Poverty Reduction Support Credit II).

4 Seventy-four of the 378 projects approved from fiscal 2001 to 2010 with education commitments managed by other sector boards were PRSOs (credits or grants).

5 The results of this section draw directly from the portfolio analysis of IEG’s PRSO evaluation, for the subset of 20 projects with at least 20 percent of total commitments attributed to education.

6 One additional project with education objectives had closed and been reviewed by IEG, but it was a project that had been cancelled, so efficacy was not rated. This section focuses on evidence of efficacy in achieving specific objectives, because the outcome rating for these multisectoral projects would be in reference to a number of objectives, many of them not education related.

7 There was no apparent relation in this small group of 16 projects between the participation of Education Sector staff in preparation or supervision and the achievement of the education objective.

Appendix A

1 This included instances in which the stated objective was to “improve the quality of education,” without specifying what aspect of quality was indicated. This includes many projects with a quality objective for which learning outcome indicators were proposed, but that did not explicitly set improvements in learning as an objective.
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