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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>MTEF</td>
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</tr>
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<td>NGO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTDF</td>
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<td>NUS</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Samoa National Assessment Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
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1 Samoa Education SWAp

Evolution of the Education Sectorwide Approach (SWAp)

At the start of the new millennium, Samoa was already on a quest to improve its aid effectiveness. In 2001, a joint Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID) harmonization document highlighted the suitability of Samoa for support through a SWAp. In 2002 Samoa attended the International Conference on Financing for Development in Monterrey, which called for improved aid effectiveness. Samoa also signed the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and the Accra Agenda for Action on Aid Effectiveness (2008). In 2006 the Government of Samoa (GoS) cosigned with AusAID and NZAID a Joint Samoa Program Strategy (2006-2010), which laid out guiding principles for development partner (DP) harmonization highlighting the importance of: Samoan leadership and ownership; mutual accountability; use and further strengthening of national capacities and systems; and use and strengthening of local analytic work. That same year an Aid Coordination Unit was created within the Ministry of Finance, whose head championed greater harmonization and aid coordination and contributed to the development of the Pacific Aid Effectiveness Principles.

Within the education sector, 2005 marked the end of Samoa’s Ten-Year Education Policies and Strategies plan and the launch of a consultative sector policy and planning process. In June 2006, following legislative elections held in March, the Ministry of Education, Sport and Culture (MESC) Strategic Policies and Plan 2006–2015 was issued. It articulated six sector goals supporting the overall aim of the sector to enhance the equity, quality, relevance, efficiency and sustainability of all levels of the education system (Box 1). Designed to align with the Education for All (EFA) initiative, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Forum Basic Education Action Plan (FBEAP), the document laid out 18 strategic components through which sector goals were to be achieved (Box 2).

Box 1: Samoa’s Education Goals 2006-2015

- **Quality improvement at all levels of education**, including improvement of literacy and numeracy, teacher quality, curriculum, materials and assessment policy, management of education, infrastructure, financing, community participation and support, and monitoring and evaluation;
- **Achievement of universal primary education**, increasing primary gross enrollment rate from 97 to 100 percent, net enrollment rate from 69 to 85 percent, and retention rate by 10 percent, all by 2015;
- **Expand and improve early childhood education**, including seeking and strengthening community support;
- **Improve adult literacy and access to life skills and continuing education for adults and youth**, to be addressed through both formal and nonformal sectors;
- **Eliminate gender disparities in schools and achieve gender equity**, including measures to address the lower performance of boys compared with girls; and
- **Poverty reduction, development of good governance, elimination of disease and achievement of environmental sustainability**, at core learning outcomes.

Source: Samoa MESC (2006); and Samoa MoF (2008).

---

1 For a brief overview of education sector issues and challenges, see Chapter 1 and Annex 1 of the Main Report.
2 This synthesis is based on a timeline of key education SWAp events, presented in Annex 1.
Box 2: National Education Strategic Components 2006-2015

1. Effective policy, planning and research services to enhance the ministry’s performance;
2. A quality early childhood education for all children between the ages of three to five in Samoa;
3. A quality primary education system that will ensure all students are successful learners regardless of their abilities;
4. A quality secondary education system that will provide a wide range of options for future study and career choices;
5. A postschool education and training subsector that is well coordinated with adequate provision to meet the needs of society and all the people of Samoa, including:
   o Higher education characterized by high and relevant standards of quality with clearly articulated pathways to opportunities for knowledge and skills development;
   o Sustainable, creative and ongoing teacher education programs (pre- and in-service) that produce good quality and committed teachers;
   o Quality technical, vocational and applied educational programs to enable people to be gainfully employed in order to meet the skills requirements of industry and commerce in Samoa; and
   o A strengthened nonformal education system that is recognized as a legitimate form of education, providing integrated and coordinated programs, aimed at improving the quality of life, and enabling individuals and communities to achieve a sustainable future;
6. A national education system supporting sustainable quality inclusive education and sports for all persons with special needs;
7. A dynamic education system in which every student actively participates in Physical Education and Health, Physical Activity and Sports as part of their educational development and experience;
8. Samoan culture is nurtured, maintained, preserved, disseminated, and utilized through innovative and creative educational experiences for all learners;
9. An education system that is committed to the advancement and maintenance of Samoan language status, and the development of people who are bilingual in Samoan and English;
10. Library services responsive to the needs of schools to enhance information literacy and learning for all;
11. A broad and balanced curriculum that encompasses the full range of academic, social, and cultural knowledge, understanding and skills, which are essential for today’s and tomorrow’s world;
12. Schools are sufficiently resourced (with teaching and learning materials) for effective and quality delivery of the curriculum;
13. A national assessment system that supports learning and recognizes achievement described by the curriculum framework, and which facilitates recognition of achievement by postschool stakeholders;
14. Educational planning and management, teaching and learning that is enhanced through the use of cost-effective information and communications technology;
15. An attractive, dynamic and motivated teaching profession of qualified, trained and committed teachers who are able to encourage and improve student learning;
16. An education system where all learners will have equal access to adequate quality facilities, furniture, equipment and related materials to meet their learning needs through asset management and maintenance;
17. A ministry with a management and work culture that will enable the most effective delivery of quality services in all areas of its mandate; and
18. Cost-effective and sustainable financing of education services to meet the needs of a learning community.

Source: Samoa MESC (2006); and Samoa MoF (2008).

The year 2005 also marked the completion of two major education projects: the AusAID-financed Education Institutional Strengthening Program (1999-2004); and the ADB-financed first Education Sector Programme (ESP I) (2000-2005). New projects were being prepared, notably an ADB project (Second Education Sector Programme—ESP II) aiming to support infrastructure-based activities and funding for research and evaluation, and an AusAID/NZAID
project aiming to support curriculum development and teacher training activities. As the Paris Declaration had just been signed, the GoS was keen to have donors work together more effectively in the education sector.

In the same year the Aid Coordination Unit was set up in the Ministry of Finance (MoF), GoS invited AusAID and NZAID to be a part of ESP II. This consolidation of efforts culminated in the jointly financed ESP II, through which the three DPs engaged to apply some of the emerging aid effectiveness (or SWAp) principles on a pilot basis. These principles include: (i) the harmonization of investments around a common strategy; (ii) government leadership and national ownership of sector policy and its implementation; (iii) the use of common implementation procedures and their alignment, to the extent possible, with government systems and capacities, especially for procurement and financial management; and (iv) the establishment and use of one monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system and a common reporting framework. The partners also agreed to pool their financing into this single project.

The development of MESC’s Strategic Policies and Plan 2006-2015 and ESP II was not sequential. Rather, their design and finetuning were synergistic, both rooted in discussions about aid effectiveness and SWAps that commenced with the new millennium.

**Education Sector Programme II (“Project”) Objectives and Design Features**

**Objectives**

Launched in 2006 with a six-year implementation period, the overall goal of ESP II was “...to help GoS establish a more equitable and effective education system that enhances learning outcomes of young people for further study, work and adult life.” This objective was designed to be supportive of the relevant MDGs and consistent with the Strategic Policies and Plan 2006–2015, and other national strategies. Project impacts expected by 2015 include: (i) increased enrollment at all levels; (ii) equal participation and performance by boys and girls; (iii) improved functional literacy rates; and (iv) increased employment rates of high school graduates. These impacts were expected to be achieved through enhancements to the quality of education by 2011, as measured by: (i) a new national assessment system; (ii) improved capacity and performance of teachers; (iii) improved learning outcomes; and (iv) reduced dropout rates. Table 1 itemizes ESP II’s goal, impact targets, outcome and outcome targets, and presents national sector targets and indicators for context and comparison.

---

3 These commitments were articulated in a Partnership Harmonization Framework (PHF) and a Consolidated Funding Agreement (CFA) cosigned by GoS, ADB, AusAID, and NZAID in May 2006.
Table 1: Sector and Project Goals, Anticipated Outcomes, Targets and Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GoS Education Sector</th>
<th>Education Sector Programme II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong>: Improved education outcomes.</td>
<td><strong>Goal</strong>: More equitable and effective education system that enhances learning outcomes for young people for further study, work and adult life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets/Indicators</strong>:</td>
<td><strong>Impact Targets (by 2015)</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Results from SPELL (Samoa Primary Education Literacy Levels) tests in year 4 show continued improvement.</td>
<td>• 100 percent net primary enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Results from SPELL tests in year 6 show continued improvement.</td>
<td>• 100 percent of children, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary education (MDG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primary net enrollment ratio over 2008-2012 increases.</td>
<td>• Eliminate gender disparity at all levels of education (MDG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proportion of pupils commencing Year 1 and reaching Year 8 increases.</td>
<td>• 85 percent total secondary net enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dropout rate between years 8 and 9 falls (primary–junior secondary transition).</td>
<td>• 100 percent functional literacy rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Literacy rates of 15-24 year olds rises.</td>
<td>• Increased enrollment at the tertiary education level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gross enrollment rate/Participation in Early Childhood Education (ECE) over 2008-2012 increases.</td>
<td>• Improved employment rates of high school graduates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of early childhood centers meeting minimum standards over 2008-2012 increases.</td>
<td><strong>Anticipated Outcome</strong>: Enhanced quality of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of students proceeding beyond year 11 over 2008-2012 increases.</td>
<td><strong>Outcome Targets (by 2011)</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ratio of boys to girls at secondary school converges.</td>
<td>• A new national assessment system is in place covering core subjects for different years at regular intervals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Samoa MESC (2006); and ESP II Project Implementation and Administration Manual (PIAM), December 2006.

ESP II was originally designed around five components, each one specifying outputs (Table 2) and performance targets (Annex 2) with a sixth component (SchoolNET) integrated in 2007.

Table 2: Project Components, Component Outputs, and Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New primary curriculum and assessment system.</td>
<td>• National teacher development framework</td>
<td>• Improved secondary school facilities and a</td>
<td>• Improved national capacity for research and</td>
<td>• Improved strategic program management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


SWAp objectives (or anticipated benefits) are not systematically articulated in any one document, but they are embedded in a number of documents reviewed for the purposes of this study. SWAp is not very prominent in MESC’s Strategic Policies and Plan 2006–2015. “Support Sector-Wide Approach in the design and implementation of programmes” is one of 10 strategies under the (eighteenth) “Financing” strategic component of this Plan, but there is no definition of SWAp, no elaboration of what this strategy means or how it will be implemented/measured, and no mention of SWAp under other potentially appropriate strategic components (especially “Policy, Planning and Research Services,” and “Management of Education”).

On the other hand, the SWAp content of the Joint Samoa Program Strategy 2006-2010 of the GoS, Australia and New Zealand, is prominent. This Strategy notes that, “The GoS is seeking to shift towards SWAp to enhance ownership and effective and efficient utilization of both external and internal resources.” It specifies guiding principles and aid delivery mechanisms and points to other expected benefits and outcomes, such as enhanced development impact and accountability, strengthened national ownership and management of development cooperation, sustainable national capacity, a focus on outcomes rather than inputs, alignment of aid with government systems and processes, and greater policy coherence of development assistance. Details of SWAp content extracted from these various documents are shown in Annex 3.

The Partner Harmonization Framework (PHF) for ESP II, cosigned by GoS and the three DPs, notes that the guiding principles of the Paris Declaration will be applied to ESP II, on a pilot

Source: Report and Recommendation of the President to the Board of Directors on a Proposed Loan and Technical Assistance Grant: Samoa Education Sector Project II, ADB, Number 34285, November 2005.

---

4 SWAp content was gleaned from a number of documents, notably: Partner Harmonization Framework for the Samoa Education Sector Project II; Joint Samoa Program Strategy 2006-2010; Strategic Policies and Plan: July 2006-June 2015; and ESP II Project Implementation and Administration Manual. Details are provided in Annex 3.
basis, and that arrangements under this project would not set a precedent for future arrangements for aid effectiveness in the sector without thorough evaluation and the concurrence of each DP. The principles, mechanisms and arrangements described in this document, therefore, apply only to the project and not to the entire sector—a “sub-sector-wide approach,” as characterized in the Mid-term Review (MTR). The PIAM specifies that the ESP II seeks to “...strengthen MESC’s capacity in the day-to-day management, evaluation, monitoring and implementation of development projects, leading to opportunities for a sector-wide approach in the future.”\(^5\) This underlines the pilot nature of ESP II’s SWAp design.

The SWAp design of ESP II is expected to contribute to the more effective and efficient use of funding and other sector resources to achieve sector outcomes (quality, relevance and excellence in service delivery). Box 3 presents the aid effectiveness and harmonization principles to which the GoS and DPs are committed in the context of ESP II. Another strong motivation for the SWAp-like arrangements of ESP II is the expected reduction of transaction costs both to GoS and to DPs (MTR Report). Some SWAp objectives of the ESP are embedded in the performance indicators of Components 4 and 5 of ESP II (Table 2), including strengthened capacities in: strategic program management; implementation oversight and coordination; research and evaluation; operations analysis; policy analysis and planning; and performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting. A strengthened, integrated financial management system (under Component 5) is also an objective inherent to a SWAp, facilitating both enhanced efficiency and the use of country systems.

**Box 3: SWAp Principles Articulated in the Partner Harmonization Framework (PHF)**

- Harmonization is Samoa-driven, led and owned.
- DPs should aim to harmonize their investments around a common strategy and should, to the extent possible where not in contravention of international policies, align with Samoan Government implementation structures, reporting systems and procurement procedures.
- This translates under the SPII framework to one M&E system, including a common reporting format and, to the extent possible and not in contravention of internal policies, the use of government systems for procurement.
- A partnership approach, based on fairness, transparency, openness, accountability and mutual trust.
- Clear and simplified processes and mechanisms tailored to local circumstances and institutional capacity.
- Work within Samoa’s national development frameworks and systems.
- Development assistance will be provided in ways that build sustainable national capacity, including civil society, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and the public sector.
- DPs will maximize their use of existing analytical work to the extent possible.
- DPs will work together to strengthen Samoan institutional capacity.
- The effective and efficient use of funding and resources.
- Quality, relevance and excellence in service delivery.

*Source: Partner Harmonization Framework (2006).*

In short, while not listed systematically or explicitly in any one place, the review of the SWAp content of key sector and project documents reveals that all of the anticipated benefits of the SWAp (top panel of Figure 1-1 of the Main Report) are essentially captured in these

---

\(^5\) Italics added by the author for emphasis.
various documents, including: (i) tools for improved sector coordination; (ii) greater harmonization and alignment of development assistance; and (iii) enhanced sector stewardship. Nevertheless, because they are not systematically or consistently presented across documents, or fully captured in performance indicators, there is a lack of clarity and risk of confusion about the objectives of the approach (as distinct from sector performance and outcome objectives) and how to measure them.

**Costs and Financing**

The total cost of ESP II was estimated at US$30 million equivalent. A breakdown of this cost by component and the financing plan are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Over and above these costs and contributions, Samoa committed to contribute up to US$100,000 for the provision of TA for teacher development programs, and ADB committed to contribute an additional US$350,000 equivalent as a TA grant from the ADB-funded TA program. Under the project about 428 person-months of domestic consulting and 150.5 person months of international consulting services were envisaged.

**Table 3: ESP II Project Cost Summary (US$, millions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Foreign Exchange</th>
<th>Local Currency</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Baseline Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing curriculum reform and assessment systems</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing effective teachers</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving access to quality education</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>19.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening capacity to undertake research evaluation, policy analysis and planning</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening capacity to implement and manage development projects</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal A.</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.31</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.60</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Contingencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical contingencies</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price contingencies</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal B.</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total A. + B.</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.71</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest charges during implementation</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ADB (2008a).*

**Table 4: ESP II Financing Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financier</th>
<th>Foreign Exchange (US$ million)</th>
<th>Local Currency</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZAID</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoS</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.92</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ADB (2008a); and Partner Harmonization Framework (2006).*
Management and Oversight

MoF is the Executing Agency for the Project while MESC is the Implementing Agency with overall responsibility for the day-to-day management of project implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and progress reporting. An Education Steering Committee (ESC) was established to provide strategic direction and oversight to ESP II implementation. Its role and composition are detailed in Box 4. An ESP II Secretariat, chaired by a Program Coordinator, coordinates project administration and reporting and includes staff drawn from the Corporate Services Division (for financial management) and the Asset Management Unit (AMU)(for procurement). Other Secretariat staff include an information technology officer, project officer and support staff.

At the operational level, the Project is managed by the MESC Core Executive Group, comprised of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the Assistant CEOs (ACEO) and the Office of the CEO, where the ESP II Secretariat is housed. All components of the project are implemented through MESC’s organizational structure, the responsibility for the oversight of each component resting with the appropriate ACEO and for component implementation with staff of the relevant divisions. Component 5 was designed to support the operations of the ESP II Secretariat as well as project financial management and procurement, with a view to ensuring that the project adheres as much as possible to MESC management, financial, monitoring and reporting systems.

Box 4: Role and Composition of the Education Steering Committee (ESC)

- The ESC will provide strategic direction and oversight for the ESP II implementation. The ESC will meet whenever necessary, but not less than once in every quarter.
- Composition: Chair (Government Ombudsman) and representatives from MoF, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Public Service Commission, Samoa Qualifications Authority (SQA), Ministry of Works, National University of Samoa (NUS) and other members yet to be determined; and the Coordinating DP (CDP).
- The ESC will undertake the following tasks:
  - Approve project progress reports, endorse proposed operational plans and support the development of project budgets;
  - Provide overall policy and strategic guidance on project implementation and decide on corrective action, if needed;
  - Ensure that project implementation is in accordance with government education sector policies and plans; and
  - Resolve issues and conflicts that may emerge.


Procurement

All goods and services financed under the project were to be procured either in accordance with ADB’s Procurement Guidelines or Samoa’s guidelines for procurement acceptable to ADB. It was also agreed that for the contracting of consulting services ADB’s Guidelines on the Use of Consultants would apply.
**Disbursements and Financial Management**

Under a pooled funding arrangement, GoS and the DPs agreed to make payments into a Special Purpose Account (SPA)—owned and operated by Samoa. AusAID, NZAID and Samoa agreed to advance funds into the SPA to cover the costs of the project (to be replenished on the basis of adequate financial reporting and the appropriate use of funds), while ADB agreed to provide funds on a reimbursement basis. All disbursements by the DPs were to be made in line with agreed shares of costs (Table 4).

**Annual Reviews, Monitoring and Evaluation and Reporting**

Joint Review Missions (JRMs) of ESP II were slated to be held at least annually to provide a forum for program policy discussions among the partners. The nature and number of JRMs to be undertaken, and the composition of the JRM team, were to be mutually agreed. At the time of design, a minimum number of JRMs to be undertaken during the life of the project was defined (Table 5). Annual JRMs were envisaged to include: an examination of budgetary allocations, operation and maintenance costs, staffing and other incremental recurrent costs, implementation arrangements and achievements under the Project. Each JRM would assess progress under each Project component, identifying difficulties and constraints, and ways to overcome them.

The reviews were also meant to assess the effectiveness of the harmonization process. MESC management, specifically the CEO and ACEOs, would be a primary source of information for these reviews. A more in-depth mid-term JRM was envisaged to: (i) review the scope, design and Project implementation arrangements; (ii) evaluate pilot programs; (iii) assess performance against targets and benchmarks; (iv) review lessons and experiences with implementation of each component; (v) review compliance with bilateral agreements; and (vi) recommend needed changes in Project implementation. A single joint record of a follow-up “partnership meeting” to discuss the JRM findings to be prepared by the Coordinating Development Partner (CDP) and agreed between the parties would formalize the outcomes and key actions to be taken. A final evaluation of the Project and the donor harmonization pilot process, following the closing of the loan, would culminate in a joint Project Completion Report.

**Table 5: Minimum Number of Joint Review Missions (JRMs) Under ESP II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Joint Review Missions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>Two reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>At least one review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>Mid-term review and at least one other review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>At least one review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>At least one review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>At least one review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Consolidated Funding Arrangement (2006).

Reporting requirements under the project provide for quarterly and annual project performance reports (PPRs). PPRs would report on: (i) basic project data; (ii) utilization of funds;
(iii) progress against project objectives; (iv) implementation progress; (v) compliance with covenants; and (vi) any problems or issues that might arise. Other reporting requirements include: statements of expenditures; unaudited project special purpose account; audited project SPA; annual plan and consolidated PPR; contract awards and disbursement projections.

At the time of project design and approval, there was a design and monitoring framework for ESP II (essentially captured in Tables 3 and 4). Specialist assistance under Component 5 was programmed to help design a sectorwide M&E framework for MESC’s Strategic Policies and Plan 2006-2015, within which ESP II is embedded, as well as a standardized performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting system for the whole sector in general, and for ESP II, specifically. This system was envisaged to accommodate requirements of donors in the spirit of the SWAp principle of one system and common reporting for M&E.
2 To What Extent Have the Anticipated Benefits of the Approach Been Realized to Date?

This section provides a brief tally of progress to date against anticipated capacity and efficiency benefits of the SWAp (top panel of Figure 1-1 of the Main Report). Underlying factors and challenges, related to the progress in realizing these benefits and their possible effect on the achievement of sector objectives, are discussed and further developed in Chapter 4. In summary, progress has been made on some fronts, but not on all.

Most of the tools for improved sector management and coordination have been put into place. But some of them (partnership and implementation arrangements) are only for ESP II in support of its role as a pilot for SWAp learning, while others (Medium-term Expenditure Framework–MTEF–and M&E framework) are sector wide in scope. The strategic framework for the education sector consists of MESC’s Strategic Policies and Plan 2006-2015 (with its medium-term vision), the series of Corporate Plans (with three-year horizons) and annual plans derived from the cited strategic plans. ESP II with its six-year implementation plan, also broken down into annual plans, supports a subset of the strategies and interventions envisaged in MESC’s broader strategy. A sectorwide M&E framework that serves both the Strategic Policies and Plan 2006-2015 and the ESP II was developed with the support of a technical expert financed under the project.  

Medium-term projections of resource availability and expenditure plans have been developed for ESP II. As part of the design, detailed project costs and a financing plan were developed, the latter based on formal commitments of GoS and the three pooling DPs (summarized in Tables 3 and 4). Project costs and financing are supposed to be updated on an annual basis in conjunction with the annual project planning process and informed by implementation progress, actual expenditures and revised cost estimates. This does not, however, appear to have been done regularly as JRMss consistently raise the need to review and revise project costs and budgets.

From the broader, sectorwide perspective, in early 2010 a Medium-Term Expenditure Framework School Finance Report was prepared by MESC with technical assistance financed under the SchoolNET project.  

This report estimates and projects annual resources available to the sector (itemizing recurrent and development resources/budgets) and annual expenditures for the period 2008-14, based on a school finance survey of 37 randomly selected schools. The projected costs of delivering the education goals and strategic objectives articulated in the Strategic Policies and Plan 2006-2015 do not appear to have been estimated. 

---

6 The existence of this M&E framework is noted in the JRMss. Some references to this document indicate that it might be only for ESP II, while others indicate that it is sector wide. This review did not have access to this document.

7 The preparation of a sectorwide MTEF was a condition of Phase 2 of the ADB-financed SchoolNET and Community Access Project, approved in December 2007, and integrated into the ESP II to achieve enhanced synergies between the two projects.

8 This MTEF was not available to this desk study.
In the context of ESP II, the PHF and CFA lay out *structures and processes for working partnerships*—between GoS and the three DPs, and among the DPs. Processes for interaction essentially flow from the aid effectiveness (or SWAp) principles (Box 3) and the Joint Review Process and Schedules (Table 5). The PHF also notes the role of a CDP, responsible for: supporting coordination and information flow between GoS and DPs and among DPs; facilitating the DP approval of Samoa’s choice of auditor; and facilitating discussions and arranging mutually acceptable dates for Joint Reviews.9

*Plans for common implementation arrangements*, laid out in the PHF and CFA, are detailed in a PIAM, which serves as a guide to all actors and stakeholders on the agreed implementation and administration requirements of the project. The PIAM includes chapters with guidelines on: (i) overall project implementation; (ii) the recruitment of consultants; (iii) procurement; (iv) disbursements and banking arrangements; and (v) reporting and auditing requirements. It is not clear from available documentation, however, whether, or to what extent, these plans, guidelines and envisaged technical assistance were based on *assessments of government systems and capacities during project design*.

The PIAM guidelines for the various components do not refer to systems/capacity assessments.10 Common arrangements for M&E were scheduled for development during the project with specialist assistance. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the M&E specialist responsible for strengthening M&E capacity and systems under ESP II do not, however, refer to any assessment of existing M&E capacity as having already been undertaken; nor do they, in the event no such assessment was carried out, incorporate such assessment as a part of the ToR.

*There is evidence of some improvement in the harmonization and alignment of development assistance on some fronts, but less progress on others, and no evidence on changes in transaction costs.* The MTR of ESP II found that under the ESP II’s SWAp-like arrangements, MESC has developed significant strengths in *leadership* with regard to program and sector oversight and implementation. It also notes that the ESC has the potential to provide even greater strategic advice, guidance and oversight if it is provided with more timely and appropriate information and encouraged to focus more on strategic than on implementation elements. There has also been progress in the *alignment of project support around the use of country systems*.

---

9 NZAID was appointed to take on this role in the first instance, which was to be rotated to other DPs every 18 months. This role has since been assumed by AusAID.

10 Among the ADB loan covenants for ESP II is the borrower’s commitment to: (i) commission an external review of the efficiency of the procurement methods and contracts packaging for equipment and materials procured under ESP I; (ii) discuss the findings of the review with ADB and the pooling DPs during the project’s inception; and (iii) agree with ADB and the DPs on the remedial measures to be taken based on such review prior to engaging in procurement under this project. MESC’s quarterly program progress report (January to March 2010) reports this as having been carried out and submitted to the DPs in March 2007, but the results and implementation of any required actions are not reported in this or any other source available for this review.
At the time of ESP II design, GoS and DPs agreed to use ADB procurement systems in the absence of sufficient government systems capacity to implement a program on this scale. Following a World Bank assessment of Samoa’s procurement systems, which noted their rigor (JRM, 2/09), and in light of the MTR’s documentation of improved procurement capacity and performance under ESP II, the feasibility of shifting into the use of country systems for procurement is being considered. It is not clear from the design documentation what the arrangements are for project financial management and to what extent they rely on country systems, but the MTR does point out important shortcomings and the need to align more with the country’s financial management systems.

The M&E sectorwide framework and system which has been developed for the use of ESP II, as well as for the entire sector, is expected to facilitate the use of one single M&E framework and system by GoS and all of its partners, but this has not yet been demonstrated. The MTR points out the need to embed ESP II processes within MESC annual plans and within MESC-wide reporting systems, which are in need of strengthening. There is insufficient evidence about the alignment of aid flows with national priorities. The MTR does point out, however, that there is scope for improving harmonization through the strengthening of ESP II planning, budget preparation, and financial management, both in terms of process and linkage. There is little indication in the documents reviewed about whether or to what extent transaction costs of GoS and/or DPs were indeed reduced as a result of alignment and harmonization efforts.

Only modest progress has been made to date in enhancing MESC’s sector stewardship. Because the costs of implementing MESC’s 18 strategies in its ten-year plan (2006-2015) have not been calculated or assessed against available financing, there is insufficient evidence to assess the efficient use of resources in support of nationally defined strategies and priorities. The recent development of a new M&E framework and of a reporting regime based on the new framework system, and ongoing capacity building of MESC’s operations research and evaluation capacity should facilitate a greater focus on results, but this has not happened yet.

The MTR has noted the lack of reporting at a strategic level with evidence-based results. ESP II has made some headway in defining accountabilities for results. Both the CFA and the Loan Agreement are clear in holding MESC accountable, not only for the transparent use of funds, but also for achievement against agreed targets. ACEOs are accountable in principle for the implementation and outcomes of the components that they are overseeing, but there is no evidence of MESC systems, capacities or practices in tracking performances and accountabilities for results. DP accountabilities are briefly discussed in Chapter 5.
3 To What Extent Have the National Health Objectives Been Achieved?

This section draws heavily from the MTR report of ESP II, which was prepared in 2009, discussed in draft with stakeholders in late 2009, and finalized in June 2010. Annex 4 provides an overview of the MTR findings, by component (and component output), highlighting: achievements and issues; progress against milestones; and recommendations for accelerating/improving performance under the remaining life of the project, and beyond. These MTR results are synthesized below.11

With a slow start, and after four years of implementation, the MTR reported some progress against some of the ESP II milestones, while performance on other milestones had fallen short of targets.

Under Component 1 (Curriculum Reform and Assessment Systems):
- A draft National Curriculum Policy Framework was produced in 2006, but with variable quality. Teachers’ manuals and guides were under production, but the appropriateness of learning materials needs to be assured. This learning materials milestone was not reached by December 2009.
- The Samoa National School Assessment Policy Framework was launched on July 30, 2010, some seven months after the agreed milestone for its approval and adoption (December 2009). The timing of its implementation might, however, be revisited to coordinate with the availability of new curriculum materials.
- The readiness for implementation of the home-school literacy partnership by December 2010 was on track; and the milestone to have courses available at the Fagaloa Community Learning Center by December 2010 was noted by the MTR to be ahead of schedule. Financial sustainability needs to remain a key focus of efforts.
- The MTR predicted that the milestone of producing multimedia science materials for use in secondary schools might be (at least partially) achieved by February 2011. There is considerable potential for greater synergy with other efforts (primary curriculum and teachers’ professional development).

Under Component 2 (Developing Effective Teachers):
- Cabinet approval of the NTDF was predicted to be met in 2010 (versus the original milestone of December 2008). Its initial draft form in 2008 was substantially improved with the technical assistance of AusAID. The scale of institutional effort required for its implementation is considerable and will only be affordable with the long-term commitment from the DPs to support the recurrent budget. Its comprehensive costing was recommended by the sixth JRM.
- While progress was made in the review and revision of the teacher performance appraisal system, it was not achieved by December 2008, and was not operational by December 2009. Development of new in-service training programs based on needs

---

11 This section provides some updates on MTR findings, as drawn from the 6th JRM which took place in July 2010, after the final MTR was issued. However, it does not necessarily capture all updates and progress made since the final MTR was issued.
assessments and aligned with the new curriculum was reported to be at a very early stage.

- The milestones of completing the development of fast-track primary teacher training and awarding the secondary fellowships by December 2008 were not reached.

**Under Component 3 (Improving Access to Quality Education):**
- The expected completion date of the new MESC HQ was September 2010, with significant cost overruns.
- Renovation of secondary schools and construction of school houses were still at the planning stage, with a considerable escalation of cost estimates.
- Work on a school maintenance handbook was scheduled to commence in late 2009.

**Under Component 4 (Research, Evaluation, Policy Analysis and Planning):**
- The milestone of strengthening research and report writing skills of Policy Planning and Research Division (PPRD) staff by December 2008 was not reached, but its late achievement was reported to be imminent. MESC databases were not completed, linked and accessible by January 2009, but this is being addressed; the first field study was almost completed by the original milestone date of August 2009.

**Under Component 5 (Management and Oversight of Development Projects):**
- Strategic program management and coordination has been strengthened somewhat (see Question 1).
- An integrated financial management system had not been fully established.
- Performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting was likely to be enabled with the new M&E framework and training supported under the project.

**Under Component 6 (SchoolNet and Community Access Project):**
- The milestones of electronic curriculum and materials in all secondary schools and teachers trained in their use by July 2010 were not met. A decision to defer to 2010 recruitment of the major Information and Communication Technology (ICT) consultancy firm was made to ensure exploration of the possibilities and potential to support the overall MESC agenda.
- This component supported the preparation of the MTEF in 2010.

The MTR did not systematically assess ESP II’s progress to date against its 2011 outcome targets or against its 2015 impact targets (listed in Table 1). It does, however, note that outcomes and impacts are not likely to be achieved by the project’s closing date. This review’s independent assessment of the evidence corroborates this finding, given that the six-year implementation period is approaching its end, and considering the findings and recommendations of the sixth JRM, which occurred after the MTR. Chapter 4 assesses to what extent the SWAp arrangements under ESP II may have affected—positively and/or negatively—the feasibility of achieving its intended outcomes and impacts.
4  How is the Adoption and Implementation of the SWAp Affecting Program Results?¹²

Quality and Relevance of the Strategic Sector Framework

Both MESC’s Strategic Policies and Plan 2006–2015 and ESP II are very ambitious. Given that ESP II is piloting a SWAp approach and is supporting a subset of the goals, strategies and interventions contained in MESC’s Strategic Policies and Plan 2006–2015, the sectorwide strategic framework for Samoa’s education sector is still in the process of formation. Each of the 18 strategic components of the Strategic Policies and Plan 2006–2015 itemizes numerous strategies for achieving sector goals. In total, there are 197 strategies to be implemented over three three-year phases: July 2006–2009; July 2009–2012; and July 2012–2015. Of these 159 (or 81 percent) were slated to start in Phase 1, 160 would be under implementation in Phase 2, and 121 in Phase 3.

Strategies identified under the Strategic Policies and Plan 2006–2015 were not translated into an implementation plan, nor were their costs estimated. With the exception of enrollment and retention targets, the Plan does not systematically lay out strategic outcome targets and their baselines. The timeframe for achieving major, long-term education sector reforms that would lead to improvements in classroom learning appears to be underestimated. The Plan was not accompanied by a results chain that would lay out clearly the underlying program logic of inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts and their linkages. The prioritization and appropriate sequencing of strategies and interventions is not clearly articulated, nor does the Plan include an assessment of MESC capacity for its implementation.

ESP II is very ambitious in terms of its targets, reform agenda and objectives, and implementation plan, especially in light of constraints imposed by limited human resources in MESC, a fixed envelope of financial resources for its support, and a six-year timeframe. As is the case for MESC’s Plan, ESP II underestimated the timeframe required for preparing and implementing sector reforms (curriculum reform a case in point) and it did not sufficiently consider and flesh out the synergies, coordination and sequencing of the various steps of reform implementation. There is no results chain to underpin the program logic. Despite initial costing of the project, various new reforms and frameworks emanating from ESP II have not been costed—the NTDF being a case in point.

The links between ESP II and MESC’s Plan are not fully established. JRM’s have noted that ESP II is regarded as a separate program, rather than a source of support to MESC’s Plan implementation. MESC’s Corporate Plans were not available for this Review, but it is important to note the MTR’s observation that ESP II needs to be more overtly linked to MESC’s (three-year) Corporate Plans and to its annual plans.

¹² This chapter addresses the middle panel of Figure 1-1 of the Main Report.
There is considerable scope for a well-designed, sectorwide M&E framework to facilitate the alignment of ESP II with MESC’s Plan. At the outset of each, there was no M&E framework. While documents reviewed indicate that a sectorwide M&E framework has now been established, serving both ESP II and the Plan, it does not appear to be fully functional, given that the MTR includes among its lessons the importance of establishing baselines from which to judge the impact of reforms on the quality of learning, and the need for appropriate tools to monitor, measure and evaluate the extent and sustainability of reforms. Another indication of persistent issues with M&E is the MTR’s recommendation to develop an M&E system aligned with the Corporate Plan and to meet the needs of ESP II.13

Another important component of a sector strategic framework is an MTEF that: (i) estimates the costs of the medium-term development plan; (ii) projects availability of resources over the medium-term; and (iii) reconciles the two, based on a system of prioritization and phasing. An MTEF was produced in February 2010 and discussed in March 2010, but it was not available for this Review.14

Strength of Country Capacity and Incentives

The regular occurrence of JRMs has provided a structure and process for carrying out key components of strategic sector management: planning, budgeting, monitoring and reporting of performance and progress of ESP II. However, weaknesses in strategic sector management, raised in JRM reports and cited in the MTR include: failure to cost (or update costs of) key elements of ESP II; the lack of a sufficiently strategic focus of meetings, reviews and progress reports; the lack of full coherence of planning, budgeting, monitoring and reporting cycles and systems. Reporting and monitoring do not pay sufficient attention to trends, risks, or links to the project’s development objectives or those of MESC’s strategic and corporate plans.

Up until 2010 the ESC has not been sufficiently focused at the strategy level. The quarterly report submitted after the new M&E framework and reporting system became available did not base itself on these new tools as had been recommended by the Fifth JRM. All of these factors have contributed to the slower-than-expected implementation of ESP II (Chapter 3). Combined with the abovementioned quality issues of the strategic sector framework, weak capacities in strategic sector management have undermined the results focus of ESP II efforts. The Sixth JRM has noted that, with shifts in key personnel (team leader, curriculum adviser and Secretariat), program reporting has been considerably strengthened. Operations research and evaluation activity and capacity building supported under ESP II have the potential to inform and further strengthen strategic sector management and a results focus. Strategic sector management capacity does not appear to have been assessed at the project’s outset.

---

13 The M&E Framework prepared by the M&E specialist under ESP II was not available for this Review.
14 The MTEF was initially slated to be sector wide in its scope, but in the end focused on schools. AusAID has noted its intention to fund a sectorwide MTEF under the partnership.
Limited *procurement capacity* caused implementation delays and risked undermining the quality of services rendered during the first four years of the project, but the series of JRM's and the MTR document indicate gradual improvements in such capacity. There were a number of reasons for limited capacity and performance, and consequent slow implementation. *First*, the substantial procurement workload of ESP II that is the responsibility of MESC is unprecedented in terms of its sheer size. *Second*, delays in the finalization of the PIAM perpetuated misinformation, misunderstanding, and overall uncertainty about how the procurement processes set out in the CFA and loan agreement would actually be implemented. *Third*, bidding documents were prepared by three different entities (ADB, MESC and AusAID) in an uncoordinated fashion. *Fourth*, procurement procedures and approval processes require clearance by both ADB and GoS systems, requiring extra time. *Fifth*, GoS capacity and its effective use were issues, notably: AMU’s need to improve quality checks on documents to reduce work duplication, and the need to ensure the involvement of the relevant technical expert (component manager) and appropriate Corporate Services Division staff in the evaluation of tenders and in contract negotiations. *Sixth*, the management and oversight of consultant contracts were not sufficiently rigorous or results-focused.

Progressive improvement in capacity, largely a phenomenon of learning-by-doing, is recorded in project reviews. The Fourth JRM did note improved compliance with procurement policies and reduced time delays and pointed to opportunities for further enhancing and better utilization of capacities. The Fifth JRM noted improved performance in procurement processes and forward planning, but deficiencies in the evaluation of tenders and in associated documentation. The MTR also notes strengthened capacity and performance, but with continued challenges in the management of large and complex international consultancies. It also recommends an independent assessment of MESC’s procurement processes to explore the feasibility of transitioning from ADB to country systems by the end of ESP II. The Sixth JRM notes continued and significant improvements in procurement performance since the MTR.

The *management and oversight of significant technical assistance* remains a critical challenge in ensuring timely and quality services and overall project implementation that encompasses, but also transcends, procurement processes. Under ESP II, 150.5 person months of international expertise and 428 person months of national expertise are envisaged, almost all of it in support of the first three components: curriculum reform and assessment systems; teacher development; and improving access to quality education services.15 There are persistent issues surrounding the quality, results, and accountability of technical assistance, the delineations of roles and responsibilities of technical assistants and of the staff/divisions they serve, communication between consultants and MESC (although this is noted in the Sixth JRM to have improved), and the appropriate planning of technical assistance, especially its full discussion with DPs and its incorporation into annual plans.

15 Only a very small proportion of envisaged assistance was in support of SWAP/strategic sector management capacities: eight months of international expertise for research, evaluation and policy; four months of a project management specialist; and four months of an M&E specialist.
The MTR notes that financing mechanisms and financial management systems are in place and document flow arrangements that are sound and in full compliance with project exigencies. There are, however, serious shortcomings in financial management capacity and performance that are undermining value for money and risking considerable cost overruns.\(^\text{16}\) Overall financial control of project finances is very weak due to the large number of people involved, untrained staff and unclear roles and responsibilities. There is no effective monitoring of financial performance of individual contracts and no quality control of performance on consultancy contracts for nonconstruction activities. Financial reporting is very weak, noted to be partial, lacking focus, and late, thus not serving its purpose as a viable management tool.

The weaknesses in program financial management and lack of quality control of contracts create a risk so substantial that it could lead to the program failing to meet its objectives, if not corrected. Slow preparation of quarterly reports has caused delays in the DPs’ ability to deposit funds into the SPA. Delays in the preparation of withdrawal applications have undermined ADB’s ability to reimburse expenditures. The appropriate institutional home for ESP II financial management (its current home in the ESP II Secretariat versus MESC’s AMU, where stronger capacity exists) and the integration of ESP II financial management functions within the wider MESC financial management process are two issues cited by the MTR as needing to be addressed.

**Quality and Functionality of the Partnership**

**Who is in the partnership?**

The partnership for the ESP II consists of the signatories to the PHF, who are also the cofinanciers of the project: GoS, ADB, AusAID, and NZAID. It does not include other international donors supporting the education sector (such as Canada, EU, JICA, SPC, UNDP and WHO),\(^\text{17}\) nor does it include any national or international NGOs or other relevant members of Samoa’s civil society. These exclusions also apply to the membership of the advisory ESC, which is limited to GoS and the CDP, as the representative of the three DPs cofinancing ESP II. The PHF does note among its principles that “...development assistance will be provided in ways that build sustainable national capacity, including civil society, NGOs and the public sector;” and it specifies under key focal area (or component): the intention to strengthen *community partnerships*.\(^\text{18}\) It does not, however, include NGOs, civil society or communities as active partners in this pilot SWAp.

A review of the six JRMs issued to date reveals that all missions were limited to representatives of the PHF signatories, and five of these six missions did not meet with any

\(^{16}\) The most recent (Sixth) JRM documents a potential cost overrun on the civil works component of US$3.3 million, which will be covered by GoS, in line with the Partners Harmonization Agreement.

\(^{17}\) EU: European Union; JICA: Japan International Cooperation Agency; SPC: South Pacific Commission; UNDP: United Nations Development Programme; and WHO: World Health Organization.

\(^{18}\) Italic added by author, for emphasis.
representative from civil society or with any other DP supporting the education sector.¹⁹ The exception was the Third JRM, which took place in February 2008. This mission convened a meeting of all the DPs contributing to the education sector to discuss how better to coordinate and target their collective assistance. Attended by China, JICA, UNESCO,²⁰ UNDP, AusAID, NZAID, ADB and SUNGO (Samoa Umbrella for Nongovernmental Organizations), this meeting’s discussions were framed by a list of donor-financed education sector projects, and their costs and financing.²¹ The other meeting with the broader network of education sector DPs was convened by the ADB education specialist on the occasion of the MTR in 2009, at which there was agreement to set up a coordination mechanism to: facilitate discussion of sector issues; coordinate support; and address and resolve partnership issues. It was subsequently agreed (at the Sixth JRM in July 2010) with MESC’s CEO to invite a wider representation from the DPs to attend monthly informal meetings and to make these meetings more issues-focused and strategic. The inclusion of civil society representation is, however, not explicit.

**To do what?**

The JRMs have been carried out along the lines defined in the CFA, notably an examination of: (i) budgetary allocations, operation and maintenance, staffing and other incremental recurrent costs; (ii) implementation arrangements; (iii) achievements under the Project; (iv) progress under each Project component; (v) difficulties and constraints and possible remedies; and (vi) effectiveness of the harmonization process. In keeping with the CFA, a single JRM report, discussed and issued by all parties, also formally records the JRM findings, and key actions to be taken. In contrast with other SWAp, and probably because of the pilot nature and project focus of this particular SWAp, the activities of the JRMs have been focused more on project implementation than on more strategic, sectorwide tasks such as policy and strategy, the allocation of sector resources, and the monitoring and evaluation of sectorwide outcomes and their underlying program logic.

The Sixth JRM has noted, nevertheless, a move toward a more strategic focus to JRMs, partly through the ESC better fulfilling its strategic, advisory role. It also points, however, to the potential for more sectorwide, policy-level discussions and advocates the opening up of these discussions to nongovernmental schools and civil society organizations. This JRM also notes the interest of GoS and DPs in evolving towards a sector-based approach that would transcend the project-specific focus of ESP II.

**How do they interact?**

---

¹⁹ This is based on a review of the list of persons met and is included as an annex to each JRM report.
²¹ This list (Annex F of the Third JRM) reveals that the following DPs, in addition to the three DPs supporting ESP II, are supporting the education sector: China, Japan, the EU, UNDP, Germany, Canada and the USA. It also reveals that, over and above their support to ESP II (including the SchoolNET project), Australia and New Zealand finance, respectively, seven and six other supports to Samoa’s education sector.
In line with the PHF and the CFA, the CDP helps to organize and facilitate information exchange among ESP II DPs and between these DPs and GoS, including the holding of JRMs and recording their outcomes and agreements. Over and above the more formal interaction associated with the JRMs, GoS and the three ESP II DPs meet informally, on a monthly basis. These meetings focus largely on ESP II information exchange and implementation monitoring. They are not focused on policy, strategy, necessarily grounded in the collection/analysis of evidence, nor are they open to other DPs. The MTR has recommended the establishment of a formal DP Coordination Group that would include all DPs supporting the education sector and that would be more strategic, sector wide and results-focused. While GoS and the three DPs agreed in July 2010 to hold only one JRM per year henceforth, they have also agreed to hold short, highly focused biannual technical meetings. The nature and quality of interactions cannot be accurately gleaned from a desk review of project/sector documentation and thus will be an important focus of fieldwork under a proposed second phase of this study.

**Predictability, Flow and Use of Assistance**

The predictability of financing, both for ESP II and for the entire sector, has been uncertain at best. The CFA for ESP II clearly spells out the project costs and formalizes the funding commitments of each of the four partners (GoS and DPs) to finance, together, 100 percent of these estimated costs (Tables 3 and 4). Progress achieved under this project to date reveals that not all of its objectives will be achieved within the six-year implementation period. This is due both to delays in implementation and to the fact that implementation plans, targets and objectives were highly ambitious for a six-year timeframe, especially given the underlying reforms being introduced. Furthermore, actual costs, especially of civil works, have exceeded initial estimates. Project expenditure projections have not been routinely updated or systematically monitored against the balance of financing available. In short, the financing needed to achieve all project objectives has neither been recalculated nor assured by the three ESP II DPs (or other DPs).

As reforms unfold and experience is gained, the recurrent cost implications of ESP II are revealing themselves to be important, especially the planned increase in recurrent spending on teacher salaries and on key incremental MESC staff to manage and oversee reforms. The costs of implementing MESC’s sectorwide plans (three-year Corporate Plans, and the ten-year *Sector Policies and Plan 2006-2015*) have not been calculated, so the adequacy and use of DP support outside of ESP II has not been assessed against the estimated costs (needs) of these sectorwide plans. An MTEF/School Finance Report was prepared and discussed with GoS in early 2010, but this document is not available for the purposes of this study. Nevertheless, it is likely to be an important contribution to MESC’s efforts to estimate and reconcile the total costs of its medium-term plans with the financing available in the medium term. Estimations of available financing would not only include DP project financing, but also the implications of Samoa’s School Fees Grant Scheme (SSFGS) that provides per capita-based grants to primary schools in lieu of school fees.
Documentation reviewed provides some indication of the flow of funds from ESP II DPs to the SPA. This had been slowed somewhat because of the slow turnaround of quarterly financial reports and statements of expenditures (SoEs) and withdrawal applications for reimbursement. But available documentation provides little indication of the adequacy of the flow of funds from the SPA to entities implementing project activities, whether MESC central divisions, community-level schools or others.

The main concern expressed by ESP II DPs regarding the use of funds is underspending, as low rates of disbursement are a reflection of slow progress in project activities, which is itself linked to low capacity and the time needed for a learning-by-doing process. This has caused AusAID and NZAID to have to continually roll over their annual commitments for ESP II into the next financial year. Documents provide little indication of how efficiently available funding has been used. At the project (ESP II) level, there has been no assessment or analysis of the actual expenditures against initial cost estimates by component and subcomponent. At the sectorwide level, in the absence of medium-term, sectorwide cost estimates, it is not possible to assess the adequacy of the allocation and use of all sector financing. The MTEF may have made headway on this front.
5 How Has the SWAp Affected the Efficacy of Each of the Donors Involved?

Performance and accountabilities of individual DPs need to be assessed against: (i) joint commitments and aid effectiveness principles committed to under the PHF and CFA; (ii) DPs own respective policies, strategies and performance criteria; and (iii) the real, unfolding needs of the country. Documentation available for this Review does not provide sufficient information or analysis to answer this question. Implementation experience has revealed though that having staff on the ground, who know the work well and have a sound working relationship with MESC, has proven invaluable to ensuring progress in the program. The collection and analysis of the perspectives of GoS, other national stakeholders and the DPs under the proposed second phase of this study (fieldwork) will be critical for exploring this question further.
6 Relevance, Efficacy, Efficiency, Sustainability of the Second Education Sector Programme

This is a learning initiative rather than an evaluation, therefore, ratings will not be assigned to these evaluation criteria. At the same time, a brief discussion of the project’s performance against each evaluation criterion is offered as a means to point to progress to date and opportunities to improve performance, where it risks falling short of satisfying these criteria, while it is still being implemented.

Relevance of Objectives

Both the expected outcomes (and outcome indicators) and the goal (and impact targets) of ESP II were drawn from, and supportive of, MESC’s three-year Corporate Plan and ten-year Strategic Policies and Plan 2006-2015. They also represented a prioritization of the broad range of goals, targets and strategies articulated in the Strategic Policies and Plan document and supported the three DPs’ respective policies and evolving approaches to education sector support in Samoa. ESP II objectives were, however, overly ambitious, in light of the fundamental reforms they were supporting and capacity and time constraints for their implementation.

Relevance of Design

The components of ESP II (including the addition of the sixth component, SchoolNET, which was integrated in 2007) were generally supportive of its anticipated outcomes and impact targets. There was, however, no results framework that would define project inputs, processes, outputs, outcomes and impacts and the underlying program logic. This may be why the synergies and sequences of activities within and across reforms were not fully fleshed out in the design documents, and their implementation was not fully coordinated to this end. The project design included the piloting of the guiding principles for aid effectiveness of the Paris Declaration (or a SWAp), but this pilot was never fully defined in terms of its objectives, learning agenda, evaluation criteria, process for evaluation, decision making and scale-up.

Efficacy

The project objectives are not likely to be achieved by the end of the initial six-year implementation period, but, with continued support and improved capacities, they could be achieved over a longer timeframe.

---

22 The extent to which the program’s objectives are consistent with the country’s current development priorities and with the current Bank country and sectoral assistance strategies and corporate goals.
23 The extent to which the project’s design is consistent with the stated objectives, including an assessment of the results framework, and risk assessment/mitigation.
24 The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.
Efficiency

Efficiency of resource use has not been assessed, either at the project level or for the entire sector. There is insufficient data to assess the extent to which expenditures have been devoted to the highest-impact interventions. Efficiency of implementation has suffered because of: slow procurement; inadequate financial management; and low absorptive capacity. Overall project efficiency has suffered due to: above-cited design deficiencies, neglect of regular monitoring and evaluation, and a neglect of strategic issues and results focus (relative to implementation issues) in the dialogue among partners.

Sustainability

The financial sustainability of project investments has not been fully assessed. It has already been established, however, that with cost overruns, the inadequacy of the six-year implementation period to achieve project objectives, and the recurrent cost implications of reforms supported under the project (especially the need for additional financing for teachers’ salaries), the sustainability of the project’s investments and flow of benefits will depend on continued financial support from Samoa’s DPs.

The SSFGS, which is a relatively recent initiative, provides per capita-based grants to primary schools in lieu of school fees. Initially conceived as a “crisis response,” it is now a MESC program, which supports the establishment and implementation of minimum service standards and aims to: (i) reduce the financial burden of schooling being placed on parents; and (ii) transfer part of the responsibility for school performance to schools. With continued financial support from DPs, this program will focus on financing school development plans to meet minimum service standards. Sustainability of reforms supported under the project will also depend on the effective management and use of technical assistance and the building of MESC capacity.

---

25 A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, and time) are converted to results.
26 The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience of risk of the net benefit flows over time.
7 Preliminary Lessons and Information Gaps

The following are preliminary lessons emanating from this desk study’s findings that point to strategic areas where DPs might, potentially, better target their assistance and guidance. These topics, and what DPs might bring, are both subject to revision, depending on the results of the proposed fieldwork. Among the most significant information gaps are: (i) the perspectives of the range of national stakeholders (encompassing government, NGOs and civil society); (ii) the quality of dialogue and interactions (which can only be observed in-country) among DPs and between DPs and GoS; (iii) the activities and perspectives of other DPs supporting Samoa’s education; (iv) key documentation not available for the purposes of this study; (v) the size and capacities of MESC; and (vi) the business models of the various DPs and their costs.

The design, implementation and evaluation of a SWAp could be greatly enhanced with the clear articulation of SWAp-specific (capacity and efficiency) objectives and indicators, distinct from, but linked to, sector-specific program objectives and indicators. This is especially important in the context of the ESP II, which is conceived as a pilot SWAp, and in light of MTR recommendations to expand the SWAp to all DPs. The PHF and CFA note that the aid effectiveness principles to be employed under ESP II should not set a precedent for future arrangements for aid effectiveness in the sector without a thorough evaluation and the concurrence of each DP.

The SWAp objectives and indicators are not systematically defined; and the pilot is not well designed. The DPs might provide assistance in the design of a successful pilot by supporting a number of critical steps: (i) the definition of the learning agenda; (ii) the definition of the pilot process, including the use of evaluation for scaling-up; (iii) a clear and coherent M&E framework and results chain that captures the SWAp, including indicators, tools and methodologies for the pilot evaluation; (iv) the availability of essential evaluation inputs; (v) a realistic timetable; and (vi) strong social and political commitment. If not well prepared, fully understood and owned by government and other stakeholders, the planned pilot is not likely to lead to a learning process or to an evidence-based finetuning of this reform.

DPs support to strengthening the various components of the strategic sector framework could help bring more coherence, quality and efficiency to the implementation of priority interventions and could facilitate the achievement of sector objectives. It could also facilitate their efforts to focus their dialogue more at a strategic level. Such support could focus on: the prioritization and phasing of reforms and activities across ESP II components (and across MESC strategic components) to ensure a logical sequencing of various inputs and interventions to ensure synergies and coordination of efforts, and to better calibrate implementation plans with available capacity, including the articulation of a realistic implementation plan.

DPs could also support the quality assurance and costing of new reforms and various other components of MESC’s (and ESP II’s) programs. Specific examples of such assistance can
be drawn from the MTR recommendations, including: the revision of the current curriculum development model; embedding assessment systems and practices into curriculum materials; according highest priority to the implementation of the NTDF, and its full costing; the development of a more sustainable model for professional learning and support for teachers; and a review of the sequencing of, and approach to, ICT in schools.

The linking of these efforts to strengthen the strategic sector framework to outcomes and impacts will be critical for ensuring that both ongoing strategic refinements and implementation efforts are results-focused and driven. The quality and effective application of the new M&E framework and system and the quality and candor of the sector dialogue are critical. The potential role of civil society in this regard, both at the school/community level, and at the central level, might be better assessed and more fully exploited. There is also opportunity to link and tailor efforts under Component 4 of ESP II (research, evaluation, policy analysis and planning) to this end.

This study has shown that capacities are being strengthened through a learning-by-doing process, but they still fall short of the needs and demands of an ambitious sector agenda implemented through a pilot SWAp. DPs can support, nurture and accelerate the development of adequate capacities in a number of ways. These would include: (i) the assessment of capacities against capacity needs (including an assessment of the allocation of roles and responsibilities within MESC structures and across various national actors); and (ii) the development of a holistic, results-based approach to capacity strengthening that might include a combination of: well-designed, well-managed technical assistance with strong accountability for results built in; review/revision of management systems to ensure their coherence, links and efficiency; revision of roles and responsibilities of individuals and institutional entities; training; supportive supervision; and performance-management and accountability systems. These two interventions might be applied to SWAp-specific capacities (planning, budgeting, procurement, financial management, M&E) as well as to technical/sectoral capacities (including curriculum reform, assessment systems, materials development, and ICT); and they might extend beyond central MESC to encompass the school/community level, as well as the nongovernmental sector and civil society organizations. Reducing the ambition of the sector agenda is another, complementary way of calibrating existing capacity and demands on capacity.

DPs (both field- and HQ-based) might take the opportunity of this study to assess their business models and their costs, and their adequacy vis-à-vis the new and emerging needs for support—both financial and nonfinancial—prompted by the aid effectiveness principles. It is especially important that such assessments take into account the unique characteristics and development challenges of the Pacific Island context.

Information gaps are defined throughout the report. In summary, the capacity issues and the quality and functionality of the partnerships can only be well understood through field visits and interviews with GoS staff. The Main Report proposes a protocol for fieldwork.
Annex 1. Samoa Education SWAp Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GoS</th>
<th>ADB</th>
<th>AusAID</th>
<th>NZAID</th>
<th>Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Samoa attends the International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, which calls for improved aid effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>The Culture Division and the Sports Division are moved from the Ministry of Youth, Sports, and Culture (MYSCA) to MESC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Education Sector Review endorses the key concepts of equity, quality, relevance, efficiency and sustainability as fundamental to progress in the sector.</td>
<td>AusAID-funded Education Institutional Strengthening Program (ISP) (1999-2004) (US$2.5 million) is completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Samoa signs the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.</td>
<td>ESP I is completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-2005</td>
<td>Education Policies and Strategies</td>
<td>The timeframe of the 1995-2005 Education Policies and Strategies comes to an end. At its completion, 42 development projects and programs had been implemented. ADB Loan No. SAM-2220 for ESP II is approved (December 16).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Legislative elections</td>
<td>Legislative elections are held (March) (MTR). GoS and ADB cosign ADB Loan No. SAM-2220 in the amount of SDR 5.65 million (US$8.1 million equivalent) for ESP II (June) and the loan becomes effective (August).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Joint Samoa Program Strategy</td>
<td>Joint Samoa Program Strategy (2006-2010), prepared by the Governments of Samoa, Australia and New Zealand to support the Strategy for the Development of Samoa (SDS) 2005-2007, seeks to enhance aid effectiveness by strengthening partnerships between the three governments and maximizing the benefits of harmonization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>AusAID and New Zealand</td>
<td>AusAID provides US$8.6 million equivalent in grants to cofinance ESP II. New Zealand provides US$8.6 million in grants to cofinance ESP II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>PHF between Samoa and its DPs</td>
<td>PHF between Samoa and its DPs (ADB, AusAID and NZAID) is cosigned (May 29, 2006).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2015</td>
<td>MESC's <em>Strategic Policies and Plan</em> July 2006–June 2015 is issued (June). This follows a process of the issuance of a draft (April) and consultations with stakeholders (May).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2015</td>
<td>CFA for ESP II is cosigned by GoS, ADB, AusAID and NZAID (May).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2015</td>
<td>Education Steering Committee is established with Cabinet approval (November).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2015</td>
<td>Bilateral partners and GoS provide first tranche of program funding to the SPA (June).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2015</td>
<td>First JRM acknowledges slow implementation start is due to delays in reaching agreement among DPs on PIAM; calls for a comprehensive M&amp;E framework with accurate baselines and realistic targets; and recommends future JRM focus on outputs, outcomes, and impacts (December).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>ESC holds its first meeting (May).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Second JRM recommends: (i) full costing and budgeting of equipment and learning materials; (ii) the review/revision of ToRs and timeframes for three consultant positions working on M&amp;E; and (iii) the revision of the design and monitoring framework (May-June).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>His Highness Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi is elected Head of State for a five-year term, following the death of the late HH Malietoa Tanumafili (June 18)(MTR).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>SchoolNet and Community Access Project Approved (December 14). ADB Grant: US$5.9 million; GoS contribution: US$1.0 million. A precondition for Phase 2 is completion of MTEF under Phase 1(MTR).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Samoa attends Accra Conference on Aid Effectiveness.</td>
<td><strong>Third JRM</strong> recommends: (i) the preparation of cost estimates by subcomponent to 2012; (ii) the revision and finalization of the design and monitoring framework (DMF) by the DPs; (iii) the expedited development of an M&amp;E framework section in the PIAM, with detailed baselines, interim objectives, milestones, component interactions, and aligned with the MTEF; and (iv) stopping the practice of fast-track consultants performing work on a voluntary basis, outside contract terms (February).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fourth JRM</strong> recommends: (i) updating of budget and cost estimate; (ii) the resolution of the NTDF-related policies as a priority; (iii) completion of the draft M&amp;E framework; and (iv) avoidance of any additional deferment of activities, given substantial implementation delays already experienced (August).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Fifth JRM</strong> recommends that: (i) ESP II reporting should be strategic and based on the sector monitoring and evaluation framework; (ii) MESC Core Executive Meetings have a more strategic focus; (iii) ESP II Secretariat be positioned within Corporate Services Division and provide financial analysis and forward expenditure projections on a monthly basis; (iv) relevant staff be included in procurement evaluation panels and contract negotiations; and (v) the MTR explore the feasibility of a full shift to the use of country procurement systems (February).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>MESC issues MTEF/School Finance Report (February).</td>
<td>MESC and its partners issue the ESP II MTR Report, which recommends: (i) <em>improvements to the SWAp</em>, including: review of planning, budgeting, monitoring and reporting cycles; formation of a formal DP coordination group; review of the ESC’s role; development of a consolidated, sectorwide monitoring and reporting system; urgently review ESP II costs and budgets for possible overruns; strengthen budget control measures and financial management; and strengthened TA contract management; and (ii) <em>improvements to program (technical) content</em>, including: revision of curriculum development model; embedding of assessment systems/practices into curriculum materials; accordance of high priority to NTDF implementation; development of a more sustainable model for professional learning and support for teachers; and review of the sequencing and approach to ICT in schools. The MTR also notes the extended timeframe (beyond the ESP II closing date) for achieving ESP II’s priority primary school objectives (June).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixth JRM
## Annex 2. Project Components, Component Outputs, and Component Performance Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component Outputs</strong></td>
<td>New bilingual primary curriculum and assessment system; Adequate supply of learning materials and teacher manuals; National assessment policy framework; and Community Partnerships Program for Demand Generation and Improved Learning Outcomes.</td>
<td>Improved secondary school facilities and a community learning center; Pilot provision of houses for teachers in rural areas; MESC headquarters; and Maintenance.</td>
<td>Improved national capacity for research and evaluation; Analysis of causes of low achievement and noncompletion, and preparation of a plan of action; and Strengthening of MESC's capacity for policy analysis and planning.</td>
<td>Improved strategic program management and coordination of implementation; Integrated financial management system; and Effective project performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Targets

- All students have access to a complete set of learning materials as specified in the curriculum; Curriculum, Material and Assessment Division (CMAD) equipped with, and able to use, appropriate equipment for the production of print and nonprint materials; Materials available in schools beginning in 2009
- Framework adopted by December 2007; Development of an Implementation plan for the Framework by March 2008; Two-year NUS program operational by January 2007; Full NUS graduate fellowship program completed by December 2009 and all graduates placed in schools in January 2010;
- Better management environment and greater productivity and safety for MESC staff; Staff absenteeism reduced; Increased use of information technology; Reduced operational costs; Improved learning environments in three secondary colleges;
- Capacity building needs of MESC and other institutions staff assessed, associated training and TA program delivered and results determined (from 2006-07 through 2007-08); Design and implementation of five research studies based on MESC priorities implemented from 2006-07 through 2009-10 with results integrated into policies and planning; and Evaluations of pilots
- Progress toward the Project's development objectives is on schedule and within budget; Program management structure operational and effective, including Secretariat and committees; Financial management system established, SPA operational by end of the first quarter and integrated with government finance and...
- Trained cadre of teacher trainers in new primary curriculum by June 2008;
- Primary teachers trained in new curriculum by December 2008;
- Trained cadre of teacher trainers in new science multimedia materials by June 2007;
- Science teachers trained in new multimedia materials by December 2007;
- All teachers are trained on new classroom assessment practices by June 2009;
- National assessment training plan implemented by December 2009;
- Secondary Principals Association in operation;
- All teachers participate routinely in pre- and in-service training programs;
- All pre- and in-service training courses staffed with trained instructors and delivered with 90% satisfactory rating;
- Schools Operations Division (SOD) staff trained in techniques and systems to assess school performance and
- Improved learning environments in nine secondary schools plus Fagaloa pilot;
- Thirteen secondary schools (including Fagaloa) renovated, furnished, and equipped;
- More qualified and experienced teachers are attracted to rural areas;
- Four houses are designed, constructed;
- Efficient and effective procurement systems developed and in use;
- Each school is provided with furniture, equipment and learning material packages, on time and within budget;
- Students have access to improved learning materials and equipment;
- Maintenance policies developed and operational plans in place by 2005;
- Funding for operational maintenance provided in each year of the project; and
- Valid and reliable assessments of student learning implemented, starting 2009.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improvement by December 2006; and SOD staff routinely use systems to assess school performance and recommend school improvement strategies from 2007.</td>
<td>• System reviewed, developed and in use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ADB (2008a).*
Annex 3. SWAp Content of Samoa Education Documents

Strategic Policies and Plan: July 2006–June 2015

• Policy, Planning and Research Services (Section 3.1):
  o Strengthen capacity in policy development, research and information analysis;
  o Review the functions and structure of the PPRD division;
  o Review data collection and methodology;
  o Strengthening the monitoring of development projects; and
  o Strengthen coordination of all MESC Plans.

• Management of Education (Section 3.17):
  o Identify areas for improvement and training needs of corporate staff at all levels;
  o From training needs identified, design and conduct training;
  o Review ministry organizational structure;
  o Review and implement ministry’s Capability Plan;
  o Develop incentives to improve performance;
  o Review management of schools;
  o Review partnership with School Committees;
  o Explore and implement ways for further cooperation with school communities;
  o Explore avenues for revival of greater commitment to A’oga Faife’au;
  o Strengthen enforcement of compulsory education legislation; and
  o Provide training and support to improve School Review Officers’ capabilities.

• Financing approach:
  o Review internal control systems and procedures;
  o Conduct training programs;
  o Conduct awareness training programs on preparing financing plan for schools and communities;
  o Support sectorwide approach in the design and implementation of programs;
  o Rationalize primary schools in the rural areas and avoid the high operation costs of running primary schools with insufficient pupil levels;
  o Strengthen scholarship support for tertiary education;
  o Encourage tertiary institutions to be self-sufficient from government assistance (grants);
  o Explore ways to provide assistance to disadvantaged families who cannot send their children to continue their education;
  o Increase both community and household contribution/commitment to education, sports and cultural programs; and
  o Encourage communities to contribute financially to the procurement of textbooks and other educational support materials.
### SWAp Content of Joint Samoa Program Strategy (JSPS) 2006-10

To ensure efficiency and effectiveness of aid, the GoS is committed not only to a formalized system of donor coordination, but also to an agreed process for harmonized procedures and processes, preferably aligned to those of the government. The GoS is seeking to shift towards sectorwide approaches to enhance ownership and effective and efficient utilization of both external and internal resources.

#### Guiding Principles

The JSPS partners seek to harmonize development assistance strategies, management and initiatives in order to enhance development impact and accountability and strengthen Samoa’s ownership and management of development cooperation. The JSPS represents an alignment of the partner’s strategic aid objectives and priorities and is guided by the following harmonization principles:

- Donor harmonization being Samoan driven, led and owned;
- Mutual accountability;
- Clear and simplified processes and mechanisms tailored to local circumstances and institutional capacity;
- Work within Samoa’s national development frameworks and systems;
- Provide development assistance in ways that build sustainable national capacity, including civil society, NGOs and the public sector;
- Utilize existing analytical work to the maximum extent possible and strengthen GoS capacity to undertake this work; and
- Work together to address weaknesses in institutional capacity.

The GoS is developing management and operational systems to enable better management of aid activities. Australia and New Zealand seek to enhance the capacity of GoS agencies to manage aid activities and will increasingly build on, and utilize, GoS systems for the management of aid.

#### Aid Delivery Mechanisms

Critical elements in achieving improved aid effectiveness and impact, which JSPS partners (GoS, GoA, GoNZ) will seek to incorporate into aid planning and programming include:

- Ensuring that development initiatives are strategically aligned to Samoa’s SDS and relevant sector plans;
- Recognizing the harmonization principles agreed to by GoS, AusAID and NZAID and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005);
- Enhancing Samoa government ownership, leadership and involvement in all stages of planning, management and delivery;
- Reducing “projectisation” of assistance to fewer initiatives aligned and integrated with Samoa’s priorities and systems;
- Utilizing more innovative and flexible aid modalities including SWAps where appropriate;
- Ensuring all aid initiatives have in-built flexibility to respond to changing circumstances;
- Multiyear programming and emphasis on sustainability;
- A focus on outcomes and impact, rather than inputs;
- Harmonizing and streamlining donor funding, management and reporting;
- Aligning with Samoa’s systems and processes, including budget cycles and sector plans (MTEF implicit here);
- Promoting policy coherence between stakeholders;
- Supporting initiatives by funding through the GoS budget; and
- Strengthening partnerships and policy dialogue between partners.

*Source: Government of Samoa, Government of Australia, Government of New Zealand (2006).*
GoS Institutional Arrangements for Managing SWApS

Samoa’s mechanism for aid coordination/management involves two structures. The Cabinet Development Committee (CDC) comprising 72 members appraises, approves and monitors the progress of development cooperation programs. Its secretariat is the Economic Planning and Policy Division of the MoF. All projects are required to be approved by the CDC. The Aid Coordination Committee (ACC) consists of seven members and considers resource allocation for development activities if required from external sources. The Secretariat is the Aid Coordination Division of the MoF. The ACC also approves requests from the NGOs intended for donor funding.

Tools for aid coordination include project coordinating committees, sector coordination mechanisms and databases of activities by sector facilitate effective and efficient utilization of resources. Government-led donor-sector meetings are a key aspect of donor coordination. Bilateral and more recently harmonized high-level talks with two or more development partners are underway and likely to lead to joint country strategies with the bilateral partners in particular.

The GoS is continuing to develop credible systems for procurement, reporting and monitoring that satisfy requirements of development partners. A new financial management information system will support devolution of financial management and strengthen financial reporting and accountability processes.

Some harmonization achievements include: joint high-level policy discussions; joint programming and review missions, joint management of programs; harmonized procurement procedures; and shared project coordinating committees.

An annual review of the JSPS will include (among other things) the assessment of the effectiveness and impact of the partnership and harmonization arrangements.


SWAp Principles Articulated in the PHF for the Samoa ESP II

- Harmonization is Samoa-driven, led and owned;
- DPs should aim to harmonize their investments around a common strategy and should, to the extent possible where not in contravention of international policies, align with Samoan Government implementation structures, reporting systems and procurement procedures;
- This translates under the SPII framework to one M&E system, including a common reporting format and, to the extent possible and not in contravention of internal policies, the use of government systems for procurement;
- A partnership approach, based on fairness, transparency, openness, accountability and mutual trust;
- Clear and simplified processes and mechanisms tailored to local circumstances and institutional capacity;
- Work within Samoa’s national development frameworks and systems;
- Development assistance will be provided in ways that build sustainable national capacity, including civil society, NGOs, and the public sector;
- DPs will maximize their use of existing analytical work to the extent possible;
- DPs will work together to strengthen Samoan institutional capacity;
- The effective and efficient use of funding and resources; and
- Quality, relevance and excellence in service delivery.

Annex 4. Mid-Term Review of Samoa ESP II: Synopsis of Progress by Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Achievements/Issues</th>
<th>Progress Against Milestones, as of the MTR*</th>
<th>Related Recommendations*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Curriculum Development and Reform</td>
<td>A new bilingual curriculum for primary schools. Polytechnics International New Zealand (PINZ) joins in early 2009. Draft National Curriculum Policy Framework produced in 2006. Syllabuses have been developed and all subject committees are developing the Teachers’ Manual, except Samoan. First draft of guides beginning to emerge. Issue: Variable quality of the first draft curriculum documents (quality and appropriateness). Issue: Provision of appropriate learning materials to support the new curriculum needs to be assured.</td>
<td>The milestones for curriculum reform are: (i) the development of all materials by December 2009; (ii) teachers trained by 2010; and (iii) full implementation of the new curriculum by teachers in schools in 2011. While progress has been made towards developing the new materials, the first milestone will not be reached by December 2009.</td>
<td>16. MESC management of the PINZ contract needs to be strengthened as a matter of urgency, with particular regard for the planning, coordination and monitoring of TA deployed to support ESP II Components 1, 2 and 4. 17. MESC to pause curriculum development activities and review its curriculum development model through engagement with PINZ management. Through the contract or a variation, build on the recognized subject knowledge of the present writing team by expanding and complementing that team with the involvement of appropriate specialists in primary pedagogy and materials development. 18. In light of the review of the development model, a revised Primary Curriculum Development Plan should be developed. This plan should take full account of lessons learned to date in ESP II and should extend beyond the present ESP II budget and timeframe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing Effective Teachers</td>
<td>19. Consideration might be given to postponing the implementation of the new assessment systems and practice in schools, and redirecting the focus to embedding this best practice into the curriculum materials being developed for each subject.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Samoa National Assessment Policy Framework (SNAPF) and Systems.</td>
<td>Samoa National School Assessment Policy Framework was launched on July 30, 2010 (7/10 JRM). The milestone for the approval and adoption of the SNAPF will be close to achievement as planned by December 2009 (or 2010?).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second draft of SNAPF has been developed, covering all schooling from preschool to Year 13, including both formative and summative assessment of learning. <strong>Issue:</strong> SNAPF appears technically sound and based on best practice, but requires schools to implement a considerable range of new processes. Its use by all schools by December 2010 is ahead of any planned implementation of the new curriculum, so would involve its adaptation to soon-to-be-replaced curriculum.</td>
<td>19. Consideration might be given to postponing the implementation of the new assessment systems and practice in schools, and redirecting the focus to embedding this best practice into the curriculum materials being developed for each subject.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Community Partnerships Programs – Fagaloa Community Learning Center.</td>
<td>The milestone for producing multimedia science materials for use in secondary schools may (at least partially) be achieved as planned by February 2011.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagaloa CLC formally opened in 2010 and is receiving a high level of community support, with over 300 community members having participated in courses. The CLC is the subject of a dedicated action research activity. <strong>Issues:</strong> It will be important to maintain the present high level of community support and momentum. Financial sustainability must be a key focus, including strategies for meeting ongoing running costs.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia Methods for Science and Agricultural Sciences in Secondary Schools.</td>
<td>The milestone of the home-school literacy partnership being operational by December 2010 is on track. Since the decision to fast-track the development of the CLC, the milestone to have courses available at the CLC by December 2010 has been achieved well ahead of schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An international Multimedia Technology Specialist TA has completed a substantial first input in 2009 (moving towards high-quality local production of CDs and DVDs rather than further developing broadcast TV). The first set of multimedia equipment for the Education Broadcasting Unit arrived in September. Teachers’ Guide started. <strong>Issue:</strong> This initiative sits apart from major ESP II activities in primary curriculum development and teachers’ professional development, with considerable potential for synergy.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Teacher Development Framework (NTDF).</td>
<td>A draft NTDF document was completed in February 2008, which still required considerable development. Additional TA support enabled substantial progress. The MTEF (about to be completed under SchoolNET funding) will also inform the process (costing and recurrent cost implications). Issues: The scale of institutional effort required to establish the mechanisms and processes to implement the various NTDF policies will be considerable. Initial focus would be on: (i) developing and applying professional standards for teachers; and (ii) establishing additional posts of responsibility. These recommendations are only affordable with long-term commitment from the DPs to contribute to the GoS recurrent budget.</td>
<td>The milestone of Cabinet approval of the NTDF by December 2008 is now slated to be met by early 2010.</td>
<td>20. The current SOD approach to finalizing the NTDF and beginning its phased implementation should continue as a matter of high priority, supported by appropriate specialist TA inputs. 21. GoS and DPs should begin intentional dialogue concerning support for GoS salary budgets over the long term, establishing clear understandings of both the scale and mechanisms of this support and the commitments and responsibilities required of both DPs and GoS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Professional Development of Teachers.</td>
<td>A start was made in 2009 on developing in-service training programs for education personnel, based on a fresh needs identification, and designed to be consistent with the new curriculum to be produced (still in early stages of development). TA undertook initial workshops and site visits to identify professional development needs. Issues: Delayed delivery of the new primary curriculum is an opportunity providing the time to identify and address training needs. Cascade training model with little or no follow-up is shown by international evidence to have limited long-term impact.</td>
<td>The milestone for the review and revision of the performance appraisal system for teachers was not reached as planned by December 2008, however, progress has been made during 2009. The milestone of the revised system being operational by December 2009 will not be reached.</td>
<td>22. A more effective and sustainable model for professional support for teachers be developed during this second phase of ESP II. This should build on the present structure involving SROs and school principals as the cornerstones, but look creatively at the opportunities presented by NTDF implementation for additional designated posts of responsibility for principals and SROs. New clusters of teacher “mentors” and “master” teachers could also be included. 23. Piloting and evaluating a model (or models) of local level professional support for teachers should be considered, using a similar action research model to the Fagaloa Community Partnership pilot. 24. Future inputs of the international TAs working in this area be fully coordinated withcomplementary terms of reference focusing on developing an improved professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Initiatives for Rapid Increase in Teacher Supply. | Given serious flaws of original design, a “Revised” Fast-Track Program has been decided. The first cohort of 50 students started the course in July 2009, with completion slated for 18 months later. An AusAID-funded study showed that teacher shortage is not as acute as previously perceived.  

A two-year Fellowship Secondary Teacher Training program, operated by NUS, is expected to start in February 2010 with a cohort of 40 students, of whom ten are financed by ESPII, and 30 by MESC.  

Issues: The recent Teacher Supply and Demand Study has confirmed that, while shortages are not as severe as first believed, the need for primary and secondary fast-track initiatives under ESP II remains wholly valid. Progress has made in overcoming weaknesses in the design of these initiatives. Implementation will occur over a slower timeframe. | The milestones of completing the development of fast-track primary teacher training and awarding the secondary fellowships by December 2008 have not been reached. | None. |
### 3. Improving Access to Quality Education

| New MESC HQ. | Planning, tendering and selection have been completed and construction commenced in June 2009 with an **expected completion date of September 2010.** Issues: cost overruns. | None. | None. |
| Renovation and Construction. | Renovation of secondary schools and construction of school houses is **still at the planning stage.** The critical issue is an estimated cost escalation of about US$9 million over the original estimate of US$7 million. | None. | None. |
| School maintenance handbook. | Work is **scheduled to commence in late 2009** and will be undertaken in conjunction with the schools program. | None. | None. |

### 4. Strengthening Capacity to Undertake Research, Evaluation, Policy Analysis and Planning

| | | The milestone of research and report writing skills of PPRD staff strengthened by December 2008 was not reached but will be achieved, according to the mid-term review. The milestone of MESC databases completed, linked and accessible by January 2009 has **not been reached, but is being addressed.** The milestone of the first field study to be completed by August 2009 was **almost achieved.** |

### 5. Strengthening Capacity to Implement and Manage Development Projects
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue: Inefficiency of not having the Secretariat’s functions integrated within the Corporate Services Division.</th>
<th>None.</th>
<th>None.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6. Samoa SchoolNet and Community Access Project (SSCAP)

**Importance of ensuring complementarity and consistency with ESP II activities and other ongoing work was recognized from the outset, especially electronic information systems across MESC. Decision to defer to 2010 recruitment of the major ICT consultancy firm was made to ensure exploration of the possibilities and potential to support the overall MESC agenda. SchoolNET included in ESP II M&E framework. All staff in MESC ICT Unit taking the CISCO course and a technical advisory committee has been established. A major TA-supported exercise under SchoolNet has been the development in 2009 of an MTEF for education.**

**Issues: Providing ICT in schools should not be allowed to become an end in itself. Present capacity to use it is quite limited, broadband access is limited and community capacity to face maintenance costs of new technology needs to be explored. A phased approach may be more appropriate.**

**The milestones of electronic curriculum and materials in all secondary schools and teachers trained in their use by July 2010 will not be met.**

25. An evolutionary, piloted and phased approach be developed to ensure that the provision of ICT in schools matches capacity development to use the technology effectively as both a teaching and management tool.

*Source: Samoa MESC (2010); and Joint Review Mission, July 2010.*

*Note: * These columns show text extracted from the MTR, which took place in late 2009 and on which a final report was issued in early 2010. This explains why some dates that have already passed are referred to in the future tense.*
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