# BASIC EDUCATION SECTOR ANALYSIS REPORT

- UGANDA -

**AUGUST 2012** 

# JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY (JICA) INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER OF JAPAN INC. (IDCJ)

| НМ     |
|--------|
| JR     |
| 12-062 |

# BASIC EDUCATION SECTOR ANALYSIS REPORT

- UGANDA -

**AUGUST 2012** 

JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY (JICA) INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER OF JAPAN INC. (IDCJ)



<sup>(</sup>Source: JICA, 2012)





(Source: Uganda Map Collections http://hiki.trpg.net/BlueRose/?RepOfUganda+UFmaps)

# Uganda National Map II with 80 Districts (as of July 2006)

# Abbreviations

| AfDB:     | African Development Bank   |
|-----------|--|
| ASC:      | Annual School Census   |
| BRMS:     | Basic Requirements Minimum Standards                             |
| BTVET:    | Business Technical, Vocational Education and Training            |
| CAO:      | Chief Administrative Officer                                     |
| CCT:      | Coordinating Center Tutor  |
| CDRF:     | Capacity Development Results Framework                           |
| DEO:      | District Education Officer                                       |
| DFID:     | Department for International Development                         |
| ECD:      | Early Childhood Development                                      |
| EDP:      | Education Development Partner                                    |
| EFA:      | Education for All  |
| EMIS:     | Education Management Information System                          |
| EPDC:     | Education Policy and Data Center                                 |
| ESC:      | Education Service Commission                                     |
| ESCC:     | Education Sector Consultative Committee                          |
| ESIP:     | Education Sector Investment Plan                                 |
| ESSP:     | Education Sector Strategic Plan                                  |
| EU:       | European Union   |
| FAL:      | Functional Adult Literacy  |
| FTI:      | Fast Track Initiative  |
| GBS:      | General Budget Support   |
| GDP:      | Gross Domestic Product   |
| GER:      | Gross Enrolment Rate   |
| GIZ:      | Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenarbeit          |
| GNI:      | Gross National Income  |
| GoU:      | Government of Uganda   |
| GPE:      | Global Partnership for Education                                 |
| GPI:      | Gender Parity Index  |
| HDI:      | Human Development Index  |
| HIPC:     | Heavily Indebted Poor Country Initiative                         |
| HIV/AIDS: | Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome |
| IDCJ:     | International Development Center of Japan Inc.                   |
| IFMS:     | Integrated Financial Management System                           |
| IMF:      | International Monetary Fund                                      |
| IMU:      | Instrumental Materials Unit                                      |
| INSET:    | In-Service Training  |
| JICA:     | Japan International Cooperation Agency                           |
|           |  |

| LRA:     | Lord's Resistance Army  |
|----------|---|
| MDGs:    | Millennium Development Goals  |
| MFPED:   | Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development                  |
| MGLSD:   | Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development                       |
| MoES:    | Ministry of Education and Science                                       |
| MoU:     | Memorandum of Understanding   |
| MTEF:    | Medium-term Expenditure Framework                                       |
| NAPE:    | National Assessment of Progress in Education                            |
| NCDC:    | National Curriculum Development Centre                                  |
| NCS:     | National Council for Sports   |
| NDP:     | National Development Plan   |
| NGO:     | Non-Government Organization   |
| NRM:     | National Resistance Movement  |
| NTC:     | National Teachers' College  |
| OVC:     | Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children                                   |
| PAF:     | Poverty Action Fund   |
| PEAP:    | Poverty Eradication Action Plan   |
| PIASCY:  | Presidential Initiative on AIDS Strategy for Communication to Youth     |
| PLE:     | Primary Leaving Examination   |
| PRESET:  | Pre-Service Training  |
| PRSP:    | Poverty Reduction Strategic Paper                                       |
| PTC:     | Primary Teachers' College   |
| SACMEQ:  | Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Education Quality |
| SESEMAT: | Secondary School Science and Mathematics Teachers                       |
| SMC:     | School Management Committee   |
| SWAps:   | Sector Wide Approaches  |
| TDMS:    | Teachers Development and Management System                              |
| TMM:     | Top Management Meeting  |
| UACE:    | Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education                                |
| UBS:     | Uganda Bureau of Statistics   |
| UCE:     | Uganda Certificate of Education   |
| UNDP:    | United Nations Development Programme                                    |
| UIS:     | UNESCO Institute for Statistics   |
| UNCCD:   | United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification                     |
| UNEB:    | Uganda National Examination Board                                       |
| UNESCO:  | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization        |
| UNHCR:   | United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees                           |
| UNICEF:  | United Nations Children's Fund  |
| UPE:     | Universal Primary Education   |
| UPPET:   | Universal Post Primary Education and Training                           |

| USAID: | United States Agency for International Development |
|--------|--|
| USE:   | Universal Secondary Education                      |
| WB:    | World Bank   |
| WBI:   | World Bank Institute                               |
| WFP:   | World Food Programme                               |
|        |  |

#### **Executive Summary**

#### **Chapter 1: Outline of the Study**

As the target year of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA) approaches, non-traditional forms of aid modalities such as SWAps and general budget support are progressively tested and used in providing aid. In this context, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has commissioned a study to carry out a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of the education sector in 13 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America<sup>1</sup> so that more strategic and effective programs/projects can be formulated. The purpose of the study is twofold: 1) to gather relevant data and information, analyze them, and to identify priorities in the education sector in each country, and 2) to propose how to improve the quality and the methodologies of JICA's analysis on basic education.

#### Chapter 2: Political and Socio-economic Situation in Uganda

The values of the basic indicators for Uganda are Gross National Income (GNI) per capita of US\$ 500 (Atlas method, 2010), GNI per capita of \$1,250 (PPP international \$, 2010), Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth rate of 5.2%, ratio of population living on less than US\$ 1/day of 7%, average life expectancy of 54 years and adult literacy rate of 73.2%.

#### **Chapter 3: Educational Policies and Reforms**

The Government of Uganda prepared Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) in 1997 as a national development plan along with its "Uganda Vision 2025". This was followed by the 5-Year National Development Plan (NDP) announced in April, 2010. The education sector is included in "increasing access to quality social services" which is one of eight priority objectives identified by the NDP. Primary and secondary education in Uganda consists of seven years and six years respectively. In 1996, the universal primary education (UPE) was introduced. Primary education became free in the following year (1997) and compulsory in 2008. Meanwhile, secondary education has been becoming free in stages since 2007.

In 2003, the Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP) 2004 – 2015 was formulated. Its latest revised version published in 2010 stipulates a number of specific objectives, such as (i) increase and improvement of equitable access and completion rate for primary education and secondary education and ensuring of gender equity, (ii) improvement of the quality and relevance of primary and secondary education, (iii) enhancement of equitable access to the business technology, vocational education and training (BTVET) and tertiary education, (iv) improvement of the relevance and quality of BTVET and tertiary education and (v) improvement of the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery of education services at all levels by increasing the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The target countries are Kenya, Ethiopia, Uganda, Rwanda, Malawi, Zambia, Cameroon, Senegal, Mali, Niger, Burkina Faso, Guatemala, and Nicaragua.

planning, management and monitoring capacity.

#### **Chapter 4: Status and Challenges of Basic Education Sector Development**

[Access] The net enrollment rate of Ugandan primary education improved from 84.8% in 2002 to 96.0% in 2010. There was hardly any gender gap and the net enrollment rate for girls was slightly higher than that for boys. The net intake rate for primary education was low at 70.2% because of the relatively small number of children entering primary education at the formal age of six years old. Meanwhile, the net enrollment rate for secondary education was 24.6% and the figure was higher for boys than girls. The gender gap widened slightly. One special feature was the relatively high level of enrollment of foreign nationals, such as Sudanese, Congolese and Rwandans.

**[Internal Efficiency]** The repetition rate in 2010 was the highest at 12.0% among P6 pupils who are one year before P7 pupils facing the Primary Leaving Examinations (PLE), followed by 11.6% for both P1 and P5 pupils. The drop-out rate in 2010 was 4.4% while the survival rate up to P5 was low at 62.0%.

**[Equity]** Although no gender gap is observed in terms of access to primary education, the figure for boys is higher than that for girls for secondary education. There are several possible reasons for the high levels of drop-out and absenteeism for girls. These include teenage pregnancy, sexual harassment, female genital mutilation (FGM) and inadequate toilet facilities for girls. By region, lagging educational development is highly noticeable in the Karamoja District in the North East which is inhabited by many nomads.

[Learning Outcomes] The completion rate of P7 pupils in primary education increased from 49.1% in 2002 to 54.0% in 2010. Although the figure for boys was higher than that for girls throughout this period, the gender gap decreased from 20 points to 5 points. The completion rate for S4 pupils in lower secondary education improved from 22.0% in 2002 to 39.0% in 2010 but the gender gap widened from 6 points to 13 points. The results of the national examinations and Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Education Quality (SACMEQ) suggest that Ugandan pupils still lag behind many neighbouring countries in terms of reading and numeracy.

[Learning Environment] With the introduction of UPE, the number of pupils enrolled in primary education has rapidly increased to 58 per classroom. The figure for public schools of 67 per classroom is even higher, clearly indicating insufficient school facilities. The number of pupils per classroom has also increased for secondary education following the introduction of USE, forcing many secondary schools to opt for a double shift system.

**[Textbook Procurement/Distribution System]** The selection and distribution of textbooks are primarily conducted by Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). The number of textbooks per pupil is still low at one textbook per three pupils for every subject.

[**Curriculum**] The curriculum for primary education has been revised to a thematic curriculum. Because of the slow progress of the work to revise the curriculum for teacher training to match it, there is concern in regard to the insufficient application of this thematic curriculum and the teaching front-line. In the case of secondary education, review and revision of the curriculum is currently in progress.

[**Teaching Staff**] Although the number of teachers has increased following the introduction of UPE, the number of enrolled pupils per teacher in primary education in 2010 stood at 57 for public schools which was much higher than the 26 for private schools. By region, the figure for the North East of 79 was high.

### **Chapter 5: Public Finance and Administration in the Education Sector**

Donor coordination efforts between MoES and major donors has been making progress with MoES performing with strong sense of leadership. However, there is no denying that decision-making in Uganda carries a strong political tone. While the educational budget and other financial aspects at the central government level are audited, the measures taken to prevent corruption are not exactly sufficient. For both primary education and secondary education, those children who cannot be absorbed by public schools because of the rapid increase of the school enrollment figure are covered by private schools. The difficulty faced by MoES to control these private schools means that there are many pending issues relating to the quality of education.

The education sector accounted for 17.0% of the national budget in 2010 which was the highest of all sectors. In the approved education budget for 2011, the recurrent budget accounts for 76.6% with the rest taken up by the development budget. Of the recurrent budget, 70% is taken up by the personnel cost. The agreement for the annual sector review used to be that at least 65% of the education budget would go to primary education. The ratio has now been revised since the introduction of free secondary education in 2007 and the ratio of education budget allocation to secondary education today is substantially higher than before.

#### **Chapter 6: Trends in Donor Assistance**

In Uganda, donor coordination is making much progress through Sector-wide Approaches (SWAps). This is evident in every sector and the education sector is said to be one of the front runners of donor coordination along with the health and water sectors. The education sector in Uganda receives financial aid from Belgium, the Netherlands, the EU and Ireland. JICA, USAID, GIZ and international aid organizations provide off-budget project aid along with many which provide financial aid. Those providing financial aid have a strong say and hold a leading position in debates on compliance with the Paris Declaration and partnership principles. However, no attempts have been made to exclude project-type assistance.

#### **Chapter 7: Results of Analysis**

The top priorities for improvement in Uganda's basic education sub-sector (primary and lower secondary education) are (i) low survival and completion rates of primary education, (ii) pupil-teacher ratio, (iii) low level of learning achievement, (iv) high absenteeism among teachers, (v) shortage of textbooks, (vi) low gross enrolment rate of secondary schools and (vii) low ownership of residents vis-à-vis schools.

The low survival rate and low completion rate are primarily caused by the high repetition and drop-out rates. The main reasons for the high drop-out rate include the family's inability to pay various costs associated with education, little awareness in education and need to help with domestic chores. The high drop-out rate as well as high absence rate among girls is likely due to inadequate toilet facilities, teenage pregnancy, sexual harassment (rape) and FGM. By region, the low completion rate in Karamoja in the North East which is inhabited by many nomads is particularly noticeable. Despite an increase of the number of teachers being recruited to cope with the rapid increase of enrollment in primary education as a result of UPE, the pupil-teacher ratio has hardly improved. Meanwhile, the pupil-teacher ratio for secondary education is rising due to increased enrollment as a result of universal secondary education (USE).

Even though access to primary education has improved in Uganda, there are still many pending issues in terms of the quality of education. These include the insufficient availability of textbooks and teaching materials, the prevalent force-feeding type of teaching method employed by teachers and inadequate use of textbooks and teaching materials in classroom lessons. Other reasons often pointed out for the low level of learning achievement are the indifference of the parents of pupils of public schools to school management, etc. as they have tended to leave everything relating to the education of their children to the school since the introduction of UPE and the inadequate monitoring/inspection of schools. The high level of absenteeism among teachers leads to a low attendance rate.

The gross enrollment rate for secondary schools is low, presumably because of the prohibitive cost of education, limited number of and long distance to schools and limited number of intakes at public schools.

The key issues which have emerged from this study for analysis of the basic education sub-sector are (i) that the relevant statistical data is not fully available and (ii) a study primarily relying on the analysis of existing materials tends to be analysis from the viewpoint of MoES and/or donor and it is difficult to conduct analysis from the viewpoint of schools or regions reflecting the reality of front-line education as observed by the researcher.

# BASIC EDUCATION SECTOR ANALYSIS REPORT - UGANDA -

### **Table of Contents**

| Map    | viations  |    |
|--------|---|----|
| Execut | tive Summery  |    |
| Execu  | uve Summary   |    |
| СНАР   | TER 1: OUTLINE OF THE STUDY   | 1  |
| 1.1    | BACKGROUND  | 1  |
| 1.2    | OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY   | 1  |
| 1.3    | BASIC APPROACHES OF THE STUDY   | 1  |
| 1.4    | TARGET AREAS/COUNTRIES  | 2  |
| 1.5    | MAJOR STEPS AND SCHEDULE  | 2  |
| 1.6    | Study Team  | 3  |
| СНАР   | TER 2: POLITICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC SITUATION IN UGANDA                 | 4  |
| 2.1    | Political Situation   | 4  |
| 2.2    | SOCIO-ECONOMIC SITUATION  | 4  |
| СНАР   | TER 3: EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND REFORMS                                 | 7  |
| 3.1    | NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS  | 7  |
| 3.2    | EDUCATION ACT   | 7  |
| 3.3    | EDUCATION POLICY  | 8  |
| 3.4    | EDUCATION SYSTEM  | 9  |
| 3.5    | EDUCATION SECTOR PLANS  | 9  |
| 3.6    | SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY   | 11 |
| СНАР   | TER 4: STATUS AND CHALLENGES OF BASIC EDUCATION SECTOR                  |    |
| DEVE   | LOPMENT   | 13 |
| 4.1    | Access  | 13 |
| 4      | 4.1.1 School Age Population   | 13 |
| 4      | 4.1.2 Enrollment Trend of Pre-school Education                          | 13 |
| 4      | 4.1.3 Enrollment Trend of Primary Education                             | 14 |
| 4      | 4.1.4 Enrollment Trend of Secondary Education                           | 17 |
| 4      | 4.1.5 Literacy Education  | 19 |
| 4.2    | INTERNAL EFFICIENCY (QUANTITATIVE INTERNAL EFFICIENCY)                  | 19 |
| 4.3    | Equity  | 23 |
| 4      | 4.3.1 Comparative Analysis of Access by Group                           | 23 |
| 4      | 4.3.2 Education for Children with Special Needs and Inclusive Education | 24 |
| 4.4    | QUALITY OF EDUCATION  | 26 |
| 4      | 4.4.1 Situation of Learning Outcome                                     | 26 |

| 4.4   | 4.2   | Learning Environment  | 29 |
|-------|-------|---|----|
| 4.4   | 4.3   | Procurement and Distribution of Teaching Material             | 30 |
| 4.4   | 4.4   | Definition of Academic Ability                                | 31 |
| 4.4   | 4.5   | Quality Assurance System of Education                         | 32 |
| 4.4   | 4.6   | Curriculum  | 34 |
| 4.4   | 4.7   | Languages of Instruction                                      | 35 |
| 4.5   | TEAC  | HERS  | 36 |
| 4.:   | 5.1   | Teacher Qualification and Placement                           | 36 |
| 4.:   | 5.2   | Teacher Education System                                      | 37 |
| 4.:   | 5.3   | Working Conditions for Teachers                               | 39 |
| 4.:   | 5.4   | Teacher Recruitment / Management                              | 41 |
| СНАРТ | TER 5 | : PUBLIC FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR   | 42 |
| 5.1   | Publ  | IC ADMINISTRATION   | 42 |
| 5.    | 1.1   | Decentralization in the Education Sector                      | 42 |
| 5.    | 1.2   | Management Capacity of the Ministry of Education              | 43 |
| 5.2   | Educ  | CATIONAL FINANCE  | 46 |
| 5.2   | 2.1   | Budget of Education Sector                                    | 46 |
| 5.2   | 2.2   | Flow and Administration of Funds Provided by Donors           | 48 |
| 5.2   | 2.3   | Management System for the Education Budget/Public Expenditure | 49 |
| 5.2   | 2.4   | Distribution of Grants  | 50 |
| 5.2   | 2.5   | Private Education Expenditure                                 | 51 |
| 5.2   | 2.6   | Unit Cost Analysis  | 52 |
| 5.2   | 2.7   | Projection of Mid-Term Demand and Cost for Teachers           | 52 |
| СНАРТ | TER 6 | : TRENDS IN DONOR ASSISTANCE                                  | 54 |
| 6.1   | Stru  | CTURE OF DONOR COORDINATION                                   | 54 |
| 6.2   | TREN  | IDS OF COOPERATION BY EACH DONOR                              | 55 |
| СНАРТ | TER 7 | : RESULTS OF ANALYSIS   | 57 |
| 7.1   | TOPF  | PRIORITIES IN THE BASIC EDUCATION SECTOR                      | 57 |
| 7.2   | FACT  | OR ANALYSIS OF TOP PRIORITIES                                 | 59 |
| 7.3   | Prioi | RITIES OF UGANDA'S EDUCATION POLICY                           | 62 |
| 7.4   | CHAL  | LENGES AND CONSIDERATIONS                                     | 64 |
|       |       |   |    |

## Annex :

| Annex I   | Survey Items and Indicators   |
|-----------|-------------------------------|
| Annex II  | Itinerary of the Field Survey |
| Annex III | Collected Data                |
| Annex IV  | References                    |

# **CHAPTER 1: OUTLINE OF THE STUDY**

# 1.1 Background

To attain the goals of Education for All (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by the 2015 deadline, the developing countries have been engaged in quantitative and qualitative improvement in basic education in collaboration with the cooperating partners (CPs). For some developing countries, reaching all of these goals by the target year still remains challenging. In the area of basic education improvement, sector-wide approaches (SWAps) have been more emphasized through direct budget support rather than through project-type interventions. There have been growing concerns in the limited capacity of the developing countries in planning, budgeting, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, which might negatively affect aid effectiveness and transparency.

Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has provided various project-type and/or program-type interventions, including technical assistance, classroom construction, education equipment procurement etc., in line with the education sector program of the developing countries. In order to implement more strategic and effective cooperation in this challenging environment, JICA has decided to conduct the Basic Education Sub-Sector Study (hereinafter, the Study) and to understand the whole picture of the basic education development to formulate more comprehensive and effective programs/projects based on the deepened analysis of the administrative, financial and socio-economic contexts as well as of the educational indicators and statistics.

# **1.2 Objectives of the Study**

The Study, through data collection and analysis of the 13 target countries chosen from the Sub Sahara Africa and the Central America, and comprehensive and comparative analysis, aimed to (1) collect and analyze general information in the basic education sub-sector and identify priority areas for development in target countries and (2) make recommendations for JICA to design and carry out any future sector and/or sub-sector study.

# **1.3 Basic Approaches of the Study**

The Study was conducted with the following basic approaches:

- (1) Information gathering and analysis were to be done from the viewpoints of *equity*; *administrative and financial capacity*; and *internal efficiency*, in addition to *quality* and *access* of the basic education. Key questions, which were identified for each target country through the preliminary document review, were also tackled to find updated information.
- (2) Problems and structural deficiencies of the basic education sector in each target country were to be identified and priority development needs and strategies were to be listed.
- (3) Recommendations for JICA to improve future sector study through comprehensive and comparative analysis of the country analyses results.

# **1.4** Target Areas/Countries

The following 13 countries were chosen as the target countries, where there were on-going programs/projects in the basic education sub-sector and program/project formulation was to be planned in the near future.

| Sub-Saharan Africa | Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Niger, |
|--------------------|---|
| (11 countries)     | Rwanda, Senegal, Uganda, and Zambia                           |
| Central America    | Guatemala and Nicaragua                                       |
| (2 countries)      |   |

The field survey in Mali was cancelled due to the coup d'état in March 2012. The basic education sector analysis report of Mali was prepared based on the data collection and analysis in Japan.

# 1.5 Major Steps and Schedule

Information collection and analysis was conducted, according to the standard research items and indicators (Annex 1-1) listed in JICA's "Standard Research Items and Methodology of the Education Sector Analysis" (drafted as of October 2011). Major steps and schedule of the Study were as follows.

| February - April 2012:  | Formulation of Inception Report  |
|-------------------------|--|
| -                       | Analysis of existing documents of the government agencies,             |
|                         | international development partners, international organizations etc.   |
| -                       | Preliminary information gathering in Japan and discussion with JICA    |
|                         | officers in charge of the target countries.                            |
| February - May 2012:    | Preparation of Field Survey  |
| -                       | Preparation of the field survey schedule and making appointments       |
| -                       | Preparation of the field survey plan and strategies                    |
| -                       | Identification of lacking data and preparation of the questionnaires   |
| March - June 2012:      | Conducting of Field Survey   |
| -                       | Information gathering from government agencies, international          |
|                         | development partners, international organization, and JICA office etc. |
| -                       | School and project site visits   |
| <u>May - June 2012:</u> | Drafting of Basic Education Sector Analysis Reports by Country         |
| July 2012:              | Formulation of Final Report  |
| -                       | Comprehensive and comparative analysis of the country-wise reports     |
|                         | and preparation of recommendations                                     |
| -                       | Report preparation   |

# 1.6 Study Team

Information gathering, analysis and report writing of the Study were conducted by the Study team as listed in Table 1-1. The field survey and data analysis for Uganda was conducted by Dr. Yoko Ishida, Director, Evaluation Department, International Development Center of Japan Inc. (IDCJ).

| Position  | Name (Affiliation)                             | Country in Charge      |
|---|--|------------------------|
| Team Leader /Comprehensive<br>Analysis of the Basic Education   | Yoko Ishida (IDCJ)                             | Malawi, Uganda, Zambia |
| Administrative and Financial<br>Analysis                        | Hiromitsu Muta (IDCJ)                          | Guatemala, Nicaragua   |
| Country-wise Basic Education<br>Sector Analysis 1               | Naomi Takasawa (IDCJ)                          | Cameroon, Niger        |
| Country-wise Basic Education<br>Sector Analysis 2               | Emi Ogata (IDCJ)                               | Senegal                |
| Country-wise Basic Education<br>Sector Analysis 3               | Yoko Takimoto (Recycle One, Inc.)              | Ethiopia, Kenya        |
| Country-wise Basic Education<br>Sector Analysis 4               | Miko Maekawa (IDCJ)                            | Rwanda                 |
| Country-wise Basic Education<br>Sector Analysis 5               | Chie Tsubone (Global Link<br>Management, Inc.) | Burkina Faso, Mali     |
| Administrative Coordination/<br>Assistance for Sector Analysis1 | Michiru Yabuta (IDCJ)                          |                        |
| Administrative Coordination/<br>Assistance for Sector Analysis2 | Mana Takasugi (IDCJ)                           |                        |

Table 1-1 : Team Members of the Study and the Countries in Charge

# CHAPTER 2: POLITICAL AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC SITUATION IN UGANDA

# 2.1 Political Situation

Since its independence in 1962 from British colonial rule, Uganda has experienced a series of domestic problems, including repeated civil strife, military conflict with Tanzania, violation of human rights under dictatorship and economic collapse. However, since January, 1986 when the NRM came to power, the Museveni Administration has largely stabilised the internal politics. Museveni decisively won the general election in 1996 and 2001. The referendum in July, 2005 restored multi-party politics and the no-party system which had been in place since 1986 was scrapped. In August the same year, the Constitution was revised to remove the restriction on the number of successive terms for an incumbent president. President Museveni was elected to a third term in 2006 followed by another victory in February, 2011.

Although the political stability has restored the domestic security, the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) has waged a civil war against the central government for 20 years in the north of Uganda. At one time, the number of internally displaced people was estimated to be nearly two million. The security situation in the north has, however, much improved since the start of peace negotiations in 2006, prompting the said people to gradually return to their homelands (MoFA, 2011).

## 2.2 Socio-economic Situation

| 1) Country Name:         | Republic of Uganda  |
|--------------------------|---|
| 2) Area:                 | 241 thousand Km <sup>2</sup> , (Land area size 197 thousand Km <sup>2*1</sup> )   |
| 3) Population:           | 33.42 million people <sup>*2</sup> , Annual growth rate 3.2% <sup>*2</sup><br>Population density 167.3 / Km <sup>2 *2</sup> , Urban population 35.9% <sup>*2</sup> (2010) |
| 4) Ethnic groups:        | Baganda, Langi and Acholi, etc. <sup>*1</sup>   |
| 5) Languages:            | English, Swahili and Luganda, etc. <sup>*1</sup>  |
| 6) Religions:            | Christians (60%), traditional religions (30%), Muslims $(10\%)^{*1}$  |
| 7) Major industries:     | Agriculture (raw fish, coffee, tea, cotton and tobacco) <sup>*1</sup>   |
|                          | Mining (copper, cobalt and gold) <sup>*1</sup>  |
|                          | Manufacturing (textile, tobacco, cement, sugar and brewing) $^{*1}$   |
| 8) GDP:                  | 17,011 million US\$ <sup>*2</sup> (2010)  |
| 9) GNI per capita        | 500 US\$ (current US\$, Atlas method), 1,250\$ (PPP international \$) <sup><math>*2</math></sup>  |
|                          | (2010)  |
| 10) GDP growth rate:     | 5.2% (2010) <sup>*2</sup>   |
| 11) Consumer price index | $150.0(2010)^{*1}$  |
| (2005=100):              |   |
| 12) Currency:            | Ugandan shilling (U.shs)  |
| 13) Exchange rate:       | US\$ $1 = 2,420$ U.shs (March, 2011) <sup>*1</sup>  |
| 14) Life expectancy:     | 54 (2010) <sup>*2</sup>   |

The socioeconomic indicators of Uganda are shown in the table below:

| 15) Adult literacy rate:    | 73.2% (2010) <sup>*2</sup> |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 16) Prevalence of HIV (ages | $6.5\% (2009)^{*2}$        |
| 15-49):                     |                            |

\*1 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan Home page "Kakkoku Chiiki Josei" (Japanese) (accessed on 16rh June 2012). <u>http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/uganda/data.html</u>

\*2 World Bank Homepage "World Data Bank" (accessed on 16th June 2012).

The economy of Uganda after independence was chronically in crisis up to the late 1980's due to a series of civil strife but the active pursuit of structural adjustment policies with the assistance of the World Bank-IMF from 1987 onwards stabilised the macro economy, allowing Uganda to enjoy the highest growth rate among Sub-Saharan countries. The first revised version of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) which spelled out a comprehensive poverty eradication plan in 2000 was approved by the World Bank-IMF as the world's first PRSP. Following this, Uganda was given debt relief in March, 2005 based on the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPCs) incentive as the first country in the world. The Third PEAP was prepared in 2004 and identified the diversification of and addition of value to export products, especially agricultural products, as the key priority for poverty reduction. Although Uganda's economy has been unable to avoid the adverse impacts of the global recession, its national economy has been fairly steady despite a rising inflation rate due to international price hikes of food and crude oil since mid-2008 (MoFA, 2012).

Uganda has 113 districts and the capital city of Kampala. These districts are classified into four regions (Northern, Central, Eastern and Western) which do not constitute part of the official administrative hierarchy of the country. Kampala City has by far the highest population density. The population growth rate of Kampala is above the national average even though the population growth rate of the Central Region, in which Kampala is located, is the lowest among the four regions. The lowest population density by region is 64.8 people per km<sup>2</sup> for the Northern Region. Data on the population, area, population density, and population growth rate by region of Uganda can be found in Annex 2-1 of this report. For analysis purposes in this report, data is classified into six areas based on the Education Management Information System (EMIS).

The nationwide poverty rate (proportion of the population living on a daily income of less than US\$ 1) in Uganda dropped from 56% in the 1990's to 25% in 2009. The HIV/AIDS infection rate which raged up to the 1990's declined from some 20% to less than 10% in 2000 and further to approximately 7% in 2009. In spite of the economic growth and improvement in socio-economic conditions, in addition to low productivity in the agriculture sector (Uganda's major industry), sluggish growth in the manufacturing sector failed to absorb labor surplus in the agriculture sector. These have become a bottleneck, and Gross National Income (GNI) per capita of US\$ 500 (Atlas method, 2010), GNI per capita of \$1,250 (PPP international \$, 2010) are still low. In terms of the Human Development Index (HDI), Uganda is ranked as low as 161<sup>st</sup> of the world's 187 countries/areas, making it one of the least developped countries (UNDP,

#### 2011).

The national poverty rate of Uganda in 2002 was 39% and the rate was the highest in the Northern Region at 63%. The lowest was 22% for the Central Region. Within the Northern Region, the northeastern area (Karamoja area consisting of such districts as Kaabong, Kotido, Abim, Moroto and Nakapiripirit) along the border with Kenya and Sudan had an extremely high poverty rate of more than 80%. This is a semi-arid plateau area through which the outer rim of the Rift Valley runs through. The main livelihood is grazing (Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBS), 2002). A map showing the poverty rate by district in 2002 can be found in Annex 2-2.

According to the 2006 data<sup>2</sup> given in the Millennium Development Goals Report for Uganda 2010, the state of achievement of the poverty and education-related goals (MDG1 through MDG3) in Uganda was "on track" for poverty-related Target 1A of Goal 1 and "slow" for both the 100% net enrollment rate and 100% completion rate up to P5 of Target 2A of Goal 2. Meanwhile, Target 3A "elimination of the gender disparity between primary and secondary education" was judged to be "on track" (Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED), 2010 and GoU, 2010).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For Goal 2, 2009 data was used.

# **CHAPTER 3: EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND REFORMS**

# 3.1 National Development Plans

Uganda's Vision 2025 issued in 1995 specifies the long-term development objectives for the country and one of the visions is the creation of "an enlightened, well-informed and prosperous society" with the over-riding goal of "increasing people's access to information and participation in self, community and national development" (UNESCO, 2010).

In line with the development objectives specified in Vision 2025, the PEAP was prepared in 1997 as a national development plan. The PEAP is revised every three years and the PEAP II prepared in 2000 was approved as the world's first PRSP by the World Bank-IMF. The subsequent PEAP III was completed in June, 2009. Throughout the history of the PEAP, the education sector is given the status of top priority to achieve "a qualitative improvement of the lives of the poor and human development" which itself has been one of the main pillars of the PEAP right from the PEAP I to the latest PEAP III (MoFA, 2008).

In April, 2010, the five-year National Development Plan (NDP) (2010/11 - 2014/15) was announced to replace the PEAP. While having emphasised poverty reduction as in the case of the PEAPs, this NDP places more emphasis on economic growth, upholding economic growth as the main pillar for national development. To achieve the vision of transforming Uganda to a modern and prosperous country in 30 years, the NDP identifies the following eight objectives:

- (i) Increase of household income and promotion of equity
- (ii) Enhancement of the availability and quality of gainful employment
- (iii) Improvement of the stock and quality of economic infrastructure
- (iv) Increase of the access to quality social services
- (v) Promotion of science, technology, innovation and ICT to enhance competitiveness
- (vi) Enhancement of human capital development
- (vii) Strengthening of good governance, defense and security
- (viii) Promotion of a sustainable population and the use of environmental and natural resources

The education falls under (iv) increase of the access to quality social services while literacy falls under (vi) enhancement of human capital development.

Some of the education-related indicators and their targets in the NDP can be found in Annex 3-1.

## **3.2 Education Act**

The Education Act was enacted in 2008 and has the following objectives.

(i) To give full effect to the education policy of the government and the functions and services of the government

- (ii) To give full effect to the decentralisation of education services
- (iii) To give full effect to the universal primary education policy of the government
- (iv) To give full effect to the universal post primary education and training policy of the government
- (v) To promote partnership with various stakeholders in the provision of education services
- (vi) To promote the quality control of education and training
- (vii) To promote physical education and sport in schools

The Act addresses such matters as the role of the Minister, categories of educational institutions, functions of government grant-aided educational institutions, free universal primary education and universal post primary education, levels of education, registration and licensing of teachers, control and management of schools, special provisions relating to private schools and the quality control of education. The Act stipulates that "the provision of education and training for a child shall be the joint responsibility of the state, parent or guardian and other stakeholders, the basic education shall be provided and enjoyed as a right by all persons." Article 13 stipulates "primary education shall be universal and compulsory for pupils aged 6 (six) years and above". The Constitution of Uganda adopted in 1995 clearly states that all persons have a right to education and that a child is entitled to basic education which shall be the responsibility of the state and the parents of the child (UNESCO, 2010).

## **3.3 Education Policy**

The Government White Paper on the Education Policy Review Commission Report of 1992 is considered to be the basic document outlining the educational policies and programmes in Uganda. It still plays the function of a priority guideline for the education sector today when education in the country has much improved (MoES, 2007a). This White Paper defines the national aims for education as cited below (UNESCO, 2010).

- To promote understanding and appreciation of the value of national unity, patriotism and cultural heritage with due consideration of internal relations and beneficial interdependence
- To inculcate moral, ethical and spiritual values in the individual and develop self-discipline, integrity, tolerance and human fellowship
- To inculcate a sense of service, duty and leadership for participation in civic, social and national affairs through group activities in educational institutions and the community
- To promote scientific, technical and cultural knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to enhance individual and national development
- To eradicate illiteracy and equip the individual with basic skills and knowledge to exploit the environment for self-development as well as national development; for better health, nutrition and family life, and the capacity for continued learning
- To equip learners with the ability to contribute to the building of an integrated, self-sustaining and independent national economy

Apart from the said White Paper, the commitment to education as shown by the President's

manifest, and the government's commitment to achieving two sets of international goals, i.e. EFA and MDGs, constitute the traction force to advance the development of education (Purcell, 2011).

# 3.4 Education System

Pre-primary education in Uganda features two or three year olds through five year olds and is outside the scope of compulsory education. The entry age to primary education is six years old. Primary education lasts for seven years from P1 to P7 while secondary education lasts for six years from S1 to S6, creating a 7-6 system. In short, basic education in Uganda consists of pre-primary education, primary education and lower secondary education.

Primary education is divided into three phases: lower primary (P1 through P3), transition year (P4) and upper primary (P5 and P7). On completing P7, pupils sit the PLE. Secondary education consists of two cycles. When pupils complete the first cycle (S1 through S4 in lower secondary education), they sit the Uganda Certificate of Education (UCE). On passing this exam, they obtain an O-level qualification. Depending on the examination results, pupils with O-level qualifications can advance to higher secondary education (S5 and S6), non-university institutions (business/technical school, vocational training school or other) or a primary teachers' college (PTC). At the end of S6, pupils sit the Uganda Advanced Certificate of Education (UACE) and obtain A-level qualifications on passing these examinations. Pupils obtaining A-level qualifications can advance to university, technical college or a national teachers' college (NTC), depending on the examination results (UNESCO, 2010).

After the introduction of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in 1996, primary education for seven years became free in 1997. In 2008, primary education became compulsory. Free secondary education was included in the election manifest of President Museveni in November, 2005 and secondary education gradually became free through the implementation of the Universal Secondary Education (USE) Initiative and Universal Post Primary Education and Training (UPPET) Programme since 2007 (UNESCO, 2010 and Arakawa, 2009).

# **3.5 Education Sector Plans**

(1) Education Sector Strategic Plan (ESSP)

The five-year Education Sector Investment Plan (ESIP) (1998-2003) introduced in 1998 was the first genuine education sector programme in Uganda. This ESIP principally focused on primary education, making it a compulsory requirement for the government to allocate at least 65% of the education budget to primary education. The ESIP was followed by a sector-wide ESSP (2004 - 2015) in 2003 (Arakawa, 2009).

This ESSP raised the following three critical concerns to be addressed within the target year (MoES, 2010d).

- (i) Primary schools were failing to provide sufficient Ugandan children with literacy, numeracy and basic life skills.
- (ii) Secondary schools were not producing graduates with the skills and knowledge required to enter the workforce or pursue tertiary education.
- (iii) Universities and technical institutes were neither affording students from disadvantages backgrounds access to tertiary education nor responding adequately to the aspirations of a growing number of qualified secondary school graduates.

The ESSP has so far been revised twice. The first revised ESSP (2007-2015) reflected the move towards free secondary education, revision of the primary education curriculum and other developments since the publication of the original ESSP. The ESSP was further updated in 2010 (to cover the period from 2010 through 2015) to respond to the top priorities identified by the NDP (Arakawa, 2009).

A major strategy adopted by this updated ESSP (2010-2015) is to prioritise access, equity, relevance and efficiency of education service delivery in Uganda by means of (i) increasing and improving the equitable access and completion rate for primary and secondary education and ensuring gender equity, (ii) improving the quality and relevance of primary and secondary education and Training (BTVET) and tertiary education, (iv) improving the relevant and quality of BTVET and tertiary education and (v) improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery of education services at all levels by increasing the capacity to plan, manage and monitor for a better performance (MoES, 2010d).

The updated ESSP upholds the following two principles to achieve the above objectives (MoES, 2010d).

- 1) Firstly to prioritise and invest in those actions which will improve the internal efficiency, to rationalise enrolment at the primary level by reducing under-age and over-age enrolment and to improve the student flow by reducing repetition and dropping-out.
- 2) Secondly to prioritise and invest in those reforms which offer good impacts relative to cost. Many changes can be achieved without major investment. Pursuing the issue of teacher absenteeism, for example, can be expected to be catalytic in raising quality and through that pupil achievement; this in turn can be expected to reduce drop-outs, improve poor pupil attendance and reduce repetition. Equally, building the capacity process can be expected to improve the accountability. These are low cost, high value actions.
- (2) Universal Primary Education (UPE)

In 1996, the primary school enrollment rate was as low as 60%. President Museveni believed that school fees were the main obstacle to improving the access to primary education and proposed free primary education for all. Following the introduction of UPE in 1996, scrapping

of the user fee for primary education for up to four children per family began in 1997. Since 2002, primary education at public schools has been free and compulsory under the UPE for all children of school age (6 years and older) (JICA, 2008).

The purposes of UPE are (i) to provide education of a certain quality for all school-age children, (ii) to indicate a fundamental positive transformation of society in the social economic and political field, (iii) to enable every child to enter and remain in school until the primary education cycle is completed, (iv) to make basic education accessible to all learners and relevant to their needs, (v) to make education equitable in order to eliminate disparities and inequalities, (v) to ensure that education is affordable for the majority of Ugandans, (vii) to eliminate illiteracy and (viii) to provide basic skills and knowledge required for self and national development for all Ugandans (JICA, 2008).

## (3) Universal Post Primary Education and Training (UPPET)

In 2007, the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) began the UPPET programme with a view to accommodating the growing number of pupils completing primary education under UPE. Under this UPPET programme, school fees are waived for those pupils meeting the required PLE score and who are enrolled either in public schools (except for a small number of elite public schools) or in private or community schools in areas without public schools. Although the UPPET programme has increased the number of enrolled pupils in lower secondary education, it has worsened the teacher and classroom shortages (WB, 2009).

Since 2009, MoES has been implementing a 10 year programme designed to expand the UPPET in three phases. Phase 1 involves the expansion of lower secondary education and the establishment of a framework for the sustainable expansion of the UPPET with such objectives as the provision of capitation grants for government and private USE participating schools to replace tuition fees, payment of examination fees, targeting bursaries for girls and disadvantaged children, implementation of double shift schooling and teacher rationalisation through the application of a school deployment formula among others. Phase II aims at achieving the continued expansion of lower secondary education and the expansion of upper secondary education. Phase III aims at achieving the consolidation of post primary education reforms (WB, 2009).

## **3.6** Supervisory Authority

MoES is responsible for pre-primary education, primary education, secondary education, technical and vocational education, teacher education and tertiary education. Its key functions include among others: (i) development and implementation of appropriate education policies, laws, regulations and strategies regarding the management and delivery of education and training, including sports services within the sector, (ii) planning, mobilisation and ensuring of the availability of resources to support and promote development and service delivery in the entire sector, (iii) ensuring of the formulation and periodic review of the education system,

sector strategic plans and education and training curricula and publications, (iv) monitoring, evaluation and ensuring of the implementation of all government policies and programmes relating to the education and sports sector, (v) setting, dissemination, monitoring, periodic evaluation and ensuring of quality and achievement of the national education and sports standards and (vi) ensuring of the establishment of an efficient, effective, fair and credible system of assessment and certification at all levels (UNESCO, 2010).

The organizations affiliated to MoES are the Uganda National Examination Board (UNEB), National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC), National Council for Sports (NCS), Education Service Commission (ESC) and government universities (UNESCO, 2010).

The administrative structure of MoES is headed by the Permanent Secretary. Two directorates responsible for sub-sectors, i.e. the Directorate of Higher, Technical and Vocational Education and Training (D/HTVET) and the Directorate of Basic and Secondary Education (DBE), and the Directorate of Education Standards responsible for the establishment of education standards and guidance on inspection and monitoring are placed under the Permanent Secretary. These directorates are complemented by the Department of Planning and Policy Analysis responsible for statistics, budget planning and implementation/management of sector development plans, Department of Inclusive and Special Education, Department of Physical Education and Sports and other departments (Annex 3-3).

# CHAPTER 4: STATUS AND CHALLENGES OF BASIC EDUCATION SECTOR DEVELOPMENT

## 4.1 Access

## 4.1.1 School Age Population

In Uganda, the population of six to sixteen year-old children eligible for basic education, i.e. primary education and lower secondary education, was around 8,351 thousand in 2000, rising to 9,828 thousand in 2005 and 11,562 thousand in 2010, thus displaying a mean annual rate of increase of 3.30% between 2005 and 2010, almost the same as the 3.31% between 2000 and 2005 (UIS, 2012). In 2010, the school age population of 12,927 thousand accounted for 34.0% of the overall population (WB, 2012). It wasn't possible to acquire forecast data on the school age population, however, based on data obtained from UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)<sup>3</sup>, assuming that the school age population increases at the same rate of increase displayed between 2006 and 2010, it will rise to 16 million by 2020.

## 4.1.2 Enrollment Trend of Pre-school Education

Pre-school education in Uganda targets children aged two to five years old. Under the Education Act, pre-school education is provided at cost by private agencies but it is not compulsory. The role of the government is to set curriculums, guidelines and minimum standards, implement teacher training and register, license and supervise preschool education agencies. The pre-school education policy (early childhood development (ECD) policy) was compiled and disseminated to 30 prefectures out of 80 nationwide in 2007/08 (UNESCO 2010 and MoES 2010d).

In FY 2007, the preschool education communication strategy and community mobilization and management committee training manual were compiled, and the ECD learning framework was also developed and translated into 16 local languages by the NCDC as an adjunct to the ECD policy. In reality, many preschool education agencies adopt curriculums from the United Kingdom and Eastern Africa and so on (UNESCO 2010 and MoES 2010d).

Concerning the number of preschool education facilities, there were 538 centers in 2004, and these had increased by 4.6 times to 2,469 centers by 2009. Half of these preschool education facilities were located in urban areas and their environs, while 30% were located in the central region. Registered facilities accounted for just 16% of the total, while only 11% of the non-registered facilities were licensed. Enrollment increased fivefold from 41,775 in 2004 to 234,428 in 2009. The enrollment rate is also increasing, however, the total enrollment rate was still only 7.60% in 2009 (MoES, 2009c).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Acquired on May 25, 2012 from the Data Centre on the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) website

 $<sup>(</sup>http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/TableViewer/document.aspx?ReportId=143\&IF\_Language=eng)$ 

According to statistics of UNESCO, the mean overall preschool education enrollment rate among 28 African countries in 2008 was 28.5%, however, the figure in Uganda was less than half this value at just 12.7% (UIS, 2012).

# 4.1.3 Enrollment Trend of Primary Education

## (1) Number of Schools

According to education statistics of MoES (2002~2010), the MoES database contained 14,281 primary schools in 2002, and this figure had increased by 1.4 times to 20,448 by 2010. The number of schools that responded to questionnaires in the 2010 Annual School Census (ASC) was 17,865 (87.3% of all primary schools on the MoES database), and of these public schools accounted for 12,576 (102.1% of public primary schools on the database), while the remaining 5,289 were private schools (79.4% of private primary schools on the database) (MoES, 2010e).

Almost all public schools respond to the school census every year, and assuming that private schools account for the majority of non-responding schools (2,583 schools in 2010) (according to the hearing with the MoES Planning Department), whereas public schools accounted for 12,576 schools in 2010, the number of private schools is thought to be 7,872. Accordingly, public schools account for 61.5% of primary schools, and private schools account for almost 40% (38.5%). Viewed in terms of urban areas and rural areas, 74.7% of the primary schools that responded to the census in 2010 were located in rural areas, 13.5% were in peri-urban areas, 8.0% were in urban areas, and the remaining 3.8% were unknown. Moreover, 76.6% of the responding primary schools were already registered with MoES, 13.5% were licensed but not registered, and the remaining 9.9% were neither licensed nor registered (MoES, 2010e).

#### (2) Enrollment

The number of children attending primary education<sup>4</sup> was 6,559 thousand in 2000 and this increased by 1.3 times to 8,374 thousand by 2010 (see Figure 4.1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Number of primary school enrolled pupils responding to the ASC



(Source: MoES, 2000~2010e)

### Figure 4-1: Trend of Primary School Enrollment by Gender (2000-2010) (persons)

School enrollment displayed a temporary decline from 2003 to 2006. Looking at the factors behind this, following the introduction of free primary education in 1997 there was a large influx up until 2003 of children of school age who had until then not attended school; and following that, children of appropriate school age came to attend schools. This trend may be viewed as the manifestation of the mop-up effect (mopping up of non-attending children) of the UPE policy (MoES, 2007a).

Looking at enrollment by gender, in 2000 the number of boys exceeded the number of girls by 230 thousand, however, by 2006 the two figures were almost the same, and by 2010 the number of girls attending primary education exceeded the number of boys by 16 thousand (MoES, 2000-2010e).

Out of the abovementioned 8,374 thousand children enrolled in primary education in 2010, 7,171 thousand or 85.6% of the total attended public schools. Looking at the enrollment in 2010 in terms of grade and gender, the number of P1 children was almost 2 million at 1,944 thousand, however, the figure falls to 1,300 thousand between P2 and P4, then becomes 1,100 thousand in P5, 850 thousand in P6 and 540 thousand in P7, thus falling to almost one-quarter of the number of children who attended P1. The rate of decline in enrollment is especially high between P1 and P2 and between P6 and P7 (MoES, 2000-2010e).

Looking at the reasons, between P1 and P2, the ratio of children repeating a year is high among children who enrolled when younger than the official enrolment age of six; whereas between P6 and P7, in cases where teachers deem that children haven't reached sufficient scholastic level to

sit the P7 (the final grade of primary education) completion examinations, they urge children to repeat P6. Such trends do not comply with the government policy of promoting children each year. Incidentally, no major disparity can be observed between boys and girls among pupils attending school between P1 and P7 (MoES, 2010e).

#### (3) Enrollment Rates

The gross enrollment rate (GER) in primary education in 2002 was 126.3%. Following that, in spite of some minor variations, it remained largely the same in excess of 120% at 133.3% in 2009 and 128% in 2010. The net enrollment rate (NER) was 84.8% in 2002 (83.0% among boys and 99.8% among girls<sup>5</sup>), however, this gradually improved and reached 96.0% in 2010 (95.6% among boys and 96.4% among girls). There is hardly any gender disparity, although the NER among girls is slightly higher than among boys. Looking at the NER by region in 2010, it was 110.6% in the Eastern region, 93.8% in the Northern region, 96.5% in the Southwestern region, 90.8% in the Central region and 85.7% in the Western region. Thus, all five regions generally displayed good figures, however, the NER in the Northeast region was low at 45.6% (MoES, 2002~2010e).

### (4) Intake Rates

The gross intake rate (GIR) of P1 pupils in primary education in 2002 was 155.0% and following subsequent variations this still was well in excess of 100% at 160.6% in 2010. The net intake rate (NIR) was 57.8% in 2002, but this had improved to 70.2% by 2010. Despite the improvement in the NIR, the fact that it was still only 70% was because only a few children enter school at the official age (six years). Out of the total 1,751,000 children entering school in 2010, six-year olds accounted for less than half (43.7%) at 765,000; meanwhile, children aged five years or less accounted for 87 thousand (5.0% of the total), those aged seven to nine accounted for 772 thousand (44.0%), and those aged ten or over accounted for 127 thousand (7.3%) (MoES, 2002~2010e).

Looking at the geographical breakdown, the NIR in 2010 was high at 84.5% in East region and 83.5% in Southwest region; it was almost on a par with the national average at 70.1% in Central region; and it was low at 59.0% in West region, 54,5% in North region and 36.6% in Northeastern region. The figures thus displayed a large geographical disparity (MoES, 2010e).

## (5) Enrollment by Nationality

A feature of education statistics in Uganda is that enrollment is displayed according to nationality. Out of 8,374,648 children enrolled in primary education throughout the country in 2010, Ugandan children accounted for 8,292,131 (99.0% of the total), while children of other nationalities accounted for 1% with 31,847 coming from Sudan, 15,291 coming from Congo,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> This may be due to erroneous inputting of education statistics but the cause is unknown.

15,185 coming from Rwanda, 6,576 coming from Kenya and so on. Enrolled children of Sudanese nationality are concentrated in the North region where they accounted for 21,344 (1.3%) out of the total enrollment of 1,674,650 (MoES, 2010e).

# 4.1.4 Enrollment Trend of Secondary Education

## (1) Number of Schools

The number of secondary schools responding to the ASC was  $2,198^6$  in 2002, increasing 1.5 times to  $3,234^7$  by 2010. Out of the 3,234 secondary schools that responded to the ASC in 2010, 996 (30.8% of the responding schools) were public schools (government-aided schools) and 2,238 (69.2%) were private schools (schools that receive no government aid at all) (MoES, 2010e).

Out of the secondary schools that responded to the ASC in 2010, 44.7% were located in rural areas, 22.7% were in peri-urban areas, 13.1% were in urban areas, and the remaining 19.5% were unknown. In terms of registration with MoES, 1,951 schools (60.3%) were already registered with MoES, 498 schools (15.4%) were licensed but not registered, and the remaining 785 schools (24.3%) were neither licensed nor registered (MoES, 2010e).

Out of the secondary schools that responded to the ASC in 2009, 43% covered only lower secondary education (from S1 to S4), 32% covered the entire secondary education (from S1 to S6), 1% only covered upper secondary education (S5 and S6), and the remaining 24% did not reply (MoES, 2010e).

## (2) Enrollment

The number of children attending secondary education<sup>8</sup>was 519,000 in 2000 and this increased greatly 2.4 times over to 12,260,000 by 2010 (see Figure 4.2). Out of the number of enrolled children in 2010, 586,000 (47.8%) were enrolled in public schools. Compared to 2006 and before, the rate of increase in 2007, when free secondary education came to be provided, was slightly higher, however, since the number of children attending private schools accounts for more than half of the total, the impact of the free education policy has been smaller than compared to primary education. Looking at secondary school enrollment by gender, boys constantly outnumbered girls up until 2010. In 2000, the disparity between boys and girls was 60,000 and this gradually increased until it reached 100,000 in 2009, however, it contracted again in 2010 to 84,000 (MoES, 2000-2010e).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> We were unable to acquire data on the number of secondary schools in 2002 on the MoE database.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> In 2010, 4,666 secondary schools were listed on the MoE database. 949 secondary school districts are listed on the database, and 996 schools, corresponding to 105.0% of these, responded to the ASC. Meanwhile, 3,335 private schools were listed, and 2,238 of these, corresponding to 67.1% of the total, responded.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> As was also the case with primary schools, this indicates the number of secondary school enrolled pupils who responded to the ASC.

Looking at secondary school enrollment by grade and gender in 2010, whereas the number of S1 students was 324,000, the numbers of S2~S4 students decreased by 10~15% and the number of S4 students was 220,000. The number of S5 and S6 students was 79,000 and 68,000 respectively, falling to around 20% of the number of S1 students. In all grades, the number of enrolled boys exceeded the number of enrolled girls, and this disparity was especially large in S4 (MoES, 2010e).



(Source: MoES, 2000~2010e)



#### (3) Enrollment Rates

The GER of secondary schools increased slightly from 19.6% in 2002 (21.1% among boys and 18.1% among girls) to 28.3% in 2010 (30.7% among boys and 26.0% among girls), while the NER increased from 16.7% in 2002 (17.2% among boys and 16.2% among girls) to 24.6% in 2010 (25.7% among boys and 23.5% among girls). Looking at the NER by gender, boys exceeded girls by 1.0 point in 2002, and this gap had increased slightly to 2.2 points by 2010 (MoES, 2002~2010e).

Looking at the regional breakdown, the NER was higher than the national average in Central region (32.9%), East region (28.1%) and Southwest region (26.6%), it was slightly lower in East region (20.1%) and North region (14.0%), and it was extremely low in Northeast region (4.9%) (MoES, 2010e).

## (4) Intake Rates

The NIR to S1 of secondary education was 6.7% nation-wide (6.2% among boys and 7.2% among girls). In terms of the regional breakdown, the rate was higher than national average in Central region (12.4%) and East region (7.1%), it was lower in Southwest region (5.6%), West

region (3.5%) and North region (2.1%), and it was just 0.4% in Northeast region. The number of students admitted to secondary education displays a greater age variation than compared to primary education. Out of 321 thousand S1 students admitted to secondary education in 2010, only 52 thousand or 16.2% were the official intake age of thirteen years. Meanwhile, students under twelve years accounted for 9 thousand (2.7%), those aged from fourteen to sixteen accounted for 215 thousand (66.9%), and those over seventeen years were 46 thousand (14.2%) (MoES, 2010e).

### (5) Enrollment by Nationality

Out of 1,225,692 students enrolled in secondary education throughout the country in 2010, Ugandan students accounted for 1,203,442 (98.2% of the total), while students from Sudan accounted for 8,821, those from Kenya for 7,745, those from Tanzania for 2,231, those from Rwanda for 2,100, and those from Congo for 704 and so on. Students of Sudanese nationality were concentrated in North region, those of Kenyan nationality were concentrated in East region and Central region, and those of Rwandan and Tanzanian nationality were concentrated in Central region (Ministry of Education, 2010e).

# 4.1.5 Literacy Education

Adult literacy education is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD<sup>9</sup>) (UNESCO, 2010). The adult literacy rate in 2005 was 81% (86% among males, 76% among females), and this had increased to 87.3% by 2010 (89.1% among males, 85.5% among females). The rate of increase among women over five years was 9.5%, far greater than the 3.1% increase among males (MoES, 2011). Incidentally, the adult literacy rate in Uganda in 2010 exceeded the average rate for Africa of 71% (UIS, 2012).

Government literacy programs such as Functional Adult Literacy (FAL<sup>10</sup>) and so on made a major contribution to improving the literacy rate. The numbers of people enrolled in the FAL program are on the increase: out of 434,663 total participants in 2011, 325,721 (74.9%) were females and 108,943 (25.1%) were males (MoES, 2011). The MGLSD has developed literacy teaching materials in the languages of Rwandan, Luo, Runyankore, Lukiga, Lunyoro, Lutoro, Ateso and Lukonji in promotion of the FAL program, which covers half of the districts in the country. It plans to strengthen the program even further by developing teacher training manuals and curriculums, etc. and procuring and allocating more than 10,000 motorbikes in order to assist the activities of teachers in learning centers (MoES, 2011b).

# 4.2 Internal Efficiency (Quantitative Internal Efficiency)

(1) Promotion (Transition) Rates

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> MGLSD = Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> FAL = Functional Adult Literacy

The education statistics compiled by the Ugandan MoES do not indicate promotion rates according to each grade. The difficulty in calculating promotion rates in each school lie in the fact that data doesn't cover all schools, for example, in 2010, only 87.3% of primary schools and 69.3% of secondary schools responded to the ASC questionnaire, the number of responding schools differs from year to year, and there are numerous pupils who transfer in and out of schools during academic years and terms (MoES, 2010e).

Students have to sit the UCE in order to be promoted (achieve transition) from S4 to S5 in secondary education. This promotion rate was 43.0% in 2002 (42.0% among boys and 43.0% among girls), and it had improved approximately 3% to 45.8% (50.7% among boys and 40.0% among girls) over nine years by 2010. In terms of the number of pupils sitting the examinations, boys (140 thousand) outnumbered girls (118 thousand) by 20,000, however, in terms of promotion rate, the girls exceeded the boys by approximately 5% (MoES, 2010e).

#### (2) Repetition Rates

Automatic promotion is basically adopted in primary education, however, the repetition rate was 12.2% in 2009 and remained in excess of 10% at 10.9% in 2010. The repetition rate is highest among P6 pupils at 12.0% and next among P1 pupils at 11.6%. As was mentioned previously, among P1 pupils, children who were enrolled at less than six years old cannot keep up with the pace of study, while among the P5 and P6 pupils, teachers sometimes make pupils repeat years if they judge them to be not ready to take the primary education completion exams in P7 (MoES, 2010e).

Another reason is that because guardians in Uganda frequently transfer their children to public or private schools that have a better reputation, even midway during academic terms, the schools strive to acquire a higher rating (according to a hearing with the director of the MoES Secondary Private Schools Department). Looking at primary education repetition rate according to region, North region displayed the highest rate of 16.9% and Central region had the lowest value of 7.0%. Meanwhile, there was no major disparity in terms of gender with the rate being 11.1% among boys and 10.6% among girls (MoES, 2010e).

In secondary education too, public schools adopt automatic promotion (private schools can decide their own promotion policies). Repetition rates are lower than in primary education, however, repeating peaks at 5.4% among S4 students who sit the examination for advancing from lower secondary education to upper secondary education (O-level to A-level), and the next highest repetition rate is 4.7% among S6 students who sit the upper secondary education completion examinations. Viewed in regional terms, as was also the case in primary education, the repetition rate is highest in North region at 3.5%, followed by West region (2.9%), East region (2.8%), Central region (2.4%) and Northeast region (2.3%), while the rate was lowest at 1.9% in Southwest region. In terms of gender, there was no major disparity with both boys and girls displaying a repetition rate of 2.6% (MoES, 2010e).

The repetition rate for primary education overall in Uganda in 2009 based on UNESCO data was 10.9% (Education Policy and Data Center (EPDC), 2012). Compared to other Sub-Saharan African countries, this figure is lower than the extremely high values displayed by Malawi and Madagascar, but it belongs to the next highest group of countries such as Mali, Cameroon and Rwanda, etc. which have repetition rates in the range of 10~15% (see Annex 4-19 Statistical Data).

(3) Dropout Rates

In primary education, according to education statistics of MoES, the dropout rate in 2002 was 4.4% (4.4% among boys and 4.5% among girls); it increased to 5.0% in 2005 and 2006, but the figure subsequently went down again until it reached 4.4% (4.4% among boys and 4.3% among girls) in 2010 (MoES, 2010e).

It wasn't possible to obtain statistics on the dropout rate in secondary education. According to data compiled by UNESCO<sup>11</sup>, the dropout rate in 2009 was 14.7% (14.7% among boys and 14.6% among girls), which was worse than the figure of 12.0% in 2008. The dropout rate in lower secondary education (2009) was 10.5% (10.3% among boys and 10.7% among girls), which was more than twice as high as the figure of 4.6% in 2008 (MoES, 2010e).

Judging from the fact that the survival rate up to P5 of primary education as described later is 62.0% (61.2% among boys and 62.9% among girls), it appears that the UNESCO data value on the dropout rate has greater validity (MoES, 2010e).

According to the UNESCO data, as is shown in Figure 4.3, the dropout rate of 14.7% in Uganda is third highest among neighboring Sub-Saharan countries behind Madagascar (18.6%) and Rwanda (15.2%) (EPDC, 2012).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Statistical data of the UIS (UNESCO Institute for Statistics)



(Source: Prepared by the Education Policy and Data Center (EPDC) based on data from UNESCO (UIS))

# Figure 4-3: Comparison of Primary Education Dropout Rates in Sub-Saharan Countries (2009) (%)

It is currently difficult to clarify dropout rates in Uganda due to the low ASC questionnaire collection rate and also because schools and local governments do not possess systems for following up the many children who switch schools during academic years or terms and confirming whether they have left school or not (according to an interview with an official in charge of EMIS of MoES).

#### (4) Cohort Survival Rates

The children who entered primary school for the first time under the UPE completed P7 in 2003; however, only 50% of the children who originally entered school were able to complete their education (MoES, 2010e).

The survival rate up to P5 in 2002 was 68.3% (65.9% among boys and 70.8% among girls), however, this dropped to a 50% figure from 2003 onwards. From 2008, the figure gradually improved until it reached 62.0% in 2010 (61.2% among boys and 62.9% among girls), although this was still lower than the value in 2002 (MoES, 2010e). According to UNESCO data, the survival rate in Uganda in 2008 was 51.5%, lower than the average figure for Africa of 66.9%. Based on the abovementioned MoES statistical data, 665,000 children, or 38.0% of the 1,751,000 children who entered school in 2010, dropped out before reaching P5, and it is presumed that the investment spent on them will be wasted (UIS, 2012).

According to the report of the survey conducted under assistance from MoES and World Bank, the internal efficiency of primary education in Uganda is low and one-third of primary education expenditure is not used appropriately. Reasons for this situation are given as follows:
i) resources of the central government, local governments and schools are partially lost due to the payment of salaries to so-called "ghost teachers" who don't teach at schools and the improper use of UPE subsidies, ii) resources are lost inside schools due to the absence of children, teachers and principals, iii) teachers that meet needs are not assigned when recruiting teachers from inside and outside of districts, iv) resources are not appropriately allocated in public schools because class sizes are large in lower grades and small in higher grades (Donald, 2008).

## 4.3 Equity

#### 4.3.1 Comparative Analysis of Access by Group

#### (1) Gender Disparities

Thanks to the UPE, enrollment rates have increased among both boys and girls. Concerning access to primary education, the NER in 2010 was 96% for both boys and girls, indicating no gender disparity. Whereas the P7 completion rate in primary education was 56% for boys, it was 51% for girls, indicating a disparity of 5 points. In secondary education, the gender disparity had increased to 6 points in 2010 with the GER for boys being 30.8% and that for girls being 24.8%, while the NER was 25.8% for boys and 22.6% for girls, again indicating a high disparity of 3 points (MoES, 2010e).

The gender parity index (GPI concerning the GER) in primary education in 2009 was 1.01 (101 girls for every 100 boys), demonstrating that the MDG target had almost been achieved (UNECO, 2012). However, the GPI tends to decline as the level of education rises from lower secondary to upper secondary. The lower secondary education GPI was 0.79 and 0.87 in 2010, while the upper secondary education GPI was 0.60 in 2000 and 0.75 in 2010. Therefore, slight improvements of 0.08 and 0.15 points respectively were observed in both stages (UIS, 2012).

The fact that education incurs various costs has an impact on school enrollment among both boys and girls, however, factors contributing to the high dropout and absence rates among girls in particular also include teenage pregnancy, sexual harassment, female genital mutilation (circumcision), lack of sanitary facilities and so on. Judging from the results of the PLE, UCE and UACE over the five years from 2004 to 2009, girls were inferior to boys in terms of both transition rate and academic achievement rate in both primary and secondary education (GoU, 2010).

## (2) Regional Disparities

Uganda is divided into six regions for purposes of education statistics. As was mentioned in Chapter 2, North region and Northwest region (in administrative terms, these two regions are combined into Northern region) have a high ratio of households that conduct subsistence farming and the poverty ratio is the highest in the country. In particular, Northeast region (Karamoja area) has poverty in excess of 80%, higher than other regions in the country (2002).

Also, North region has large area and small population, giving it the lowest population density in the entire country<sup>12</sup>.

Figure 4-4 illustrates results of comparing NER and NIR in each region with the national average (0% showed in the figure) in primary education and secondary education. Poverty level and population density and so forth are linked; however, Northeast region has the lowest NERs and NIR for both primary education and secondary education, making it the most backward region for education in the country (MoES, 2010e).



(Source: MoES, 2010e)

Note: The difference between the national average (0.0%) and each region is indicated by positive or negative rate

## Figure 4-4: Comparison of NER and NIR in Each Region with the National Average in Primary Education and Secondary Education

## 4.3.2 Education for Children with Special Needs and Inclusive Education

#### (1) Trend of Education for Children with Special Education Needs

In 2010, there were 205 thousand children with special education needs (CSEN) enrolled in primary schools throughout the country, this figure corresponding to approximately 2.4% of the total enrollment in primary education in that year. Viewed in terms of impairment, children with impaired hearing accounted for the highest percentage at 28.8%, and they were followed by children with impaired sight at 24.3% and children with mental impairments at 23.7%. Meanwhile, in 2010, there were 13 thousand children with CSEN in secondary education, and this figure corresponded to approximately 1.1% of the total enrollment in secondary education

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> See Annex 2-1 and 2-2 (Statistical Data).

in that year. Out of the CSEN in secondary education, 48.3% had impaired sight, 20.7% had impaired physical capability and 16.4% had impaired hearing (MoES, 2010e).

The MoES Special Needs and Guidance and Career Council Department are in charge of education for CSEN. There are some primary schools that cater to children with sight, hearing or perceptual impairments, however, usually special classes are established within primary schools or CSENs belong to ordinary classes without any particular measures being taken. The special education department of Kyambogo University conducts training (human resources development) for teachers of CSEN (Arakawa, 2009).

MoES compiled the Policy on Special Needs and Inclusive Education in 2011. According to this policy, the goal is to strengthen the CSEN education and inclusive education in both schools and households and the following major strategies are raised: i) improve understanding by guardians and schools, ii) conduct early assessment and countermeasures, iii) provide licenses to, and strengthen the registration system for, private schools that offer special needs and inclusive education, iv) improve sign language and other instructional languages, v) nurture teachers to take charge of special needs and inclusive education, vi) strengthen the partnership with related persons, vii) renew curriculums, and viii) advance various programs and so forth. At the same time, the policy stresses the importance of realizing strategies based collaboration between various ministries and agencies, primarily MoES but also the Ministry of Financial Planning and Economic Development, Ministry of Public Services, Ministry of Local Government, Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Public Works and so on (MoES, 2011c).

#### (2) Trend of Enrollment of Orphans

In 2010, 1,350 thousand persons or 16.1% of pupils enrolled in primary education were orphans who had lost either both or one of their parents. Among these there were 683 thousand boys (16.4% of enrolled boy pupils) and 667 thousand girls (15.9% of enrolled girl pupils), indicating slightly more orphaned boys. Viewed in regional terms, Central region had the highest number and rate of orphans at 410 thousand (20.6% of enrolled pupils in the region), while East region had the lowest number at 318 thousand (12.9%) (MoES, 2010e).

Meanwhile, in 2010, 279thousand persons or 22.8% of children enrolled in secondary education were orphans who had lost either both or one of their parents. Out of these, orphans who had lost their father were most common at 125 thousand (45.0% of all orphans), while orphans who had lost their mother and orphans who had lost both parents accounted for more or less the same figure of 77thousand (27.5%). Viewed in regional terms, Central region had the highest number of orphans at 108 thousand (25.1% of enrolled pupils in the region), while North region had the highest rate of orphans with 26.7% (37 thousand persons) (MoES, 2010e).

The Office for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children (OVC) within the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development has compiled a national OVC policy and national strategic program for promoting OVC and it is supervising and coordinating the implementation of these. In a survey conducted in 2007, it was estimated that there were 2,300 thousand orphans, both those enrolled at schools and those not enrolled, throughout the country, working out that one in every four households had an orphaned child. Roughly half of these were said to be AIDS orphans. There were estimated to be 7,500 thousand OVCs including AIDS orphans throughout the country, and this figure corresponded to 46% of the school age population (UNESCO, 2010).

## (3) Persons Infected with HIV/AIDS

Uganda is frequently pointed to as a model country in Africa for dealing with HIV/AIDS, however, in 2010 it still had 1,200 thousand people infected with the virus nationwide, and of these 150 thousand were children of school age (MoES, 2010).

According to the ASC of 2010, 42 thousand primary school pupils (20 thousand boys and 22 thousand girls), corresponding to 0.5% of all pupils enrolled in primary education, were infected with HIV/AIDS. Moreover, 2,646 teachers (1,277 male teachers and 1,369 female teachers), equivalent to 1.5% of all primary education teachers, were similarly infected. In secondary education, 3,988 students (1,967 boys and 2,021 girls), corresponding to 0.3% of all students enrolled in secondary education, and 359 teachers (244 male teachers and 115 female teachers) or 0.6% of the total were reported to be infected (MoES, 2010e).

In order to improve access to primary and secondary education for children infected with HIV/AIDS, MoES conducts Presidential Initiative on AIDS Strategy for Communication to Youth(PIASCY) and other programs that are designed to enlighten and educate children through assemblies, guidance, debate meetings, dances and music, etc. (MoES, 2010e).

## 4.4 Quality of Education<sup>13</sup>

## 4.4.1 Situation of Learning Outcome

## (1) Completion Rates

According to education statistics of MoES for 2010, completion rates indicate the ratios of pupils and students (out of the corresponding school age populations) who reach P7 in primary education and S4 in lower secondary education and pass the corresponding completion tests (PLE and UCE).

The completion rate for P7 of primary education was 49.1% (58.8% among boys and 41.0% among girls) in 2002 and, although this increased to 62.0% in 2004 (72.0% among boys and 54.0% among girls), it subsequently fell back to 40~50% between 2006 and 2008. The figure gradually improved again from 2009 and was 54.0% (56.0% among boys and 51.0% among

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> This excludes internal efficiency and teacher policies.

girls) in 2010. Viewed in terms of gender, completion rates have always been higher among boys than among girls and the disparity was almost 20 points in 2002, although it had closed to 5 points by 2010 (MoES, 2010c and MoES, 2010e).

Meanwhile, the completion rate for S4 of lower secondary education steadily increased from 22.0% (25.0% among boys and 19.0% among girls) in 2002 to 39.0% (45.0% among boys and 32.0% among girls) in 2010. However, the disparity between boys and girls increased from 6 points in 2002 to 13 points in 2010 (MoES, 2010e).

#### (2) Performance in National Examinations

UNEB has implemented the National Assessment of Progress in Education (NAPE) for primary education since 1996 and for secondary education since 2008 with the objective of monitoring effectiveness of the education process and reflecting survey findings in admission requirements and curriculums for teacher training colleges. Until then, results of the PLE (primary education completion examination), etc. were used for monitoring the effectiveness of the education process, however, because this only indicated the condition of students on completion of primary education and was designed to select students for progression to secondary education, the contents of the NAPE were designed in order to assess the acquired level of capacity and skills intended for pupils in P3 and P6 in light of the curriculum (UNEB, 2010a).

For example, in 2010, an academic achievement survey concerning reading comprehension (English) and numeric ability was implemented targeting 21,876 P3 pupils and 21,907 P6 pupils in 1,098 selected schools throughout the country (7% of all primary schools). A survey of reading comprehension (local language) was also conducted on some P3 pupils. In secondary education, a total of 508 schools were selected and examinations were conducted in biology, mathematics and English targeting 19,288 S2 students (UNEB 2010a and 2010b).

Looking at the NAPE results for primary education in 2003, the average score (ratio of correct answers) in reading comprehension was 34.3% (33.1% among boys and 35.5% among girls) in P3 and 20.0% (20.3% among boys and 19.5% among girls) in P6, and in numeric ability it was 42.9% (43.9% among boys and 41.9% among girls) in P3 and 20.5% (25.7% among boys and 15.3% among girls) in P6. Therefore, scores in general were low; however, by 2010 average scores had generally improved. In this year, the average score (ratio of correct answers) in reading comprehension was 60.9% (60.4% among boys and 61.3% among girls) in P3 and 50.5% (49.8% among boys and 51.1% among girls) in P6, displaying an improvement of almost 30 points over 2003. In terms of reading comprehension, girls displayed a higher average score than boys in both P3 and P6. The average score in numeric ability in 2010 was 72.7% (75.0% among boys and 71.1% among girls) in P3 and 55.4% (59.9% among boys and 49.5% among girls) in P6, indicating an improvement of almost 30 points in P6, indicating an improvement of almost 30 points in P6, indicating an improvement of almost 30 points in P3 and 55.4% (59.9% among boys and 49.5% among girls) in P6 and 50.4% among girls) in P3 and 55.4% (59.9% among boys and 49.5% among girls) in P6, indicating an improvement of almost 30 points in P6 and 71.1% among girls) in P3 and 55.4% (59.9% among boys and 49.5% among girls) in P6 and p0.5% among boys and 71.1% among girls) in P3 and 55.4% (59.9% among boys and 49.5% among girls) in P6 and p0.5% among boys and 71.1% among girls) in P3 and 55.4% (59.9% among boys and 49.5% among girls) in P6 and p0.5% among boys and 71.1% among girls) in P3 and 55.4% (59.9% among boys and 49.5% among girls) in P6 and p0.5% among boys and 49.5% among girls) in P6 and p0.5% among boys and 71.1% among girls) in P3 and 55.4% (59.9% among boys and 49.5% among girls) in P6 and p0.5% among boys and 71.1% among girls) p0.5% among b0.5% among b0.5% among b0.5% among b0.5% among b0.5% among b0.5% among b

Looking at primary education examination results by school management type, private schools

showed better scores in reading comprehension and numeric ability. Moreover, in private schools, whereas hardly any disparity was observed between boys and girls in terms of reading comprehension and numeric ability, in the case of public schools, boys' results were far higher than those of girls for numeric ability in P6. Also, pupils who had received preschool education displayed better results, and this trend was especially pronounced in reading comprehension among P3 pupils. Looking at districts, pass marks were obtained by more than 50% of pupils in only six districts, namely Kampala and Wakiso in Central region, Bukwa in East region, and Kabarole, Kiruhura and Mbarara in West region. In sub-regions such as Akoli, Rango, Teso, Busoga and the former Tororo (now divided into Budaka, Pallisa and Tororo), etc., only very small numbers of pupils scored pass marks (UNEB, 2010a).

In secondary education, hardly any improvement was observed in results for biology, mathematics and English in the period between 2008 and 2010. In terms of school management type, public schools scored higher than private schools in all three subjects. This is due to the fact that private schools comprise various institutions from high quality to low quality schools. Looking at achievement levels by gender, girls' results were 5 points higher than for boys in English, whereas the boys were 10 points better off in mathematics and biology. Better results were observed in non-USE schools rather than USE schools, while single shift schools had better results than double shift schools (UNEB, 2010b).

#### (3) Performance of the International/Regional Assessment (SACMEQ)

Uganda has participated in by the Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Education Quality (SACMEQ)<sup>14</sup> since SACMEQ II. The results of SACMEQ II (2000) and SACMEQ III (2007) are shown in Annex 4-28, 4-29, and 4-30.

Uganda was 9<sup>th</sup> of 14 countries in reading scoring below the average 500 of 14 countries and 8<sup>th</sup> in mathematics with a score nearing the average in SACMEQ II in 2000. The result of SACMEQ III in 2007 was worse: Uganda was 11<sup>th</sup> of 15 countries in both subjects scoring below the average (SACMEQ, 2010).

In terms of comparison of gender, area and income groups in SACMEQ III, boys had higher score than girls. Urban area had higher score than rural area and high income group did better than low income group (SACMEQ, 2010). The difference was larger in urban/rural areas and income group comparison. The gender difference was 5 points and 9 points in reading and math respectively. However, the differences were 57 points and 40 points between urban and rural areas and 50 points and 40 points between income groups (SACMEQ, 2010).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Uganda has participated in the regional research on the pupils' achievement to monitor the quality of education conducted by SACMEQ from SACMEQ I. SACMEQ I (1996) had seven participant countries and tested reading ability. SACMEQ II had 14 African countries with new participants such as South Africa. SACMEQ III covered 15 countries. The latter two surveys tested Reading and Math abilities targeting P6 pupils.

|         | Ger   | nder   | Ar    | ea    | Income group  |                | Overall |
|---------|-------|--------|-------|-------|---------------|----------------|---------|
|         | Male  | Female | Rural | Urban | Lowest<br>25% | Highest<br>25% | average |
| Reading | 481.5 | 475.9  | 462.9 | 520.9 | 459.6         | 511.1          | 478.7   |
| Math    | 486.7 | 477.2  | 470.8 | 511.5 | 465.4         | 504.2          | 481.9   |

Table 4-1: SACMEQ III Average Scores by Gender, Area and Income Groups (score)

(Source: SACMEQ, 2010)

#### 4.4.2 Learning Environment

#### (1) Pupils per Classroom Ratio

The pupils per classroom ratio in primary education in 2010 was 58 pupils in primary schools overall, breaking down as 67 pupils in public schools and 32 pupils in private schools. In the five years prior to that, there was some improvement in that the ratio of pupils per classroom decreased at a rate of 3% per year. Viewed in regional terms, the pupils per classroom ratio was especially high (more than 70) in North region at 78, Northeast region at 76 and East region at 72. As for the other three regions, the pupils per classroom ratio was 40 in Southwest region, 47 in Central region and 57 in West region. Out of secondary schools overall, the pupils per classroom ratio was 45 and the figure was 58 in public schools (MoES, 2010e).

The pupils per classroom ratio is larger in lower grades and smaller in higher grades, however, grade-separate figures are not given in education statistics. However, the ratio of pupils possessing ample sitting space is given as an indicator for each grade. According to this, in 2010, 5,561 thousand primary school pupils, corresponding to 66.4% of all pupils enrolled in primary education, had sufficient space to sit down and write. This figure was lowest at 51.8% in P1, where only one in two pupils had sufficient space, whereas it was highest in P7 at 89.1%. Viewed in regional terms, Central region had the highest figure at 77.3%, while North region was lowest with 44.7%. In secondary education, this figure was 87.0% in S1 and it increased steadily with grade (MoES, 2010e).

#### (2) Number of Schools Introducing the Shift System

MoES has phased in the double shift system as a provisional measure for dealing with the shortage of classrooms in secondary education. In 2008, the double shift system was introduced to 32 overcrowded schools (having more than 60 pupils per class) in line with the newly adopted curriculum of 10 subjects and 35 hours per week. It was planned to implement this system at 64 overcrowded commuting schools in 2009 and a further 96 schools in 2010 (WB, 2009).

#### (3) Instruction Hours

According to the curriculum (plan), lessons (hours) in P1~P7 in primary education last for 40 minutes each. In P1~P3, there are 40 lesson hours per week comprising the following: news: 3

hours, conversational skills: 2 hours, arithmetic: 5 hours, reading comprehension I: 5 hours, reading comprehension II: 5 hours, English: 5 hours, music: 3 hours, art: 2 hours, physical education: 5 hours, religious education: 3 hours, free activities: 2 hours. In P4~P7, there are 40 hours of lessons covering eight subjects per week as follows: English: 7 hours, social studies: 5 hours, religious education: 3 hours, mathematics: 7 hours, science (including agriculture): 7 hours, local language: 3 hours, art and physical education: 7 hours, library: 1 hour. In secondary education, these is no common curriculum and the number of subjects taught ranges from 14 to 21 subjects depending on the state of facilities at each school. Moreover, lesson times vary between schools from 40 minutes to 1 hour and there are 50 lessons per week (UNESCO, 2012a).

Actually, lessons are conducted for 30 minutes per hour in P1~P3, 40 minutes per hour in P4~P7 and 40 minutes per hour in S1~S6. According to the 2010 plan, lessons including those during examination periods are conducted for 253 days per year comprising 36 weeks (5 lesson days per week) and three terms, and if lessons are conducted according to this plan, there should be 720 hours per year in P1~P3, 960 hours per year in P4~P7 and 1,200 hours per year in S1~S6. However, in reality, the number of lessons is less than planned due to school breaks for examinations and events as well as absence of teachers and so on (UNESCO, 2012a).

## 4.4.3 Procurement and Distribution of Teaching Material

#### (1) Procurement and Distribution System

It became necessary to make new teaching materials (textbooks, teacher manuals, auxiliary teaching materials, etc.) for primary schools and colleges for primary school teachers in response to the rapid increase in the number of children enrolled in primary education. According to the government guidelines, 35% of UPE subsidies allocated to each school should be spent on purchasing teaching materials. Additionally, part of the government's recurrent budget can also be used for procuring teaching materials. The Instrumental Materials Unit (IMU) of MoES is responsible for coordinating procurement of teaching materials. There are problems concerning the cost of preparing, printing and distributing teaching materials, which were previously the monopoly of a state-run enterprise, however, following the advance of market liberalization, the large majority of teaching materials today are prepared and printed by local corporations (IOB, 2008).

Selection of textbooks is managed by MoES, and the numbers of English, mathematics, science and social studies textbooks that are printed are determined based on the education statistics database and reports by MoES. In 2000, 6,600,000 textbooks were printed in the said four subjects, however, this figure had jumped to 10,300,000 by 2005 (IOB, 2008). Textbooks are frequently selected with priority given to lower preparation and printing costs rather than whether or not they fit with curriculums, and this sometimes leads to inappropriate textbooks being chosen. However, the NCDC, which is in charge of curriculums, is not in a position to

comment on the selections that are made by MoES (according to a hearing with the NCDC).

(2) Textbooks per Pupil Ratio

Uganda has traditionally been faced with a chronic shortage of textbooks, and the ratio of textbooks per pupil has always been low. On average, there is one textbook for every three pupils. This ratio assumes that textbooks in each subject are the same types and same editions, however, the ratio of textbooks per pupil is even lower if it is assumed that there are multiple titles (IOB, 2008).

The poor distribution of textbooks to pupils and students is another factor hindering the extension of new curriculums and achievement of learning goals. In the lower grades of primary education (P1~P3), it is reported that there are four pupils for every textbook, however, the actual situation is thought to be even worse than this. When the IMU indicated that 41.9 billion shillings would be needed to realize the new curriculum textbook procurement and distribution plan in 2010/11, a budget of just 13.7 billion shillings or one-third the required amount was allocated, and it was guessed that each textbook was being used by between five and ten pupils (MoES and DPs, 2010).

## 4.4.4 Definition of Academic Ability

Children are expected to have acquired the following capacity by the time they complete primary education (UNESCO, 2010).

- 1) Acquire functional, permanent and sustainable literacy, numeric ability and communication ability in English, Swahili and one local language of Uganda.
- 2) Achieve and maintain a sound mental and physical state of health.
- 3) Understand the importance of cooperating with other people in daily life and activities and respecting others in the community.
- 4) Respect the cultural, moral and spiritual value of life and understand the wealth of Uganda's diverse culture and values.
- 5) Advance the protection and utilization of the natural environment utilizing scientific knowledge and technology.
- 6) Understand individual rights, responsibilities and obligations for taking part in civil society and fulfilling one's responsibility.
- 7) Foster a patriotic spirit and understanding of unity of the state amidst diversity.
- 8) Nurture the conditions that are needed for ongoing education.
- 9) Acquire diverse techniques so that one can exploit multiple such techniques to make a living in the future.
- 10) Understand the dignity of labour and the importance of earning a living through making sincere and concerted efforts.
- 11) Give children knowledge, ability and a sense of values regarding responsible guardians.

- 12) Acquire time and money management skills so that one can respect resources in the private and public sectors.
- 13) Acquire the ability to utilize problem solving approaches in various life situations.
- 14) Acquire good training and manners.

Secondary education is regarded as the stage where students prepare to receive higher level education based on what they have learned in primary education. By the end of secondary education, it is intended for students to i) respect and further the unity of the state, ii) understand ethical and spiritual values, iii) have a positive attitude towards productive labour, and iv) acquire basic science, technology and business ability (UNESCO, 2010).

#### 4.4.5 Quality Assurance System of Education

(1) Promotion/Graduation System

As was mentioned previously, automatic promotion is adopted in primary education P1~P7, lower secondary education S1~S4 and upper secondary education S5~S6, however, in order to progress to lower secondary education, it is necessary to sit the PLE on completion of P7. Moreover, in order to progress to upper secondary education on completion of lower secondary education, it is necessary to sit the UCE, and it is necessary to sit the UACE on completion of S5 in upper secondary education. The Uganda National Examination Board (*UNEB*) is responsible for compiling and implementing these examinations (UNESCO, 2010).

The PLE comprises a written examination (Section A consisting of short answers and Section B consisting of written answers) in the four subjects of English, arithmetic, science and social studies, and the grade referred to as the aggregate is determined based on the scores achieved in each subject. The grade is divided into nine ranks so that a score of 75 or more is Grade 1, 70 to 74 is Grade 2, and the remaining grades are demarcated according to each five-point grouping. Grade 6 and upwards is deemed a pass, while scores in the range of 40~49 (Grades 7 and 8) are reserve passes, and scores of 39 or less are deemed Grade 9 and a failure (Arakawa, 2008).

In the UCE, in addition to the compulsory subjects of English, mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology, students are required to achieve pass marks in at least eight subjects selected from history, geography, politics, English literature, music, art, trading and so on. In the UACE, in addition to the general problems (primarily composed of English), students are required to obtain pass marks in optional subjects (three or four subjects) selected out of mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, history, geography, economics, politics, religion, French, literature, national language and so on in order to graduate (Yoshikawa, 2005 and Arakawa, 2008).

(2) Situation of Implementing the Promotion/Graduation System

In 2010, 510,584 pupils were registered for the PLE, and of these 431,706 (224,025 boys and 207,681 girls) or 96.0% actually sat examinations and the pass rate was 88.0% (89.8% amongst boys and 86.2% amongst girls). The PLE pass rate has been around 85% since 2005 (MoES,

#### 2010e).

Similarly, 263,026 students (142,581 boys and 120,445 girls) were registered for the UCE, and of these 258,196 (140,122 boys and 118,074 girls) or 98.2% actually sat examinations and the pass rate was 93.5%. As for the UACE, 101,257 students were registered and 99,802 (58,946 boys and 40,856 girls) or 98.6% sat examinations. Of these, 61.9% of students (63.1% of boys and 60.3% of girls) passed and progressed to higher education (MoES, 2010e).

#### (3) School Inspector System

School inspectors assigned to the district education offices of district governments are responsible for school inspections. The MoES Standards Department provides the framework and guidelines for school inspections to inspectors, who are able to inspect schools at any time in order to confirm the state of activities in education agencies. They prepare reports on the results of inspections according to the format established by the Standards Department and submit these to the Deputy Minister of Education, district education administrative officers and other related agencies. School inspectors conduct audits of school accounts and they have the authority to temporarily sequester and inspect school records and documents when they deem it necessary (MoES and DP, 2010).

MoES in 2009 revised the Basic Requirements Minimum Standards (BRMS) covering preschool education, primary education, secondary education, occupational training and teacher training. The BRMS are used as basic information when conducting school inspections. As basic requirements, the BRMS indicate the conditions that are required as a minimum in order to provide education and training of a certain quality in education agencies, and as minimum standards (indicators) they indicate basic benchmarks for measuring whether or not the actual performance and level of achievement of education and school management have reached the anticipated level (MoES, 2009a).

For confirming the actual performance and level of achievement of education agencies (schools), the BRMS indicates points for confirming the following items: i) administration in general, ii) establishment and maintained condition of organization and facilities, iii) staff composition and human resources development, iv) composition and management of the education process, v) state of conformance with curriculums, vi) current conditions and development of pupils/students, vii) fundraising and financial management, viii) current conditions and development of guardians and community organizations, ix) current conditions and development in terms of public health, sanitation and environment, x) discipline management and development, xi) time management, xii) safety management, and xiii) current conditions and management of dormitory facilities (MoES, 2009a).

The problems facing school inspectors on the district level are as follows: i) because school inspectors are not independent of central government administration and local administration, it is difficult for them to conduct unbiased investigations and offer impartial advice; ii) there are

not enough human resources to cover all schools, and existing school inspectors have not been employed as specialists in the field; iii) types of ability and standards required when employing school inspectors are not clearly specified; iv) effective inspections are hindered by the fact that offices for inspectors are not adequately provided on the sub-district and district levels and vehicles, etc. are not provided for conducting school inspections; v) inspection reporting systems are not established so the collected information is not compiled into databases or utilized; vi) collaboration is not carried out between school inspectors and the schools, communities and coordinating centers (described later), and so forth (MoES and DP, 2010).

In addition, a teacher training outreach service centering on PTCs is provided under the Teachers Development and Management System (TDMS<sup>15</sup>), and schools also undergo monitoring and guidance under this system. Out of PTCs throughout the country, 23 PTCs are selected, between 15~25 coordinating centers are established under each PTC, and these centers are manned with coordinating center tutors (CCT) and are also provided with resource centers and tutor housing. The CCTs are in charge of around 50 outreach schools, which they periodically visit in order to provide education guidance and support to principals and all teachers (Yoshikawa, 2005 and hearing with the principal of Shimoni PTC).

## 4.4.6 Curriculum

(1) Present System and Process of Curriculum Development, Approval and Dissemination

The curriculum of Uganda is developed by the National Curriculum Development Centre (NCDC). When it comes to revising the curriculum, first an Education Policy Review Committee is appointed and a government white paper is prepared based on the EPRC report. Next, a Curriculum Review Task Force is established and following curriculum development the syllabus for each subject is prepared by the subject-separate panel of the NCDC (UNESCO, 2010).

Uganda's first primary education curriculum following independence was compiled in 1965 and it was subsequently revised in 1967 and 1989-90. Furthermore, in 2000 and 2002, curriculum revision and dissemination were carried out over two stages. MoES launched a Curriculum Task Force under NCDC coordination in 2003 and this implemented curriculum review in 2004. As a result, it was confirmed that the curriculum introduced in 2000-2002 had only limited effectiveness because it was compiled based on an inappropriate plan and introduced with insufficient budget allocation and support given to teachers and schools for disseminating it (UNESCO, 2010).

In response to the review findings, it was decided to conduct curriculum reform in 2005 and this

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> TDMS = Teachers Development and Management System. The MoE has implemented this project since 1994 with assistance from the World Bank, Ireland, DfID, USAID and the Netherlands, etc. with the objective of conducting in-service training and conferring qualifications to unqualified teachers and so on.

was started in order beginning from the lower grades of primary education. The new curriculum was a thematic curriculum under which multiple subjects are taught according to general themes, and it was disseminated to P1~P3 between 2007 and 2009 and to P4 in 2010. In 2010, the revised curriculum was disseminated to P5 and curriculum review for the upper grades of primary education was implemented (UNESCO, 2010).

The secondary education curriculum review was started in 2007/08. In secondary education, because there were too many (42) subjects and the burden placed on teachers was too heavy in lower secondary education, curriculum revision including resetting of the minimum number of lessons per week was carried out in order to rectify the situation. As a result, the O-level syllabus (18 subjects) for S1~2 was compiled (UNESCO, 2010).

## (2) Capacity of Curriculum Development Agency

The NCDC was established in 1973 and is responsible for surveying needs concerning syllabus and curriculum revision in primary, secondary and higher education, revising and developing syllabuses and curriculums, preparing teaching materials such as textbooks and guidance manuals, surveying and assessing revised syllabuses, disseminating new curriculums and new teaching materials, and so on (UNESCO, 2010).

According to the capacity assessment implemented in the curriculum development process, the following problems were clarified in the development and introduction of thematic curriculums (MoES and DP, 2010).

- 1) The IMU was unable to distribute the required quantity of materials indicated in the latest survey to schools. The teaching materials procurement process was complicated and incapable of covering wide areas.
- Kyambogo University was unable to renew the teachers' education curriculum on schedule. As a result, teachers have to teach according to the new curriculum without having received training.
- 3) The NCDC conducted orientation for teachers in cooperation with the PTC and CTT, however, it was unable to fully enhance the technical capacity of teachers regarding the ongoing implementation of assessment.
- 4) The current composition of classes, which contain too many pupils/students and a broad range of ages and languages, impacts the dissemination of the new curriculum, however, the NCDC is not in a position to remedy this.

## 4.4.7 Languages of Instruction

In the 1990 revised version and the 2000-2002 revised version curriculums, it was proposed that local languages be used in lower grades and also adopted as subject options, however, these ideas were not realized in the 1990 curriculum due to lack of preparation. Under the new curriculum, local languages are used in lower grades (P1~P3), P4 is used as a transition period

for switching to English, and by the end of P4 English is used in lessons (except for explaining difficult concepts), teaching materials and examinations (UNESCO, 2010).

## 4.5 Teachers

#### 4.5.1 Teacher Qualification and Placement

#### (1) Number of Teachers

In 2002, the number of teachers in primary education was 139,484 (87,883 male teachers and 51,601 female teachers). After that the number of teachers increased by 2.7% per year on average until it reached 172,403 (101,879 male teachers and 70,524 female teachers) by 2010. In 2002, the ratio of male to female teachers was 63% to 37%, but this had shifted to 59% to 41% by 2010. Looking at the regional placement of teachers in 2010, 30.2% of all teachers were assigned to Central region, 25.2% to East region, 16.3% to Southwest region, 15.5% to North region and 11.7% to West region. Northeast region had the lowest number of pupils in primary education at 137,362 (1.60% of the national total), however, its ratio of teachers was even lower than this at 1.1% of the total number of teachers (MoES, 2002-2010e).

The number of teachers displayed greater increase in secondary education than in primary education. In 2002, the figure was 37,227 (29,567 male teachers and 7,660 female teachers), and this subsequently increased at an average rate of 6.8% per year until it reached 62,921 in 2010 (48,486 male teachers and 62,921 female teachers). In 2002, the ratio of male to female teachers was 79.4% to 20.6% and this had shifted to 77.1% to 22.9% by 2010. Therefore, even though there was a slight increase in the number of female teachers during this period, male teachers in 2010, 38.5% of all teachers were assigned to Central region, 24.0% to East region, 15.2% to Southwest region, 11.6% to North region and 10.1% to West region. Northeast region had the lowest number of students in secondary education at 10,221 (0.80% of the national total), while its number of teachers was just 423 (0.7% of the total) (MoES, 2002-2010e).

(2) Pupils/Students per Teacher Ratio (Geographical Distribution)

The pupils per teacher ratio in primary education was 49 throughout Uganda in 2010. The figure was 57 in public schools and 26 in private schools, indicating that the number is less than half in private schools (MoES, 2010e). The target ratio of pupils per teacher indicated in the NDP is 43.

Viewed in regional terms, the pupils per teacher was good in Central region at 38 and Southwest region at 39 but high in Northeast region at 79 and North region at 63. In all the regions except for Northeast region, the pupils per teacher ratio was higher in public schools than private schools, however, in Northeast region, the figure in private schools (99) was higher than in public schools (75) (MoES, 2010).

In secondary education, the students per teacher ratio throughout the country was 19, rising to

22 in public schools. Looking the regional breakdown, the figure was good at 19 in Central region, Southwest region and North region, while it was highest in Northeast region at 24, although figures were generally lower than compared to those in primary education (MoES, 2010e).

#### (3) Number of Teachers by Qualification

In Uganda, there are two types of teacher qualification, namely Grade 3 and Grade 5. Teachers can obtain Grade 3 by receiving teacher education for two years at PTC following graduation from UCE, and they can obtain Grade 5 by receiving teacher education at NTC or university after passing the UACE or acquiring Grade 3. According to the education statistics for 2010, Grade 3 teachers accounted for the highest proportion of primary school teachers at 63.3%, while Grade 5 teachers accounted for 4.7%. Teachers who possessed the minimum required qualification to teach in primary schools or above accounted for 89% of the total (MoES, 2010e).

Qualifications for secondary education teachers comprise Grade 5 and university degrees, the former qualification being required to teach in lower secondary education and the latter being required to teach in upper secondary education. Out of the teachers who teach at secondary schools, teachers who possess Grade 5 accounted for the highest proportion at 45.3%, while teachers with degrees accounted for 38.1%. The ratio of teachers who possess the minimum qualification required to teach in secondary education or above was 14.7% (MoES, 2010e).

More than 80% of the teachers of the schools which responded to the questionnaire of the education statistics of MoES had the minimum or higher qualification. In these schools, the scarcity of teachers and their absenteeism are considered as more serious issues than unqualified teachers. On a contrary, many of those which did not respond the questionnaire were private. Many teachers of the private schools are considered as unqualified, although the data was not obtained in the study.

## 4.5.2 Teacher Education System

## (1) Pre-Service Training (PRESET) System

Primary school teachers are trained in PTCs. There are a total of 47 such PTCs, comprising 45 public colleges and two private colleges (UNESCO, 2010). The public colleges consist of 23 hub PTCs, which play a central role, and 22 other PTCs. The students who have passed the UCE in eight subjects including the compulsory disciplines of English, mathematics, and three sciences are eligible for admission to PTC. At PTC, students sit lessons for two years and need to pass final examinations (nine subjects) in order to graduate. When students graduate, and pass the teacher qualification examination, they acquire the Grade 3 qualification. Grade 3 in-service teachers receive further teacher training during recess at their schools of current employment and they aim for Grade 5 (equivalent to a diploma or graduation from a two-year college).

Teachers are required to undergo two courses of practical education training lasting 1.5 months each over a period of three years. At PTC, most students live in dormitories and the government bears the costs of tuition and accommodation. The pass rate in the teacher qualification examinations at the end of PTC varies from year to year but it generally between 60~80% (Arakawa, 2009 and interview with the principal of Shimoni PTC).

Secondary school teachers can obtain Grade 5 qualifications when they graduate from one of four NTCs throughout the country upon completing a two-year course. Students who have completed upper secondary education are eligible for admission to NTC. Grade 5 can also be acquired in the two-year teacher training course at university. Holders of Grade 5 can teach in lower secondary education, however, degree level qualifications are required in order to teach in upper secondary education. Degree level teacher qualifications can be obtained by completing a three-year course at university (Arakawa, 2009).

#### (2) Teacher Training Curriculum

The subjects taught at PTC include but are not limited to specialist education (basic education, psychology, philosophy, education, curriculum), languages (English, local languages, Swahili), social studies (geography, history), mathematics, sciences (biology, chemistry, physics), cultural education (music, religion, art, physical education) and so on. Lessons at PTC are conducted in English, however, following the decision to teach lower grade (P1~P3) lessons in local languages, it has become necessary to also learn local languages. As was mentioned above, students are required to conduct two courses of practical education training lasting 1.5 months each during two years at PTC (Yoshikawa, 2005 and hearing with the principal of Shimoni PTC).

MoES is in the process of revising the curriculum for primary teacher education in line with the new curriculum for primary education, and it aims to train teachers who are capable of offering guidance to lower grades on thematic curriculums. It is also intended for the new curriculum to cover HIV/AIDS, gender, guidance and counseling, inclusive education, education for children with special needs and ongoing assessments (MoES, 2010a).

Work on revising the curriculum is being conducted at Kyambogo University, however, the overall schedule is delayed, and teachers who still haven't received training of thematic curriculums are conducting lessons using teaching materials based on the new curriculum (MoES and DP, 2012).

## (3) In-service Training (INSET) System

In addition to pre-service training (PRESET), the hub PTCs implemented in-service training programs. CCTs of the coordinating centers for 15~20 schools assigned to the area of jurisdiction of each hub PTC take the initiative in conducting training for in-service teachers who have no qualifications (Yoshikawa, 2005).

Unqualified teachers were hired at primary schools in response to a substantial increase in enrollment after the introduction of the UPE policy. They can acquire Grade 3 in approximately three years if they receive training at coordinating centers at weekends twice a month and at PTC during school recesses. Moreover, under the nationwide Secondary School Science and Mathematics Teachers Programme (SESEMAT Programme) that is based on assistance from JICA, training is conducted for secondary school teachers in the science and mathematics fields (Arakawa, 2009).

## (4) Teachers Development and Management System (TDMS)

In order to respond to major needs for the employment and training of teachers in primary education, it is necessary to expand the capacity of PRESET and INSET. The TDMS, which started in 1994 as a World Bank project with support from United States Agency for International Development (USAID), has played a vitally important role in developing the PRESET and INSET systems. From 1998, the TDM has been operated by the Government of Uganda with assistance from the European Union (EU), Ireland, USAID and the Netherlands (IOB, 2008).

Under the TDMS, the following activities have been conducted: i) training geared to conferring qualifications on unqualified teachers, and training for in-service teachers, principals, managers and community mobilizers, ii) review for revision of primary education curriculums, iii) provision of teaching materials and teacher guidance manuals, etc. to hub PTCs, coordinating centers and outreach schools, and iv) infrastructure development and procurement of equipment and supplies for the 23 core PTCs, outreach schools and coordinating center resource centers. Following the TDMS, the PTDMP was implemented with a view to improving the quality of primary education PRESET and INSET systems, and the development of TDMS-Secondary System has started under assistance from the World Bank in order to enhance the PRESET and INSET systems for secondary education (IOB, 2008).

## 4.5.3 Working Conditions for Teachers

## (1) Teacher Salaries

The monthly salary for primary school teachers in the past was 200,000 shillings irrespective of age and ability, however, MoES introduced a salary system corresponding to ability and experience in order to boost incentive for teachers from 2008 (Arakawa, 2009).

Public primary schools and secondary schools have government-employed teachers and school-employed teachers, and the government-employed teachers usually receive higher salary than their school-employed counterparts. As is indicated in Table 4-2, whereas the salary of general government-employed teachers in public primary schools ranges from 113,000~335,000 shillings, the salary of school-employed teachers ranges from 10,000~80,000 shillings, indicating a disparity of four to ten times. This disparity becomes even larger in secondary

schools (Yoshikawa, 2005).

|                                       | Primary  | y Schools   | Seconda  | ry Schools  |  |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|--|
|                                       | School-  | Government- | School-  | Government- |  |
|                                       | employed | employed    | employed | employed    |  |
| Public (general teachers)             | 1~8      | 11.3~33.5   | 2~15     | 26~55       |  |
| Public (principals and head teachers) | _        | 35~65       | _        | 65~111      |  |
| Private schools (famous schools)      | 8~50     | —           | 20~80    | _           |  |
| Private schools (community)           | 1~10     | _           | 2~15     | _           |  |

Table 4-2: Teacher Salaries in 2005 (Unit: Ugandan Shilling)

(Source: Yoshikawa, 2005)

In 2007, the average salary of a primary school teacher was 3.8 times the per capita GDP, the figure rising to 6.9 times in the case of lower secondary education teachers and 9.4 times in the case of upper secondary education teachers. According to the World Bank, a survey conducted in 2002<sup>16</sup> found that an average salary of primary school teachers corresponding to 2.5 times the per capita GDP is appropriate as a service delivery benchmark. Judging from this figure, the salaries paid out of the government budget are considered to be appropriate, albeit rater high (WB, 2008).

#### (2) Conditions of Teacher Employment

Teacher absenteeism is a critical issue in Uganda (IOB, 2008). The World Bank Public Expenditure Review Report of 2004 estimated the absentee rate of teachers to be 27%. The absentee rate of teachers in primary education and secondary education ranges from 20% to 30%, meaning that 20~30% of teacher salaries are paid for "teacher services that are not provided." The major reasons given for teacher absenteeism are sickness, poor working environment, absence of teacher lodgings or poor lodging conditions, long distances to schools, low salary, late payment of salary, lack of morals and so on. Furthermore, the fact that school inspections by school inspectors on the district level are not implemented appropriately and there is a lack of transparency and partiality in employment of teachers by districts contributes to teacher absenteeism and deterioration in the working attitude of teachers (IOB, 2008).

In order to create incentive for teachers to resolve the problem of teacher absenteeism, the government has appropriated budget to provide allowances for teachers assigned to remote areas and has increased the basic salary of teachers, however, moonlighting by teachers is not easily restrained. The issue of morals regarding the upholding of discipline is also not easily overcome (Ushiro, 2010).

Reasons for absenteeism and even resignation of teachers include the following: the burden placed on teachers is great due to the large numbers of pupils/students per teacher and the large number of subjects they have to teach; salaries are low and not always paid on time; teachers

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> World Bank (2002) "Financing Education for All by 2015: Simulations for 33 African Countries"

sometimes fall sick or even die due to HIV/AIDS infection, and so on. The resignation rate of teachers in 2008 was approximately 6% (WB, 2009).

Most teachers prefer to work in urban areas rather than rural areas and the reasons are as follows: rural areas are faced with harsh natural conditions such as climate and terrain and have hardly any means of transportation and communication; dealing with nomadic peoples is difficult; safety is poor; some communities are hostile to formal education; basic social services are poor and so on (IOB, 2008).

In these circumstances, an important point for the working environment is that schools have teacher accommodation. MoES has encouraged each school to construct at least four teacher lodgings as a minimum target, however, in 2001, only 31% of schools in urban areas and 18% of schools in rural areas had complied with this target. By 2005, these ratios had increased to 34% and 20% respectively. In 2005, 86,000 out of 124,000 teachers were in need of lodgings, but only 25,000 units were provided so there was still need for another 61,000 units. According to the findings of the ASC, 70% of teachers are in need of teacher lodgings, and the shortage of lodgings is more critical in urban areas than rural areas (WB, 2009).

## 4.5.4 Teacher Recruitment / Management

Decentralization is progressing in primary education, and government-employed teachers are employed following subscription and holding of interviews by District Service Commissions. Employees from the ESC of MoES also take part in interviews and make employment decisions. After that, the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) of the district appoints teachers via the District Education Officer (DEO) (Arakawa, 2009).

PTCs carry out teacher training and in-service training; however, they do not especially conduct placement or job introduction and recommendation services for graduates. Moreover, they don't keep track of whether or not graduates become teachers and the schools and districts they work in, and they have no store of information. It is guessed that many graduates work in private schools or general enterprises (hearing with the principal of Shimoni PTC).

In secondary education, the central government (MoES) is in charge of recruiting teachers. The ESC directly advertises positions in newspapers and other media. After recruitments are notified to the Ministry of Public Works, teachers are registered on the salary list. Until 2003, because teacher recruitments were concentrated in primary schools, other new recruitments were postponed. Accordingly, many graduates of NTC and universities were unable to find new teacher positions at government expense, or they were forced to seek employment not as government-employed teachers but as school-employed teachers with extremely low salaries. It is not unusual for teachers of public schools to also work part-time teaching in nearby private schools (Yoshikawa, 2005).

# CHAPTER 5: PUBLIC FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR

## 5.1 Public Administration

## 5.1.1 Decentralization in the Education Sector

In Uganda, decentralisation is defined as democratic reform which seeks to transfer the political, administrative, financial and planning authority from the centre to local government councils. In the education sector, the authority for primary and secondary education has been transferred to local governments along with the legal framework centered on the Constitution and Local Government Act (JICA, 2008).

In the primary education sub-sector, decentralisation to local governments and schools has gradually progressed since the introduction of UPE in 1997 while decentralisation in the secondary education sub-sector lags behind the primary education sub-sector. While the DBE of MoES was and remains the key organization for decision-making, the pace of decentralisation has picked up since the introduction of free secondary education in 2007. In the secondary education sub-sector, school management is entrusted to the Board of Governors (Arakawa, 2009).

The roles of MoES have been narrowed to the formulation and analysis of policies with the participation of districts, control of the quality of education and the setting of standards, management of national examinations and curricula, formulation of guidelines and monitoring/evaluation of the educational activities of district councils. Each district government has its own Education Office. Senior Education Officers, Principal Education Officers and School Inspectors work under the DEO.

The DEOs are not part of the command hierarchy of MoES and is answerable to the CAO and District Education Committee. The Education Office is responsible for planning, preparation and execution of the budget, supervision and monitoring of educational activities in the district. It receives reports from schools under its jurisdiction and distributes textbooks and classroom furniture. As mentioned earlier, districts recruit, employ and deploy teachers. The authority to execute and manage capitation grants and to procure textbooks has been transferred to districts. The CAO has the ultimate authority for district-level education-related activities (Arakawa, 2009 and interviews with district education offices).

The number of districts has increased by more than 20 to 80 in recent years and further to 113 in 2012. These increases are political and many new districts do not have sufficient capacity in terms of facilities and manpower to properly conduct their work (Arakawa, 2009).

#### 5.1.2 Management Capacity of the Ministry of Education

This study has reviewed the management capacity of MoES with reference to the Capacity Development Results Framework<sup>17</sup> (CDRF) of the World Bank Institute.

Together with human, financial and natural resources, the CDRF regards sociopolitical, institutional and organizational capacities of program/project implementation agency (government, private sector, or civil society) as potential contributing / hindering factors toward achievement of development goals. To this effect, the CDRF aims to construct plans for capacity assessment and development and to conduct monitoring and evaluation by measuring capacity factors, which express 1) conduciveness of the sociopolitical environment<sup>18</sup>, 2) efficiency of policy instruments<sup>19</sup> and 3) effectiveness of organizational arrangements<sup>20</sup> (WBI, 2009).

The study team considers the above factors to be linked with the interests of this study in the following ways. While conduciveness of the sociopolitical environment is related to relevance or validity of the sociopolitical environment in basic education, the efficiency of policy instruments is considered to have close ties with the efficiency of conducting improvement plans on basic education, and effectiveness of organizational arrangements links with the effectiveness of identifying how the Ministry interacts with stakeholders and makes use of resources to achieve development goals.

As there is a limit to adopt the CDRF rigorously in this study within a given timeframe for this assignment, in this report, a similar framework learning from CDRF to review the management capacity of MoE is used, as shown in Table 5-1. The frame has utilized the basic concepts of the CDRF while using the terms relevance, efficiency and effectiveness in place of the capacity factors of the CDRF. (However, their definitions basically followed those of the CDRF). The frame has chosen possible indices from the CDRF indices that are reviewable in this study

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> A framework created and adopted by the World Bank to design, enforce, monitor, manage and evaluate development programs and projects aimed at capacity development.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Factor composed of the political and social forces that determine priorities of development goals set by the government, the private sector, and civil society. Indicators for this factor include leadership commitment, consistency with social norms, participation of stakeholders in decision making, status of accountability of public institutions, and transparency (WBI, 2009).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> This refers to the mechanisms used to guide stakeholder actions to achieve each development goal, which include administrative rules, laws, regulations, and standards. Indicators for this factor include clarity of policy documents, clarity of stakeholders' rights and role, legality and relevance with upper goals of policy documents, feasibility against the current administrative procedure, flexibility of policy documents, and resilience against corruption (WBI, 2009).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> This factor is composed of cooperation structure including the systems, rules of action, processes, personnel, and other resources that government and non-government stakeholders use to achieve development goals. Indicators for this factor include clarity of development goals, vision and mission, level of achievement of outcomes directly linked with development goals, efficiency to achieve output, financial management capacity and certainty of financial source, trust among stakeholders, and adaptability to change of external environment (WBI, 2009).

based on the information gathered through the study.

|                 |                                     |                         | 11111111 J 01 2440401011              |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 3 review points | Relevance                           | Efficiency              | Effectiveness                         |
| Viewpoints in   | <ul> <li>Is MoES showing</li> </ul> | • Are the roles of each | • Are goals in the sector             |
| the reviewing   | commitment?                         | stakeholder in and      | plan achieved?                        |
| process         | • Are stakeholders able             | outside MoES clear?     | • Are actions taken and               |
| (Possible       | to participate in the               | • Are plans such as the | budgets used in                       |
| indices)        | process of                          | sector plan compatible  | compliance with the                   |
|                 | formulating sector                  | with policies of higher | sector plan?                          |
|                 | plans and policy                    | order?                  | <ul> <li>Does MoES possess</li> </ul> |
|                 | related documents?                  | • Are methods taken to  | enough coordination                   |
|                 | <ul> <li>Is MoES showing</li> </ul> | prevent corruption?     | skills to coordinate                  |
|                 | accountability?                     | (Such as an adoption of | with stakeholders?                    |
|                 |                                     | a monitoring system)    |                                       |

Table 5-1: Frame to Review the Management Capacity of the Ministry of Education

(Source: Developed by the study team in reference to the CDRF)

Results of the review are as follows.

\_\_\_\_\_

The organization of the Ugandan MoES is given in 3-6 – Supervisory Authority. To review the management capacity of MoES, "relevance", "efficiency" and "effectiveness" were used as the review items and the results of the analysis, primarily featuring the three existing reference materials listed below, are described in this section.

- MoES and Education Development Partners (2010), Fast Track Initiative Appraisal Report: Updated Education Sector Strategic Plan 2010 – 2015 (MoES & DPs, 2010)
- MoES, Aide Memoire for 18<sup>th</sup> Annual Education and Sports Sector Review 15<sup>th</sup> 17<sup>th</sup> November (MoES, 2011a)
- 3) Education Development Partners (EDP), Uganda, Technical Recommendations in Response to Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Scoping Mission (EDP, 2012b)
- (1) Relevance

Since the commencement of SWAps in 1998, donor coordination has been promoted between MoES and major donors with a high level of ownership on the part of MoES (MoES, 2011a). The capacity of government administrative staff is said to be superior to that of their counterparts in development countries, especially Sub-Saharan countries (Yoshikawa, 2005). Aid officers of the USAID, Belgium and others interviewed share a similar opinion concerning the coordination capacity of MoES.

Meanwhile, the decision-making process in Uganda is highly political as evidenced by the start of UPE and USE based on relevant proposals by the President. Hardly any political influence on

education is mentioned in reports compiled by not only MoES but also various donors.<sup>21</sup> Although information is exchanged with donors for the formulation of plans or projects, the exchange of opinions with district councils, schools and the private sector (private schools) is insufficient. There has not yet been any participation by local stakeholders (MoES, 2011a).

One critical problem is the low reliability of statistical data on education which is crucial for the formulation of plans, monitoring and evaluation of MoES. Especially noticeable is the lack of vital information on private schools in educational statistics because of the low response of private schools to questionnaires despite their importance in primary and secondary education. Transfer to another school during term time frequently occurs in Uganda and is not properly recorded. This situation has led to insufficient data on the internal efficiency (especially the drop-out rate) and others which is required for the improvement of education access and equality (EDP, 2012b).

#### (2) Efficiency

The roles to be played by MoES and local stakeholders in education are yet to be properly clarified following the reorganization of MoES which started in 2006 and was approved in 2009. Many of the positions in MoES are only filled by people with "acting" status (MoES and DPs, 2010).

The fund flow from the central government to schools via local governments suffers from leakages caused by the existence of ghost teachers and the improper use of UPE grants. The irregular timing of grants makes it difficult for schools to prepare a funding plan. At the school level, the principal and teachers as well as many pupils are frequently absent, wasting resources. The lack of teacher deployment to suit the actual needs of schools despite the progress of decentralisation is another factor for the low efficiency (MoES and DPs, 2010).

While the education budget, etc. at the central government level is audited, the fund flow from local governments to schools is not checked sufficiently. The political influence on the education administration is very strong. The Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of MoES is not fully functioning and measures to prevent corruption, etc. are insufficient<sup>22</sup> (EDP, 2012b).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> The section dealing with the political environment in the report entitled "Primary Education Systems Analysis" by Cambridge Education (not quoted in this report because of the draft nature of the report) mentions the difficulty of opposing opinions on educational policy, level of learning achievements and other matters because of the overwhelming strength of the ruling party and lack of proper accountability.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> According to Transparency International (http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2011), the corruption perceptions index for the Government of Uganda is 2.4 points and is ranked 143<sup>rd</sup> of 183 countries/territories around the world or 34<sup>th</sup> among African countries, indicating the relatively low status of Uganda in terms of public sector corruption. Illegal donations and other forms of corruption during presidential and parliamentary elections in Uganda attract much attention as detailed by the "Primary Education Systems Analysis" by Cambridge Education.

#### (3) Effectiveness

With the introduction of UPE and UPPET, the number of enrolled pupils has substantially increased. The teacher and classroom shortages have worsened at public primary schools, often forcing them to increase the class size to more than 100 pupils at the lower primary (P1 through P3). In both the primary and secondary education sub-sectors, children who cannot be absorbed by public schools are covered by private schools. While this arrangement is not particularly inadequate from the viewpoint of public-private collaboration and the efficient use of the available resources, MoES has been unable to properly regulate private schools. There are many pending issues relating to the quality of education, including the high drop-out rate of primary education, low enrollment rate of secondary education and low level of learning achievement of both primary and secondary education (EDP, 2012b).

In regard to the implementation of the ESSP and related projects, 3 - 4 years are usually required for such new logistic inputs as additional manpower to be fully made to MoES, slowing the speed of the process to strengthen and utilise resources.

## 5.2 Educational Finance

## 5.2.1 Budget of Education Sector

## (1) Proportion of the Education Sector in the National Budget/Expenditure and GDP

In 2008 and 2009, the share of the education sector in the national budget was the second largest after the public works sector. In 2010, the share increased to 17.0% of the national budget, making the education sector the largest sector for national budget allocation (WB, 2010b) (Annex 5-2). The GDP share of the education sector was also the second largest after the public works sector in 2008 and 2008 but moved to top place in 2010 with 3.3% (WB, 2010b) (Annex 5-2).

## (2) Details of Education Budget

Of the approved budget for the education sector in 2011, the recurrent budget and development budget accounted for 76.6% and 23.4% respectively. The wage expenditure accounted for 70.0% of the recurrent budget (Table 5-2) (GoU, 2010).

|  |                          | 2010/11 | 2011/12            | MTEF Budget Projections |          |          |  |
|--|--------------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|--|
|  |                          | Actual  | Approved<br>Budget | 2012/13                 | 2013/14  | 2014/15  |  |
|  | Wage Expenditure (a)     | 562.22  | 761.01             | 761.01                  | 879.44   | 1,028.82 |  |
|  | (% of Total Budget (e))  | 502.25  | (53.6%)            | (50.7%)                 | (50.9%)  | (60.9%)  |  |
| Docurrent                                  | Non Wage Expenditure (b) | 222.12  | 326.22             | 326.21                  | 361.83   | 397.77   |  |
| Recuirent                                  | (% of Total Budget(e))   | 232.12  | (23.0%)            | (21.7%)                 | (20.9%)  | (23.5%)  |  |
|  | Total Recurrent Budget   | 704 25  | 1,087.22           | 1,087.22                | 1,241.27 | 1,426.59 |  |
|  | (% of Total Budget(e))   |         | (76.6%)            | (72.4%)                 | (71.8%)  | (84.4%)  |  |
|  | GoU (c)                  | 102.02  | 158.78             | 152.92                  | 168.09   | 174.06   |  |
|  | (% of Total Budget (e))  | 105.95  | (11.2%)            | (10.2%)                 | (9.7%)   | (10.3%)  |  |
| Develop-                                   | Donor Assistance (d)     | 0.000   | 174.27             | 261.73                  | 319.90   | 89.18    |  |
| ment                                       | (% of Total Budget(e))   | 0.000   | (12.3%)            | (17.4%)                 | (18.5%)  | (5.3%)   |  |
|  | Total Development Budget | 102.02  | 333.05             | 414.65                  | 487.99   | 263.24   |  |
|  | (% of Total Budget(e))   | 103.95  | (23.4%)            | (27.6%)                 | (28.2%)  | (15.6%)  |  |
| Total GoU B                                | udget = (a) + (b) + (c)  | 002.20  | 1,246.00           | 1,240.14                | 1,409.36 | 1,600.65 |  |
| (% of Total Budget(e))                     |                          | 902.29  | (87.7%)            | (82.6%)                 | (81.5%)  | (94.7%)  |  |
| Total Budget (e) = $(a) + (b) + (c) + (d)$ |                          | NT/A    | 1,420.27           | 1,501.86                | 1,729.26 | 1,689.83 |  |
| (% of Total Budget(e))                     |                          | IN/A    | (100.0%)           | (100.0%)                | (100.0%) | (100.0%) |  |
| Non-tax Rev                                | enue                     | 2.92    | 190.15             | 206.51                  | 143.84   | 14.32    |  |
| Grand Total                                |                          | N/A     | 1,610,42           | 1,708.37                | 1,873.10 | 1,704.15 |  |

Table 5-2: Details of Total Education Sector Budget (Unit: billion Ugandan Shilling)

(Source : GoU, 2010)

Because of the high proportion of teachers' salaries in the education budget, the distribution of at least 33% of the national recurrent budget to the education sector is agreed in the annual sector review (WB, 2010b and Arakawa, 2009). For example, the educational budget in 2009 accounted for 28.5% of the national recurrent budget. Even though this figure was below the level agreed in the annual sector review, it was higher than the FIT benchmark figure of 20.0% and the average figure of 22.2% for Sub-Saharan countries (UNESCO, 2012b).

#### (3) Budget by Sub-Sector

The agreement in the annual sector review used to be that at least 65% of the education budget would go to the primary education sub-sector. Following the commencement of free secondary education in 2007, this ratio was revised to substantially increase the portion going to the secondary education sub-sector (Arakawa, 2009).

In the approved budget for 2011, 2.5% of the budget goes to MoES for spending on pre-primary and primary education and 39.6% goes to local governments for their spending on pre-primary and primary education, totalling 42.1%. 11.9% of the budget also goes to MoES for spending on secondary education (including vocational education) and 14.1% goes to local governments for the same purpose, totalling a secondary education share of 26.0% (GoU, 2010) (Annex 5-3). In the 9<sup>th</sup> Education and Sports Sector Planning and Budget Workshop held in February, 2012, the budget share of the primary education sub-sector in 2012 will be less than 50% at 48.4% with secondary education accounting for 28.3% and vocational education for 11.3% (Table 5-3).

|                     | 2008/09 | 2009/10 | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 |
|---------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Primary Education   | 51.5    | 48.4    | 50.7    | 51.9    | 48.4    |
| Secondary Education | 29.0    | 32.5    | 30.7    | 29.5    | 28.3    |
| BTVET               | 5.3     | 4.5     | 5.3     | 6.6     | 11.3    |
| Higher Education    | 12.0    | 12.2    | 10.8    | 10.3    | 9.7     |
| Other               | 2.3     | 2.1     | 2.4     | 1.7     | 2.2     |

Table 5-3: Projections of Proportion of Education Sector Budget by Sub-sector (%)

(Source : MoES, 2012)

#### (4) Proportion of Domestic Financing

The approved budget (excluding outstanding payments and taxes) for the education sector in 2011 was 1,610.419 billion U.shs (approximately US\$ 587 million) of which 87.7% or 1,246.00 billion U.shs. was funded by the government and 12.3% or 174.27 billion U.shs was funded by donors (Table 5-2). In the budget plan of the MTEF, the portion of government funding for 2012 will be 82.6% with donor funding of 12.3%. For 2013, the figures are 81.5% for government funding and 18.5% for donor funding. For 2014, the figures are 94.7% for government funding and 5.3% for donor funding (MoES, 2012).

#### 5.2.2 Flow and Administration of Funds Provided by Donors

The financial assistance of donors follows the three routes of (i) GBS, (ii) sector and basket assistance and (iii) MTEF projects to suit the budget plan. As shown in Fig. 5-1, the flow of donor budget assistance consists of many steps: (i) indication of commitment and prediction for the following year by a donor, (ii) application of this prediction and disbursement plan to the budget preparation process, (iii & iv) finalisation of the budget based on the draft budget and funding plan of each ministry or agency and input of the finalised budget to the Integrated Financial Management System (IFMS), (v) funding by the donor to an integral fund or special account of the Bank of Uganda along with the finalised budget, (vi) notification of fund disbursement by the Bank of Uganda to the MFPED, (vii) requests by individual ministries and agencies for the allocation of funds to special project accounts, (viii) confirmation of the legitimacy of fund allocation prior to allocation by budget department, (ix) transfer of funds to special accounts, leaving the transfer records at the IFMS, (x) start of the recording of expenditure by each ministry or agency and forwarding of the records to the IFMS and (xi) review of the expenditure records of each ministry or agency by the MFPED as well as each ministry or agency and relevant donor in the MTEF review process.



(Source : JICA, 2011)

#### Figure 5-1: Flow of Funds Provided by Donors

The Government of Uganda and donors try to ensure effective and efficient education service delivery along with the respective MoUs while implementing measures designed to ensure the good governance of the former and the prevention of corruption in the process. The government audit body conducts the necessary audits and the annual audit report is submitted to the parliament as well as each donor. When a problem is found in the audit process, the Public Accounts Committee and MoES conduct the necessary follow-up actions.

#### 5.2.3 Management System for the Education Budget/Public Expenditure

The budgetary year in Uganda is from July to June of the following year. The central government prepares a MTEF to cover its budget for a three year period and the budget allocation amount for each sector is decided in the MTEF. In November each year, budgetary deliberations in each sector begin on receipt of the Budget Call Circular issued by the MFPED. MoES uses the upper limit in the MTEF as the ceiling for its own budget for the year and coordinates the allocation of the education budget to different sub-sectors in accordance with the ESSP. In reality, it is often the case that a supplementary budget is arranged in the middle of the budget year and the accuracy of the original budget amount is not high. The budget execution rate is commonly above 90%. Approximately one-half of the education budget is directly allocated by MoES to district councils (Arakawa, 2009).

MoES is responsible for the budget execution and implementation of various education programmes. In the case of a large-scale project, such as the UPPET, the Permanent Secretary of MoES is responsible for project accounting and fund management, acting as the chairman of the

relevant steering committee. The budget management system of MoES is given in the GoU Treasury Accounting Instructions of 2003. At the local level, the district CAO supervises the budget in general while staff members of the district education office conduct the actual work. Each district council functions as a budget unit. The authority to manage each school rests with the principal, school management committee (primary school) or board of governors (secondary school) and PTA (WB, 2009).

## 5.2.4 Distribution of Grants

#### (1) Grants for Free Primary Education

At the time of the introduction of free primary education in 1997, the Government of Uganda committed itself to the provision of (i) tuition fees, (ii) textbooks and instructional materials, (iii) construction of basic physical activities, including teachers' homes, and also the construction of community-based private schools, (iv) payment of teachers' salaries and (v) training of teachers (JICA, 2008).

As part of the policy to make tuition fees free, the UPE grant for schools by local governments was introduced to fill the funding gap caused by the abolition of user fees for primary education along with a grant for school facilities. The grant for schools consists of the basic grant and the variable grant of which the amount is calculated based on the number of enrolled pupils. The basic grant is 100,000 U.shs/months x 9 months (3 terms x 3 months/term), totalling 900,000 U.shs/year (approximately US\$ 370/year). This UPE grant is distributed to each primary school via the local government and can be used for the procurement of additional teaching materials, activities in line with the curriculum and school management (MoES, 2008b).

The size of this grant of around US\$ 370/year plus a small amount of variable grant cannot possibly cover the necessary cost of textbooks, etc. at primary schools where the number of enrolled pupils has been rapidly increasing. Other problems faced by public primary schools in relation to the UPE and school grants include the somewhat arbitrary timing of grant disbursement, even after the end of a term, and the inability of schools to request donations from parents because of the free education policy (interview with the principal of a public primary school).

## (2) Grants for Free Secondary Education

A grant for secondary schools via the UPPET is provided for those schools participating in USE to cover the tuition fees of pupils who are entitled to free schooling because of their good performance in the PLE. Unlike primary schools, this grant is directly paid to the bank account of each school. This grant consists of the variable capitation grant and the fixed basic grant. The variable grant can be used for textbooks, equipment, activities in line with the curriculum and others (cost of issuing certificates of qualification, academic record sheets and career guidance for pupils, health and sanitation cost, lighting and heating cost and other costs). The amount of

the grant per pupil is 29,420 U.shs/term (approximately US\$ 12/term) for secondary schools and 68,702 U.shs/term (approximately US\$ 28/term) for vocational schools. The basic grant is used for school management and the amount is 7 million U.shs per term (approximately US\$ 2,850 per term) for both secondary and vocational schools (MoES, 2006a).

## 5.2.5 **Private Education Expenditure**

Since the introduction of UPE, the government pays all tuition fees for public primary schools. The annual government grant per pupil was originally 5,000 U.shs per pupil for P1 through P3 pupils and 8,100 U.shs per pupil for P4 through P7 pupils. The grant amount was later changed to a uniform basic amount of 900,000 U.shs/school plus the capitation grant of 3,464 U.shs per year for all P1 through P7 pupils. Even since the introduction of UPE, parents have been required to pay the PLE fee. Although the amount of 6,100 U.shs per pupil (approximately US\$ 4/pupil) was not especially expensive, there are many parents in rural areas who could not afford this payment, resulting in a high drop-out rate. Today, parents are still required to pay the PLE fee which currently stands at 10,000 U.shs (IOB, 2008).

Although primary education is free, the average household education expenditure for those who send their children to public primary schools is 24,936 U.shs per year (approximately US\$ 10 per year) to cover the cost of the uniform, transport, school supplies and others. While this amount is extremely small compared to the cost for a private primary school or for secondary education, it does mean that primary education is completely "free". In the case of secondary education, the average household expenditure is slightly higher for public schools compared to that for private schools (WB, 2008). The impacts of the UPPET introduced in 2007 are unclear.

| Timary and Secondary Education in 2000 (Cint. Cgandan Shining) |              |                   |         |  |  |  |
|--|--------------|-------------------|---------|--|--|--|
|  | Tuition Fees | Other Expenditure | Total   |  |  |  |
| Primary Schools  | 14,254       | 14,240            | 29,494  |  |  |  |
| Public   | 9,006        | 15,930            | 24,936  |  |  |  |
| Private  | 259,336      | 167,453           | 426,789 |  |  |  |
| Secondary Schools  | 161,432      | 76,512            | 237,944 |  |  |  |
| Public   | 270,123      | 158,448           | 428,572 |  |  |  |
| Private  | 259,336      | 167,453           | 426,789 |  |  |  |

Table 5-4: Average per Pupil Household Expenditures on Primary and Secondary Education in 2006 (Unit: Ugandan Shilling)

(Source : WB, 2008 (Calculated based on "Uganda National Household Survey 2006")

As shown in Table 5-5, Uganda invested 7% of GDP in primary, secondary and tertiary education. In aggregate of the three sub-sectors, expenditure by government/donor and expenditure by households accounted for 3.45% and 3.68% of GDP, respectively. The share of primary education expenditure in the GDP is 3.59% of which government expenditure and donor assistance accounts for 2.27% (63% of the overall primary education expenditure) and households account for 1.32% (the remaining 37%). In the case of secondary education expenditure (2.51% of the GDP), government expenditure and donor assistance account for only 0.63% (25% of the total secondary education expenditure) and households are responsible for

1.88% (the remaining 75%). The corresponding figures for tertiary education expenditure are 53% for government expenditure and donor assistance and 47% for expenditure by households. Among the different sub-sectors, the secondary education sub-sector has the highest proportion of education expenditure by households (WB, 2009).

|                     | 1                |           | < / / |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------|-------|
|                     | Government/Donor | Household | Total |
| Primary Education   | 2.27             | 1.32      | 3.59  |
| Secondary Education | 0.63             | 1.88      | 2.51  |
| Tertiary Education  | 0.55             | 0.48      | 1.03  |
| Total               | 3.45             | 3.68      | 7.13  |

Table 5-5: Education Expenditures as Share of GDP (Unit: %)

(Source : WB, 2008 (Calculated based on "Uganda National Household Survey 2006," "Livelihood Survey 2004," and UBS "Demographic Health Survey 2000")

## 5.2.6 Unit Cost Analysis

The unit cost of primary education in 2007 was equivalent to 10% of the GDP per capita. The figure was much higher for lower secondary education at 57% and upper secondary education at 103%. These discrepancies are believed to be attributable to the lower pupil-teacher ratio and higher level of teachers' salaries in upper secondary education (WB, 2008).

In 2009, the unit cost of recurrent public expenditure (featuring pupils attending public schools) for primary education was equivalent to 6.7% of the GDP per capita which was lower than the corresponding figure for Sub-Saharan Africa of 11.4% on average (UNESCO, 2012b).

## 5.2.7 **Projection of Mid-Term Demand and Cost for Teachers**

MoES and donors in the education sector project the number of enrolled pupils, demand for teachers and cost based on three scenarios to reflect the different speeds of progress of UPE and USE-related policies and measures: ESSP1 (slow progress), ESSP2 (intermediate progress) and ESSP (fast progress). Table 5-6 shows the estimated number of enrolled pupils while Table 5-7 shows the prediction results for the teacher demand in both the primary and secondary education sub-sectors based on the figures in Table 5-6.

| (Unit: thousand persons) |        |                |       |                |       |                |       |
|--------------------------|--------|----------------|-------|----------------|-------|----------------|-------|
|                          | 2009   | Scenario ESSP1 |       | Scenario ESSP2 |       | Scenario ESSP3 |       |
|                          | Actual | 2012           | 2015  | 2012           | 2015  | 2012           | 2015  |
| Primary Education        | 7,964  | 8,656          | 9,030 | 8,352          | 8,306 | 8,346          | 8,415 |
| Secondary Education      | 1,089  | 1,533          | 2,070 | 1,579          | 2,269 | 1,658          | 2,618 |
| Lower Secondary          | 939    | 1,309          | 1,800 | 1,345          | 1,964 | 1,414          | 2,271 |
| Upper Secondary          | 150    | 234            | 270   | 234            | 305   | 244            | 347   |

 Table 5-6: Projection of Enrollment in Primary and Secondary Education

 (Unit: thousand persons)

(Source : MoES and DP, 2010)

|             | FY2008            | FY2009  | FY2010  | FY2011  | FY2012  | FY2013  | FY2014  |  |  |
|-------------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--|--|
| Primary Edu | Primary Education |         |         |         |         |         |         |  |  |
| ESSP1       | 157,084           | 163,117 | 165,393 | 167,502 | 169,989 | 171,864 | 173,250 |  |  |
| ESSP2       | 157,084           | 163,117 | 163,586 | 163,973 | 164,684 | 164,532 | 163,472 |  |  |
| ESSP3       | 157,084           | 163,117 | 163,113 | 163,522 | 164,586 | 164,994 | 164.546 |  |  |
| Secondary E | Education         |         |         |         |         |         |         |  |  |
| ESSP1       | 19,590            | 21,034  | 22,402  | 24,086  | 26,269  | 28,485  | 31,310  |  |  |
| ESSP2       | 19,590            | 21,034  | 22,526  | 24,495  | 27,160  | 30,071  | 33,853  |  |  |
| ESSP3       | 19590             | 21,034  | 22,750  | 25,225  | 28,743  | 32,903  | 38,420  |  |  |

 Table 5-7: Projected Teaching Force in Primary and Secondary Education (Unit: persons)

(Source : MoES and DP, 2010)

Table 5-8 shows the projected personnel cost based on the projected teacher demand in Table 5-7. The ratio of the education budget to the GDP in 2014 is estimated to be between 2.77% (ESSP2) and 2.94% (ESSP3). The ratio of the government budget to the GDP in 2012 is expected to show a decrease from the level in 2009 but to start increasing from 2013 to reach 2.59% in 2014. There is an estimated funding gap in each scenario, ranging from 0.07% (ESSP1) and 0.13% (ESSP2) to -0.03% (ESSP3) to the GDP (MoES and DPs, 2010).

The budget amount for the personnel cost of the education sector in 2011 was 761 billion U.shs. In the projection shown in Table 5-8, the figure for 2009 already exceeds this budget amount, indicating a colossal budget requirement to meet the cost of teachers' salaries in the coming years.

 

 Table 5-8: Projection of Personnel Cost based on Projected Teaching Force in Primary and Secondary Education (Unit: billion Ugandan Shilling)

|             |           | -      |        | -      |        | -      |        |
|-------------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|             | FY2008    | FY2009 | FY2010 | FY2011 | FY2012 | FY2013 | FY2014 |
| Primary Edu | ucation   |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| ESSP1       | N/A       | 548.1  | 590.3  | 633.7  | 681.0  | 727.6  | 776.6  |
| ESSP2       | 499.7     | 548.5  | 583.5  | 620.2  | 659.8  | 696.6  | 732.8  |
| ESSP3       | 499.7     | 548.4  | 582.0  | 619.0  | 660.3  | 699.4  | 738.8  |
| Secondary E | Education |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| ESSP1       | 186.4     | 226.0  | 274.6  | 304.5  | 342.0  | 385.0  | 441.8  |
| ESSP2       | 186.4     | 226.0  | 275.8  | 308.6  | 351.3  | 402.9  | 472.3  |
| ESSP3       | 186.4     | 226.0  | 278.0  | 316.0  | 368.3  | 435.3  | 527.3  |
|             |           |        |        |        |        |        |        |

(Source : MoES and DP, 2010)

# **CHAPTER 6: TRENDS IN DONOR ASSISTANCE**

## 6.1 Structure of Donor Coordination

In Uganda, donor coordination is making much progress through SWAps. This is evident in every sector and the education sector is said to be one of the front runners of donor coordination along with the health and water sectors. In the education sector, SWAps began in full swing along with the ESIP formulated in 1998 as the first development plan for the sector. The Government of Uganda and donors assisting the education sector agreed in the form of a MoU on collaboration to achieve the NDP, MDGs and EFA goals (GoU & EDP, 2009).

The organizations involved in decision-making in the education sector are shown in Table 6-1 and the mechanism for decision making is shown in Annex 6-1 taking the mechanism of donor coordination into consideration.

| Meeting            | Chairperson | Participants | Frequency   | Objectives                       |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------------|
| Top Management     | Minister    | Deputy       | n.a.        | Finalization of policies         |
| Meeting (TMM)      |             | minister,    |             | Approval on decisions made       |
|                    |             | Directors    |             | by ESCC                          |
|                    |             | (excluding   |             |                                  |
|                    |             | donors)      |             |                                  |
| Education Sector   | Permanent   | MoES,        | Annual      | • Semi-annual performance        |
| Review Meeting     | secretary   | Donors,      | (October)   | assessment                       |
|                    |             | Concerned    |             | • Agreement on the way forward   |
|                    |             | ministries   |             | to challenges                    |
|                    |             |              |             | • Discussions on undertakings of |
|                    |             |              |             | the measures to address issues   |
|                    |             |              |             | in the activities lagging behind |
| Education Sector   | Permanent   | MoES,        | Bi-monthly  | • Proposal of agenda to TMM      |
| Consultative       | secretary   | Donors,      | (every last | Approval on decisions made       |
| Committee (ESCC)   |             | Concerned    | Thursday)   | by Working Group                 |
|                    |             | ministries   |             | Monitoring of ESSP               |
|                    |             |              |             | Monitoring of Undertakings       |
| Monitoring &       | Director of | MoES,        | Monthly     | • Monitoring surveys and         |
| Evaluation Meeting | Education   | Donors,      |             | programs                         |
|                    | Planning    | Concerned    |             |                                  |
|                    | Department  | ministries   |             |                                  |
| EDP Meeting        | Embassy of  | Donors       | Monthly     | • Sharing information on         |
|                    | Belgium     |              |             | new/existing projects            |

 Table 6-1: Decision Making Bodies in the Education Sector

(Source : Ushiro, 2010)

The supreme organization for any decision-making regarding coordination between the GoU and donors is the ESCC which provides technical and strategic advice for the education sector. The ESCC meets every two months. The Permanent Secretary of MoES acts as the chairperson

and reports to the TMM of MoES. The framework and system for partnership are reviewed by the GoU and donors at the annual joint review meeting. Technical cooperation is decided through full coordination efforts between MoES and donors so that there is no overlapping of cooperation and all assistance is highly relevant (GoU & EDP, 2009).

#### 6.2 Trends of Cooperation by Each Donor

The education sector in Uganda receives financial aid from Belgium, the Netherlands, the EU and Ireland. The JICA, USAID, GIZ<sup>23</sup> and international aid organizations provide off-budget project aid along with many which provide financial aid (EDP, 2012c). Of the donors providing financial aid, only Ireland contributes to Poverty Action Fund<sup>24</sup> (PAF) in the education sector, while the World Bank and most Western donors provide general financial aid (or contributions to the general PAF) (Table 6-2 and Table 6-3). Those providing financial aid have a strong say and hold a leading position in debates on compliance with the Paris Declaration and partnership principles. However, no attempts have been made to exclude project-type assistance (Arakawa, 2009).



| Belgium              | 20,708,800  |
|----------------------|-------------|
| Netherlands          | 98,420,000  |
| EU                   | 149,583,268 |
| GIZ                  | 1,758,000   |
| Ireland              | 51,696,162  |
| JICA                 | 6,338,690   |
| SIDA                 | 23,200,000  |
| UNHCR <sup>25</sup>  | 4,178,464   |
| UNICEF <sup>26</sup> | 25,688,893  |
| USAID                | 32,745,000  |
| Total                | 414,317,277 |



(Source : EDP, 2012c)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> GIZ = Gesellschaft fur Internationale Zusammenarbeit

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> PAF has been established to improve transparency of fund flow for HIPCs, and has been used for basic education, primary health care, water supply and sanitation, agriculture, road construction in rural areas (UNCCD, 2008) (UNCCD = United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> UNHCR = United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup> UNICEF = United Nations Children's Fund

|             |                   | FY2010     |                     | FY2011     |               |            |  |
|-------------|-------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|---------------|------------|--|
|             | Budget Support Pr |            | Project-based Total |            | Project-based | Total      |  |
| Belgium     | 5,412,400         | 4,671,000  | 10,083,400          | 5,412,400  | 4,671,000     | 10,083,400 |  |
| Netherlands | 18,900,000        | 1,491,000  | 20,391,000          | 18,900,000 | 62,000        | 18,962,000 |  |
| EU          | 35,100,000        | 815,239    | 35,915,239          | 38,610,000 | 364,084       | 38,974,084 |  |
| GIZ         | 0                 | 270,000    | 270,000             | 0          | 0             | 0          |  |
| Ireland     | 9,201,623         | 1,826,788  | 11,028,411          | 8,119,079  | 1,826,788     | 9,945,867  |  |
| JICA        | 0                 | 1,029,900  | 1,029,900           | 0          | 462,200       | 462,200    |  |
| SIDA        | 0                 | 6,300,000  | 6,300,000           | 0          | 5,000,000     | 5,000,000  |  |
| UNHCR       | 0                 | 2,447,475  | 2,447,475           | 0          | 0             | 0          |  |
| UNICEF      | 0                 | 9,510,011  | 9,510,011           | 0          | 10,078,882    | 10,078,882 |  |
| USAID       | 0                 | 12,325,000 | 12,325,000          | 0          | 0             | 0          |  |
| Total       | 68,614,023        | 40,686,413 | 109,300,436         | 71,041,479 | 22,464,954    | 93,506,433 |  |

Table 6-3: Pledge of Each Donor in the Education Sector (Budget Support and<br/>Project-based Support) (FY2010-FY2011) (Unit: US\$)

(Source : EDP, 2012c)

Table 6-4 shows the trends of project assistance by donor in the education sector. The UNICEF is the main player in the pre-school and primary education sub-sectors with the World Bank and the Netherlands being quite active. In the secondary education and BTVET, the main player is the World Bank with Belgium, JICA, GIZ and Ireland being the prominent donors.

| Table 6-4: Donor | Support (Pro | ject-based) by | y Sub-sector in th | e Education Sector |
|------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|
|                  | ~~~~~ (= = • |                | ,                  |                    |

| Sub-sector/Area                  | Lead Donor             | Major Donor                               |  |  |  |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Pre-primary/Primary Education |                        |   |  |  |  |
| Pre-primary Education            | UNICEF                 | UNHCR, World Bank                         |  |  |  |
| Special Education                | USAID                  | UNICEF, World Bank                        |  |  |  |
| Water Supply and Sanitation      | UNICEF                 | WFP, <sup>27</sup> Embassy of Netherlands |  |  |  |
| School Health and Nutrition      | WFP                    | UNICEF, Embassy of Netherlands            |  |  |  |
| 2. Secondary Education/ BTVET    |                        |   |  |  |  |
| Secondary Education              | World Bank             | AfDB, <sup>28</sup> Embassy of Belgium    |  |  |  |
| Teacher Education                | Ireland                | JICA, Embassy of Belgium                  |  |  |  |
| BTVET                            | Embassy of Belgium     | GIZ, JICA, AfDB, World Bank               |  |  |  |
| 3. Tertiary Education            | Embassy of Netherlands | World Bank                                |  |  |  |
| 4. Cross-cutting issues          |                        |   |  |  |  |
| Gender                           | UNICEF                 | UNHCR, USAID, AfDB, WFP,                  |  |  |  |
|                                  |                        | Embassy of Belgium, World Bank            |  |  |  |
| HIV/AIDS                         | USAID                  | AfDB, USAID, WFP, GIZ, Ireland            |  |  |  |
| Decentralization                 | Embassy of Netherlands | World Bank                                |  |  |  |
| Northern Part                    | USAID                  | JICA, GIZ, UNHCR, World Bank,             |  |  |  |
|                                  |                        | Embassy of Netherlands                    |  |  |  |
| FTI                              | Chairperson of EDP     | All donors                                |  |  |  |
| EMIS                             | Chairperson of EDP     | All donors                                |  |  |  |

(Source : Ushiro, 2010)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> WFP = World Food Programme

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> AfDB = African Development Bank

# **CHAPTER 7: RESULTS OF ANALYSIS**

## 7.1 Top Priorities in the Basic Education Sector

The research and analysis of the basic education (primary and lower secondary education) sector in Uganda have found that the overall access to primary education has greatly improved following the introduction of UPE and UPPET and other policies. However, GoU has not been able to provide enough classrooms and teachers in line with the rapid increase of enrollment in public schools, while MoES has been facing difficulty in supervising private schools. Furthermore, decentralization process in the education sector has been delayed, due to insufficient capacity of regional education administration. As a result, the situation has worsened the problem of the quality of education, including a low level of internal efficiency and insufficient learning outcomes, as well as regional disparities.

For a better understanding of the challenges faced by primary and lower secondary education in Uganda, Table 7-1 compares Uganda to other countries in Sub-Saharan Africa in terms of access (primary NER, secondary GER, and net intake rate (NIR) of primary education), internal efficiency (repetition rate of primary education), learning outcome (completion rate of primary education), teachers (PTR of primary education) and inputs (percentage of education sector expenditure in government expenditure).

In terms of primary education, Uganda is ranked in the middle of the 11 countries, as indicated by its rankings; fifth in the NER, following Rwanda, Malawi, Cameroon, and Zambia; forth in the NIR; sixth in the repetition rate; seventh in the completion rate; and sixth in the PTR. As for secondary education, Uganda's GER and PTR are low among the countries compared, ranking the country ninth and tenth, respectively (WB, 2012).

|                      |                    |                    |                    | ,                             |                               |                |   |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---|
|                      | Primary<br>NER     | Primary<br>GER     | Primary<br>NIR     | Primary<br>Repetition<br>Rate | Primary<br>Completion<br>Rate | Primary<br>PTR | Education Sector<br>Expenditure (%<br>of Government<br>Expenditure) |
| Uganda <sup>*1</sup> | 90.9               | 28.1               | 67.8               | 10.8                          | 57.2                          | 48.6           | $15.0^{*2}$   |
| Malawi               | 96.9 <sup>*2</sup> | 32.1               | 80.6               | 19.0                          | 66.8                          | 79.3           | 12.1  |
| Zambia               | 91.4               | 33.4 <sup>*3</sup> | 50.6               | 6.0                           | 103.3                         | 58.0           | 19.9 <sup>*3</sup>  |
| Kenya                | $82.8^{*2}$        | $60.2^{*2}$        | -                  | -                             | -                             | $46.8^{*2}$    | 17.2  |
| Ethiopia             | 81.3               | 35.7               | 68.4               | 3.9                           | 72.2                          | 54.1           | 25.4  |
| Rwanda               | 98.7               | 32.2               | 86.4               | 13.8                          | 69.6                          | 64.6           | 18.2  |
| Senegal              | 75.5               | 37.4               | 57.2 <sup>*4</sup> | 6.3                           | 59.2                          | 33.7           | $24.0^{*2}$   |
| Burkina Faso         | 58.1               | 20.7               | 19.4               | 10.1                          | 45.1                          | 47.8           | $21.8^{*4}$   |
| Mali                 | 62.0               | 37.7               | 19.3               | 12.9                          | 54.8                          | 50.4           | 22.0  |
| Cameroon             | 92.4               | 42.2               | 58.9 <sup>*2</sup> | 13.1                          | 78.7                          | 45.5           | 17.9  |
| Niger                | 57.2               | 13.4               | 64.4               | 4.4                           | 41.2                          | 38.6           | 16.9  |

 Table 7-1: Comparison of Education Indices of Uganda and 10 Neighboring Countries

 (in 2010)

(Source: World Bank, World Data Bank obtained on 28th May, 2012)

Notes: \*1 Figures are from the World Data Bank to make a better comparison with other countries.

- \*2 Figures in 2009 from World Bank website
- \*3 For Zambia, the numbers correspond to data from the Education Sector Program (NIF III) as well as statistical data from MoES as data regarding the secondary education GER and the education sector expenditure to government expenditure ratio could not be obtained from the World Bank website. However, the figure under the education sector expenditure to government expenditure ratio for Zambia corresponds to the education sector budget to general budget ratio.
- \*4 Figures in 2007 from World Bank website

Table 7-1 suggests that Uganda enjoys relatively good values for the indices regarding access to primary education compared to neighbouring countries. However, it faces a formidable challenge found in this research and analysis, although Uganda's indices regarding the quality such as the repetition rate and the completion rate are ranked in the middle among the neighboring countries. Access to secondary education and percentage of education sector expenditure in government expenditure also remain low compared with the neighboring countries. Among SACMEQ countries, Uganda is ranked 11<sup>th</sup> in terms of both reading and math, indicating its low learning outcome as a key challenge.

Table 7-2 compares the educational indices from the present study to the benchmark indices of the FIT Indicative Framework to clarify the challenges faced by the primary education sector in Uganda.

Although the NIR (an index for access) in Uganda is below the average of the countries showing positive performance in achieving EFA, it is better than that of many neighbouring countries as shown in Table 7-1. The figures for Uganda are worse than the average in terms of the completion rate and repetition rate for primary education, PTR and annual teaching hours. Both percentage of the government revenue allocated to the education sector and percentage of education sector budget allocated to basic education are also below the average.

| Index  | Average of countries<br>showing positive<br>performance in achieving<br>EFA | Uganda<br>(National Figure) (2010/11)                             |
|--|---|---|
| 1. Percentage of the government revenue allocated to the education sector  | 20%   | 17.0% (2010/11)*1   |
| 2. Percentage of education sector budget allocated to basic education      | 42 - 62%  | 42.1% (2011/12) <sup>*2</sup>                                     |
| 3. Intake Rates  | 100%  | GIR 160.6% (2010) <sup>*3</sup><br>NIR 70.2% (2010) <sup>*3</sup> |
| 4. Primary education completion rate                                       | 100%  | 54.0% (2010) <sup>*3</sup>  |
| 5. Primary education repetition rate                                       | Less than 10%   | 10.9% (2010) <sup>*3</sup>  |
| 6. Pupil teacher ratio in public schools                                   | 40: 1   | $57:1(2010)^{*3}$   |
| 7. Percentage of non-salaries spending in the recurrent education spending | 33%   | 30.0% <sup>*2</sup>   |
| 8. Annual hours of instruction   | 850 - 1000 hours  | 720 hours <sup>*4</sup>   |

 Table 7-2: Comparison of EFA-FTI Indicative Framework Indices

(Source: WB, 2004 and Uganda MoES, 2010) Notes: \*1 WB, 2010b
\*2 GoU, 2010
\*3 MoES, 2010
\*4 UNESCO, 2012a

### 7.2 Factor Analysis of Top Priorities

As described in 7.1, the top priorities for the education sector in Uganda are the low primary education completion rate, high pupil-teacher rate, low level of learning achievement and low gross enrolment rate for secondary education compared to the corresponding figures for other Sub-Saharan countries and also to the values of indicators in the EFA-FTI Indicative Framework. The GPE Scoping Mission conducted by the World Bank in May, 2012 identified such major issues as (i) the extremely low survival rate of 30% of P7 pupils, (ii) declining level of reading among P3 and P6 pupils, (iii) inadequate employment and management of teachers, (iv) shortage of textbooks and (v) insufficient participation by local residents.

In short, the top priorities for improvement in Uganda's education sector (primary and lower secondary education) are (i) low survival and completion rates of primary education, (ii pupil-teacher ratio, (iii) low level of learning achievement, (iv) high absenteeism among teachers, (v) shortage of textbooks, and (vi) low gross enrollment rate of secondary schools. The results of the factor analysis of these top priorities are described next.

(1) Low Survival and Completion Rates of Primary Education

The low survival rate and low completion rate are primarily caused by the high repetition and drop-out rates. According to a national household survey (2006) conducted by the UBS, the top reason for the high drop-out rate is the family's inability to pay the various costs associated with education even though primary education is free and this reason is cited by 39% of the respondents (35% for boys and 43% for girls). Other reasons include little interest in education with 21% (31% for boys and 15% for girls), illness with 13% (14% for boys and 13% for girls) and need to help with domestic chores with 5% (1% for boys and 7% for girls). The problem of the education cost affects girls more than boys while the need to help with domestic chores is a major reason for the dropping-out of girls. In the case of boys, little interest in education is a strong reason cited by 31% of boys' families. The dropout rate for children is high when their parents do not understand the importance of education or lack the means to pay the education costs (IBO, 2008). The high drop-out rate, as well as high level of absence among girls at the age of puberty (i.e. in secondary education), is likely due to the lack of proper toilet facilities, teenage pregnancy, sexual harassment (rape) and FGM. By region, the low completion rate in Karamoji in the North East which is inhabited by many nomads is particularly noticeable (WB, 2008).

#### (2) High Pupil-Teacher Ratio

Despite an increase of the number of teachers being recruited to cope with the rapid increase of

enrollment in primary education as a result of UPE, the growth of the number of teachers did not keep up with the enrollment increase, the pupil-teacher ratio has hardly improved. Meanwhile, the pupil-teacher ratio for secondary education is rising due to increased enrollment as a result of USE (MoES, 2010).

In the primary education sub-sector, this ratio is higher for the lower grades. It is also high in rural areas compared to urban or peri-urban areas because of the prevalent shortage of teachers. Primary schools have a lower pupil-teacher ratio than public schools and community schools. The disparity between regions is substantial. In the Western and Central Regions, the pupil-teacher ratio band of between 30 - 49 pupils/teacher has the highest ratio of 47% for the Western Region and 43% for the Central Region among all bands. In contrast, schools with a pupil-teacher ratio of between 30 and 60 account for 54% of all schools in the Eastern Region. In the Northern Region, schools with the said ratio of 60 or higher account for 55% of all schools (IOB, 2008).

#### (3) Low Level of Learning Achievements

Even though access to primary education has improved in Uganda, there are still many pending issues in terms of the quality of education. These include the high pupil-classroom ratio, high pupil-teacher ratio, insufficient availability of textbooks and teaching materials, the prevalent force-feeding type of teaching method employed by teachers and inadequate use of textbooks and teaching materials in classroom lessons. The level of learning achievement is particular low among the most numerous pupils at lower grades compared to pupils of other grades, presumably because of the relatively smaller inputs of such resources as teachers, classrooms and textbooks. The high number of children enrolled in P1 at the wrong age and the high drop-out rate are also contributory factors (IOB, 2008). Other reasons often pointed out for the low level of learning achievement are the indifference of the parents of pupils of public schools to school management, etc. as they have tended to leave everything relating to the education of their children to the school since the introduction of UPE and the inadequate monitoring/inspection of schools (IOB, 2008).

The SACMEQ III results for Ugandan pupils show that the average score is higher for urban areas than rural areas, for the high income group than the low income group and for boys than girls. These results clearly indicate a significant impact of regional and income gaps on the reading and mathematical ability (SACMEQ, 2010).

#### (4) High Level of Teacher Absenteeism

In Uganda, in spite of high proportion of qualified teachers in total number, teachers' poor attitude to work is recognized as a serious issue. In particular, teacher absenteeism is a rampant problem in Uganda which leads to a low attendance rate among pupils. In 2000, head teachers in several schools in southern Africa were asked how often they are confronted with the unjustified absence of teachers. The results of this survey revealed that this occurs more often in Uganda

than in any other country. In Uganda, 24% of head teachers are frequently confronted with the unjustified absence of teachers which is significantly more than in any other country (IOB, 2008).

Chaudhury et al. (2005) investigated the absence of teachers and health workers in six countries (Uganda, Peru, Ecuador, Bangladesh, Indonesia and India). The results show that teacher absenteeism is the highest in Uganda. Even though the reasons for this high teacher absenteeism in Uganda were not clearly established by this study, the researchers found that head teachers, better-educated teachers and older teachers are more likely to be absent. Moreover, the attendance of male teachers is lower than that of female teachers. Local teachers are less likely to be absent than teachers born in other districts. The socioeconomic environment also plays a role: absence is lower in areas with a higher literacy rate. Finally, teachers at private schools are absent less often than teachers at public schools. Schools with (relatively) more functional teachers' houses have a lower absence rate. High parental involvement correlates with low teacher absenteeism (IOB, 2008). Through interviews with the PTC conducted as part of the field survey, information emerged that some public school teachers teach at public or private schools on a part-time basis in their spare time. No exact information on the situation of such part-time work by teachers and is implications regarding absenteeism is, however, available in the existing reference materials.

#### (5) Shortage of Textbooks

In regard to such teaching materials as textbooks and teacher guides, the number of textbooks for the four main subjects (English, mathematics, science and social studies) increased by almost 60% between 2000 and 2005, improving the access of pupils to textbooks. On average, three pupils share one book for each subject and this situation is far from satisfactory. By region, the book-pupil ratio is lower in the Northern Region and relatively higher in the Western Region. This disparity is assumed to be the result of the fact that the distribution of textbooks does not necessarily reflect the actual needs of each school and that textbooks are not efficiently distributed to remote schools (IOB, 2008).

#### (6) Low Gross Enrollment Rate of Secondary Schools

There are several factors responsible for the low gross enrollment rate of secondary education. Firstly, the primary education completion rate is still low. Secondly, even though conscious efforts have been made to make secondary education free, the number of secondary school pupils who enjoy free tuition is not very large. Many families cannot afford to pay the tuition fee for secondary education. Thirdly, because the number of secondary schools is still small, their locations are quite distant for many potential pupils. Fourthly, the intake figure for public secondary schools is small.

In fact, 40% of secondary schools are private schools. As MoES does not have accurate data on private schools, it must be remembered that the number of enrolled pupils, drop-out rate and

other data for secondary education are not very accurate.

# 7.3 Priorities of Uganda's Education Policy

In the ESSP, MoES identifies the following strategic priorities to achieve the goals set in primary and secondary education, in addition to education administration and finance.

# (1) Primary Education

Objective 1: Expansion in equitable access to quality primary education and improvement of the transition rate and the completion rate

- To support and encourage NGO programs targeted for disadvantaged children and youth in poor communities in rural and urban areas
- To reinforce education for children with special needs (orphans, children in nomadic communities and conflict areas, dropouts and handicapped children).
- To lower the cost of primary education to many families with the introduction of UPE and UPPET including a nutrition improvement program for children from poor families
- To lower social-cultural barriers to girls' attendance
- To expand and improve primary school facilities
- To promote enrollment of six-year-olds and to reduce repetition and dropout

# Objective 2: Improvement of the quality and relevance of primary education, as well as primary-level pupils mastering basic literacy and numeracy

- To improve the instructional processes that lead to students' achievement of literacy, numeracy, and basic life skills
- To strengthen the teaching force through improvement of teaching
- To use pre-primary programs and other measures to prepare children for the intellectual requirements of primary school

# (2) Secondary Education

# Objective 1: Increased and equitable participation in a coherent and flexible post-primary system

- To reconfigure sub-sector of post-primary education (six-year secondary education and two to three-year BTVET)
- To expand, equip, and improve post-primary school facilities
- To improve equity in the participation of girls and needy students (those from poor families or handicapped)

## Objective 2: Post-primary students prepared to enter the workforce and higher education

• To make more efficient use of teachers/instructors' and learners' time, and other resources by reviewing curriculum and teaching materials, by redeploying teachers from schools

where there is a surplus to those where there are deficiencies, increasing standard minimum class size, and introducing double-shifts and multi-grade classrooms

- To reconfigure sub-sector of post-primary education (six-year secondary education and two to three-year BTVET)
- To provide highest priority to competencies for the workforce and further education
- To reform and improve curricula and instruction in priority disciplines
- To strengthen the teaching force in terms of quantity and quality

(3) Education Administrative and Financing Capacity

Objective 1: Improvement of accuracy of education data and information

- To strengthen a data collection system from schools and to improve EMIS
- To improve a management information system of teacher attendance and textbook distribution
- To improve a system of planning and M&E

## Objective 2: Quality assurance and accountability throughout the sector

- To improve working conditions for teachers and a teacher management system
- To improve an evaluation system of administrative capacity of local government
- To introduce award programs for schools and counties in terms of school management and administrative management, respectively
- To introduce a coherent education assessment policy per education level and grade
- To expand activities of School Management Committee (SMC) by strengthening relationship between SMC and communities
- To establish a system of appropriate standards and performance monitoring
- To prevent and reduce corruption and misuse of public resources

Objective 3: Strengthened capacity of the Ministry - its agencies and institutions - to provide leadership and management

- To reorganize MoES and deploy full-time staff to vacant posts
- To strengthen leadership and management of PTC through capacity development of head teachers
- To enhance capacity of UNEB
- To improve accountability
- To strengthen management of education service delivery and monitoring system through decentralization

Objective 4: Partnerships between the Ministry and other agencies in service delivery and capacity-building

• To develop and maintain partnerships with other agencies in service delivery and capacity

building

# 7.4 Challenges and Considerations

The study has identified the following challenges and points for consideration for any attempt to analyse the basic education sub-sector.

# (1) Insufficient Availability of Statistical Data

The educational statistics of MoES in Uganda do not necessarily give an accurate total picture of the country's primary and secondary education because of the low response rate of private schools to its questionnaire and lack of data on pupil transfers between schools even though this is a common phenomenon. The available data published by the World Bank and other organizations tends to be rather old (prior to 2005), making it extremely difficult to establish the latest picture of education in Uganda.

# (2) Analysis from the Viewpoint of MoES and Donors

In view of the fact that the present analysis is based on existing materials prepared by MoES, donors and international organizations, the analysis approach reflects the viewpoint of MoES, donors and international organizations, making it difficult to conduct the analysis from the viewpoint of schools or regions reflecting the reality of front-line education as observed by the researcher.

(3) Difficulty in collecting information from interviews with MoES officials during a short period due to complex organizations within MoES

In the process of making appointments with MoES officials, submission of the official request letter to the top of the directorate each interviewee belongs to, alongside the approval letter from the Director, was required. Since each directorate in MoES has Director and Commissioners, it took time to make necessary arrangements. It is necessary to allow adequate time to conduct the study.

(4) Difficulty in collecting information on private schools

In Uganda, compared with its neighboring countries, private schools represent high proportion of the total number of schools in both primary and secondary education. However, as described in (1), EMIS does not fully cover data on private schools. Private schools located in urban areas are considered to provide quality education services, while private schools in rural areas suffer from inadequate facilities and many unqualified teachers. Difficulty in collecting information on private schools was one of constraints to identify challenges in Uganda's basic education sector.

ANNEX

# I. Survey Items and Indicators

| N | Aain Grouping | in Grouping Sub Grouping    |                                  | Items and Indicators                                       |  |  |  |
|---|---------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|   |               |                             |                                  | Current situation of school age population                 |  |  |  |
| 1 | Population    | 1-1                         | Current situation and projection | Projection of school age population                        |  |  |  |
|   | projection    |                             | 1 5                              | Regional distribution of population density                |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Education system   |  |  |  |
|   | Educational   |                             |                                  | National development policy                                |  |  |  |
| 2 | development   | 2-1                         | Trend of improvement policy      | Education development policy                               |  |  |  |
| 2 | trend         | 2-1                         | on education sector              | Education sector program                                   |  |  |  |
|   | trenta        |                             |                                  | Education sector program                                   |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Donor         |                             | Trend of donor assistance        | Amount and contents of assistance and aid modality         |  |  |  |
| 3 | assistance    | 3-1                         | Extent of adopting the global    | Donor coordination   |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             | aid framework                    | Adoption of the aid framework                              |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Net enrollment rate  |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | (Primary/Secondary)  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Access        | 4-1                         | Enrollment trend                 | Gross enrollment rate (Primary/Secondary)                  |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             | Projection of enrollment rate    | Net intake rate (Primary/Secondary)                        |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Gross intake rate (Primary/Secondary)                      |  |  |  |
|   | Literacy,     |                             |                                  | • •  |  |  |  |
| 5 | non-formal    | 5-1                         | Literacy rate                    | Adult literacy rate  |  |  |  |
|   | education     |                             | 2                                |  |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Promotion rate by grade                                    |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Repetition rate by grade                                   |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Dropout rate by grade                                      |  |  |  |
|   | Internal      | <i>c</i> 1                  |                                  | Transition rate  |  |  |  |
| 6 | efficiency    | 6-1                         | Quantitative internal efficiency | Cohort survival rate                                       |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Schooling years per graduate                               |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Total number of pupils form whom educational               |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | investment resulted in waste.                              |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Repetition Rate by Group                                   |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Survival Rate by Group                                     |  |  |  |
|   |               | 7-1                         | Comparative analysis of access   | Promotion Rate by Group                                    |  |  |  |
|   |               | , 1                         | by group                         | Transition Rate by Group                                   |  |  |  |
| 7 | Equity        |                             |                                  | Gender Parity Index  |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             | Special education for pupils     |  |  |  |  |
|   |               | 7-2                         | with special needs and inclusive | Education policy and current situation of special          |  |  |  |
|   |               | , 2                         | education                        | education  |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Completion rate  |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Performance of the national examination                    |  |  |  |
|   |               | 8-1                         | Situation of learning outcome    | Performance of international student ability assessment    |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | such as PISA, SACMEO etc.                                  |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             |                                  | Pupils per class by region                                 |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             | Analysis of learning             | Pupils per class by group                                  |  |  |  |
|   | Quality 8-2   |                             | environment                      | Number of schools introducing shift system                 |  |  |  |
| 8 |               |                             |                                  | Teaching hours   |  |  |  |
| 0 |               |                             | Procurement and distribution     | Analysis on procurement system of teaching material        |  |  |  |
|   |               | 8-3                         | system of teaching material      | Efficiency of distribution system of teaching material     |  |  |  |
|   |               | <b>8</b> .1                 | Definition of academic ability   | Definition of academic ability to achieve                  |  |  |  |
|   |               | 0-4                         | Definition of academic admity    | Existence of national nunil/student shility standards      |  |  |  |
|   |               | Quality assurance system of |                                  | Contents of national pupil/student ability standards       |  |  |  |
|   |               | 8-5                         | education                        | Punil/ctudent ability assessment system                    |  |  |  |
|   |               |                             | Cucation                         | How to put the results of pupil/student ability assessment |  |  |  |

1-1 Standard Research Items and Indicators for the Basic Education Sector Analysis

| N  | Iain Grouping                      |       | Sub Grouping                       | Items and Indicators                                    |  |  |
|----|------------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|
|    |                                    |       |                                    | open to the public                                      |  |  |
|    |                                    |       |                                    | School inspector system                                 |  |  |
|    |                                    | 8-6   | Curriculum                         | Capacity of curriculum development agency               |  |  |
|    |                                    | 00    | Currentum                          | Curriculum updating                                     |  |  |
|    |                                    | 8-7   | Medium of instruction              | Medium of instruction (languages)                       |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | Teacher qualification and          | Number of Pupils Per Teacher (Regional distribution)    |  |  |
|    |                                    | 9-1   | placement                          | Number of Pupils Per Teacher by Type (Regional          |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | *                                  | distribution)   |  |  |
|    |                                    |       |                                    | Teacher training System (pre-service and in-service)    |  |  |
| 9  | Teachers                           | 9-2   | Analysis on teacher education      | Appropriateness of teacher training curriculum          |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | system                             | pedagogy and educational psychology                     |  |  |
|    |                                    | 9-3   | Analysis on teacher salary         | Level of teacher salary                                 |  |  |
|    |                                    | )-5   | Analysis on teacher recruiting     | Teacher recruiting and removing agency                  |  |  |
|    |                                    | 9-4   | and management                     | Regulations of recruiting and removing teachers         |  |  |
|    |                                    |       |                                    | Situation of devolution among education administration  |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | Analysis of structure and          | Canacity of each level                                  |  |  |
|    | Educational 10-1<br>administration |       | function of devolution             | Mechanism of devolution and financial distribution      |  |  |
| 10 |                                    |       |                                    | Situation of devolution process                         |  |  |
|    | system                             |       | Management of Ministry of          |   |  |  |
|    |                                    | 10-2  | Education (MoE)                    | Management capacity of MoE                              |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | Demonstrate of a demotion as stern | Percentage of government education budget and           |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11.1  | Percentage of education sector     | expenditure of education sector comparing to GDP        |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11-1  | and expenditure                    | Percentage of government education expenditure in total |  |  |
|    |                                    |       |                                    | government expenditure                                  |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | Percentage of education            |   |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11-2  | sub-sectors in the government      | Percentage of education sub-sectors in the government   |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | education budget and               | education budget and expenditure                        |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | Paraentage of advection sector     |   |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11-3  | in the total government working    | Percentage of education sector in the government        |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11.5  | budget                             | working budget and expenditure                          |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | Analysis of recurrent budget       | Percentage of teacher salary in the education recurrent |  |  |
|    | Amalania of                        | 11-4  | and expenditure                    | budget  |  |  |
| 11 | Analysis of                        | 11 5  | Percentage of donor assistance     |   |  |  |
| 11 | finance                            | 11-5  | in MoE budget                      | Percentage of donor assistance in MoE budget            |  |  |
|    | innance                            | 11-6  | Analysis on flow and               | Flow of donor's fund                                    |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11-0  | management of donor's fund         | Management system                                       |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11-7  | Analysis of private spending on    | Percentage of spending of beneficiaries and households  |  |  |
|    |                                    | ,     | education                          | in education expenditure                                |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11-8  | Analysis on unit cost              | Government education expenditure per pupil/student by   |  |  |
|    |                                    |       |                                    | each education stage                                    |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | Mid-term needs projection of       | Number of teachers to be needed in the mid-term period  |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11-9  | teachers and expenses              | Projection of expenditure needed in the mid-term period |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | penses                             |   |  |  |
|    |                                    |       | Analysis of management system      | Mechanism of public finance management system in        |  |  |
|    |                                    | 11-10 | of education budget and            | education sector  |  |  |
| L  |                                    |       | government expenditure             | Appropriateness of the existing mechanism               |  |  |
|    | Public                             |       | Situation of public-private        | Comparison of enrollments by school type                |  |  |
| 12 | private                            | 12-1  | partnership (PPP)                  | Factor analysis on which groups go to which school      |  |  |
|    | partnerships                       |       |                                    | types   |  |  |

(Source: JICA "Standard Research Item and Methodology of the Education Sector Analysis" (Draft as of

October 2011)

| No.  | Date        | ;  | Activities  |  |  |  |
|--|-------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1  | 27-May      | Sun  | 14:10 Arrival from Nairobi at Entebbe by KQ412  |  |  |  |
| 2  | 28-May      | Mon  | <ul><li>10:00 Meeting with JICA Uganda Office</li><li>11:00 Meeting with MoES Planning Dept.</li><li>pm Meeting arrangement with MoES Depts.</li></ul>  |  |  |  |
| 3  | 29-May      | Tue  | 10:00 Meeting with Basic Education Commissioner<br>pm Meeting arrangement with MoES Depts.  |  |  |  |
| 4 30-May Wed 11:00 Meeting with Secondary Education Det.<br>15:00 Meeting with Special Needs Education |             | <ul><li>10:00 Meeting with Secondary Education Dept.</li><li>11:00 Meeting with Private Secondary Dept.</li><li>15:00 Meeting with Special Needs Education Dept.</li></ul> |   |  |  |  |
| 5  | 31-May      | Thu  | 8:30 Government Primary School Visit<br>11:00 Meeting with National Curriculum Development Center<br>pm Data analysis and report writing  |  |  |  |
| 6  | 6 1-Jun Fri |  | 61-JunFri9:00 Meeting with Primary/Secondary Teacher Education<br>2:00 Meeting with Teacher Training College  |  |  |  |
| 7  | 2-Jun       | Sat  | Preparation of meeting memo and data analysis   |  |  |  |
| 8  | 3-Jun       | Sun  | Preparation of meeting memo and data analysis   |  |  |  |
| 9  | 4-Jun       | Mon  | Data analysis and report preparation  |  |  |  |
| 10   | 5-Jun       | Tue  | <ul> <li>8:30 Meeting with Uganda National Examination Board</li> <li>10:00 Meeting with UNICEF</li> <li>12:00 Meeting with USAID</li> <li>14:00 Meeting with Education Service Commission (ESC)</li> </ul> |  |  |  |
| 11   | 6-Jun       | Wed  | 8:30 Meeting with Department of Education Standard<br>2:00 Meeting with MoES EMIS   |  |  |  |
| 12   | 7-Jun       | Thu  | am School Visit (Private Secondary School)<br>2:00 Meeting with Belgium Embassy   |  |  |  |
| 13   | 8-Jun       | Fri  | 9:00 Meeting with JICA Uganda Office<br>2:00 Meeting with MoES and Vocational Training Center   |  |  |  |

# II. Itinerary of the Field Survey

# **III.** Collected Data

### Chapter 2

| (1991  and  2     | 2002)                |                      |                           |  |  |
|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| Region            | 1991<br>(Population) | 2002<br>(Population) | Area<br>(Km <sup>2)</sup> | Population Density<br>(person/Km <sup>2)</sup> | Annual Average<br>Population Growth<br>Rate (1991-2002)<br>(%) |
| Kampala (Capital) | 774,241              | 1,189,142            | 197.0                     | 7,258.6  | 3.7  |
| Central Region    | 4,843,594            | 6,575,425            | 61,403.3                  | 175.7  | 2.6  |
| Eastern Region    | 4,128,469            | 6,204,915            | 39,478.8                  | 225.8  | 3.5  |
| Northern Region   | 3,151,955            | 5,363,669            | 85,391.7                  | 64.8   | 4.6  |
| Western Region    | 4,547,687            | 6,298,075            | 55,276.5                  | 126.9  | 2.8  |
| Total             | 16,671,705           | 2,442,084            | 241,550.7                 | 123.9  | 3.3  |

2-1 Population, Area, Size, Population Density and Population Growth Rate by Region (1991 and 2002)

(Source: UBS, 2002)

### 2-2 Poverty Level by District (Ratio of the population living on less than US\$ 1/day)



(Source: UBS, 2002)

| Goal                                      | Target   | Indicator  | Baseline<br>(2009) | Target (2015) | Current<br>Status |
|---|--|--|--------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| Goal 1:<br>Eradicate<br>extreme poverty   | Target1.A:Halve,between1990 and 2015,the proportion of people  | Proportion of population<br>below national poverty line<br>(poverty headcount)               | 31%<br>(2006)      | 25%           | On Track          |
| and hunger                                | whose<br>income is less than one<br>dollar a day   | Poverty gap  | 9%<br>(2006)       | %             | No Target         |
|   | Target 1.C: Halve,<br>between 1990 and 2015,<br>the proportion of people<br>who suffer from hunger     | Prevalence of underweight<br>children under five years of<br>age                             | 16%<br>(2006)      | 10%           | On Track          |
| Goal 2:<br>Achieve                        | Target 2.A: Ensure that,by2015,children  | Net enrolment rate in primary education  | 93%                | 100%          | Slow              |
| universal<br>primary<br>education         | everywhere, boys and<br>girls alike, will be able to<br>complete a full course of<br>primary schooling | 2.2 Proportion of pupils<br>starting grade 1 who reach<br>last grade of primary<br>education | 52%                | 100%          | Slow              |
|   |  | Literacy rate of 15- to 24-year-olds, women and men  | 88%<br>(2008)      | %             | No Target         |
| Goal 3:<br>Promote gender<br>equality and | Target 3.A: Eliminate<br>gender disparity in<br>primary and secondary                                  | Ratios of girls to boys in primary education   | 1.00               | 1             | On Track          |
| women                                     | 2005, and in all levels of   | Ratios of girls to boys in secondary education   | 0.84               | 1             | On Track          |
|   | later than 2015  | Share of women in wage<br>employment in the<br>non-agricultural<br>sector                    | 28%<br>(2006)      | %             | No Target         |
|   |  | Proportion of seats held by<br>women in national parliament                                  | 30%<br>(2006)      | 50%           | No Target         |

2-3 Progress Situations of MDGs in Uganda (Goal 1 through Goal 3)

(Source: MFPED, 2010)

### Chapter 3

|  | T 1'                    | Base Year |         |         | Target  |         |         |
|--|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| NDP Goals  | Indicator               | 2008/09   | 2010/11 | 2011/12 | 2012/13 | 2013/14 | 2014/15 |
| Goal 3<br>Enhancing<br>Human<br>Capital<br>Development | Literacy Rate           | 73.6      | 75.2    | 76.9    | 78.7    | 80.4    | 82.2    |
|  | NER - Primary (%)       | 93.2      | 93.3    | 95      | 95.6    | 96      | 96.4    |
| Goal 5   | NER - Secondary (%)     | 23.5      | 25      | 28      | 30      | 32      | 35      |
| Increasing   | Pupil-Teacher Ratio     | 53        | 49      | 47      | 46      | 44      | 43      |
| Access to  | Pupil-Classroom Ratio   | 72        | 68      | 66      | 64      | 63      | 61      |
| Quality Social   | Student-Teacher Ratio   | 18        | 19      |         |         |         |         |
| Services   | Student-Classroom Ratio | 45        |         |         |         |         |         |
|  | BTVET Enrollment        | 185,430   | 215,181 | 249,705 | 289,768 | 336,258 | 390,208 |

#### **3-1** Educational Goals of the NDP

(Source: GoU, 2010)

# 3-2 Structure of Uganda's Education System



(Source: UNESCO, 2010)





(Source: MoEST, 2012)

# Chapter 4

| (Unit:                     | persons) |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|----------------------------|----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Education<br>Stage         | Gender   | 2000       | 2001       | 2002       | 2003       | 2004       | 2005       |
| Primary                    | Male     | 2,486,348  | 2,569,683  | 2,656,851  | 2,746,368  | 2,836,625  | 2,925,908  |
| Education                  | Female   | 2,510,621  | 2,595,055  | 2,681,084  | 2,767,434  | 2,852,968  | 2,936,467  |
| (Age: 6-12)                | Total    | 4,996,969  | 5,164,738  | 5,337,935  | 5,513,802  | 5,689,593  | 5,862,375  |
| Lower                      | Male     | 1,155,843  | 1,192,622  | 1,231,975  | 1,273,413  | 1,316,839  | 1,362,339  |
| Education                  | Female   | 1,162,729  | 1,202,045  | 1,243,391  | 1,286,485  | 1,331,291  | 1,377,857  |
| (Age: 13-16)               | Total    | 2,318,572  | 2,394,667  | 2,475,366  | 2,559,898  | 2,648,130  | 2,740,196  |
| Upper                      | Male     | 517,225    | 533,829    | 551,096    | 569,505    | 589,238    | 609,895    |
| Education                  | Female   | 518,369    | 535,957    | 554,457    | 573,986    | 594,525    | 615,839    |
| (Age: 17-18)               | Total    | 1,035,594  | 1,069,786  | 1,105,553  | 1,143,491  | 1,183,763  | 1,225,734  |
| Total                      | Male     | 1,673,068  | 1,726,451  | 1,783,071  | 1,842,918  | 1,906,077  | 1,972,234  |
| Population -<br>Secondary  | Female   | 1,681,098  | 1,738,002  | 1,797,848  | 1,860,471  | 1,925,816  | 1,993,696  |
| Education<br>(Age: 13 -18) | Total    | 3,354,166  | 3,464,453  | 3,580,919  | 3,703,389  | 3,831,893  | 3,965,930  |
| Total                      | Male     | 4,159,416  | 4,296,134  | 4,439,922  | 4,589,286  | 4,742,702  | 4,898,142  |
| Population -               | Female   | 4,191,719  | 4,333,057  | 4,478,932  | 4,627,905  | 4,778,784  | 4,930,163  |
| Education<br>(Age: 6 -16)  | Total    | 8,351,135  | 8,629,191  | 8,918,854  | 9,217,191  | 9,521,486  | 9,828,305  |
| Education<br>Stage         | Gender   | 2006       | 2007       | 2008       | 2009       | 2010       | 2011       |
| Primary                    | Male     | 3,023,410  | 3,129,156  | 3,241,540  | 3,357,619  | 3,474,248  | 3,599,169  |
| Education                  | Female   | 3,027,005  | 3,123,999  | 3,226,523  | 3,332,304  | 3,438,880  | 3,553,645  |
| (Age: 6-12)                | Total    | 6,050,415  | 6,253,155  | 6,468,063  | 6,689,923  | 6,913,128  | 7,152,814  |
| Lower                      | Male     | 1,405,186  | 1,450,624  | 1,498,110  | 1,547,443  | 1,598,529  | 1,650,136  |
| Education                  | Female   | 1,421,906  | 1,467,378  | 1,513,665  | 1,560,680  | 1,608,612  | 1,656,684  |
| (Age: 13-16)               | Total    | 2,827,092  | 2,918,002  | 3,011,775  | 3,108,123  | 3,207,141  | 3,306,820  |
| Upper                      | Male     | 628,711    | 648,743    | 670,102    | 692,784    | 716,290    | 738,868    |
| Secondary                  | Female   | 635,685    | 656,698    | 678,796    | 701,975    | 725,590    | 747,728    |
| (Age: 17-18)               | Total    | 1,264,396  | 1,305,441  | 1,348,898  | 1,394,759  | 1,441,880  | 1,486,596  |
| Total<br>Population -      | Male     | 2,033,897  | 2,099,367  | 2,168,212  | 2,240,227  | 2,314,819  | 2,389,004  |
| Secondary                  | Female   | 2,057,591  | 2,124,076  | 2,192,461  | 2,262,655  | 2,334,202  | 2,404,412  |
| (Age: 13 -18)              | Total    | 4,091,488  | 4,223,443  | 4,360,673  | 4,502,882  | 4,649,021  | 4,793,416  |
| Total<br>Population -      | Male     | 5,057,307  | 5,228,523  | 5,409,752  | 5,597,846  | 5,789,067  | 5,988,173  |
| Basic                      | Female   | 5,084,596  | 5,248,075  | 5,418,984  | 5,594,959  | 5,773,082  | 5,958,057  |
| (Age: 6 -16)               | Total    | 10,141,903 | 10,476,598 | 10,828,736 | 11,192,805 | 11,562,149 | 11,946,230 |

# 4-1 Trend of School Age Population Based on UNESCO Statistics (2000 - 2011)

(Source: UIS, 2012)

|                 |             | 2004   | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008    | 2009    |
|-----------------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|
| Facilities      |             | 538    | 405    | 717    | 703    | 1,724   | 2,469   |
|                 | Male        | 20,596 | 15,130 | 34,500 | 37,689 | 86,006  | 114,473 |
| Enrollment      | Female      | 21,179 | 15,110 | 34,840 | 38,849 | 89,296  | 119,955 |
|                 | Total       | 41,775 | 30,240 | 69,340 | 76,538 | 175,302 | 234,428 |
| Gross Enrollmer | nt Rate (%) | 2.24%  | 2.19%  | 2.35%  | 2.50%  | 5.60%   | 7.60%   |
| Net Enrollment  | Rate (%)    | 1.47%  | 1.63%  | 1.60%  | 1.50%  | 3.90%   | 5.60%   |

4-2 Number of Facilities, Enrollment and Enrollment Rate of Pre-Primary Education (2004 – 2010)

(Source: MoES, 2004~2009, 2010c)

Note: Rise and fall in the figures from 2004 until 2007 were reflected by fluctuation in the ratio of respondents (33% in 2004, 20% in 2005, and 22% in 2007, respectively) (the ratio in 2006 is not available).

|                                      | 2002   | 2003   | 2004   | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   |
|--------------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Public Schools                       | 10,420 | 10,460 | 10,876 | 11,313 | 11,350 | 11,654 | 11,787 | 12,305 | 12,576 |
| % of Responding<br>Schools           | 78.2%  | 78.3%  | 81.3%  | 83.3%  | 80.5%  | 79.1%  | 73.8%  | 71.8%  | 70.4%  |
| Private Schools                      | 1,884  | 1,705  | 1,521  | 1,509  | 1,877  | 2,029  | 1,824  | 3,922  | 5,289  |
| % of Responding<br>Schools           | 14.1%  | 12.8%  | 11.4%  | 11.1%  | 13.3%  | 13.8%  | 11.4%  | 22.9%  | 29.6%  |
| Community Schools                    | 994    | 1,121  | 937    | 713    | 851    | 861    | 614    | 900    |        |
| % of Responding<br>Schools           | 7.5%   | 8.4%   | 7.0%   | 5.3%   | 6.0%   | 5.8%   | 3.8%   | 5.2%   |        |
| Total(Responding Schools)            | 13,332 | 13,353 | 13,371 | 13,576 | 14,093 | 14,728 | 15,962 | 17,127 | 17,865 |
| Non-responding Schools               | 34     | 67     | 37     | 41     | 15     | 184    | 1,737  | 2,750  | 2,583  |
| % of Schools Registered<br>with MoES | 0.3%   | 0.5%   | 0.3%   | 0.3%   | 0.1%   | 1.2%   | 10.9%  | 13.8%  | 12.7%  |
| Schools Registered with<br>MoES      | 14,281 | 14,816 | 15,339 | 15,828 | 17,807 | 18,583 | 19,185 | 19,877 | 20,448 |

4-3 Number and Proportion of Primary Schools by Ownership

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010c)

Note: In the educational statistics of MoES, statistical data on community schools had been treated separately from public and private schools. In 2010, MoES combined their data with data on private schools (Interview with Planning Department of MoES).

|  |  |  | -  |  |  | _  |  |  |       |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
|  | 2002   | 2003   | 2004   | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010  |
| Public Schools   | 711  | 713  | 764  | 809  | 807  | 877  | 914  | 949  | 996   |
| % of Responding Schools  | 32.3%  | 34.7%  | 38.8%  | 41.3%  | 35.3%  | 33.2%  | 31.4%  | 30.1%  | 30.8% |
| Private Schools  | 799  | 855  | 1,175  | 903  | 1,064  | 1,254  | 1,666  | 1,825  | 2,238 |
| % of Responding Schools  | 36.4%  | 41.6%  | 59.7%  | 46.0%  | 46.5%  | 47.4%  | 57.3%  | 58.0%  | 69.2% |
| Community Schools  | 688  | 487  | 30   | 249  | 404  | 485  | 328  | 375  |       |
| % of Responding Schools  | 31.3%  | 23.7%  | 1.5%   | 12.7%  | 17.7%  | 18.3%  | 11.3%  | 11.9%  |       |
| Total (Responding Schools)   | 2,198  | 2,055  | 1,969  | 1,961  | 2,286  | 2,644  | 2,908  | 3,149  | 3,234 |
| % of Responding Schools         Private Schools         % of Responding Schools         Community Schools         % of Responding Schools         Total (Responding Schools) | 32.3%<br>799<br>36.4%<br>688<br>31.3%<br>2,198 | 34.7%<br>855<br>41.6%<br>487<br>23.7%<br>2,055 | 38.8%<br>1,175<br>59.7%<br>30<br>1.5%<br>1,969 | 41.3%<br>903<br>46.0%<br>249<br>12.7%<br>1,961 | 35.3%<br>1,064<br>46.5%<br>404<br>17.7%<br>2,286 | 33.2%<br>1,254<br>47.4%<br>485<br>18.3%<br>2,644 | 31.4%<br>1,666<br>57.3%<br>328<br>11.3%<br>2,908 | 30.1%<br>1,825<br>58.0%<br>375<br>11.9%<br>3,149 | 6     |

4-4 Number and Proportion of Secondary Schools by Ownership

(Source: MoES,  $2002 \sim 2010c$ )

Note 1: In the educational statistics of MoES, statistical data on community schools had been treated separately from public and private schools. In 2010, MoES combined their data with data on private schools (Interview with Planning Department of MoES).

Note 2: The number of secondary schools from MoES database was not obtained.

|        | 2000      | 2001      | 2002      | 2003      | 2004      | 2005      |
|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Male   | 3,395,554 | 3,528,035 | 3,721,135 | 3,872,589 | 3,732,928 | 3,642,568 |
| Female | 3,163,459 | 3,372,881 | 3,633,018 | 3,760,725 | 3,644,364 | 3,581,311 |
| Total  | 6,559,013 | 6,900,916 | 7,354,153 | 7,633,314 | 7,377,292 | 7,223,879 |
|        | 2006      | 2007      | 2008      | 2009      | 2010      |           |
| Male   | 3,623,854 | 3,779,338 | 3,987,160 | 4,150,037 | 4,179,187 |           |
| Female | 3,600,907 | 3,758,633 | 3,976,819 | 4,147,743 | 4,195,400 |           |
| Total  | 7,224,761 | 7,537,971 | 7,963,979 | 8,297,780 | 8,374,587 |           |

4-5 **Enrollment Trend of Primary Schools (2000 – 2010)** 

(Source: MoES, 2000~2010 e)



4-6 **Enrollment by Grade and Gender of Primary Schools (2010)** 

|             | P1        | P2        | P3        | P4        | P5        | P6      | P7      |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|
| Male        | 974,209   | 668,145   | 666,162   | 646,705   | 526,687   | 420,405 | 276,935 |
| Female      | 969,343   | 667,451   | 663,527   | 656,279   | 539,245   | 431,959 | 267,596 |
| Total       | 1,943,552 | 1,335,596 | 1,329,689 | 1,302,984 | 1,065,932 | 852,364 | 544,531 |
| (Source) Ma | EC 2010a) |           |           |           |           |         |         |

(Source: MoES, 2010e)

#### 4-7 **Enrollment Trend of Secondary Schools (2000-2010)**

|        | 2000    | 2001    | 2002      | 2003      | 2004      | 2005    |
|--------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------|
| Male   | 290,176 | 301,814 | 359,494   | 374,659   | 383,652   | 400,758 |
| Female | 228,755 | 237,972 | 296,457   | 308,950   | 313,855   | 327,635 |
| Total  | 518,931 | 539,786 | 655,951   | 683,609   | 697,507   | 728,393 |
|        | 2006    | 2007    | 2008      | 2009      | 2010      |         |
| Male   | 443,716 | 517,254 | 589,358   | 648,014   | 654,971   |         |
| Female | 370,371 | 437,074 | 499,386   | 546,440   | 570,721   |         |
| Total  | 814,087 | 954,328 | 1,088,744 | 1,194,454 | 1,225,692 |         |

(Source: MoES, 2000-2010 e)



|           | S1         | S2      | <b>S</b> 3 | S4      | S5     | S6     |
|-----------|------------|---------|------------|---------|--------|--------|
| Male      | 167,882    | 145,640 | 136,763    | 119,501 | 44,722 | 40,463 |
| Female    | 156,605    | 131,705 | 119,622    | 100,840 | 33,966 | 27,983 |
| Total     | 324,487    | 277,345 | 256,385    | 220,341 | 78,688 | 68,446 |
| (Campan N | LEC 2010.) |         |            |         |        |        |

(Source: MoES, 2010e)

|  | 4-9 | Trend of Gros | ss Enrollment | <b>Rate of Primary</b> | Education | (2002 - 2) | 2010) |
|--|-----|---------------|---------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|-------|
|--|-----|---------------|---------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|-------|

|             |         |             |        |        | •      |        | ,      |        |        |
|-------------|---------|-------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|             | 2002    | 2003        | 2004   | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   |
| Male        | 128.4%  | 129.9%      | 107.6% | 108.8% | 117.8% | 116.5% | 118.8% | 134.1% | 128.3% |
| Female      | 124.3%  | 125.1%      | 101.4% | 106.8% | 111.2% | 109.9% | 113.0% | 132.5% | 127.6% |
| Total       | 126.3%  | 127.5%      | 104.4% | 107.8% | 114.4% | 113.1% | 115.7% | 133.3% | 128.0% |
| (Source: Me | EC 2002 | $\sim 2010$ |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

| 4-10 | Trend of Net Enrollment Rate of Primar | y Education | (2002 - 2010) | ) |
|------|--|-------------|---------------|---|
|------|--|-------------|---------------|---|

|        | 2002  | 2003   | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Male   | 83.0% | 101.2% | 92.5% | 93.6% | 94.1% | 95.0% | 96.9% | 97.4% | 95.6% |
| Female | 99.8% | 100.4% | 87.6% | 92.4% | 90.1% | 91.4% | 93.1% | 94.7% | 96.4% |
| Total  | 84.8% | 100.8% | 90.0% | 93.0% | 92.0% | 93.3% | 95.0% | 96.1% | 96.0% |
|        |       |        |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

## 4-11 Trend of Gross Enrollment Rate of Secondary Education (2002 – 2010)

|             | 2002    | 2003        | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007   | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |  |  |  |
|-------------|---------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--|--|--|
| Male        | 21.1%   | 21.4%       | 19.1% | 20.5% | 24.7% | 27/.9% | 30.7% | 31.2% | 30.7% |  |  |  |
| Female      | 18.1%   | 18.4%       | 15.3% | 16.6% | 19.6% | 22.4%  | 24.7% | 25.4% | 26.0% |  |  |  |
| Total       | 19.6%   | 19.9%       | 17.2% | 18.6% | 22.0% | 25.0%  | 27.6% | 28.2% | 28.3% |  |  |  |
| (Courses Ma | EC 2002 | $-2010_{2}$ |       |       |       |        |       |       |       |  |  |  |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

# 4-8 Enrollment by Grade and Gender of Secondary Schools (2010)

|        | 2002      | 2003   | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
|--------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Male   | 17.3%     | 17.4%  | 15.5% | 16.3% | 20.0% | 22.8% | 25.2% | 25.1% | 25.7% |
| Female | 16.2%     | 16.4%  | 13.6% | 14.6% | 17.3% | 19.8% | 21.9% | 22.5% | 23.5% |
| Total  | 16.7%     | 16.9%  | 14.6% | 15.4% | 18.6% | 21.3% | 23.5% | 23.8% | 24.6% |
| (C     | EG 2002 - | 2010.) |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |

|  | 4-12 | Trend of Net Enrollment Rate of Secondary Education ( | 2002 - 2010 | J) |
|--|------|---|-------------|----|
|--|------|---|-------------|----|

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

### 4-13 Trend of Gross Intake Rate of Primary Education (2002 – 2010)

|        | 2002      | 2003   | 2004   | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   |
|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Male   | 152.0%    | 156.9% | 145.0% | 156.0% | 133.3% | 132.5% | 140.9% | 166.8% | 162.3% |
| Female | 158.0%    | 154.6% | 149.3% | 149.7% | 125.4% | 124.7% | 133.5% | 167.5% | 159.0% |
| Total  | 155.0%    | 155.7% | 147.1% | 152.8% | 129.2% | 128.5% | 137.1% | 168.1% | 160.6% |
| (C     | EC 2002 - | 2010.) |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

#### 4-14 Trend of Net Intake Rate of Primary Education (2002 – 2010)

|        | 2002  | 2003  | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Male   | 55.9% | 59.1% | 54.3% | 67.2% | 57.0% | 58.0% | 59.3% | 74.9% | 69.5% |
| Female | 59.7% | 59.0% | 58.0% | 66.5% | 56.0% | 56.9% | 58.8% | 73.1% | 70.9% |
| Total  | 57.8% | 59.1% | 55.9% | 66.8% | 56.0% | 57.4% | 59.0% | 71.4% | 70.2% |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

# 4-15 Trend of Promotion (Transition) Rate from Lower Secondary Education to Upper Secondary Education (2002 – 2010)

|              |        | 2002  | 2003  | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
|--------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Promotion    | Male   | 43.0% | 35.0% | 36.0% | 33.0% | 33.0% | 39.0% | 38.0% | 39.0% | 40.0% |
| Rate from S4 | Female | 49.0% | 38.0% | 39.0% | 36.0% | 37.0% | 42.0% | 41.0% | 44.0% | 45.8% |
| to S5        | Total  | 41.0% | 41.0% | 41.0% | 39.0% | 40.0% | 44.0% | 44.0% | 48.0% | 50.7% |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

#### 4-16 Trend of Repetition Rate for Primary and Secondary Education (2002 – 2010)

|                     | 2002  | 2003  | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Primary<br>School   | 11.2% | 13.8% | 13.3% | 13.4% | 15.1% | 14.8% | 11.0% | 12.2% | 10.9% |
| Secondary<br>School | 2.4%  | 2.2%  | 2.0%  | 2.3%  | 2.5%  | 3.0%  | 2.4%  | 2.3%  | 2.6%  |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)



4-17 Repetition Rate for P1 – P7 in Primary Education (2010)

(Source: MoES, 2010e)



# 4-18 Repetition Rate for S1 – S6 in Secondary Education (2010)

(Source: MoES, 2010e)



4-19 Comparison of Repetition Rate for Primary Education among Sub-Saharan Countries (2009) (Unit: %)

(Source: Developed by EPDC based on UIS data)

|        | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Male   | 4.4% | 4.4% | 4.7% | 5.0% | 5.0% | 5.0% | 4.8% | 4.5% | 4.4% |
| Female | 4.5% | 4.6% | 4.9% | 5.1% | 5.0% | 4.9% | 4.6% | 4.4% | 4.3% |
| Total  | 4.4% | 4.5% | 4.8% | 5.0% | 5.0% | 4.9% | 4.7% | 4.5% | 4.4% |

4-20 Trend of Dropout Rate for Primary Education (2002 – 2010)

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

# 4-21 Trend of Transition Rate from Primary Education to Lower Secondary Education (2002 – 2010)

|        | 2002  | 2003  | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Male   | 55.0% | 49.0% | 48.2% | 44.1% | 50.5% | 69.7% | 71.1% | 65.8% | 66.7% |
| Female | 57.4% | 49.1% | 48.1% | 45.0% | 51.4% | 67.4% | 68.0% | 62.0% | 63.0% |
| Total  | 56.1% | 49.0% | 48.2% | 44.5% | 50.9% | 68.6% | 69.6% | 63.9% | 64.8% |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

4-22 Trend of Cohort Survival Rate (from S1 to S5) (2002 – 2010)

|        |       |       |       | ·     | , (   | ,     |       |       |       |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|        | 2002  | 2003  | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
| Male   | 65.9% | 52.0% | 55.2% | 52.0% | 49.2% | 49.0% | 53.3% | 60.0% | 61.2% |
| Female | 70.8% | 51.0% | 56.2% | 53.0% | 49.8% | 50.0% | 54.9% | 61.8% | 62.9% |
| Total  | 68.3% | 52.0% | 55.7% | 52.0% | 49.5% | 49.0% | 54.1% | 60.9% | 62.0% |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

|            | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Primary    | 0.02 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Education  | 0.92 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.90 | 0.97 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| Lower      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Secondary  | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 0.87 |
| Education  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Upper      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Secondary  | 0.60 | 0.59 | 0.63 | 0.67 | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.65 | 0.74 | 0.72 | 0.75 |
| Education  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Total      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| -Secondary | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.83 | 0.82 | 0.85 |
| Education  |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

4-23 Trend of Gender Parity Index for Net Enrollment Rate (2000 – 2010)

(Source: UIS, 2012)

4-24 Trend of Completion Rate by Gender for P7 and S4 Pupils (2002 – 2010)

|    |        | 2002  | 2003  | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
|----|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|    | Male   | 58.8% | 66.0% | 72.0% | 54.0% | 55.0% | 50.0% | 51.0% | 55.0% | 56.0% |
| P7 | Female | 41.0% | 47.0% | 54.0% | 47.0% | 42.0% | 44.0% | 47.0% | 48.1% | 51.0% |
|    | Total  | 49.1% | 56.0% | 62.0% | 51.0% | 48.0% | 47.0% | 49.0% | 52.0% | 54.0% |
|    | Male   | 25.0% | 20.0% | 28.0% | 34.0% | 33.0% | 39.0% | 39.0% | 42.0% | 45.0% |
| S4 | Female | 19.0% | 17.0% | 22.0% | 26.0% | 25.0% | 31.0% | 31.0% | 31.0% | 32.0% |
|    | Total  | 22.0% | 18.0% | 25.0% | 30.0% | 29.0% | 35.0% | 35.1% | 37.0% | 39.0% |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

# 4-25 Net Enrollment Rate and Net Intake Rate for Primary Education and Secondary Education (2002 – 2010)

|                        | GER in Primary<br>Education | NER in Primary<br>Education | GER in Secondary<br>Education | NER in Secondary<br>Education |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Central Region         | 90.8%                       | 70.1%                       | 32.9%                         | 12.4%                         |
| Eastern Region         | 110.6%                      | 84.5%                       | 28.1%                         | 7.1%                          |
| Northeast<br>Region    | 45.5%                       | 36.6%                       | 44.7%                         | 0.4%                          |
| Northern Region        | 98.3%                       | 54.6%                       | 54.5%                         | 2.1%                          |
| Southwestern<br>Region | 96.5%                       | 83.5%                       | 73.1%                         | 5.6%                          |
| Western Region         | 85.7%                       | 59.0%                       | 69.9%                         | 3.5%                          |
| Total                  | 96.0%                       | 70.2%                       | 66.4%                         | 6.7%                          |

(Source: MoES, 2010e)

|            |    |        | 2003  | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
|------------|----|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|            |    | Male   | 33.1% | 35.1% | 37.0% | 44.2% | 43.8% | 43.8% | 55.2% | 60.4% |
| Dooding    | Р3 | Female | 35.5% | 37.8% | 40.0% | 46.9% | 47.2% | 45.3% | 56.5% | 61.3% |
|            |    | Total  | 34.3% | 36.7% | 39.0% | 45.6% | 45.5% | 44.5% | 55.9% | 60.9% |
| Reading    |    | Male   | 20.3% | 26.2% | 32.0% | 33.4% | 48.2% | 47.9% | 47.9% | 49.8% |
|            | P6 | Female | 19.5% | 23.8% | 28.0% | 33.6% | 50.8% | 47.8% | 48.2% | 51.1% |
|            |    | Total  | 20.0% | 25.0% | 30.0% | 33.5% | 49.6% | 47.9% | 48.1% | 50.5% |
|            |    | Male   | 43.9% | 45.0% | 46.0% | 45.4% | 46.3% | 74.6% | 72.8% | 75.0% |
|            | P3 | Female | 41.9% | 43.0% | 44.0% | 39.6% | 43.3% | 68.1% | 69.7% | 71.1% |
| Numoracy   |    | Total  | 42.9% | 44.0% | 45.0% | 42.6% | 44.8% | 71.4% | 71.3% | 72.7% |
| Numeracy - |    | Male   | 25.7% | 32.4% | 39.0% | 34.4% | 45.9% | 58.8% | 58.7% | 59.9% |
|            | P6 | Female | 15.3% | 21.2% | 27.0% | 26.7% | 37.2% | 48.4% | 48.1% | 49.5% |
|            |    | Total  | 20.5% | 26.8% | 33.0% | 30.5% | 41.4% | 53.5% | 53.3% | 55.4% |

4-26 National Assessment of Progress of Education: Trend of Achievement Level of P3 and P6 Pupils (2003 – 2010)

(Source: UNEB, 2010a)

# 4-27 National Assessment of Progress of Education: Trend of Achievement Level of S2 Pupils (2008 – 2010)

|         |        | 2008  | 2009  | 2010  |
|---------|--------|-------|-------|-------|
|         | Male   | 43.2% | 41.4% | 43.2% |
| Biology | Female | 28.8% | 30.6% | 32.5% |
|         | Total  | 36.7% | 36.3% | 38.2% |
|         | Male   | 74.4% | 60.8% | 74.4% |
| Math    | Female | 63.3% | 56.6% | 57.0% |
|         | Total  | 69.4% | 58.8% | 62.3% |
|         | Male   | 81.3% | 73.5% | 76.4% |
| English | Female | 82.5% | 78.8% | 81.5% |
| C       | Total  | 81.9% | 76.0% | 78.3% |

(Source: UNEB, 2010b)

### 4-28 SACMEQ II and III Results (Unit: points)

|              | SACMEQ  | 0 II (2000) | SACMEQ  | III (2007) |
|--------------|---------|-------------|---------|------------|
|              | Reading | Math        | Reading | Math       |
| Botswana     | 521     | 513         | 534.6   | 520.5      |
| Kenya        | 546     | 563         | 543.1   | 557.0      |
| Lesotho      | 451     | 447         | 467.9   | 476.9      |
| Malawi       | 429     | 433         | 433.5   | 447.0      |
| Mauritius    | 536     | 584         | 573.5   | 623.3      |
| Mozambique   | 517     | 530         | 476.0   | 483.8      |
| Namibia      | 449     | 431         | 496.9   | 471.0      |
| Seychelles   | 582     | 554         | 575.1   | 550.7      |
| South Africa | 492     | 486         | 494.9   | 494.8      |
| Swaziland    | 530     | 516         | 549.4   | 540.8      |
| Tanzania     | 546     | 522         | 577.8   | 552.7      |
| Uganda       | 482     | 506         | 478.7   | 481.9      |
| Zambia       | 440     | 435         | 434.4   | 435.2      |
| Zanzibar     | 478     | 478         | 536.8   | 489.9      |
| Zimbabwe     |         |             | 507.7   | 519.8      |
| Average      | 500     | 500         | 512.0   | 509.7      |

(Source: SACMEQ, 2010)



4-29 SACMEQ III Results

<sup>(</sup>Source: SACMEQ, 2010)

| 4-30 | Average Score by Region and Percentage of Pupils Read | ching Reading Competency |
|------|---|--------------------------|
|      | Level of SACMEQ III (Units: points, %)                |                          |

|          | Average<br>Score |         | 9       | 6 of Candi<br>(from Lo | dates at Ea<br>ower Level | ch Achieve<br>1 to Uppe | ement Leve<br>r Level 8) | el      |         |
|----------|------------------|---------|---------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------|---------|
|          | Reading          | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3                | Level 4                   | Level 5                 | Level 6                  | Level 7 | Level 8 |
| Central  | 488.7            | 4.6     | 13.5    | 24.7                   | 23.3                      | 14.8                    | 11.5                     | 6.8     | 0.9     |
| Eastern  | 462.7            | 7.5     | 17.4    | 31.1                   | 21.6                      | 12.4                    | 6.9                      | 2.6     | 0.3     |
| Northern | 456.8            | 8.7     | 21.1    | 28.0                   | 21.4                      | 12.4                    | 6.7                      | 1.6     | 0.1     |
| Weston   | 508.1            | 2.3     | 6.3     | 16.8                   | 28.6                      | 25.4                    | 15.0                     | 4.9     | 0.8     |
| Total    | 478.7            | 5.8     | 14.6    | 25.5                   | 23.7                      | 16.1                    | 9.9                      | 4.0     | 0.5     |
|          | Math             | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3                | Level 4                   | Level 5                 | Level 6                  | Level 7 | Level 8 |
| Central  | 483.8            | 4.8     | 32.1    | 36.3                   | 20.6                      | 4.6                     | 1.3                      | 0.3     | 0.0     |
| Eastern  | 471.5            | 6.2     | 38.1    | 35.3                   | 14.2                      | 4.6                     | 1.4                      | 0.3     | 0.0     |
| Northern | 461.3            | 7.2     | 44.1    | 33.3                   | 11.6                      | 2.5                     | 1.3                      | 0.0     | 0.0     |
| Weston   | 511.6            | 1.5     | 20.8    | 39.6                   | 26.0                      | 8.4                     | 3.4                      | 0.1     | 0.2     |
| Total    | 481.9            | 5.0     | 33.8    | 36.1                   | 18.0                      | 5.1                     | 1.8                      | 0.2     | 0.0     |

(Source: SACMEQ, 2010)

| 4-31 | Overall Evaluation (Grading) of 4 PLE Subjects (English, Mathematics, Science and |
|------|---|
|      | Social Studies)   |

|         |              |             | Score  | Overall Evaluation<br>(Grading) |
|---------|--------------|-------------|--------|---------------------------------|
| Pass    | Pass         | Distinction | 75-100 | 1                               |
|         |              |             | 70-74  | 2                               |
|         |              | Credit      | 65-69  | 3                               |
|         |              |             | 60-64  | 4                               |
|         |              | Principle   | 55-59  | 5                               |
|         |              |             | 50-54  | 6                               |
|         | Reserve Pass |             | 45-49  | 7                               |
|         |              |             | 40-44  | 8                               |
| Failure |              |             | 0-39   | 9                               |

(Source: Arakawa, 2008)

|           |        | 2005    | 2006    | 2007    | 2008    | 2009    | 2010    |
|-----------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|           | Male   | 218,953 | 214,154 | 217,903 | 236,773 | 247,795 | 258,654 |
| for PLF   | Female | 191,410 | 190,781 | 201,303 | 226,858 | 240,950 | 251,930 |
| TOFTEE    | Total  | 410,363 | 404,935 | 419,206 | 463,631 | 488,745 | 510,584 |
|           | Male   | 190,415 | 193,346 | 193,719 | 197,497 | 217,046 | 225,003 |
| Passed    | Female | 157,418 | 163,872 | 168,884 | 176,828 | 201,433 | 223,009 |
|           | Total  | 347,833 | 357,218 | 362,603 | 374,325 | 418,479 | 448,012 |
|           | Male   | 87.0%   | 90.3%   | 88.9%   | 83.4%   | 87.6%   | 89.8%   |
| Pass Rate | Female | 82.2%   | 85.9%   | 83.9%   | 77.9%   | 83.6%   | 86.2%   |
|           | Total  | 84.8%   | 88.2%   | 86.5%   | 80.7%   | 85.6%   | 88.0%   |

#### 4-32 Trend of PLE Results (2005 – 2010)

(Source: MoES, 2011b)

| -33 = 1(united of features of finitially behavis by Genuer (2002 – 2010 | 4-33 | Number of Teachers | of Primary | Schools by | Gender ( | (2002 - 2010) |
|---|------|--------------------|------------|------------|----------|---------------|
|---|------|--------------------|------------|------------|----------|---------------|

|            |            |                |         | •       | •       |         |         |         |         |
|------------|------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|            | 2002       | 2003           | 2004    | 2005    | 2006    | 2007    | 2008    | 2009    | 2010    |
| Male       | 87,883     | 91,424         | 91,846  | 88,946  | 91,858  | 80,457  | 95,985  | 100,264 | 101,879 |
| Female     | 51,601     | 54,163         | 55,396  | 55,886  | 58,277  | 51,868  | 63,531  | 68,112  | 70,524  |
| Total      | 139,484    | 145,587        | 147,242 | 144,832 | 150,135 | 132,325 | 159,516 | 168,376 | 172,403 |
| (Source: M | 10ES. 2002 | $2 \sim 2010e$ |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |

Note: The low total figure in 2007 might be caused by improper input. According to Sector Indicators' Fact Sheet 2000/01-2009/10 of MoES, total number in 2007 was 152,086 (Data by gender was not available).

| 4-34 | Number of Te | eachers of | f Secondary | Schools by | Gender ( | (2002 - 2010) | )) |
|------|--------------|------------|-------------|------------|----------|---------------|----|
|      |              |            |             |            |          |               | ۰. |

|        |        |        |        |        | •      |        | /      |        |        |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|        | 2002   | 2003   | 2004   | 2005   | 2006   | 2007   | 2008   | 2009   | 2010   |
| Male   | 29,567 | 30,107 | 29,073 | 29,234 | 33,258 | 39,520 | 42,949 | 50,572 | 48,486 |
| Female | 7,660  | 8,417  | 8,238  | 8,323  | 9,415  | 11,247 | 14,209 | 14,473 | 14,435 |
| Total  | 37,227 | 38,549 | 37,313 | 37,607 | 42,673 | 50,767 | 57,158 | 65,045 | 62,921 |
|        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

(Source: MoES, 2002~2010e)

Note: From 2003 until 2005, the total number of each year was not correspondent with the sum of the number of male and female teachers, due to non-respondents on gender.



4-35 Proportion of Pupils of Primary Schools with Adequate Sitting Space by Grade (2010)

(Source: MoES, 2010e)



4-36 Proportion of Pupils of Secondary Schools with Adequate Sitting Space (2010)

(Source: MoES, 2010e)

|         | -    |      |      | •    | ,    |      |      |      |
|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|         | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| Public  | 04   | 94   | 70   | 70   | 70   | 70   | 80   | 67   |
| School  | 94   | 04   | 19   | 70   | 19   | 10   | 80   | 07   |
| Private | 52   | 17   | 12   | 42   | 41   | 42   | 29   | 20   |
| School  | 55   | 47   | 43   | 42   | 41   | 42   | 50   | 52   |
| Total   | 87   | 79   | 74   | 72   | 72   | 70   | 68   | 58   |

4-37 Trend of Pupil-Classroom Ratio of Primary Schools (2003 – 2010)

(Source: MoES, 2003~2010e)

#### 4-38 Pupil-Teacher Ratio by Region of Primary Education and Secondary Education

|                 | Р      | rimary Educati | on           | Secondary | Education    |
|-----------------|--------|----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
|                 | Public | Private        | All types of | Private   | All types of |
|                 | School | School         | School       | School    | School       |
| Central Region  | 49     | 24             | 38           | 20        | 18           |
| Eastern Region  | 63     | 28             | 57           | 26        | 22           |
| Northeast       | 75     | 00             | 76           | דר        | 24           |
| Region          | 75     | 99             | 70           | 27        | 24           |
| Northern Region | 65     | 37             | 63           | 20        | 19           |
| Southwestern    | 44     | 26             | 30           | 20        | 10           |
| Region          | 44     | 20             | 39           | 20        | 19           |
| Western Region  | 59     | 25             | 50           | 26        | 21           |
| Total           | 57     | 26             | 49           | 22        | 19           |

(Source: MoES, 2010e)

Note: The figures in Secondary Education are related with public schools due to a low response rate of private schools.

# Chapter 5

|  | 04/05   | 05/06  | 06/07   | 07/08   | 08/09   | 09/10  | 10/11   |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| Agriculture  | 2.7   | 4.0  | 3.9   | 4.6   | 3.8   | 4.9  | 4.5   |
| Tourism, Trade & Industry  | 0.6   | 1.1  | 1.2   | 1.0   | 0.5   | 0.8  | 0.7   |
| Energy & Minerals  | 1.5   | 3.5  | 9.0   | 10.3  | 7.9   | 11.0   | 5.3   |
| Transport & Works  | 8.8   | 8.4  | 12.2  | 14.3  | 18.5  | 19.1   | 14.2  |
| Information &<br>Communication Technology  | -   | -  | 0   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1  | 0.2   |
| Lands, Housing & Urban<br>Development  | -   | 0.3  | 0.5   | 0.2   | 0.2   | 0.3  | 0.3   |
| Education  | 18.9  | 18.8   | 18.9  | 17.6  | 15.4  | 17.0   | 17.0  |
|  |   |  |   |   |   |  |   |
| Health   | 11.4  | 11.7   | 10.0  | 9.8   | 10.7  | 11.6   | 9.0   |
| Health<br>Water & Environment  | 11.4<br>2.6   | 11.7<br>2.3  | 10.0<br>3.2   | 9.8<br>3.6  | 10.7<br>2.6   | 11.6<br>2.7  | 9.0<br>3.4  |
| Health<br>Water & Environment<br>Social Development  | 11.4<br>2.6<br>0.5  | 11.7<br>2.3<br>0.4   | 10.0<br>3.2<br>0.4                                    | 9.8<br>3.6<br>0.6                                     | 10.7<br>2.6<br>0.4  | 11.6<br>2.7<br>0.5                                     | 9.0<br>3.4<br>0.4                                     |
| Health<br>Water & Environment<br>Social Development<br>Justice, Law, and order   | 11.4<br>2.6<br>0.5<br>5.8   | 11.7<br>2.3<br>0.4<br>5.6  | 10.0<br>3.2<br>0.4<br>5.4                             | 9.8<br>3.6<br>0.6<br>5.4                              | 10.7<br>2.6<br>0.4<br>4.8   | 11.6<br>2.7<br>0.5<br>5.7                              | 9.0<br>3.4<br>0.4<br>7.3                              |
| Health<br>Water & Environment<br>Social Development<br>Justice, Law, and order<br>Accountability   | 11.4<br>2.6<br>0.5<br>5.8<br>6.0  | 11.7<br>2.3<br>0.4<br>5.6<br>9.5   | 10.0<br>3.2<br>0.4<br>5.4<br>7.2                      | 9.8<br>3.6<br>0.6<br>5.4<br>7.7                       | 10.7<br>2.6<br>0.4<br>4.8<br>7.1  | 11.6<br>2.7<br>0.5<br>5.7<br>7.3                       | 9.0<br>3.4<br>0.4<br>7.3<br>6.6                       |
| Health<br>Water & Environment<br>Social Development<br>Justice, Law, and order<br>Accountability<br>Public Sector Management   | 11.4<br>2.6<br>0.5<br>5.8<br>6.0<br>5.5   | 11.7<br>2.3<br>0.4<br>5.6<br>9.5<br>7.1  | 10.0<br>3.2<br>0.4<br>5.4<br>7.2<br>6.8               | 9.8<br>3.6<br>0.6<br>5.4<br>7.7<br>11.1               | 10.7<br>2.6<br>0.4<br>4.8<br>7.1<br>9.1   | 11.6<br>2.7<br>0.5<br>5.7<br>7.3<br>11.1               | 9.0<br>3.4<br>0.4<br>7.3<br>6.6<br>11.4               |
| Health<br>Water & Environment<br>Social Development<br>Justice, Law, and order<br>Accountability<br>Public Sector Management<br>Public Administration                | 11.4<br>2.6<br>0.5<br>5.8<br>6.0<br>5.5<br>4.5                                    | 11.7<br>2.3<br>0.4<br>5.6<br>9.5<br>7.1<br>5.3   | 10.0<br>3.2<br>0.4<br>5.4<br>7.2<br>6.8<br>4.6        | 9.8<br>3.6<br>0.6<br>5.4<br>7.7<br>11.1<br>4.0        | 10.7<br>2.6<br>0.4<br>4.8<br>7.1<br>9.1<br>2.3  | 11.6<br>2.7<br>0.5<br>5.7<br>7.3<br>11.1<br>3.4        | 9.0<br>3.4<br>0.4<br>7.3<br>6.6<br>11.4<br>4.1        |
| Health<br>Water & Environment<br>Social Development<br>Justice, Law, and order<br>Accountability<br>Public Sector Management<br>Public Administration<br>Legislature | $ \begin{array}{r} 11.4\\ 2.6\\ 0.5\\ 5.8\\ 6.0\\ 5.5\\ 4.5\\ 0.2\\ \end{array} $ | 11.7           2.3           0.4           5.6           9.5           7.1           5.3           0.2 | 10.0<br>3.2<br>0.4<br>5.4<br>7.2<br>6.8<br>4.6<br>1.4 | 9.8<br>3.6<br>0.6<br>5.4<br>7.7<br>11.1<br>4.0<br>1.8 | $     \begin{array}{r}       10.7 \\       2.6 \\       0.4 \\       4.8 \\       7.1 \\       9.1 \\       2.3 \\       1.9 \\     \end{array} $ | 11.6<br>2.7<br>0.5<br>5.7<br>7.3<br>11.1<br>3.4<br>1.9 | 9.0<br>3.4<br>0.4<br>7.3<br>6.6<br>11.4<br>4.1<br>1.8 |

# 5-1 Trend of Sectoral Share in Government Budget (2004/05–2010/2011 (Unit: %)

(Source: WB, 2010b)

# 5-2 Trend of Sectoral Share in GDP (2004/05 – 2010/2011) (Unit: %)

|  | 2004/05 | 2005/06 | 2006/07 | 2007/08 | 2008/09 | 2009/10 | 2010/11 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Agriculture                                  | 0.6     | 0.8     | 0.7     | 0.8     | 0.7     | 0.9     | 0.9     |
| Tourism, Trade & Industry                    | 0.1     | 0.2     | 0.2     | 0.2     | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0.1     |
| Energy & Minerals                            | 0.3     | 0.7     | 1.6     | 1.8     | 1.5     | 2.0     | 1.0     |
| Transport & Works                            | 1.8     | 1.6     | 2.2     | 2.6     | 3.6     | 3.5     | 2.7     |
| Information &<br>Communication<br>Technology | -       | -       | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0       | 0       |
| Lands, Housing & Urban<br>Development        | -       | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0       | 0       | 0.1     | 0.1     |
| Education                                    | 3.9     | 3.7     | 3.4     | 3.1     | 3       | 3.1     | 3.3     |
| Health                                       | 2.3     | 2.3     | 1.8     | 1.7     | 2.1     | 2.1     | 1.7     |
| Water & Environment                          | 0.5     | 0.5     | 0.6     | 0.6     | 0.5     | 0.5     | 0.7     |
| Social Development                           | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0.1     | 0.1     |
| Justice, Law, and order                      | 1.2     | 1.1     | 1.0     | 1.0     | 0.9     | 1.0     | 1.4     |
| Accountability                               | 1.2     | 1.9     | 1.3     | 1.4     | 1.4     | 1.3     | 1.3     |
| Public Sector Management                     | 1.1     | 1.4     | 1.2     | 2.0     | 1.8     | 2.0     | 2.2     |
| Public Administration                        | 0.9     | 1.0     | 0.8     | 0.7     | 0.5     | 0.6     | 0.8     |
| Legislature                                  | 0       | 0       | 0.3     | 0.3     | 0.4     | 0.4     | 0.3     |
| Security                                     | 2.3     | 2.1     | 1.8     | 1.8     | 1.6     | 1.4     | 1.4     |

(Source: WB, 2010b)

|   | 2010/11 | 2011/12               | MTEF Budget Projection |           | ection  |
|---|---------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------|---------|
|   | Actual  | Approved              | 2012/13                | 2013/14   | 2014/15 |
| MoES  |         |                       |                        |           |         |
| Pre-primary and Primary Education (% of Total)              | 30.449  | 39.515<br>(2.5%)      | 39.625                 | 39.111    | 43.625  |
| Secondary Education<br>(% of Grand Total)                   | N/A     | 190.721<br>(11.8%)    | 229.193                | 231.98    | 81.306  |
| Special Needs Education<br>(% of Grand Total)               | 0.906   | 2.113<br>(0.1%)       | 2.114                  | 2.114     | 2.114   |
| Higher Education<br>(% of Grand Total)                      | 13.368  | 12.106 (0.8%)         | 12.106                 | 13.106    | 15.842  |
| Skills Development<br>(% of Grand Total)                    | N/A     | 86.810<br>(5.4%)      | 132.469                | 197.101   | 124.489 |
| Quality and Standards<br>(% of Grand Total)                 | 17.265  | 25.840<br>(1.6%)      | 24.892                 | 25.840    | 32.142  |
| Physical Education and Sports<br>(% of Grand Total)         | 2.089   | 2.360<br>(0.2%)       | 3.850                  | 3.060     | 5.060   |
| Policy, Planning and Support Services<br>(% of Grand Total) | 13.996  | 9.354<br>(0.6%)       | 9.706                  | 9.354     | 9.344   |
| Total - MoES<br>(% of Grand Total)                          | N/A     | 370.720<br>(23.0%)    | 453.954                | 521.667   | 313.922 |
| Tertiary Education and Research                             |         |                       |                        |           |         |
| Total-Tertiary Education & Research<br>(% of Grand Total)   |         | 349.091<br>(21.7%)    | 0.000                  | 358.132   | 0.000   |
| Local Governments   |         |                       |                        |           |         |
| Pre-primary and Primary Education<br>(% of Grand Total)     | 448.779 | 637.455<br>(39.6%)    | 0.000                  | 940.773   | 0.000   |
| Secondary Education<br>(% of Grand Total)                   | 121.269 | 227.668<br>(14.1%)    | 0.000                  | 176.751   | 0.000   |
| Skills Development<br>(% of Grand Total)                    | 16.536  | 23.081<br>(1.4%)      | 0.000                  | 68.991    | 0.000   |
| Monitoring and supervision<br>(% of Grand Total)            | 0.000   | 2.404<br>(0.2%)       | 0.000                  | 0.000     | 0.000   |
| Total – Local Governments<br>(% of Grand Total)             | 586.585 | 890.608<br>(55.3%)    | 0.000                  | 1,186.515 | 0.000   |
| Grand Total<br>(% of Grand Total)                           | N/A     | 1,610.419<br>(100.0%) | 453.954                | 2,066.314 | 313.922 |

# 5-3 Education Budget by Sub-Sector (2010/11 – 2014/15) (Unit: billion U.shs)

(Source: GoU, 2010)

#### Chapter 6

#### 6-1 Decision-Making Mechanism in Education Sector



(Ushiro, 2010)

#### **IV. References**

- Education Development Partners, Uganda (EDP) (2012a) Aide Memoire: GPE Scoping Mission 5-16 March 2012.
- EDP (2012b) Technical Recommendations in Response to GPE Scoping Mission.
- EDP (2012c) Mapping Matrix EDP
- Education Policy and Data Center (EPDC) (2012) Search Data (http://www.epdc.org/searchdata/searchdata.aspx)
- Education Service Commission (2008) *The Scheme of Service for Teaching Personnel in the Uganda Education Service*.

Education Service Commission (2011) Annual Report for the Financial Year 2010/2011.

Government of Uganda (GoU) (2010a) National Development Plan (2010/11 - 2014/15).

- GoU (2010b) Sector Budget Framework Paper: Education.
- GoU and Education Development Partners (GoU & EDP) (2009) Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of Uganda and the Education Development Partners.
- Hedger, Edward, Tim Williamson, Tom Muzoora, and Justina Stroh (2010) Sector Budget Support in Practice: Case Study, Education Sector in Uganda (Final Draft), Overseas Development Institute and Mokoro.
- IOB (2008) Primary Education in Uganda Impact Evaluation
- JICA (2008) Uganda Case Report: Local Level Service Delivery, Decentralization and Governance, A Comparative Study of Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania Education, Health and Agriculture Sectors

JICA (2011) Uganda Development Partnership Framework

- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2010) Millennium Development Goals Report for Uganda 2010.
- MoES (2001) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2001.
- MoES (2002) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2002.
- MoES (2003) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2003.
- MoES (2004) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2004.
- MoES (2005) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2005.
- MoES (2006a) Guidelines for Disbursement and Utilization of Threshold and Variable Grant Under Universal Post Primary Education and Training (UPPET) Capitation Grant Programme.
- MoES (2006b) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2006.
- MoES (2007a) Education and Sports Sector Annual Performance Report (ESSAPR).
- MoES (2007b) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2007
- MoES (2008a) Education and Sports Sector Annual Performance Report (ESSAPR).
- MoES (2008b) Guidelines on Policy, Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders in the Implementation of Stakeholders in the Implementation of Universal Primary Education (UPE).
- MoES (2008c) Revised Education Sector Strategy Plan 2007-2015.

MoES (2008d) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2008.

- MoES (2009a) Basic Requirement and Minimum Standards Indicators for Education Institutions.
- MoES (2009b) Strategic Plan for Universal Secondary Education in Uganda (2009-2018).
- MoES (2009c) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2009.
- MoES (2010a) Aide Memoire for 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Education and Sports Sector Review 15<sup>th</sup> 17<sup>th</sup> November.
- MoES (2010b) Primary Six Curriculum: Set One: English, Integrated Science, Local Language, Mathematics, Religious Education (Christian, Religious Education and Islamic Religious Education) and Social Studies.
- MoES (2010c) Sector Indicators' Fact Sheet (2000/01 2009/10).
- MoES (2010d) Updated Education Sector Strategic Plan 2010-2015.
- MoES (2010e) Uganda Education Statistical Abstract 2010.
- MoES (2011a) Aide Memoire for 18<sup>th</sup> Annual Education and Sports Sector Review 15<sup>th</sup> 17<sup>th</sup> November.
- MoES (2011b) Education and Sports Sector Annual Performance Report (ESSAPR).
- MoES (2011c) Policy on Special Needs and Inclusive Education.
- MoES (2012) Aide Memoire for the 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Education and Sports Sector Planning and Budgeting Workshop.
- MoES and Education Development Partners (MoES & DPs) (2010) Fast Track Initiative Appraisal Report: Updated Education Sector Strategic Plan 2010-2015.
- Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (2010) Sector Budget Framework Paper 2010/2011, Education.
- Purcell, Ray (2010) Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative, Country Desk Study: Uganda.
- Teaching Service Commission (TSC) (2010) Salary Structure for 2010/2011 Financial Year.
- The Republic of Uganda (2008) The Education (Pre-primary, Primary and Post-primary) Act.
- The Republic of Uganda (2010) National Development Plan 2010/11-2014/15.
- The Republic of Uganda and UNDP (2010) Millennium Development Goals Report for Uganda 2010.
- SACMEQ (2010) SACMEQ III Project Results: Pupil Achievement Levels in Reading and Mathematics, Working Document Number 1.
- SACMEQ (2011) Progress in Gender Equality in Education: Uganda (Policy Brief No.6).
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBS) (2002) 2002 Uganda Population and Housing Census Analytical Report: Household Characteristics.
- Uganda National Examinations Board (UNEB) (2009) PLE Report on Work of Candidates: November 2008 Examination.
- UNEB (2010a) The Achievement of Primary School Pupils in Uganda in Numeracy, Literacy in English and Local Languages: National Assessment of Progress in Education.
- UNEB (2010b) The Achievement of Senior Two Students in Uganda in Mathematics, English

Language and Biology: National Assessment of Progress in Education.

UNEB (2010c) PLE Report on Work of Candidates: November 2009 Examination.

UNEB (2011) PLE Report on Work of Candidates: November 2010 Examination.

UNDP (2011) Human Development Report 2011.

- UNESCO (2010) World Data on Education: Uganda" (7<sup>th</sup> edition, 2010/11).
- UNESCO (2012a) Data on Instrumental Time (Focusing on Formal and General Education Offered by Public Institutions.

UNESCO (2012b) Uganda EFA Profile.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) (2012)

(http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/TableViewer/document.aspx?ReportId=143&IF\_Language=eng

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) (2008) Budget Processes and Financing Instruments in Uganda

Winkler, Donald and Sondergaard, Lars (2008) The Efficiency of Public Education in Uganda.

World Bank (2002) Financing Education for All by 2015: Simulations for 33 African Countries.

World Bank (2004) Education for All (EFA) – Fast Track Initiative Progress Report.

World Bank (2008) The Efficiency of Public Education in Uganda.

World Bank (2007) Uganda Fiscal Policy for Growth: Public Expenditure Review 2007.

- World Bank (2009) Project Appraisal Document for the Proposed Credit to the Republic of Uganda for a Post Primary Education and Training Adaptable Program Lending Project in Support of the First Phase of the Uganda Post Primary Education and Training Program.
- World Bank (2010a) Post Primary Education Program Increases Student Enrollment in Uganda.
- World Bank (2010b) Uganda Public Expenditure Review: Strengthening the Effectiveness of the Public Investment Program in Uganda.

World Bank Institute (2009) The Capacity Development Results Framework, A strategic and results-oriented approach to learning for capacity development.

World Bank Website (2012) Data & Research

< All of the references listed below are written in Japanese. >

Aya Arakawa, JICA Uganda Office (2009) *Outline of the Education Sector in Uganda 2008*, (Uganda Kyoiku Sector Gaiyo 2008 nendo-ban).

Iki Ushiro, JICA Uganda Office (2010) Report for 16th Education Sector Review Report (Ver. Feb.24) (Dai 16 kai Kyoiku Sector Review Hokokusho (Ver. Feb.24)).

- JICA (2012) Project on Improvement of Health Service through Health Infrastructure Management (Hoken Infrastructure Management wo tsujita Hoken Service Kyoka Project).
- Naoki Yoshikawa (2005) Educational Situation in Uganda (Education Planning Advisor Report)(Uganda Kyoiku-Jijo (Kyoiku Keikaku Advisor Hokokusho)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2012) Country and Regional Situations (Uganda) (Kakkoku Chiki

Josei/Africa/Uganda) (http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/area/uganda/data.html)

- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2008) ODA Data Book by Country 2008 (ODA Kuni-betsu Data Book 2008)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2011) Country Assistance Evaluation of Uganda (Uganda Kuni-betsu Hyoka)