Ethics and corruption in education

Advanced training workshop on:
Resource leakage and corruption in the education sector in Kenya
Capacity building for KESSP investment programme managers

(Lake Naivasha Simba, Kenya: 29 May-02 June 2006)
An advanced training workshop on “Resource leakage and corruption in the education sector in Kenya and capacity building for KEESP investment programme managers” was organised jointly by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST), the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP-UNESCO), the Utstein Anti-Corruption Centre (U4) and the Department for International Development (Dfid), from 29 May to 02 June 2006 in Lake Naivasha Simba, Kenya.

The major aims of this workshop were information and awareness building regarding the challenge of improving transparency and accountability in education; exposure to methodologies of successful anti-corruption measures; the initiation of policy dialogue on anti-corruption in education; and the implications of all these issues on the implementation of the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP).

This report includes the various materials that were prepared and used for the Seminar, in particular: the plenary presentation outlines, as well as group work reports. The appendix contains the opening remarks by the Education secretary as well as the list of participants.
## PROGRAMME

**Resource leakage and corruption in the education sector in Kenya and Capacity Building for KESSP Investment Programme Managers**

*Lake Naivasha Simba, 29 May to 2 June 2006*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE &amp; TIME</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PRESENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sunday 28th May 2006</strong></td>
<td>Arrival and Registration</td>
<td>Course Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 – 7.30</td>
<td>Welcome cocktail</td>
<td>MoE/DFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday 29th May 2006</strong></td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>Course coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opening of Workshop</td>
<td>Education Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ground Rules and Climate Setting</td>
<td>Harald Mathisen, U4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30 – 9.00</td>
<td>KESSP Overview</td>
<td>Director P&amp;P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to the workshop (objectives, modalities and agenda) – including a presentation on selected prospects from KESSP</td>
<td>Harald Mathisen, U4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TEA BREAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture: Corruption basic; definitions, causes and consequences. Corruption as an international development problem</td>
<td>Harald Mathisen, U4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture: Transparency and accountability in education: overview with focus on finance.</td>
<td>IIEP-UNESCO Team, Jacques Hallak, Muriel Poisson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formula Funding: A Kenyan Perspective</td>
<td>Ole Kingi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group work on formula funding</td>
<td>IIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00- 2.00</td>
<td><strong>LUNCH BREAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 6.00</td>
<td>Lecture: Transparency and accountability in educational management – three areas of concern: teachers, private tutoring and academic fraud</td>
<td>IIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges for Transparency in Exams; A Kenyan Perspective</td>
<td>Mrs Mutea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEA BREAK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work on exams</td>
<td>IIIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Breakout informal session (KESSP)</em></td>
<td>IIIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday 30th May 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.00 – 1.00</td>
<td><em>Focus</em>: Diagnosis, methods of audit and assessment</td>
<td>IIIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audit; A Kenyan Perspective</td>
<td>Mrs Magoha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEA BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Group work on audit</em></td>
<td>IIIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 2.00</td>
<td>LUNCH BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 6.00</td>
<td>Presentation on FMR</td>
<td>M Wasike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Group work on FMR</em></td>
<td>M Wasike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEA BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Breakout informal session (KESSP)</em></td>
<td>(KESSP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>DINNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday 31st May 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.00 – 1.00</td>
<td>Overview of PETS</td>
<td>IIIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEA BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PETS, a Kenyan Perspective</td>
<td>Mr Mugambi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 – 2.00</td>
<td>LUNCH BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 5.00</td>
<td><em>Focus</em>: Education contracting through procurement</td>
<td>IIIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement; A Kenyan Perspective</td>
<td>Mr Nyamwange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Group work on contracting in education</em></td>
<td>IIIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative Evaluation</td>
<td>Harald Mathisen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIIEP-UNESCO Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 – 7.30</td>
<td>Wrap Up Cocktail</td>
<td>MoE/ DFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 1st June 2006</td>
<td>8.00 – 8.30 Introduction to 2 day-Programme and Expectations</td>
<td>Mr Kimathi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.30 – 10.30 Linking KESSP Programme Work plans to Budgets</td>
<td>Ms. Alice Gichu, CFO &amp; Paul Blay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.30 – 11.00 TEA BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 – 1.00 Monitoring and Evaluation and EMIS &amp; Education Statistics</td>
<td>Mr Nyongesa/ Mr Obiero/ Tim Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 – 2.00 LUNCH BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 – 4.00 Group Work on Selected IP Log Frames on M&amp;E</td>
<td>Team Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 – 4.30 TEA BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30 – 5.30 Feedback from Group work</td>
<td>Mr Nyongesa/ Mr Obiero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.30                      DINNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 2nd June 2006</td>
<td>8.00 – 8.30 Recap of the previous day’s work</td>
<td>B Onguko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.30 – 10.30 Budgeting and Group work on selected IPs</td>
<td>Carla Bertoncino/ Paul Blay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.30 – 11.00 TEA BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00 – 12.00 Feedback on Group work</td>
<td>Carla Bertoncino/ Paul Blay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00 – 1.00 Team Building Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00 – 2.00 LUNCH BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00 – 3.30 Refining Work plans and Procurement Plans</td>
<td>P Blay/ Mr Nyamwange/ C Bertoncino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.30 - 4.00 TEA BREAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 – 6.00 Workshop Evaluation and Development of Action Plans from workshop and Next Steps</td>
<td>Director Policy and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00 – 6.30 Workshop Closing</td>
<td>L Banham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.30                      DINNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 3rd June 2006</td>
<td>7.00 – 9.00 BREAKFAST AND DEPARTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of Development and Implementation of KESSP;
By
Director Of Policy and Planning

Background

In the NARC manifesto of 2002, the Government committed to:

- Carry out a comprehensive review of the current system of education.
- Provide free and compulsory education to all
- Design a system which guarantees all citizens the right to education and competitive edge in the global job market
- Establish a comprehensive adult and continuing education programme.
Background

- To realise the obligations of the NARC manifesto, the ministry embarked on activities focusing on Sector reforms
- These included Sector Review, Sector Plan, the National Conference on education and training, the development of Sector Policy and eventually the Sector Programme

Background Cont

From January 2003, the Government implemented Free Primary Education (FPE) based on the realization that quality and affordable basic education is the window of hope for poverty eradication and combating other evils in society.
National Conference on Education and Training

- Held in November 2003 and brought together over 800 key stakeholders in the sector.
- The Conference mandated the MOEST to develop the policy framework for education Sector that culminated in the development of Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005 on A Framework for Education, Training and Research.

Background Cont

- To build on the success of the FPE reform the MoE realised that it was critical to undertake a more comprehensive sector-wide development programme.
- This would ensure that other sub-sectors were strengthened alongside primary education.
The blue print constitutes the Government's Policy on education and training based on the conference recommendations and those of various studies undertaken in the sector i.e. the Education Sector Review.

The paper provides a policy framework for education and training sector

Aims at harmonising various policies, Acts, guidelines and emerging issues in the sector since 1988

Sets out objectives to ensure that the country attains EFA and MDGs in conformity with ERS
Sessional Paper on Education and Training

- Sets out policies to be pursued to attain the sector goals and objectives
- Sets out targets for the sector
- Sets out strategies for all sub-sectors to implement the policies

Development of Sector Programme

- Based on best-practice lessons from other countries in Africa, as well as internationally, the MoE concluded that the most effective way to develop and implement such a programme was through a Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp).
- Since June 2004, the MoE worked with a wide range of stakeholders to develop a SWAp for the development of the Education Sector in Kenya for five years (2005 – 2010).
**Development of Sector programme**

- Incorporated representation from key line ministries including Finance and Economic Planning.
- Conducted various consensus building workshops which incorporated Development Partners, Civil Society, Private Sector, NGOs, CBOs and Teacher Union.
- The product of these initiatives was the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme, 2005 - 2010 (KESSP).

**What is the KESSP?**

- The KESSP is a five-year plan to improve education provision across all sub-sectors in Kenya.
- The KESSP consists of 23 separate investment programmes.
KESSP provides a road map for Education Sector development and is intended to:

- Facilitate the attainment of Millennium Development and EFA goals.
- Harmonize, financial and procurement systems in the sector.
- Enhance mobilization of resources to support the sector development.
- Enhance wider participation, ownership and partnership

**Preparatory Activities**

- Agreeing on Financing Mechanisms.
- Developing and agreeing on partnership principles
- Developing governance and accountability action plans (social responsibility)
Preparatory Activities Cont..

- Agreeing on implementation structures and oversight organs.
- Developing a capacity building plan.
- Developing Financial Management Manuals.
- Developing Procurement manuals.
- Developing work and procurement plans.

Programme Coordination, Implementation, and Accountability Structures

1. National Education Advisory Council
   - Advise the Minister on policy issues affecting education
   - Foster co-ordination and collaboration between GOK and other providers of education services
   - Mobilize resources for the education sector
   - Advocate on key issues affecting education
   Not yet operationalized.
Programme Structure cont.

2. Education Sector Consultative Group
- Comprise development partners supporting the education sector.
- Review programme implementation
- Discuss resource mobilization and utilization
- Meetings are held quarterly.
- Development partners contact points sets the agenda.

3. Donor Consultative Group
- Comprises of development partners supporting the sector and the Ministry.
- Holds meetings every first Thursday of the month.
- Meeting are chaired by the Permanent Secretary, MoE.
- MoE sets the agenda which must include the review of programme progress.
4. Inter-Ministerial Committee on Education and Training

- Membership comprise line relevant Ministries (MOLG, MOF, MOHA, MORPW, MOPND, MOH, OP, MOGSCSS, MOW, NACC, CDF).
- Designed to address key multi-sectoral issues such as school infrastructure construction, school health, nutrition and feeding, HIV/AIDS, water and sanitation.
- Chaired by the PS Education.

5. Senior MoE Management

- Meets once every month.
- Chaired by the Hon. Minister of Education.
- Provides overall guidance on programme implementation.
- Reviews implementation progress against agreed targets.
6. Programme Steering Committee
- This committee meets once a month.
- Membership comprise of all Directors, Heads of support departments and Heads of Semi-Autonomous Government Agencies such as K.I.E, T.S.C, K.N.E.C
- Monitors programme implementation
- Approves work and procurement plans
- Provide overall guidance to programme implementation
- Reviews the outputs of ongoing technical work.
- Advise on resource allocation and utilization
- Accountable for programme implementation

7. Reform Secretariat
- Comprises of a core team for coordination and all investment programme team leaders.
- Coordination of the programme activities;
- To undertake the secretariat functions for the Steering Committee;
- Advisory support services for the MU Team Leaders and their staff;
- Holding regular coordination meetings with the MU Team leaders;
- Tracking the performance of Results-Based workplans of the Management Units;
Reform Secretariat Cont..

- Tracking the utilization of funds for each Investment Programme;
- Coordinate closely with the Finance Department at the MoE;
- Provide quarterly financial reports to the Steering Committee and partners;
- Provide procurement advisory support services to all Programme Management Units; and
- Update on regular basis the Procurement Plans.
- Programme documentation and reports compilation.

8. Provincial Education Boards (PEBs)

- Co-ordination of all programmes to eliminate duplication of activities of the district
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Advising the District Education Officer
- Supervising District Education programmes.
9. **District Education Boards (DEBs)**
- Management of education services
- Teacher management
- School audit
- Supervision of education programmes
- Accounting for funds
- Quality assurance
- Resource mobilization
- Approve establishment of schools.

10. **Institutional level**
10.1 **Boards of Governors (BOGs)**
- Ensuring official policies and guidelines are adhered to.
- Strategic management of the institution
- General oversight on delivery of education programmes
- Planning
- Resource mobilization, utilization and accounting
- Monitoring of education standards
- Overall teacher management and discipline
- Collaboration with the communities
- Management of non-teaching staff.
10.2 School Management Committees (SMCs)

- Receive and account for all resources
- Develop and implement school plans
- Mobilise additional resources
- Implement government policies and guidelines

10.3 Parents-Teachers Association (PTA)

- Monitoring implementation of school programmes
- Monitoring education services
- Mobilizing additional resources

Capacity Building

- This involves reorganization of office accommodation structures into management units for team work.
- Development of directorates organograms showing which IPs fall under each.
- Setting up the reform secretariat work station.
- Equipping the work station.
Capacity Building Cont..

Successful implementation of a SWAp requires a well coordinated and professional management training at all levels of programme implementation.

- Training was planned and implemented at all levels i.e. province, district, school level management bodies and PTAs.
- Cascading mode of training was applied using ToTs.
- Focus of training included programme implementation guidelines, rules and responsibilities, work planning, Monitoring and Evaluation and district strategic planning.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Critical to the Implementation process are:

- Strengthening of capacity and skills of the MoE for monitoring and evaluation be strengthened through training
- Harmonization and co-ordination of multiple partners monitoring and evaluation tools.
Joint Monitoring

Annual Review Workshop (Oct/Nov)
- Participation embraces all pooling partners, discrete partners, Government Ministries, CBOs, NGOs, CSOs etc.
- Focuses on the review of the previous fiscal year.
- Provides partners an opportunity to give initial indications of funding to be provided the following fiscal year and possibly projections for the MTEF period.

Budget Review Workshop (Feb/March)
- Participation similar to Annual Review
- Focuses on:
  - review of the proposed work and procurement plans for the succeeding fiscal year.
  - Audit findings.
  - Reaching an agreement on the level of support and schedule of disbursements.
- The review is designed to assist the Ministry in budget preparation.
Challenges

- Human Resource capacity – too few officers for too many tasks.
- Slow process of attitude change (resistance to change).
- Relating programme costing to budget.
- Development of well thought out and realistic work and procurement plans.
- Preparation of financial monitoring reports.

Lessons Learnt

- Realistic and credible budgets are critical to implementation.
- Programmes preparation and monitoring must be all inclusive.
- Well thought out and realistic work and procurement plans are principal tools of implementation.
Lessons Learnt Cont..

- Development of a communication strategy is critical.
- Identification of technical assistance needs is very important.
- Multi and sub-sectoral teaming increases bargaining power.
- Risk management plan is critical to programme implementation.

Conclusions

- As we implement KESSP we need to ask ourselves the following:
  - Are we ready to embrace ethics and integrity to eliminate resource leakage?
  - Are we committed to change the way we have been carrying out our business?
  - Are we ready to accommodate diverse opinions?
  - Where are we since we began the implementation of KESSP?
Specialised in-country training workshop:

Resource leakage and corruption in the education sector in Kenya

Lake Naivasha, May 29-31 2006

Introductions

- Who are we – Muriel, Jacque and Harald!
- Folder
- Program
- Ground rules
- Diploma?
Introduction

Purpose

- To provide a framework to better understand
  - Corruption in general
  - Corruption in the education sector worldwide

- To improve the effectiveness anti-corruption strategies in the education sector in Kenya

DFID
Department for International Development, United Kingdom

MINISTRY of FOREIGN AFFAIRS
MinBuZa/DGIS, The Netherlands

NORAD
The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

GTZ
German Technical Cooperation

CIDA / ACDI
Canadian International Development Agency

Sida
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
U4 Resources

- Projects Database
- Resources
  - Theme Pages/Focus Areas
  - Public Finance Management
  - Health and Education
  - African Anti-Corruption Commissions
  - Donor Coordination
  - Knowledge management
  - Corruption in Emergencies
  - Political Will
  - Selected literature
  - Tool kits
- Links
  - Web-sites
  - Organisations
- Services
  - Helpdesk
  - Training

http://www.U4.no

U4 Anti-Corruption Training Workshop

Part 1: Corruption basics

- What is corruption?
- What forms of corruption do we have?
- Causes and consequences.
- Corruption as an problem for international development
Introduction

Warm up activity

What is corruption?
Come up with a definition.

Widely-used definitions:

- The misuse of entrusted power for private gain (Transparency International)
- The abuse of public power for private gain (World Bank)
- The UN Convention against Corruption does not define corruption at all!
Introduction

Two actors

The STATE

- Civil servants
- Functionaries
- Bureaucrats
- Politicians

Any non-governmental agent

- Private individuals
- Private firms, corporations
- Businesses, organisations
- Contractors, bidders
- NGOs
- Users, clients

Some characteristics

- Illegal and immoral
- Concealed, hidden, under-the-table
- Informal
- Personalised
  - Middlemen, brokers
Introduction

Two perspectives

**Demand oriented**
- Corrupted, public side
- The extractive state, neopatrimonial, kleptocratic

**Supply oriented**
- Corruptor, private side
- Captured state, bribing firms

Two levels

**Political corruption**
- Grand, large scale

**Administrative corruption**
- Petty, small scale
## Introduction

### Two forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlled</th>
<th>Uncontrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralised</td>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated</td>
<td>Disorganised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Damaging!*

### Several manifestations

- **Bribery**
  - Corruption *per se*
  - Kickbacks, sweeteners, grease money, pourboire, pay-offs, consultant fees, …
- **Embezzlement**
  - Theft. Only one party
- **Fraud**
  - Economic crime. Element of cheating, swindle
- **Extortion**
  - Element of violence. No/little returns
- **Favouritism**
  - *Nepotism*
Corruption: how big a menace?

- The principal obstacle to development?
- An acceptable stage in a country’s economic development process?

Medical-militaristic language

- Corruption
  - Disease
  - Social cancer
  - Virus
  - Beast
- AC crusades
  - Fighting…
  - Combating…
  - Eliminating…
  - Eradicating…
  - War on…
  - Root out…
- Capital punishment
  - China & Vietnam
Introduction

Measuring corruption

- Corruption cannot be measured directly
  - Illegal, informal, concealed, personalised
  - Definitions are varying

- Indirect measures
  - Perceptions
  - Anecdotic evidence
    - Household surveys
  - Court and media cases
  - Revenue/expenditure tracking
# TI’s CPI 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>CPI Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## The Center For Public Integrity: Integrity Scorecard Kenya

### Category 1: Civil Society, Public Information and Media
1.1 Civil Society Organisations (Strong)  
1.2 Access to information law (Very weak)  
1.3 Freedom of the media (Strong)

### Category 2: Electoral and Political Processes
2.1 National elections (Strong)  
2.2 Election monitoring agency (Very strong)  
2.3 Political party finances (Very weak)

### Category 3: Branches of government
3.1 Executive (Very weak)  
3.2 Legislature (Moderate)  
3.3 Judiciary (Very weak)

### Category 4: Administration and civil service
4.1 Civil service regulations (Very weak)  
4.2 Whistle blowing measures (Moderate)  
4.3 Procurement (Moderate)  
4.4 Privatization (Very weak)

### Category 5: Oversight and regulatory mechanisms
5.1 National ombudsman (Very weak)  
5.2 Supreme audit institution (Weak)  
5.3 Taxes and customs (Moderate)  
5.4 Financial sector regulation (Strong)

### Category 6: Anti-corruption mechanisms and rule of law
6.1 Anti-corruption law (Moderate)  
6.2 Anti-corruption agency (Strong)  
6.3 Rule of law and access to justice (Weak)  
6.4 Law enforcement (Very weak)
Introduction

Types of consequences

- Economic development
- Political system
- Institutional arrangements
- Socio-cultural

Primary stakeholders

The poor

CORRUPTION

ECONOMIC
- Less revenue
- Reduced growth
- Investment aversion
- Higher consumer prices
- Reduced growth potential
- Higher investment costs
- Reduced competition
- Wrong investments
- Capital flight

POLITICAL
- Authoritarianism
- Lack of political will
- Lack of political trust
- Non-transparent decisions
- Reduced competition
- Perverted elections
- Unaccountability
- Delegitimation

The POOR

Social
- Distrust
- Nepotism
- Clientelism
- More inequality
- Less participation
- Disconnected leaders
- Reduced social capital
- Brain drain

Institutional
- Less access to services
- High costs of control
- Bad procurement
- Bad governance
- Inefficiency
- Unfairness
- Waste

Economic
- Less revenue
- Reduced growth
- Investment aversion
- Higher consumer prices
- Reduced growth potential
- Higher investment costs
- Reduced competition
- Wrong investments
- Capital flight

Political
- Authoritarianism
- Lack of political will
- Lack of political trust
- Non-transparent decisions
- Reduced competition
- Perverted elections
- Unaccountability
- Delegitimation

The POOR

Services ↓
Voice ↓
Humiliation ↑
Introduction

Background factors

- Perceptions (and some research!)
  - History
  - Geography
  - Religion, ethno-linguistic fractionalisation
  - Gender

…but not very helpful for strategy development…

U4 Explanations

1. Economic explanations and theories
2. Political explanations and theories
3. Institutional explanations
4. Social/cultural and individual explanations
Introduction

Economic explanations and theories

Political explanations and theories
Introduction

Institutional factors

- Weak professionalisation
  - Recruitment and training
  - Administrative history and established practice
  - Esprit d’état, esprit de corps

- Scarce resources
  - Low salaries

…public position for self service

Economic framework

- Incentives
  - Needs, size of bribe

- Opportunities
  - Power, influence, discretion
  - Much power, much influence, much financial discretion

- Risks
  - Legislation, detection, punishment
# Why explanations matter

- **Economic explanations**
  - Privatisations?
  - Deregulation?
  - Control and punishment?

- **Institutional explanations**
  - Watchdog agencies?
  - Administrative reform?
  - Capacity building?

- **Political explanations**
  - Democratisation?
  - Institutional reform?
  - Checks and balances

- **Socio-cultural explanations**
  - Sensitisation, awareness raising?
  - Preaching?
TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION: Overview with focus on finance

Jacques Hallak and Muriel Poisson

Introduction: examples of corruption in education

- **Bangladesh**: many fictitious teachers
- **Cameroon**: students pay to get good grades
- **Ghana**: illegal school fees and ghost personnel
- **France**: violating tendering processes
- **Italy**: selling exam questions in advance
- **Kenya**: only part of the curriculum covered (“coaching”)
- **Pakistan**: fictitious schools, teachers, pupils
- **USA**: many bogus e-mail colleges

"Corruption is a major drain on the effective use of resources for education and should be drastically curbed". (EFA Dakar, 2000)
Outline of the presentation

I. What is corruption?
II. How to assess corruption?
III. What are the opportunities for corruption?
IV. Focus on finance

I. What is corruption?

Definitions
Ethical dimensions
Factors
1. General definition of corruption

- Definition used for all public sectors:
  
  “The use of public office for private gains”
  
  - diversion of funds from govt accounts
  - favouritism in personnel appointments

- Definition used for education:
  
  “The systematic use of public office for private benefit whose impact is significant on access, quality or equity in education”

- Where to draw the line between corrupt and honest behaviour?

2. Ethical education / ethics in education

- The education sector – by including the teaching/learning of ethical values and behaviours in the school curricula – is regarded today as a major component of strategies to fight corruption.

- It is therefore of vital importance to ensure integrity and limit unethical behaviours within the educational sector itself. Otherwise, in a “corrupt environment”, education cannot successfully promote ethical values and behaviours.
Kenya’s National Civic Education Programme

Kenya’s National Civic Education Programme (URAIA):

- **Objective**: to consolidate vibrant democratic political culture
- **Five main themes**: nation-building, democracy, good governance, constitutionalism, human rights
- **Financing**: Canada, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, UK, Australia, UNDP, USAID, EU
- **Implementation**: by CSOs

Launch of public education campaign of KACC

---

3. Causes of corruption

- Low salaries of public officials/teachers
- Effort to extend status or power
- Complexity and lack of accessibility to rules
- Discretionary power/monopoly
- Poor governance/supervision at all levels
- Lack of absorption/management capacity
- Poor public information on govt decisions
- Lack of transparency of stakeholders
- Weakening of ethical norms
4. Focus education

- Priority given by donors to education / pressure exerted by taxpayers: public budget squeeze
- Growing share of private delivery services
- Development of ICTs
  - Paper mills / diploma mills
- High rate of return for investment in education*
  - Links between GNP per capita and criteria of access to managerial jobs
- Competition for access to jobs
  - Academic fraud
  - Private tutoring

* Linkage education and corruption

Fig 4. Education and Corruption Linkage

1: Sub-Saharan countries

Source: Parajuli, 2001
II. How to assess corruption?

Subjective data

Objective data

1. How to assess: “subjective” data

- Corruption Perception Index (CPI):
  - Degree to which corruption is perceived to exist among public officials and politicians
  - Reflects perception of business people, academics and risk analysts
  - Composite index, drawing on 17 different polls from 13 independent institutions
  - CPI=10: highly clean; 0: highly corrupt*

- Participatory diagnosis (3 cities in Ukraine)

- Other perception surveys**
### The 2005 Corruption Perceptions Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>High-Low Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>9.5 – 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>9.5 – 9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>9.3 – 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>7.0 – 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>5.1 – 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>4.2 – 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>3.8 – 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina</td>
<td>3.7 – 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>2.1 – 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>2.3 – 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2.6 – 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroun</td>
<td>2.0 – 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>1.8 – 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo DR</td>
<td>1.8 – 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1.7 – 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>1.3 – 2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Urban Bribery Index, Kenya

1. Kenya police: 68.7
2. Ministry of Public Works: 41
6. Judiciary: 32.3
13. Public hospitals: 27.7
17. Teacher Service Commission: 25.4
26. Postal corporation: 18.8
33. Ministry of education: 16.7
34. Kenya Power and lighting Co.: 15.6

*Source: TI toolkit, 2002*
2. How to assess: “objective” data

- Limit of “subjective” data
- Lack of “objective” data

Collection of quantified data through:
- School census
- Survey approaches
- Audits (sector/institutions/staff/financial)
- Risk analysis
- Public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS)
- Multiple indicators (QSDS)

---

Different approaches to surveys

I. Fact finding
Objective data (MoE/Institutions)
- Organizational (management, central & local level)
- Human resources (‘ghost’ teachers, absenteeism, recruitment)
- Financing (financial statements of an activity/ entity, budget, fund raising)
- Procurement (tendering)

II. ‘Perception’
Subjective data (Teachers/Students)

Participatory assessment
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### III. What opportunities for corruption?

**Some major practices of corruption in education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Corrupt practices</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Impact on education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| School building, rehabilitation| • Fraud in public tendering  
• Embezzlement  
• School mapping | Contracting              |                          |
| Equipment, Textbooks, Food     | • Fraud in public tendering  
• Embezzlement  
• Bypass of criteria | Contracting  
Focus finance      |                          |
| Teacher appointment/management | • Favouritism  
• Nepotism  
• Bribe | Focus teachers     |                          |
| Personal behaviour             | • "Ghost teachers"  
• Bribe (for school entrance, exams, assessments, private tutoring, etc.)  
• Bypass of criteria | Focus private tutoring |                          |
| Examinations and diplomas      | • Selling of information  
• Favouritism  
• Nepotism  
• Bribe  
• Academic fraud | Focus academic fraud  
Focus private tutoring |                          |
| Information systems            | • Manipulating data  
• Selecting/approving information | PETs Audit       |                          |
| Finance                        | • Transgressing rules/procedures  
• Inflation of costs and activities  
• Opacity of flows | Focus finance  
PETs       |                          |
| Specific allowances (fellowships, subsidies, etc.) | • Favouritism  
• Nepotism  
• Bribe  
• Bypass of criteria | Focus finance     |                          |
IV. Focus on finance

Definitions
Reliable data
Financial control

Decentralisation & school based management

- Better relevance to needs and good governance can be expected by:
  - getting closer to the users
  - promoting participation and building ownership
- More transparency and accountability: consistently applied formula determines what each school is allocated: this is known by the school and can be made publicly available
- At the same time, the introduction of FF and the delegation of spending decisions can increase the possibility of fraud as many more people have direct access to funds
- This depends obviously on ‘how FF operates in practice’
1. Definition of formula funding

- “Agreed set of criteria for allocating resources to schools, impartially applied to each school”
- Different systems of management:
  - From centralised system of resource allocation: from the MOE down to the schools
  - To decentralized system of resource allocation: from the source of financing directly to the schools
- Use of formula funding:
  - *Rather simple*: deployment of teachers linked to class size
  - *Rather sophisticated*: e.g. UK: pupils number (75%), students additional needs (5%), physical conditions (20%), extra allowances/learning difficulties, using as a proxy Free School Meal (% FSM)
*Selected examples of formula funding in Kenya*

- Grants to primary schools to improve supply of textbooks
- School improvement grants for infrastructure development
- Bursary programme in secondary education

---

### 2. Reliable system of data

Allocation by formula requires school level data on all the indicators that are included in the formula.

⚠️ Not to create perverse incentives to schools that encourage them to generate more funds by manipulating the formula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of formula</th>
<th>Pervasive effects</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocations according to size of schools</td>
<td>Inflation of enrolment figures</td>
<td>• To collect data on enrolment externally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• To check for accuracy externally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility costs funded according to past expenditures</td>
<td>No incentive for more efficient use of energy, water and telephones</td>
<td>• To include variables that predict the amount that the school must spend but cannot itself affect (e.g. size and conditions of buildings and climatic variations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of students' learning needs</td>
<td>Incentive to principals to encourage low scores</td>
<td>• Not to use tests administered by the school itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data for calculating extra funding collected from the school (socio economic background, poverty, ethnicity, language)</td>
<td>Principals tempted to falsify statistical returns</td>
<td>• To check for accuracy externally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comparison Australia / England

- In Australia: data are collected at state level from schools four times a year; it has the most rigorous external check
- In UK: data are collected from schools by the annual census; IT management systems complete the forms and submit electronically to the ministry; deliberate misreporting does not seem to be widespread
  - Example of misreporting: Free School Meals (visit of LEAs auditors and inspectors)
  - If FF is not to be corrupted, strong data verification procedures and sanctions for deliberate misreporting must be in place

3. Financial control at school level

- Financial management at school level increases opportunities for corruption:
  - Fraudulent use of school money for private gain
  - Graft or bribery in the awarding of contracts
- As a result, need for:
  - Financial regulations: transactions administered either via the public sector treasury (Sweden) or bank accounts reduces opportunities for personnel to embezzle money (except when treasury does not operate accurately)
  - Budget scrutiny: the exercise of budget scrutiny at school level is important for minimizing opportunities for corruption
- This may require to have a common financial management systems and good capacities at school level
Australia and England have similar budget scrutiny processes, relying on accurate recording and reporting of financial information through computerized accounting software.

In Australia, there is a common management system; and TA and training is provided.

In UK, with 150 LEAs, this is not the case: each school must buy its training and support.

4. Independent financial reviews

- Budget scrutiny insufficient to prevent fraud/incompetence in the management of school finances and ensure accountability.
- Independent reviews conducted by registered private accounting firms.
- Are financial reports or financial regulations fully complied with?
- Reports submitted to the various stakeholders at various levels with sanctions for misconducts and irregularities:
  - Intervention of relevant public authorities (removal from school positions)
  - Intervention of the police (embezzlement of funds)
Victoria (Australia)

- The financial regulation of schools is the responsibility of the Financial Management Unit (FMI), Standards and Accountability Division (SAD) [Department of Education and Training of the Ministry of Finance]
- School councils scrutinize and approve the financial accounts on a monthly basis
- The Auditor General, under the authority of the Audit Act 1994, has responsibility for the conduct of independent reviews and financial statement audits of public sector agencies, including schools

Formula funding and transparency...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>How to address?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of formula</td>
<td>Too complex</td>
<td>Equity/ transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data sharing / indicators</td>
<td>Data manipulation</td>
<td>ITC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial regulations / control</td>
<td>No compliance</td>
<td>Use various sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No capacity</td>
<td>Internal audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opacity of rules</td>
<td>Outsource/ training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No routine control</td>
<td>National standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Formula funding and accountability…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>How to address?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Weak Local Authority (LA)/LEA</td>
<td>TTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability chain</td>
<td>Data manipulation</td>
<td>Capacity building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit/certification</td>
<td>Power structure</td>
<td>Change procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper level control</td>
<td>Costs incurred</td>
<td>Outsource control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In-country training workshop

TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION

Three areas of concern: teachers, private tutoring and academic fraud

Jacques Hallak and Muriel Poisson
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Reminder: Practices of corruption in education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Corrupt practices</th>
<th>Impact on education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School building, rehabilitation</td>
<td>Fraud in public tendering, Embezzlement, School mapping</td>
<td>Access, Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, Textbooks, Food</td>
<td>Fraud in public tendering, Embezzlement, Bypass of criteria</td>
<td>Equity, Quality, Example bad location of schools, too high or too low use demanded for places unattended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher appointment/management</td>
<td>Favouritism, Nepotism, Bribery</td>
<td>Quality, Example less qualified teachers appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher behaviour</td>
<td>&quot;Ghost teachers,&quot; Bribery (for school entrance, exams, assessment, private tutoring, etc.)</td>
<td>Equity, Ethics, Example disparity in staffing by schools, discrimination against the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations and diplomas</td>
<td>Selling of information, Favouritism, Nepotism, Bribery, Academic fraud</td>
<td>Equity, Ethics, Example unjustified credentials available to students who can afford to pay bribes**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information systems</td>
<td>Manipulating data, Selecting/suppressing information</td>
<td>Equity, Ethics, Example omitting data on repetition/dropout, less priority on quality improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific allowances</td>
<td>Favouritism, Nepotism, Bribery, Bypass of criteria</td>
<td>Access, Equity, Example inflating enrolment figures to increase financial transfers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corrupt practices – three major areas of concern:

- Teachers
- Private tutoring
- Academic fraud

Concluding remarks

- Definitions
- Scope and magnitude
- Forms of malpractice
- Examples of strategies

I. Teachers

Definitions

Scope and magnitude

Forms of malpractices

Strategies
1. Definitions

Malpractices in teacher management can have different forms in:

- Recruitment
- Deployment
- Promotion
- Daily management

2. Scope and magnitude

- Teachers are the largest proportion of civil servants in most countries
- Salaries of teachers is the largest component of education costs (50-90%), hence impact of distorted behavior being proportionately higher
- Teachers misbehavior can undermine the crucial aims of education
3. Different forms of malpractices

- Bribes interfering in appointment, deployment and promotion, as well as in-service training
  - *The National Education Workers Union, in Mexico, has created a system of patronage, including the selling of teaching positions*
- Fraud in credentials affecting recruitment, promotion and retirement
- Lack of transparency and accountability in managing time on task: absenteeism*, ghost teachers**, double payments, fake information on overtime work, undeclared sick leave

*Absence rates in various countries*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Primary schools (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: WDR, World Bank 2004*
**The case of ghost teachers**

- Teachers listed on the payroll but who no longer or never did exist
- Some did exist but are now dead or retired and no longer teaching in a school
  - Teachers who resigned, absconded, on leave without pay, on study leave without permission
- Others are deliberately created at the school, or the next higher level so as to increase the funding to a school or District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honduras 2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea 2002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda 1993</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4. Strategies

- Establishment of “a clean list of staff” (Kenya?)
- Auto motion of personnel functions
- Setting of clear and objective criteria/procedures
  - e.g. competition based on credentials
  - Audit of the certificates and diplomas given to teachers
- Easy access to information from within the system/in response to requests
  - New information system at central, local and school level
  - Single centralised and transparent system of archives
  - Public posting of information
Example: the case of Colombia

In Bogotá, 240,000 additional pupils (33% of total) enrolled with no additional recruitment of teachers for half of them, thanks to the redeployment of existing staff – 1998-2003

1. Updated database with occupied and vacant positions
2. Verification of location of teachers
3. Application of criteria (size of group, number of teachers per group)
4. Identification of surpluses and deficits of teachers in each school
5. Transfers or new appointments
6. Determining personnel for each school and specifying principal’s personnel management responsibilities
7. New transfer systems
8. Competition for new teachers
9. Control of absenteeism
10. Reporting of anomalies

II. Private tutoring

Definitions
Scope and magnitude
Forms of malpractices
Strategies
1. Definitions

- Tutoring in academic subjects
  - *e.g. languages and maths*
  - *Excludes extra-curricular subjects*
- Provided for the financial benefit of tutors or companies
  - *Excludes voluntary help*
- Additional to mainstream schooling
  - *Outside school hours, often in separate premises*
- Either by the same or by other teachers
- Variable intensity (family income)

---

**Large tutorial schools, individual tutors**

- In East Asia, the major tutorial schools are large, and extremely modern companies
- In Japan their shares are quoted on the Stock Exchange
- In Korea, they have advertisements in trains and buses
- In Kenya, “coaching has been exploited and converted into a money-minting enterprise. Teacher deliberately fail to cover the syllabus during the normal school hours and wait to teach during extra hours to make a quick buck” (The Nations, 2000).
- In other countries, individual tutors or small tutoring centres predominate
2. Scope and magnitude

- Since 1960 major phenomenon in East Asia
- Over 1/3 of pupils in India, Egypt
- Spreading worldwide (Latin America, Africa)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Forms of malpractice

- Undermining the system:
  - Teachers neglect their mainstream duties in favour of PT
  - PST examination-oriented, distorting balanced mainstream curricula
  - Pressure exerted by teachers on head teachers to be affected at higher levels (more demand for PT)

- Fraudulent practices:
  - Public facilities used for private interests
  - Pressure exerted on parents to pay for private tuition
  - Curriculum taught in a distorted way
  - Penalisation of pupils not attending PT (including their deliberate failing)
Critical question: does monopoly cause illicit behaviour?

**Corruption = Monopoly + Discretion - Accountability**

- Illicit behaviour flourishes when agents
  - Have monopoly power over their clients
  - Can exercise their discretion
  - Have weak accountability
- This is true for teachers providing private tutoring to their own pupils
- Such teachers are in a position to make more money by:
  - Failing in their duty in mainstream classes
  - Suggesting that tutoring ensures the promotion of children

4. Strategies

- Ignore private tutoring (*Canada, Japan*)
- Prohibit private tutoring (*South Korea in the 80ies*)
- Recognize and regulate PT (*Mauritius, Hong Kong*, *Taiwan*)
  - Law and regulations defining PT clearly
  - Budget allocation for monitoring and policing PT
  - Establishment of self-regulated associations*
**Hong Kong: Government response**

- PST takes place in private tutorial schools, but employs public school teachers part time
- *Until 1990:* Govt had *laissez-faire* approach
- *1990’s:* public complaints about high fees, poor quality, lack of safety; many unregistered tutorial schools
- Govt campaign to educate parents on choice of a tutorial school; publicity to warn operators and inform clients of their rights:
  - Information booklet, web site
  - List of registered tutorial schools (specifications, premises, fees, offences, safety of premises)
  - List of unregistered schools: convictions

---

**Self-regulated association: example of Taiwan**

- Dominance of the examination system reduced
- Academic ‘buxiban’ forbidden to enrol primary school students
- Secondary school students not allowed to have tutoring classes from Monday to Sunday noontime
- Establishment of adequate regulations for private centres, with clear criteria for registration
- Creation of an association of tutoring schools functioning as a self-regulating body
III. Academic fraud

Definitions
Scope and magnitude
Forms of malpractices
Strategies

1. Definitions

- “The use of public office for private gain in the academic field, especially regarding examinations, certificates and diplomas, university/college research and publications”

- “Any prescribed action taken in connection with an examination or test that attempts to gain unfair advantage or, in some cases, to place a candidate at a disadvantage”

- “Extent to which procedures to standardise the conditions under which examinations are prepared, administered and scored are observed or violated”
2. Scope and magnitude

- Academic fraud is increasing everywhere
- Example: in the USA
  - 30% primary, 70% secondary students cheat
  - 40-70 confirmed frauds in bio-medical research per year
- In some countries, examination corruption has become a business
- Academic fraud is a threat to societies, both developing and developed, because it throws a doubt on the quality of diploma and degree holders
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3. Forms of malpractice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Forms of malpractice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examination development</td>
<td>• Leakage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of students for</td>
<td>• Test preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testing/examinations</td>
<td>• Impersonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of examinations</td>
<td>• External assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Smuggling of foreign materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Copying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Intimidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Substitution of scripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improper assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ghost centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Marker malpractices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diploma mills and false credentials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marking of examinations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuing of certificates and use of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A few examples

- India: relatives stood outside a govt school hurling answers to students; they had got the answers through bribes
- China: Hired “gun men” take exams for anywhere between $200 to $1200
- Pakistan: Paper setters ran their own tuition centres where candidates, on payment of substantial fees, were granted access to at least part of the examination papers
- Israel: dozens of civil servants obtained fake academic degrees to win pay raises
- USA: obtaining counterfeit diplomas is fast, easy and potentially effective (US General Accounting Office)

Higher stakes, higher fraud

« The higher the stakes, the greater the likelihood of cheating and unethical practices » (less than 5% of a cohort gaining admission to university in most developing countries)

- No overall policy on fraud:
  - Inconsistent or conflicting definitions of academic fraud
  - Lack of supervision, no effective mechanism for detecting and punishing fraud
- Low quality of education and of management capacities
- Assessment of teachers/schools linked to students success
- Poverty (low salaries of teachers and exams officers)
- Weakening of ethical norms
4. Strategies

- Increasing security
  - Exam format (multiple choice tests)
  - Preparation of several sets of papers (Uganda, Indonesia)
  - Confidentiality of exam content and format
  - Anonymity (substitute candidate numbers, centralised marking)

- Controlling measures:
  - Reinforced supervision, identity checks, warning announcements*
  - Scouting missions to exams centres (India)

- Using ICTs to improve transparency and confidentiality
  - Automating the admission process (Azerbaijan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan)**
  - Use of statistical techniques to detect fraud in MCT (Philippines)
  - Detection and prevention of plagiarism

- Increasing the cost of misbehaviours
  - Cancellation of results, exclusion from exam, fines (Malawi, Kenya), sacking of professors (Korea), non-payment provision in case of leakage

* A few examples

- China:
  - Deduction of 30 to 50 % for writing one’s name on the test paper on the wrong place
  - Disqualification for one year for whispering and copying; for two years for fabricating certificates or interfering with examination personnel; and for three years for impersonation
  - Malpractice by examination officials, bribery, etc. punishable either under the State Secrets Act of the Criminal Code

- North Dakota (USA): A bill to punish the use of a degree from a diploma mill as a legitimate credential
** Form One Selection System (FOSS), Kenya

- **Aim:** automating the Form 1 selection process
- **Rationale:**
  - improve efficiency and effectiveness of selection
  - Reduce cost
  - Minimize influence in selection
  - Increase transparency
- Is part of many Government processes of automating for effective and efficient service delivery to the citizens.

*** Fighting examination fraud, Kyrgyzstan

- Since 2002, admission into universities is based on National Scholarship Test (NST):
  - Run by Independent Testing Organization (ITO)
  - Standardized multiple-choice aptitude tests
  - Administered with strict security measures
  - Sheets are scanned and graded by computer
- NST is supported throughout the country
  - Because scholarships are fairly distributed
- But pervasive effect on equity and transparency in the use of NST
Concluding remarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher management</td>
<td>Clear and objective criteria</td>
<td>Computerized/automated process</td>
<td>Involvement of trade unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private tutoring</td>
<td>Some criteria</td>
<td>IF complementary to mainstream education</td>
<td>Involvement of the profession (enforcement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financing</td>
<td>Information to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic fraud</td>
<td>Transparent rules and procedures</td>
<td>Computerized/automated process</td>
<td>Social mobilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanisms to detect fraud</td>
<td>Enforcement of the profession (honour codes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sanction of fraud (penalties)</td>
<td>Information to the public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF REGULATORY SYSTEMS

STRENGTHENING MANAGEMENT CAPACITIES

ENCOURAGEMENT OF ENHANCED OWNERSHIP
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Exams play a very important role in the education system in Kenya. They are used for:

- Selection
- Placement
- Certification

These are so critical that:
- teachers teach for exams and many students will stop at nothing to acquire good grades
- Coaching – which start as early as pre-school
- Cheating in examinations is a very big challenge – it can occur at any stage
- Maintaining transparency in exams is a big challenge – (workers are under pressure from the public)
- All activities that go into test development and administration are security activities
- Other than academic qualifications, to deal with exams one must practice professionalism, integrity, accountability and a great sense of responsibility
- Dealing with examinations is like “Walking a tight rope”
- You are under public scrutiny all the time
- A small mistake is blown out of proportion and it becomes a public outcry
All examination activities are security activities

- Test Development
- Subject officers - with a panel of setters and moderators drawn
- From KIE, MOE, Universities and other tertiary institutions.
- No practicing teachers are used
- Moderations of items by the panel (marking schemes) test construction by the subject officers

- Items that have been set over a long period of time (item banking)
- Type setting – senior officers
- Security printing of exams
- Closely supervised by the senior
- Officers to check for error
- And control quality – frisking and surveillance are used to maintain security
• Centering of question papers
• Packing of question papers according to centres and data of exams
• DEOs examinations of officers and DEOs, among AEOs, chief
• Securing system
• **Supervision and Invigilation**
  • Supervisors and invigilators are appointed by
  • DEOs they must be teachers
  • They are briefed very carefully about their work and the need for accountability and integrity
  • Ensure that examinations procedures are followed strictly and report any cases of irregularity, absenteeism etc.

• Preparation for marking
• Chief examiners – coordination by subject officers
• Coordination of team leaders and examiners to ensure that the right marks are allocated
• **Processing of results**
• Checking the entries - KCPE ½ million
• KCSE ¼ million
• - Awards
• Awarding means deciding on how you will allocate the grades
• This is usually done by a panel comprising:
  • – subject officer
  • chief examiner and
  • research officers
• Research officers who look at statistics to arrive at the cut off points for A- B- D+
• Release of results
• **Forms of Cheating**
  • Collusion – coordinators, supervisors, invigilators, teachers etc.
  • Smuggling materials into the classroom
  • Leakage – when the paper is seen in advance
  • Impersonation – when another person rather than the registered candidate sits for the examination.
• When cheating cases are reported and proved, the examination results are cancelled.
1. Why this presentation?

- Diagnosis, audits & assessments (DAAS) are **central in all areas** and at all **levels** (institutional, functional, resource level)

- Key tools to analyze whether a project has been a ‘success story’ or not in avoiding corruption. Using DAAS **before** and **after** the implementation of a project makes it possible to detect if the ‘numbers’ in the budgets are incorrect and to see if the **use of resources** is **in accordance with the existing rules**

- Priority concern for Kenya*
2. Usefulness of audits

Audit in education

- Initiate discussion / awareness raising among staff on a certain issue
- Clarify the range of activities that should be used to obtain the objectives
- Identify how far and in what area development should take place
- Prevent corruption by providing valuable information about sanctions used internally
- Contribute to improve performance by identifying faults (fraud, corruption)

An expert, purposeful and organized activity with the purpose of objectively identifying the difference between the desired and actual state
3. Audit, assessment, diagnosis in education

I. ‘Professional’
   ‘Hard facts’
   (MoE/Institutions)
   Audits
   PETS

II. ‘Perception’
   ‘Subjective data’
   Participative Diagnosis
   Report Card
   Surveys

- Organizational (management; central & local level)
- Human resources (‘ghost’ teachers, absenteeism, recruitment. )
- Financing (assess the financial statements of an activity/entity; budget, fund raising.)
- Procurement (tendering)

4. Professional audits in education

I. Professional’ /‘Hard facts’
   (MoE/Institutions) Audits*

External audit
Ex. University managing audit, Slovakia***
Ex. PETS (‘flow’ audit)

Internal audit: continued control carried out by the MoE/institution itself to give a general formative evaluation to improve its functioning (Ex. Lithuania*)

External audit: control of budget, accounts, transfers, treatment of personnel etc., carried out by neutral, independent professional auditors

Further check: global control by central body, carried out f.ex. every 2-5 year, due to the costs. Can question the entire system
5. Traditional methods of audits

Audit system

Public financial control environment
- Internal Control
- Internal Audit

Out-sourcing
- Internal Audit
- Internal evaluation
- External Audit

Department of control
- Ministry of education
- Teachers, Head master
- SAO

1. Rector, academic functionaries, university chief executives and their expert departments

* Internal audit, Lithuania

- 100 external inspectors, working at the municipality and ministry level, assess teacher’s performance and the quality of schools in general

- ‘3 minus 2’ formula is applied to the assessment of the teacher’s work:
  - External auditors shall indicate 3 ‘strengths’ of the teacher and 2 areas that the teacher should improve

• National education strategy for 2003-2012: To develop ‘a modern culture of evaluation and self-evaluation at all levels of education’...( )...‘part of inspection and control is gradually replaced by school audit [internal evaluation], with the aim of improving quality and effectiveness of education’
**Internal evaluation, Lithuania**

- The first ‘internal-evaluation’ system started up in 1999 with 6 pilot schools. In 2000 it was extended to another 22 schools.
- ‘Internal evaluation’ became compulsory 1 September 2004, which means that teachers have an active role in the auditing procedure.

7 KEY AREAS
- Teaching quality, curriculum, attainment of students, supports for students, ethics, resources, management

All teachers are trained to assess school activities by using an evaluation scale of 4 points (4 = ‘very good’, 1 = ‘bad’)

All the areas should be evaluated at least one time during a period of 3 years, i.e. not all the activities should be evaluated at the same time.

Teachers select data sources, collect & analyze data, make a report

Present the report before the community → more transparency

***University managing audit, Slovakia***

- Audits conducted by the Supreme Audit Office (SAO) at universities in Slovakia have revealed that an internal audit does not pay sufficient attention to public procurement audits.

- Ex. A university in Slovakia conducted 36 public procurements over the period of two years. The internal audit did not conduct any audit of the public procurement during the 1st year. In the 2nd year, 3 audits of this type were conducted. The university internal audit did not identify any signs of corruption, while the external audit identified 8 violations of the law on public procurement.
Recommendations from SAO:

- **Permanent and routinely use of internal audit** to be able to react ‘in time’ in case of irregularities
- **Audit of the procurement procedure** (especially selection of bidders)
- Designing an audit system for **specifying additional costs**, if they occur
- Contractual provision of the right to conduct an audit of a supplier, introduction of audit programme
- Be aware of the necessity to use **both internal and external audit** as these are in complementation and not in concurrence to each other

6. The need to address ‘intangible inputs’

- **Limits to traditional audits**

  Plans for addressing issues of access, quality, equity and efficiency in education often focus on the use of *quantitative data*, such as the number of teachers by age/grade/status/level of qualifications and pupils/teachers ratios rather than on ‘intangible inputs’

- ‘Intangible inputs’ concern professional and ethical commitments of teachers and staff (absenteeism, bribes, discrimination of colleagues…)

- These ‘intangible inputs’, which only can be measured by use of ‘*perception*/subjective audits’, are, however, necessary conditions to the delivery of quality education
**7. Characteristics of assessment in education**

II. ‘Perception’ /Subjective Data/Part. Diagnosis**

Participatory diagnosis: perception survey among users; students/teachers on certain questions/situations (distribution of scholarships, quality of textbooks, teaching, ‘ghost’ teachers etc.)

The results of the surveys can encourage…

Proper system of monitoring: internal effort to reduce corruption within the institution in question

---

**Report Card survey, Bangladesh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Preparatory stage</th>
<th>Used methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification of institutions:</strong></td>
<td>Primary education sector in Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
<td>To identify the shortcomings &amp; defects in the education system + locate &amp; investigate corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identification of respondents:</strong></td>
<td>Providers &amp; recipients: Government Primary Education Offices, primary school teachers, students &amp; guardians in 8 sub-district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation of questionnaire:</strong></td>
<td>To address following issues: corruption in the appointment of teachers, identify the nature of corruption + level of corruption in the admission system of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determining the size of sample:</strong></td>
<td>The survey was conducted on 171 head teachers, 966 students and 966 guardians + 105 government, 40 non-government, 14 satellite &amp; 12 community primary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparing the sampling list:</strong></td>
<td>Primary schools were selected by random sampling as were the students of the 4th &amp; 5th grades. Minimum 20 schools was selected from each sub-district; 10 of those were covered by the Government ‘Food for Education Programme’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The report was sent to several officials to alert them about incidences of corruption and solicit their cooperation.

Follow-up

Recommendations: There should be a valid account for collecting extra payments from students, with an identical rate for all schools/students. Advocacy: to curb corruption in sub-district Education Offices, to improve the quality of education in primary education sector.

The report was sent to several officials to alert them about incidences of corruption and solicit their cooperation.

Lack of accountability, low salary, monopoly of power encouraged corruption.

Analyzing coll. info.
The survey revealed several cases of corruption; fees were collected for sport events from students + promotion to higher classes and examination fees, as teachers do not get paid for conducting examinations (Over 96% of the students paid fees to be allowed to sit for the 1st term examination.)

Lack of accountability, low salary, monopoly of power encouraged corruption.

Releasing report, initiate adv.

Recommendations: There should be a valid account for collecting extra payments from students, with an identical rate for all schools/students. Advocacy: to curb corruption in sub-district Education Offices, to improve the quality of education in primary education sector.

Follow-up

The report was sent to several officials to alert them about incidences of corruption and solicit their co-operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Implementation stage</th>
<th>Used methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collecting information</td>
<td>Info. was collected from guardians, head teachers and the Government's 'Food for Education Programme'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing coll. info.</td>
<td>The survey revealed several cases of corruption; fees were collected for sport events from students + promotion to higher classes and examination fees, as teachers do not get paid for conducting examinations (Over 96% of the students paid fees to be allowed to sit for the 1st term examination.) Lack of accountability, low salary, monopoly of power encouraged corruption.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Reporting &amp; advocacy</th>
<th>Used methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Releasing report, initiate advocacy</td>
<td>Recommendations: There should be a valid account for collecting extra payments from students, with an identical rate for all schools/students. Advocacy: to curb corruption in sub-district Education Offices, to improve the quality of education in primary education sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>The report was sent to several officials to alert them about incidences of corruption and solicit their co-operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corruption in Upazilla* education offices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Upazilla*</th>
<th>Percentage of head teachers facing corruption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madhupur</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalitabari</td>
<td>36.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mymensingh Sadar</td>
<td>56.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muktagachha</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kishoreganj Sadar</td>
<td>61.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharishabari</td>
<td>18.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouripur</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamalpur Sadar</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Upazilla = sub-district
Source: Karim, 2004

### Objectives
- To implement procedures that promote public participation and in that way encourage partnership between civil society and local government to resolve problems related to service delivery
- To conduct an analysis of current education policies and to make recommendations on improving their effectiveness
- Greater transparency and accessibility to municipal decision-makers

### Strategies/tools put in place
- Ad hoc education committee of 8-10 persons, representing both education and the community interests (NGOs, parent council representatives, business leaders..)
- Public hearings on issues as education financing, city budget preparation..
- Public awareness campaigns
- Training courses for the local population
- Report cards were developed, notable on educational policy in the city of Ternopil

---

**‘Perception’ survey:** The project in Ternopil began with the delivery of the *Public Service Citizen Satisfaction Survey*, which assess the quality of local public services, the attitudes of public servant and the perception of transparency among these.

The survey has been highly valued by local government as it not only gives them a sense of the scope of the problem, but they also begin to understand the need to involve the general public in the decision-making process.

*Carried out by the Ternopil Agency of Urban Development and local stakeholders, including municipal authorities and NGO partners*
Evaluation of service quality in Ternopil (scale 0 to 5, 5 is "very good"), 1999:

Percentage of respondents that have to make unofficial payments for public services in Ternopil, 1999:
8. Methods of audit: awareness indicators

- One of the keys to success in detecting fraud is the possibility to spot anomalies, also called ‘red flags’

- Situations or occurrences within a program or activity that can indicate susceptibility of corruption

- In education, these may include...

---

### 8. Methods of audit: awareness indicators (ctd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>‘Red-flags’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School building, rehabilitation</td>
<td>- Many sub-contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of clear contracts/ vague or no existing specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Too short contracting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment, textbooks, food</td>
<td>- Supply of inferior materials or less equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ‘Timeliness’ is not respected (meals must arrive in a timely,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regular and continuous way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers appointment</td>
<td>- Appointment of family/close friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher behaviour</td>
<td>- Very high teacher/student ratio according to the ‘lists’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Low salaries, extravagant lifestyle of employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations &amp; diplomas</td>
<td>- Teachers do not get paid for conducting examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Very high % of students pass the exams/ very good results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>- Lack or seldom internal and external control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unusual transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Signing of cheques, use of credit card is in the hands of only one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person/not controlled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Ethical audit

The idea of standardizing and certification of goods has existed in the business sector for quite a long time. This concept has been adapted to the service sector.


CEPAA* is an affiliate of the Council on Economic Priorities, which is a pioneer in the field of corporate social responsibility.

9. Ethical audit (ctd.)

Provides a framework for independent verification of the ethical production of all goods, made in companies anywhere in the world.

Based on a ‘third party verification’

Follow-up by NGOs, other stakeholders (teachers, donors...)

Sources of guidance:
- ILO charters
- Relevant reports from UN
- Contracts of employment
- Professional & ethical obligations: conditions for membership etc.

Deals with areas such as:
- Child/Forced labour
- Health & safety
- Freedom of associations
- Discrimination
- Working conditions

Who can apply for certification:
- Companies seeking to verify their social record or that of their contractors
- Contractors that wish to demonstrate that they are treating workers fairly
- Development organisations seeking to ensure that they procure from ‘non-exploitative’ companies
9. Ethical audit (ctd.)

- The idea behind SA 8000 is 'standardization' of codes of conduct. The multitude of codes of conduct for donors, contractors make the use & distribution of resources opaque.
- A common standard/certificate can improve this situation.
- It is possible to extend the use of SA 8000 to the education sector, universities and projects financed by the donors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Examples of use of 'ethical audit' in education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child/Forced labour</td>
<td>• Contracting of textbooks, school construction: use of child labour in fabrication of paper, materials etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; safety</td>
<td>• School building too close to the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• School building containing carcinogenic/dangerous materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distribution of school meal of bad quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of associations</td>
<td>• Financing of corrupt teacher unions (Example; Mexico)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>• Distribution of scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruitment of teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Textbooks with racist attitudes/gender discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Entrance to universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sexual harassment on the working place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>• Too long working day for contractors/sub-contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unsafe school buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PRE-AUDIT (fin.)  
Collusion?  
No findings

Audit (fin.)  
Collusion?  
No findings

Internal audit (top down)  
Collusion?  
No findings

Internal audit (participatory)  → Red flags?
Definition of Internal Auditing is an independent objective assurance and consulting activity designed to add value and improve an organization operation accomplished its objectives by bringing a systematic disciplined approach to alleviate and improve the effectiveness of risk, management, control and governance process.

Internal Audit provides assurance by assuring management that the internal control process are working efficiently.

And effective and if not advices the management on weaknesses noted so that they can take corrective action because internal control is the responsibility of management.

Internal Audit has previously been looked at as mainly performing pre-audit function but pre-audit is a control function and as stated above is a management function as seen from the approve is not a function of Internal Audit.
Change comes slowly and as a result in MOE we still perform this function but are moving away gradually to concentrate on Risk Based Audit approach.

In RBA approach risks are identified by the management on a high, low, medium scale basis. The Internal Audit then conduct interviews with managers and based on their perspective of what is high, low or medium risk, internal audit experience, external audit reports, amounts allocated in the budget. The auditable entities are identified and audit is given to the highest rated risks.

- High rated risk are audited annually
- Medium risk every two years

Low risks

RBA is an improved and more scientific way of performing systems audit because it is not what the auditors would like to audit on a random basis but it is what gives the management “sleepless nights” and he/she considers high risk.

- Risks are aligned as per management, it is management who determines the risk management
It is true the internal audit are part of management and that is why we advice management of the risks, evaluate control processes.

The aim of evaluating high risks is so that the objectives of the ministry can be achieved.

Internal Audit also provides consulting activities as opposed to assurance on internal controls at the request of the management.

Independence and objectivity of the internal audit cannot be overemphasized. It is only in this way that the role expected of the internal audit can fully achieved.
External Audit (independent)

- Free Primary education
- Ernest and Young
- Objective – to give an independent view to determine if finances and resources injected into the programme have been used in accordance with established rules – provide true and fair view

School Audit Unit (Role)

- Support the ministry in supporting schools in the management of Financial Resources
- Ensure that resources are utilized for the intended
- Ensure that resources the schools and learning institutions adhere to financial and procurement guidelines.
Quality Audit in Curriculum Delivery (Directorate of Quality Assurance & Standards)

The mission statement of DQAS is “to establish, maintain and improve educational standards in Kenya”

During routine visits to educational institutions the following are the areas of quality assurance and standards assessment:

- Enrolment
- Teaching establishment
- Physical facilities
- Time tabling

- Lesson plans/schemes of work/lesson notes and pupils’ progress, record/mark sheets
- Teachers, professional records and policy documents
- Visitors book
- Syllabus coverage and time on task
- Absenteeism of teachers and pupils
- Legal status of the school – whether the school has an active BOG/School
Committee and whether the school is registered or not
The state of schools’ stores and financial management
The match between human/financial resources and schools performance at exams.
World Bank
KESSP
Financial Monitoring Reports

Moses Wasike, FMS

Bank Expectations

Compliance with terms of the DCA:
- Maintenance of Proper Accounting Records
- Periodic Financial Monitoring Reports (FMR)
- Independent Annual Audit
- Reporting Deadlines
Bank Remedies

The Effects of Noncompliance:

- Suspension of credit
- Refund of unaccounted funds
- Delayed project progress
- Poor country rating

Report Based Disbursement

Documents Required:

- Quarterly FMR
- Budget vs Actual disbursement analysis
- Special Account balances
- Cash Forecast for next 2 FMR periods
- Procurement progress and plan
- Project progress narrative
**FMR Underlying Objectives**

- Funds are used for their intended purpose
- Project implementation is on track
- Better contribute to sustainable capacity
- Better budgetary monitoring
- Harmonization with client and counterpart reporting systems

**Scope of FMR**

- Encompasses the total project as described in the PAD
- Includes Government Contribution and funds from other donors
- Includes non cash contributions and directly procured goods and services
**Structure of FMR**

Financial information should be linked with physical progress and procurement, to give assurance that financial and physical progress are consistent.

**Considerations**

- Avoid parallel or duplicate systems
- Shared structure for all financial information ie. Planning, costing, FMR, financial statements, ICRs etc.
- Alignment of financial and procurement reporting
Considerations (Cont)

- Avoid providing information already available to the Bank
- Harmonised donor reporting and monitoring arrangements

Content of FMR

The FMR should normally include:

- Financial reports
- Physical progress reports, and
- Procurement reports.
Financial Reports

- Cash inflows and outflows for the period (e.g., quarter), and cumulatively for the project life
- Expenditures should be reported according to project activities not disbursement categories
- Use borrower systems as far as possible
- Relate FMRs and annual financial statements.

Physical Progress Reports

- Physical progress reports should link physical outputs or implementation progress to costs of achieving them.
- Indicators of physical progress and outputs should be selected during project preparation, stated in the Project Implementation Plan (PIP)
- Monitored outputs should be quantifiable, material and relevant to implementation progress.
**Procurement Reports**

- Show the status of procurement of goods, works, services, and consultants.
- Compare the actual procurement performance with the plan agreed with Bank at negotiations or in a subsequent review.
- Highlight specific problems (e.g., staffing or training needs).
- Explain deviations from plan, and proposes solutions to problems identified.

**Responsibilities**

**Task Team Leader:**

- Determining and agreeing with the borrower the format, contents and frequency of FMRs.
- Supported by financial management specialist (FMS), procurement specialist (PS) or procurement accredited staff (PAS), and other TT members.
- Responsibility for physical progress reporting issues
Report Based Disbursements

Additional requirements

- Cash flow projection based on procurement and work plans
- Special Account Activity Statement and reconciliation
- Review and clearance by TTL, FMS and PAS

Responsibilities

- The FMS has primary responsibility for financial reporting issues
- The PS (or PAS) has primary responsibility for procurement reporting issues.
- Loan Department staff provide support to TTs on disbursement issues.
Interpreting FMR

- Monitor overall project performance in relation with the original/revised plan
- Budgeted expenditures normally reflect the project activities scheduled for the period
- Variance analysis
  - Planned/actual costs, outputs and contracting
  - Significant variances require attention and remedial action

Poverty Reduction: Global Partnership
Working for a world free of poverty
Characteristics of public expenditure tracking surveys (PETS)

- Diagnostic or monitoring tool to understand problems in budget execution*
  - delays/predictability of public funding
  - leakage / shortfalls in public funding
  - discretion in allocation of resources
- Data collected from different levels of government, including service delivery units
- Reliance on record reviews, but also head teacher/ school manager interviews
- Variation in design depending on perceived problems, country, and sector

Main sources of funds in Indonesia

- National Budget
  - General Allocation Grant / DAU
  - Local Revenues / PAD
- Local Budget
  - Other Rev.
  - Local Government
  - Other Sectors 50 – 60 %
  - Allocation for Education Sector 40 – 50 %
  - *87 – 92 % for Salaries
  - *3 – 8 % for Capital Expenditures
  - *2 – 7 % for Operational Expenditures
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I. Design and implementation of PETS
II. Analysis of PETS results
III. Dissemination of PETS results
1. Design of PETS

- Stakeholder consultations and scope of the study
  - Purpose of the study
  - Who is in charge of what? How do resources flow?
  - Only 1 or 2 sectors at a time
- Rapid data assessment
  - Usually needed from frontline units (schools and clinics)
  - Simple questionnaire can be useful
- Questionnaire design for PETS
  - Each level needs its own instrument
  - Recorded data to be cross-checked against the same information from another source

1. Design of PETS (ctd.)

- Data kept by facilities for own use are typically most reliable
- Questionnaires for:
  - school director / head teacher
  - local governments
  - relevant central government ministries
- Data sheets for the same
- Training, field testing, and data entry
- Requires significant time (several weeks each activity)
- Local participation essential
- Test instruments at each level separately as record-keeping differs
2. Implementation of PETS

- Data management
  - Important to reduce time required by data cleaning after the survey
  - Take into account in the instrument design
  - CSpro the preferred data entry program
    http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/cspro

- Survey implementation (1-3 months)
- Analysis, report, and dissemination

3. Contacts with Government

- Renew contacts as soon as analysis begins:
  - to align analysis with govt concerns
  - to involve govt personnel

- This will:
  - help to build govt ownership of the study
  - increase chances that recommendations following the analysis will suit govt’s goals
4. Sampling

- School census for sampling frame, but often census on private and/or community schools not available
- How to overcome?
  - Draw sampling units randomly from an existing set
  - Enumerate all private and/or community facilities in these sampling units
  - Randomly draw private and/or community facilities from the obtained enumeration list
- Stratified random sample (region, urban-rural, ownership, etc.)
- Links to other surveys can complicate sample design

5. Questionnaires

- What determines the number of questionnaires for PETS?
- Good understanding of the following combination:
  - Administrative structures
  - Sources of funds
  - Flow of each type resource through such structures
  - The institutional arrangement at each level for handling education from higher level and to another level
  - Can vary from local government to another in decentralized systems
- Good understanding of the banking system with respect to flows of funds
6. Types and number of questionnaires

- Data sheets for extraction of data at specific levels:
  - Central government (MOES, MOF, etc), province/region, district, sub district, school, student/patients
- Clear understanding of the sources and types of education funding, administrative structures and the flow of funds through such structures are key to determining the number of questionnaires
- Questionnaire with portions covering different respondents in the institutions or separated questionnaire for each respondent to avoid confusing enumerators
- Include a sheet at the end of the questionnaire where qualitative information is recorded

II. Analysis of PETS results

Locating and measuring leakages

Analysis of causes
Analysis

- Renew contacts as soon as analysis begins, with Government and other stakeholders to:
  - Help build govt ownership of the study
  - Increase chances that recommendations following the analysis will suit govt’s goals

- For managers and policy makers: two complementary tasks:
  - Analysis of leakage: locating and measuring
  - Analysis of causes to propose remedies*

- For researchers: other tasks
  - Equity analysis**
  - Econometric studies, etc.

*Uganda: leakage and enrolment

LEAKAGE AND ENROLLMENT
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*Uganda: leakage and PTA income

LEAKAGE AND PTA INCOME

Leakage %

PTA income per student

*Uganda: leakage and qualified teachers

LEAKAGE AND TEACHER QUALIFICATION

Leakage %

Teachers qualified %
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**Zambia: inequalities in public funding**

![Graph showing share of funding for all schools by wealth quintiles.](image)

- Shares: Rule-Based
- Shares: Discretionary
- Shares: Staff Payments
- Perfect Equality

---

**Urban Schools**

![Graph showing share of funding for urban schools by wealth quintiles.](image)

- Shares: Rule-Based
- Shares: Discretionary
- Shares: Staff Payments
- Perfect Equality

---

**Rural Schools**

![Graph showing share of funding for rural schools by wealth quintiles.](image)

- Shares: Rule-Based
- Shares: Discretionary
- Shares: Staff Payments
- Perfect Equality
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III. Dissemination of PETS results

Newspaper campaign in Uganda

Lessons from Uganda

1. Background

- Increased public spending on education: no improvement in pupil enrolment/quality education
- Budget allocation alone can be a poor indicator of the quality and quantity of public services delivered at the frontline
1. “Newspaper campaign to cut capture” (Uganda)

- Main national newspapers (2) and their local language editions
- Monthly transfers of capitation grants to districts published in newspapers since 1996
  - Parents will know what their entitlements are
- Posters required at district HQs announcing the date and the amount of funds received
- Schools required to maintain public notice boards/posters displaying receipts
  - Parents will know what the actual receipts are
- Subsequently expanded to other sectors

2. Lessons from Uganda

- Through an inexpensive policy action, mass information through the press, Uganda has managed dramatically to reduce capture of a public program aimed at increasing primary education*
- Because the poor were less able than others to claim their entitlement from district officials before the campaign, but just as likely in 2001, they benefited most from it
- Public access to information is a powerful deterrent of local capture

* IIEP-UNESCO
*Ugandan schools received more after a newspaper campaign*

![Graph showing the increase in funds reaching schools](image)

Source: Reinikka and Svensson (2001), Reinikka and Svensson (2003a)

---

**Conclusion**

- Timely information about actual spending not provided by public accounting systems
- Usefulness of PETS to provide an accurate picture of the supply
- Importance to make budget transfers transparent
- Information dissemination as a powerful tool of change
- Need to integrate PETS:
  - in the administrative process (linkage with audit)
  - in the public communication policy
- Crucial role to be played by the “social control” exerted by communities
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Rationale

For the first time capitation grants to all primary schools based on enrolments were being made to all schools through EFT hence the concerns:

• over efficiency and effectiveness of primary schools to utilise the resources and account for the expenditure properly
• over possible leakage of resources to individuals or unintended organizations.
objectives

• Track down to what extent resources flow from funding agencies to MOF – MOE – banks - schools

• Establish the flow and efficiency of budgetary allocations to schools (SIMBA and GAP)
• Establish how resources are translated into (outputs) cash receipts and value for money at the primary school level

Tasks

• Collect data and document receipt of funds by each agency at each stage in their transmission through the banking system
• Verify that the flow of funds have been made in accordance with the approved financial management instructions for educational institutions and that spending decisions are fully supported by proper documentation
• Identify any bottleneck in the flow, investigate and report on the findings for such bottlenecks
• Analyze data and present findings on the end user of the funds at the primary school level. Assess the extent to which the end user of the fund is in accordance with MOE guidelines issued for the two accounts.

Study was undertaken in two phases (1) 2003/2004 Financial Year and 2004/2005 Financial Year

• The study involved random sampling of over 10% of primary schools in all provinces and districts
• Sampling was made taking into account, urban, rural, high potential and ASALS
General Findings

• Funds flowed from the funding Agencies – MOF – MOE – Banks
• Some schools did not receive the funds due to wrong account No’s or wrong bank sort codes
• Initially the funds did not reach all the schools within 48 hours as targeted
• That the committees met and that minutes and records were maintained in most schools

• That funds were utilized for the intended purposes (SIMBA)
• That in some few instances, funds for GAP were vired in cases where items of expenditure were not a main issue (electricity and water in rural areas)
• That flow of funds was made in accordance with the approved financial management instructions
• The concerns over leakage and wastage were not evident. The situation was assisted by:
  • A uniform accounting system had been rolled down, guidelines and possible sanctions that were in practice by MOE
  • Sanctions- The Embu case (6 schools) where guidelines on textbook procurement were not strictly adhered to
  • Financial management training which captured the target of over 90% headteachers.

• Initially some schools especially in urban areas in particular Nairobi had funds co-mingled in the school accounts.
  • Small schools did not enjoy the economics of scale in view of the funding formula based on enrollments.
1. Definitions: procurement / contracting

- *Procurement* refers to the acquisition of goods and services by any individual or organization (public, private, international)
- *Contracts* are the means by which public money is spent and public policy is implemented
- *Contracting* includes all activities that, in the shape of a contract, channel government expenditure

*Ex.*: privatisations, licenses and other types of contracts, which also affect the budget
2. Why care about contracting in education?

Reducing corruption in contracting can:

- Increase the efficiency of public spending and donors’ resources
- Improve the quality of education services
- Increase the level of transparency and accountability, making it easier to justify use of funds
- As the risks are lower, improve the level of confidence in contracting and therefore attract more investment
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3. Management structure

Central level
Coordination of rules & guidelines in contracting

Local level
Implementation of rules & Use of local contractors

Problems
Misinterpretation or non-respect of the rules/contracts, risk of monopoly, cultural aspects

Solution
Create an independent control commission
However central, local or mixed?

Central* → Local**

Idea:
Local capacity building & ownership can improve the use of resources, foster local participation and prevent corruption
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**Toward transparent procurement systems, Kenya**

- **Summer 2004:** Procurement scandals, followed by the resignation of senior civil servants
- **April 2005:** Anti-corruption action plan
- **August 2005:** Procurement bill establishing an autonomous Public Procurement Oversight Authority (responsible for regulation of procurement in the public sector)
- **September 2005:** Stakeholders’ meeting convened by the Government, to review Government anti-corruption action plan

The declared intention is: to improve competition in the procurement process, promote compliance with the Public procurement Act, improve information on the call for tenders, make operational public procurement complain mechanisms.

---

**Central State procurement agency, Azerbaijan**

- **Introduction of the first procurement legislation**
- **Establishment of an executive body answerable to the Cabinet of Ministers, with responsibility for carrying out State policy in the field of public procurement (1997)**
- **Main activities:** implementation measures, information dissemination, training, supervision and control
  - Preparation of critical documents for use by procuring entities and of these entities
  - Preparation of reports for the Cabinet of Ministers, on the status of the public procurement system
  - Preparation of annual reports of its activities
- **Limited by its size** (less than 20 members of staff)
**Local procurement centers, China**

- In January 2000 the Tendering and Bidding Law entered into force.
- In 1994 ministries helped promote the Tangible Construction Market (TCM), a market for open tendering and bidding for civil or urban infrastructure construction projects.
- Currently 325 of China’s 336 cities have established similar procurement centres.
- TCM have helped but not enough because under resourced and under utilised.

4. Risks of corruption in contracting

- Profits of corruption are particularly high in school construction* and textbook** contracting.
  - Bidders ‘encouraged’ to pay bribes, since sales levels are guaranteed.
- However, service provision which imply long-term contracts, can present more monitoring challenges in order to assess the quality of the service provided, such as for school-meals***.
**Corruption in school-building, China**

- Huge investment in new infrastructure, combined with weak enforcement of contracting regulations
- Local officials play decisive role in tendering and in many cases ignore relevant regulations
- From 1997, 14 directors of transport in nine provinces have been investigated for corruption
- Three successive heads of transportation in Henan province were caught taking bribes and convicted for complicity in other crimes
- Similar malpractices in land development and real estate, leading to popular protests especially in the fast growing coast and in Beijing
- But major improvements underway

*Source: TI Annual report 2005*

**Corruption in textbooks contracting, Philippines**

- Bribes given to the regional office and schools divisions can represent 20 % of a contract, accounting administrative officer and auditor can each receive 0.5 - 1 %
- *Result:* Critical shortage of textbooks in nearly all the 40 000 public schools; 1 textbook is shared by 6 pupils in elementary schools, by 8 in high schools
- *Sign of change:* A freelance agent working for several textbook publishers was caught when handing over a bribe of 3 million PHP. The agent had to answer corruption charges to the National Bureau of Investigation and later to the Senate and House of Representatives.
Background: Contracting of school meals represent 26 billions of francs every year, shared between 15 private enterprises

Sodexo proposed to pay for and manage the construction of a kitchen to fabricate the meals (price calculated into price per meal). But the kitchen was over-dimensioned. Result: the community lost a lot of money

Scolarest signed a contract giving them the right to sell school-meals for 14 years. According to the contract, the city must pay for non-consumed meals. The contract foresaw 421 000 meals/year in 1996, but the real number was 363 000. Result: the city paid 1.6 million Francs extra

5. How to address risks in education contracting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Main risks</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision to contract/ definition of contract characteristics</td>
<td>- Risk of channel benefits to an individual or an organization - Over specification - Vague or nonexistent specification</td>
<td>- Adequate legal and regulatory framework* - Preparation of written contracting procedures, fixing explicit selection criteria - Contracting requirements and specifications made by outside consultants or external auditors, - Pre-qualification of bidders**, through questionnaires or detailed reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* IIEP-UNESCO
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**Prequalification of bidders, New York city**

The City School Construction Authority evaluates the capability and credentials of potential firms:

- Experience
- Quality and timeliness of past performance
- Financial capability
- Reliability and responsibility
- Safety record
- Compliance with equal employment requirements
- Compliance and enrolment with wage, hour, labour standards
- Integrity of the firm, its key people, affiliates, current and past owners

Firms need to be in existence at least for two years.

The Contractor Qualification Unit (CQU) looks at the firm performance on its four most recent largest contracts and reviews the firm’s work history.

*Source: Thomas, 2005*

---

**5. How to address risks in education contracting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Main risks</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracting</td>
<td>- Invitation to tender is not publicized</td>
<td>- Promotion of additional competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process</td>
<td>- Invitation to tender is publicized but little time is given to present offers</td>
<td>- Bidding procedures and documents made publicly and timely available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bidders or contractors collude to influence prices or to share the market</td>
<td>- Use of electronic procurement systems*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Chance given for bidders from multiple countries to take part in the process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**E-procurement: some basic principles**

- **e-GP**: use of information technology systems and networks by governments in conducting their procurement relationships with suppliers and contractors for the procurement of works, goods, services and consulting services

- **Key principles**: transparency, non-discrimination, equality of access, open competition, accountability and security of process
  - **Implications**: Bid advertising, technological neutrality, technical standards for interoperability and security, good audit trails, cost and ease of participation

- **All procurement stages concerned**: pre-qualification, advertising, preparation and issuance of bidding documents, receipt of bids, bid opening, evaluation of bids, clarification and modification, notification, publication of results

  *Source*: ADB, IADB, World Bank, 2005

---

**5. How to address risks in education contracting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Main risks</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract award</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria are not clearly stated in tender documents, leaving no grounds to justify the decision</td>
<td>Selection by a central body in charge of comparing tenders and awarding contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucratic corruption bribes kickbacks political considerations</td>
<td>Setting up of a series of successive filters, based on technical, qualitative and financial criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality (or cost) is the single measure of merit for awarding the contract</td>
<td>Reliance on written justifications, bid openings in public, outside reviews, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement of civil society organizations (integrity pacts*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Establishment of a committee dealing with objections and claims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**The Integrity Pact for textbooks, Argentina**

- In 2003, the Ministry of Education (MEST) asked an NGO to assist in the procurement process of more than three million textbooks.

- The MEST and 48 publishing companies signed an Integrity Pact (IP) to eliminating any incentives/opportunities for bribery in the contracting process.

- 65 publishing houses and associations took part in a debate on textbook selection criteria, submission and eligibility of offers, contract award and contract implementation.

- Each member of the National Advisory Committee was required to complete a statement (publications, public offices held, positions held in the private sector, relationships with publishing companies, royalties).

- Following the publication of these statements, publishers submitted a series of remarks and half of the 19 CAN members were excluded from the process.

---

5. How to address risks in education contracting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Main risks</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract implementation and</td>
<td>- Contract changes and renegotiations after the award are of a nature that</td>
<td>Internal and external supervisory and control systems of contract implementation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supervision</td>
<td>change the substance of the contract itself</td>
<td>- Efficient rewards and penalties systems for contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Corruption at sub-contractor level</td>
<td>- Role of &quot;watchdogs&quot; played by communities (&quot;report cards&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cost overruns</td>
<td>- Mechanisms to handle complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supply of inferior materials or less equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Award cancellation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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*Monitoring the School Feeding Program, Chile*

- **Variables monitored**: quality of the service, quality of nutrition, size of the portions served, students’ acceptance or rejection of food products, based on information provided by the students, or the teacher (random samples from schools)
- Teacher in charge of the PAE must certify whether each day’s meals were served completely, incompletely, or not served at all; and vouch for the quality of the service provided
- Laboratory analysis verify whether the food served fulfill the requirements
- Testing of other control mechanisms, such as the “smart cards”: a flexible and efficient technological control system, with a card to monitor access by beneficiaries to the food provided

Source: Latorre, 2004

---

### 6. Learning by experience: ‘red flags’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Red flags’</th>
<th>Main risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over specification</td>
<td>Only one or very few contractors respond to the criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of clear contracts/vague or no existing specification</td>
<td>Difficult to justify contract award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive or restricted calls for tender</td>
<td>Suspicion of favouritism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to tender not publicized</td>
<td>Unfair concurrence, monopoly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation publicized but too short contracting process</td>
<td>Unfair concurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims urgency as an excuse to award contract to one contractor</td>
<td>Difficult for inexperienced bidders to present bids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bids not kept confidential</td>
<td>Only fair bidding if bids are secret until results are revealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many sub-contractors</td>
<td>Suspicion of collusion to influence prices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply of inferior materials or less equipment</td>
<td>Quality delivery of resources are ‘spent’ elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purely formal control of contract implementation</td>
<td>The results of the control are dependent from decision-makers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area:
- School building & rehabilitation
- Library
- Equipment
- Textbooks
- Uniforms
- Food
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OVERVIEW

- Procurement is the process of acquisition of goods, services and works in accordance with the laid down government procurement regulations and procedures.

- Procurement is not complete until these goods, works or services are received, certified correct and meet the users specifications.
In Government, procurement is decentralised, and each unit, Ministries, Parastals, public colleges/universities, schools and co-operative societies operate independent procurement Tender committees each.

Each Tender Committee is answerable to the ministry of finance through the public procurement Review and Appeals Board.

It is the responsibility of each Tender Committee to adjudicate and award tenders transparently and therefore being accountable for each decision taken.
• Procurement is also responsible for asset management and disposal of unserviceable items.
• The ministerial Tender Committee adjudicates tenders whose value per single item is over Ksh500,000.

• There are four main methods of procurement
  • Direct procurement (no quotations)
  • Restricted tendering (selective)
  • Open tendering
  • Request for proposals (mainly used for consultancy services)
• Procurement is done through committees or authority depending on the threshold (value) of the procurement.
• Departmental Committees
• Ministerial Tender Committee
• Accounting Officer’s approval
• Procurement plans.

• It is the responsibility of each user department to develop specifications of the item or service required, and upon adoption by the users the procurement process proceeds to the tendering/quotations stage for competitive sourcing.
• Procurement involves:
  • Development of specifications by users
  • Tendering/advertising (invitation of bids)
  • Opening and award
  • Implementation (commissioning operationalisation)
  • Therefore procurement is a task performed through team work.

• Thereafter the bids and their evaluation results are presented to the MTC for adjudication and award.
Specialized in-country training workshop:
“Resource leakage and corruption in the education sector in Kenya”


Group work

IIEP Project on:
“Ethics and corruption in education”

© UNESCO-IIEP 2006
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please read the extract from the 'Kenya Education Support Programme 2005-2010' (KSSP), below:

"The MOEST proposes a 5-year investment programme to provide school improvement grants of amounts between KShs 100,000 and KShs 200,000 per year (depending on the enrolment at the school) to 4,000 primary schools, to allow them upgrade their infrastructure in line with their priorities. In addition, about 970 schools selected through a district based needs assessment will be provided with additional grants to construct approximately 3,880 classrooms, 9,700 toilets, upgrade water supplies, and provide a range of other school infrastructure depending on the local needs.

The overall aims of this investment strategy are to encourage schools to develop their own development plans; support schools financially and technically, to improve their infrastructure; build capacity for implementation; mobilize community support; and to monitor and evaluate both progress and impact. This component will address the needs for infrastructure provision in the most overcrowded schools and the poorest areas of the country.

School improvement grants will be prioritised on district or location basis based on existing pupil-to-classroom ratios and poverty indices. Within the 5 prioritised areas, all schools will receive the basic school improvement grant. Further work will be undertaken during the programme design stage to develop clear and agreed targeting criteria that are linked to the targets and priorities of the KESSP. Schools with serious backlogs of infrastructure will receive additional funding and will be selected on the basis of need. Across and within districts, disbursement of funds and construction work will be phased to ensure efficient and cost effective rollout of the programme. The programme will take particular care to address the infrastructural needs of ASAL areas, in particular, by providing among other items, dormitory facilities and teachers housing, where appropriate."
The development of the 5-year development plans by schools will describe individual schools’ priority areas for investment. Each plan will be developed and agreed by the School Management Committees (SMCs) and the Parents-Teachers-Associations (PTAs) before being submitted to higher authorities. Some of the items that may be included in the plan are improvement of existing permanent classrooms, toilets, storage facilities, fences, water supply infrastructure, furniture and cooking facilities. In addition, the programme will ensure that adequate routine maintenance of school assets is incorporated into the school planning process.

- Mobilizing communities, parents, community-based organizations and other stakeholders to provide support in improving and maintaining existing infrastructure. Community contributions, either in financial resources (depending on the economic level) or in kind will be required to support Government and other partners’ contributions.

- Training of SMC members and PTAs representatives on how to successfully implement school improvement plans and ensure prudent utilization of grants.

- Disbursement of grants to schools and combining these with community contributions to improve school infrastructure”.

Extract from KESSP, Kenya.

Based on your reading, make comments on the following:

1. Describe the context of the investment programme adoption.

2. Provide a set of criteria to be kept in mind in the design of the proposed grant, to address the issue of reliability, transparency and accountability.

3. What should be included in the guidelines to be prepared for the users of the grant?
Please read the extract from Max Eckstein's book "Combating academic fraud" attached in the Appendix.

Based on your reading, answer the following questions:

1. What are the major types of examination fraud in your country for each of the following steps:
   a) Design;
   b) Administration;
   c) Marking;
   d) admission of successful candidates to the next education level?

2. On the basis of your country's experience, what would be the respective advantages and disadvantages of establishing an independent non-governmental examination agency to fight examination fraud?

3. On the basis of your country's experience, what would be the advantages and disadvantages of adopting standardized multiple-choice tests?

4. On the basis of your country's experience, what would be the advantages and disadvantages of processing admissions to Universities automatically by computer?
Please read hereafter the extracts from the ‘Kenya Education Support Programme 2005-2010’ (Part II), regarding (i) the construction and improvement of primary school infrastructure; (ii) school feeding programmes; and (iii) textbooks and training materials.

### Primary school infrastructure (page 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy of objectives</th>
<th>Indicators of achievement</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Critical assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2</strong></td>
<td>4000 new, completed or refurbished classrooms in existing schools by end FY 2007/8 and an additional 4000 by end FY 2009/10 [basic SIG]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Programme implementation guidelines and regulations are acceptable to GoK and donor partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school infrastructure in existing schools improved in ASAL areas, urban slums and pockets of poverty</td>
<td>1940 new classrooms constructed in selected schools by end FY 2007/8 and an additional 1940 by end FY 2009/10 [additional SIG]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate teachers available to staff new schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% of infrastructure construction completed to an agreed cost and quality standard by end FY 2007/8 and 95% by end FY 2009/10 [additional SIG]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil/latrine ratio reduced to 1:35 for girls and 1:45 for boys in areas prioritised for the SIG programme for both boys and girls by end FY 2007/8 and 1:25 for girls and 1:35 for boys by end FY 2009/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective implementation and coordination of infrastructure and school health programmes by end FY 2005/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## School feeding programmes (p 98)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative summary</th>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. School feeding in ASAL and Nairobi slums</td>
<td>1.1 1,068,500 pre-primary and primary school children provided with a daily mid-day meal and optional mid-morning snack</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Number of school that have initiated IGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 150 trainers and 1500 school heads and SMC members trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community based and school based income generating activities to sustain school feeding programme</td>
<td>3.1 560,000 pupils in 3500 school located in the poorest areas benefit from treatment and health promotion initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 1.2 million pupils in 7500 schools receive immunization plus interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Health and hygiene promotion, immunization plus services education and de-worming in schools in poorest or most vulnerable communities undertaken.</td>
<td>3.3 Improved water and sanitation facilities in X number of water source schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Development of IEC materials</td>
<td>3.4 Nutritional support to X Malnourished under-5 children at X ECD centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strengthening National school Health co-ordination office</td>
<td>3.5 6000 teachers and 149 trainers trained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 3,500 health education IEC materials produced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 3,500 schools monitored by head office and DEO’s office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 2 computers, 2 printers and 1 photocopier issued to National school health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Textbooks and training materials (p 110)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative summary</th>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
<th>Critical assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Access to education</td>
<td>Enrollment in public primary &amp; non-formal schools. rise in enrollment from 7.0M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Textbooks available in schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textbook pupil ration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of training &amp; Instructional materials documents</td>
<td>Number of schools with training and management documents. All schools to have 7 updated management documents yearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbursement of funds</td>
<td>18,000 Public primary schools received PFE Funds</td>
<td>Continuous flow of information from the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td>No. of computers at TMU increased from 5 to 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds for computers available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TMU officers &amp; clerks computer literate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Officer are trained on IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of stationery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial tracking of PFE funds</td>
<td>Disbursed PFE funds available in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Availability of funds and transport for officers to the districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textbooks purchased available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved TDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the extracts from the 'Kenya Education Support Programme 2005-2010':

1. Identify different 'red-flags'/awareness indicators of corruption possibilities that donors/institutions/local stakeholders should be particularly aware of and the reason for this.

2. Indicate - in the cases where a control is necessary - what type of audit/assessment/diagnosis is the best suitable.
Each group will analyze the structure of the government’s resource flow for primary education. Your analysis could, among others, include the following points:

1. Draw up a provisional graph of the government’s resource flow for primary education, including the funds concerning textbooks. An example of a similar graph is shown below.

2. On the basis of your experience, discuss the opportunities for corruption offered by this pattern of resource flow. What corrupt practices could arise from such opportunities?

3. List a set of research questions to be tested by the PETS.
The School Improvement Grants Program (SIGP) in Indonesia was implemented by the Ministry of National Education between 2000 and 2004. The program was funded by the Government of Indonesia with multi-donor support, predominantly from the World Bank and ADB loans. The Royal Netherlands Government, which resumed development cooperation with Indonesia in 2000, became the largest bilateral contributor. SIGP provided grants to a total of 8001 schools in 130 districts, at a cost of approximately US$ 60 million. Out of this amount, approximately 70% was spent on physical rehabilitation of school buildings.

The first phase of SIGP (2000-2002) became known as SIGP 1 and operated in 73 districts providing substantial cash grants to three categories of primary and junior secondary schools. From 2002-2004, SIGP II, covering 60 districts introduced a number of important design changes and focused entirely on schools serving poor communities.

The School Improvement Grants gives the schools, within broad parameters, the possibility to decide how they spend the money based on their own priorities. This idea of school managed, community-led improvement is not new. It has been practiced in a number of donor-funded projects, but it is in stark contrast to the usual business of school construction and rehabilitation. Use of local labour and locally purchased materials were encouraged and centrally contracted construction consultants were assigned to provide technical support and supervision.

However, irregularities and corruption were soon discovered by the Central Independent Monitoring Unit (CIMU). CIMU was established by the World Bank and other donors to make sure that the scholarship and operational support fund were given in a correct and transparent way.
1. Corruption awareness

Before the implementation of the project, specific program procedures were deliberately planned in the full knowledge of the prevalent corruption that had infused education projects in the past. The following features were intended to promote accountability and minimize leakage:

- **Decision-making process at several levels:** While the direction of program policy, the definition of guidelines and the setting of district allocations were centrally determined, the selection of beneficiaries was the responsibility of multi-sectoral committees at the district and local levels, including non-government representatives. In schools, implementation was the responsibility of school committees on which community participants served.

- **Strong emphasis on pro-active school committee involvement to promote transparency and engender community participation.** Where physical rehabilitation of school buildings took place, technical teams of local people with useful skills were co-opted into school committees and as much of the work as possible was carried out by local people.

- **Adoption of block grants as the principal mechanism for funding schools.** SIGP earmarked specific amounts of cash for specific recipient schools. Once allocated, schools were allowed freedom to spend within fairly liberal parameters.

- **Program procedures were highly specified in comprehensive guidelines.** The purpose and organization of the program was explained. Rules and formats for planning, handling and scrutinizing grant expenditure were set out. Considerable effort also went into briefing implementers.

- **Program processes were open to public scrutiny.** Efforts were made to publicize the program through the media by publishing lists of recipient schools in local newspapers. Information about the grants was to be made freely available to school communities, through “socialization” meetings and school notice board displays.
2. Irregularities and examples of corruption

In the description above, a picture emerges of a program that was deliberately set up to avoid leakage and corruption. Nevertheless, several cases of corruption were discovered by the CIMU. Corrupt practices by local officials within the field of contracting included:

- Corruption in school building contracts and,
- Operating opaque central procurement arrangements on behalf of schools for the purchase of books and furniture, which provided poor value for money.

In the School rehabilitation in Ponorogo, East Java, the district committee responsible for administering the SIGP, for instance, instead of following the established guidelines for the project, chose a more ‘traditional’ approach. The committee chose to misinterpret the program guidelines, which clearly intend school improvement to be in the hands of the schools themselves. The district engaged contractors to manage the use of grants and effectively take away from the school communities all decision-making concerning the use of grants. Representatives of the contractors were co-opted to school technical committees in charge of the rehabilitation works. It was argued that there was really nothing wrong with the practice as ‘schools often lacked the necessary technical knowledge to manage rehabilitation and needed all the help they could get’.

It also occurred that the contractors accompanied the head teachers when they collected the grants from the bank, which they then took as down payments for the work. On the whole, the results of the rehabilitation work undertaken have been disappointing in this district – mainly because the involvement of contractors reduced the amounts available for the schools.

In some cases, the corruption started even before the contracting procedure had been announced. This was the situation in the school rehabilitation project within the SIGP in the Garut district, West Java. Before the school rehabilitation

could start, the project had to establish which school should be part of the reconstruction or not. In order to get the grant, the school had to respect some general criteria. The amount of the fund depended on:

- The level of damage of the school;
- Geographical situation (access from the school to the District capital); and,
- Whether the school has received other grants in the last two years.

Investigation revealed that schools belonging to the local elite often received the grant despite the physical condition of their school buildings being quite good. At the same time, several schools which were damaged due to natural catastrophes or in general bad shape obtained no funding (see tables below). In the Garut district, although the school building conditions were different, it was given the same amount for all the schools.

List of schools which did not respond to the project requirement criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of The School</th>
<th>Type of Irregularities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SDN Langensari III</td>
<td>Still in good condition, in 2002 got support fund from local government budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SDN Kadungora III</td>
<td>In 2002 got support from OECF. The Headmaster is one of public officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SLTP II Malangtong</td>
<td>In 2002 got support from APBD Rp. 150 million, still in good condition as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SLTPN V Tarogong</td>
<td>Still in good condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MI Ahidayah</td>
<td>Still in good condition. The owner is The Chairman of The Awakening Party of Umbang Sub District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MIJuliard</td>
<td>The owner is Abuhamim, S.Ag, Vice Chairperson of Commission E (Commission for Education) Garut Local Parliament (DPRD II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SLTP II Malangtong</td>
<td>Still in good condition, has got support from local government budget previously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SLTP S Tarogong</td>
<td>The physical condition is quite good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SDN Pasirkramas II</td>
<td>Still in good condition. In 2002 got the rehabilitation fund Rp. 115 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SDN Sarinuldi II</td>
<td>The condition is quite good and got the rehabilitation fund at 2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of schools in bad shape but received no financial help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name of The School</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SDN Jayamukti I</td>
<td>Cinjor</td>
<td>The school building is ruined totally (caused by landslide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SDN Jayamukti I</td>
<td>Cinjor</td>
<td>Two units were broken (caused by typhoon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SDN Seiawii II</td>
<td>Talasseh</td>
<td>The condition is broken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SDN Tanjungaya I</td>
<td>Pakejeng</td>
<td>Class room and roof are broken. Two class room without roof and some of the student have class at the nearest SDN. They are no toilet for teacher and student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SDN Sippen III</td>
<td>Fatubur, Limbangen</td>
<td>Three class room are running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SDN Sippen V</td>
<td>Fatubur, Limbangen</td>
<td>One class room and teacher room are running.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SDN Ciptaming 3</td>
<td>Sariyaemi</td>
<td>The school building are broken. Many student moved to other school because some the school will be running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SDN Padasauh III</td>
<td>Fatubur</td>
<td>The school condition are broken and can’t use anymore.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SDN Negatiru 3</td>
<td>Pakejeng</td>
<td>The school is broken, the land-floor will be watered when it rain fall and the building made from bamboo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the case of Indonesia presented above and your own experience, your group will try to answer the following questions:

1. What are the concrete as well as potential problems concerning corruption in contracting in this example?

2. How can these problems be addressed?

3. What do you think about the share of control between central and local level in this example?
GROUP WORK REPORTS
Group work 1: Formula funding

Q1. Context of Investment Programme

- Inadequate physical infrastructure in many primary schools against expanding enrolments;
- Poor state of some existing physical infrastructure;
- Disparities in the existing physical infrastructure;
- Need to target areas of infrastructure deficit such as ASALs and Pockets of Poverty

Q2. Criteria in the Design of the Proposed Programme

- Overcrowded schools;
- Pupil-classroom ratios
- Poverty indices;
- Existence of sub-standard classroom sizes
- Water and sanitary facilities to address issues of gender equity
- Communities encouraged to develop their own development plans - then oversee their implementation and monitoring;
- Mobilization of communities through the existing management structures - SMCs, PTAs, etc.

Q3. Guidelines for Users

- Financial management systems;
- Financial Monitoring systems;
- Procurement procedures;
- Reporting relationships;
- Defining the responsibilities for the stakeholders - i.e. communities, SMCs and PTAs.
Group work 1: Formula funding

- Group 4 resolved to tackle question 2 of the exercise provided
- Criteria to be used in disbursement of grant
- Disbursement of grants will be based on enrolment and the status of infrastructure in schools as is captured under EMIS data

- Reliability
- Data production (data collection, processing analysis dissemination and feedback) should be timely and reliable

- Transparency
- Identification of benefiting districts and schools should be carried out in an objective manner
Accountability
- Clear management structures should be put in place from school level district and national
- Capacity building to be carried at all levels of implementation to ensure quality of the project undertaking
- Mechanisms for flow of information and feedback to be established.
Group work 1. Formula funding

- Development plans to be prepared and implemented at school.
- Prioritization of investment areas
- Ownership school management committees and Teacher Associations
- Finance to be allocated according to Technical Assistance to schools
- For the success of the programme, phased approach will be adopted in implementation
- Mobilize Community and other stakeholders to support the programme
- Capacity of stakeholders for implementation

ROLES OF USERS OF GRANTS

Q3

- Develop and agreed workplan (SMCOPTA)
- Prioritise the activities (SMC & PTA)
- Submit workplan to higher authorities for approval
- Usage of funds should be in accordance with existing financial and procurement regulations
- Training of SMC & PTA representatives
Q3
• SMC to monitor and evaluate progress of the project
• SMC to ensure proper financial management to ensure accountability and transparency
• SMC and PTA to ensure routine maintenance of school assets.
Group work 3: AUDIT

Q1: Primary School Infrastructure

- Possibility of collusion in the tendering process;
- Compromise of quality of the output.
- The pre-determined cost may occasion leakage - i.e., the cost may be lower/higher: if lower - there is a possibility of leakage of resources to ensure all resources are utilize; if higher - there is a possibility of the programme stalling.
- If the criteria for selection of schools is not objective and transparent, the selection may be based on other considerations rather than the identified need.
- The absence of means of verification implies a vacuum in monitoring and evaluation of programme implementation.

Q2: School Feeding Programme

Type of Audit/Assessment

- Participatory - continuous participation of the community in the monitoring and evaluation of the programme progress.
- Involvement of the Ministry of Works - Audit report and certification.

Red-Flags

- Delivery of less amount of food to be the designated areas.
- Delivery of food to schools but not given to the pupils.
- Lack of cooperation from the other-related muilt-subsectors, especially in water and health leading to non-achievement and leakage of resources.
Q3: Textbooks and Training Materials

Red-Flags

- Inflation of the enrolment data.
- Collusion between the school administration and the book sellers to share discount.
- Collusion between the school administration and the book-sellers in the award of the contract - this is due to lack of capacity in the SIMU Procurement Committee.
- Temptation of headteachers to steal the money intended for School Instructional Materials
- Creation of 'ghost school' to mischief funds.
Group work 4: PETS

Q1: Flow of Government’s Funds for TSC Salaries

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

TEACHERS SERVICE COMMISSION

DEPOSITORY BANK – NBK

CLIENT BANKS (Teachers & Secretariat Staff)

TEACHERS AND SECRETARIAT STAFF GET THEIR MONEY
Q2: Opportunities for Corruption

- Ghost teachers and staff - IPPD system addressing this.
- *Manipulation of the payroll* - by staff in collusion with trs.
- Payment of absentee teachers - e.g., trs on study leave, etc.
- *Payment by voucher* for teachers who have undergone disciplinary process.

- *Collusion in the check-off systems* (Third party deductions) - i.e., contributions to Insurance Firms, Hire Purchase Firms, etc.

- *Possible leakage of savings* in view of the activities that are carried out with the savings.

Q3: Research Issues

- How the savings are spent in relation to the objectives of the organization.

- Tracking of the flow of funds and possible leakage from the National Banks to the teachers.

- How many teachers do you pay through Commercial Banks and Financial Institutions to all teachers in the districts?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Red flags</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Improvement of primary school infrastructure</td>
<td>1.1 Many sub-contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Lack of clear criteria to identify pockets of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Lack of clear criteria for section of contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Lack of clear guidelines on the number of classes to be completed or refurbished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Omission of other stakeholders as a critical assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 School Feeding Programme</td>
<td>1.1 No specification on quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>1.2 Optionality of the mid morning snack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of specification of expected income from income generating project (IGP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Logistic of identifying of hygiene programme in poor areas
- No direct control of health officials
- No timeframe set for immunization programme
- The actual number of schools not quantified
- The nutritional support not quantified
3. Textbooks and Training Manuals
   • The expected number to increase not quantified
   • No specification of training and management materials
   • Lack of clear criteria for disbursement of funds
   • No specification of computer literacy
   • No specification of type of stationery
   • Unspecified financial tracking methods
Group work 5: Contracting

Question 1. Primary School Infrastructure
1. Design, planning and costing process may not meet the user specifications. Standardize designs of similar projects within the same region.

2. Failure to follow laid down procurement procedures and regulations
   Establish and strengthen school management committees
3. Price variation in goods and services in construction of the infrastructure.
   School management committees to be involved in supervision and monitoring of construction works.
• 4. Delay in delivery of goods and service and .. By the suppliers/contractors Can make costs escalated or course sub-standard work or less delivery.

• Identification and selection should be subjected to a strict criteria, open tendering system is preferred.

• Completion certificates and supervision of works in progress can provide a loope hole.
• There should be involvement of the school management committee at all levels.
• Actual payment for the goods and services offered
• Retention fee should not be released until the mandatory period is over.
Question 2. School feeding programme

- Enrolment of pupils – figures are often inflated
- Use and independent verifier to authenticate the enrolment data provided
- Implement EMIS and ensure the data is used in school feeding programme.

2. Poor record keeping by the schools

Involve SMC/PTA and staff in school feeding management.

3. Frequent condemnation of food due to health hazards can be a result of collusion. Any condemnation must involve school management committees.
• Pilferage during transportation storage and delivery.
• Failure to cook food that has been supplied to the school.
• Involve parents and school Associations in food preparation to children.

Question 3. Textbooks and training materials

1. Enrolment of pupils is normally inflated for schools to receive more Instructional materials
   Use EMIS data and frequent monitoring.

   Maintenance of the book ratio over a long period of time despite regular allocation of funds to procure books.

2. Regular inspections and monitoring
• Failure to practice transparency by not displaying income expenditure.
• Display of income and expenditure returns should be done on a school notice board for all stakeholder to see.
• Discounts should be in form of books and materials not cash to SMC or executive committee members
• Frequent loss of books and materials
• Any loss returns should be accompanied by police abstract/report.
Group work 5: Contracting
PRIMARY SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE

• Means of Verification
  – School inventory giving number of classrooms
  – Progress reports from various parties involved at different levels e.g
    • School infrastructure
    • Committee reports
    • Alert of works reports
    • Tendering reports
    • Records of financial expenditure
    • School census data

• Red Flags
  – Identification of beneficiary schools
  – Tendering procedures
  – Lack of a functional infrastructure committee
  – Failure to follow the building code
  – Delayed and incorrect submission of progress reports
  – Inflated expenditures
  – Unauthorized advance payments
  – Distorted school enrolments data
• Ensure the formula is reliable and transparent
• Building capacity of the school infrastructure committee and SMC
• Strengthen participatory monitoring and evaluation process
• Impose sanctions for delay in submission of progress reports

• Impose sanctions on the contractor through surcharge as termination of the contract
Group work 5: Contracting School infrastructure

Q1  Construction completion/refurbishment
    4000 classrooms by end of financial year
    2007/08
Separation for the activities
- construction of new classrooms
- completion of existing classrooms
Refurbishment of classrooms
- Estimated cost per class in each category
  not specified at some cases to be agreed upon.

- Criteria of selection of 1940 new classrooms not clear
- The number of completed classroom not clear as the categories are all mixed up
- What is 75% pegged on?
- Activity: pupil/latrine
- Number of toilets/to be constructed not clear
• Criteria of deterring the effectiveness implementation not clear.
• q2 Pre –Audit to determine the current status e.g. number of classrooms in each category and latrines/toilets
• Assessment of the costs per item in each area should be identified.

---

**SFP**

• Q1.1 quantify the number for pre-primary and primary school from the total 1,068,500
• 2.1 Audit the IGP to determine the level of sustainability
• 1.1 Standardization of the meals (we either do without or give meals to all, since optional is open to fraud)
3.4 specify the number
3.5 specify the trainers
4.1 How many schools to benefit
5.1 period for auditing
Q2 Pre-audit required

3.1 Children to benefit from the health initiative programme to be subjectively selected otherwise target in the selected areas.
3.2 m pupils in 7500 school to receive immunization require more information
3.3 number not specified furthermore the activity is replicated in school infrastructure more information required
Opening remarks by the Education Secretary, Professor George Godia during the KESSP building workshop to be held at Lake Naivasha Simba Lodge from 28th May to 3rd June 2006.

Senior Government Officials
Officials from the DfID
Facilitators
Course Participants
Ladies and Gentlemen.

It is my greatest pleasure to be with you here this morning. I am glad to note that we have finally mounted this important course for the critical actors towards the successful implementation of the Kenya Education Sector Support Programme (KESSP). I have to mention that this workshop should have been held at the beginning of this financial year. However, due to unforeseen circumstances, we have not been able to hold this workshop into such a time when we are drawing near to end of the financial year. I would like to thank the organizers of the workshop and specifically the Department of International Development (DfID), UK who together with the Ministry of Education have made it materialize.

This country recognizes that education is a basic human right and is fundamental for the development of a human resource base critical for the improvement of quality of life. Kenya subscribes fully to the Education for All (EFA) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and is taking necessary steps to fulfill the relevant obligations. Alongside the design of relevant programmes, Kenya has also undertaken major and rapid reforms in the education sector.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are aware that with the change of government at the end of 2002, the current government committed itself to reforming the provision of education. the Declaration of Free Primary Education, was the Foundation on which the other major reforms in Education were built. After launching the Free Primary Education programme in the year 2003, the Government realized the need for more focus on the education sector as a whole. This realization led to the successful hosting of the National Conference on Education in November 2003, whose objective was to build a national consensus on the kind of education Kenya needed for the 21st century. The Conference mandated the Ministry of Education to develop a policy framework for education in Kenya, and this saw the development of the Sessional Paper No. 1 of 2005 (“a Policy Framework for Education, Training and Research).

The Sessional Paper was operationalized through the engagement of stakeholders in planning through the Sector Wide Approach Process (SWAP). This process whose overall aim is to develop and secure funding for the Kenya Sector Support Programme (KESSP) focuses on resource mobilization, allocation and utilization for the education sector.

KESSP is the basis upon which all stakeholders in the education sector including the government, individuals, communities, non governmental organisations, private sector, and development partners are jointly supporting the Education Sector for the period 2005/2006 to 2009/2010.
KESSP was developed around six key thematic areas to enhance access, equity, and improve quality and relevance of education. Within these six thematic areas there 23 Investment Programmes that address all levels of education from early childhood development to the university level. It also provides the framework for implementation of programmes in the Education Sector and is all-inclusive in terms of partnership involvement and sectoral focus. Hence we continue to encourage participation by other stakeholders, including NGOs and international development partners in the financing and management of education.

The overall objective of the Capacity Development Investment Program is to enhance the skills of the various practitioners involved in the implementation of KESSP. Towards this end, the Provincial Directors of Education, District and Municipal Education officers were appraised on the content and structure of KESSP in August/September 2005 at the Kenya Institute of Administration and Egerton University. Further, 108 middle level managers from the MOE headquarters and SAGAs were sensitized regarding the programme in November, 2005 at Egerton University. In order to enhance programme implementation on the ground, 2064 district stakeholders were also sensitized on KESSP at various venues around the country. Currently, sensitization of stakeholders at the district level is still going on and this has resulted in the development of District Action Plans to aid implementation.

The KESSP Investment Managers and members of the KESSP Secretariat are key to the implementation of the KESSP programme. It is therefore critical that they are trained in various skills to enhance effective programme implementation. This is because they have the prime responsibility for resource management and programme steering. They are also expected to provide technical support to provincial and district level implementation teams in the broad areas of programme management and education outcomes. It is therefore necessary that their capacities be enhanced as a strategy to aid effective implementation, to inculcate in them skills in resource management, accountability and effectiveness. A course focusing on enhanced programme implementation is therefore considered apt.

Ladies and gentlemen, this workshop whose theme is Capacity Building for KESSP Implementation, and whose general objective is to enhance the management and planning skills among KESSP Investment Managers and the support departments for the effective implementation of KESSP aims to achieve the following:

- Equip Investment Managers with skills for the effective implementation of KESSP
- Enhance the roles of Investment Managers in programme planning, monitoring and evaluation
- Enhance governance and accountability in the implementation of KESSP
- Enhance team work among the KESSP Investment Managers
- Enhance risk management.

The specific objectives above translate into workshop topics which will be covered over the five-day duration. This include a wide range of topics that are critical to the successful implementation of Education Sector programmes. Among the topics that you will be covering are:

- Transparency and Accountability in Educational Management
- Corruption: Causes and Consequences
- Methods of Programme Auditing and Assessment-Emphasis KESSP
- Public Expenditure Tracking Surveys (PETS)
- Risk management in education contracting
- Linking KESSP Programme to Budgets/Expenditure Monitoring
Ladies and gentlemen, we are operating in an environment in which we do not have enough resources. Prudent management of our resources is therefore of great concern. The Kenyan public and the international community have raised issues of transparency and accountability in the management of public resources. We have to operate above board in all our dealings and more so bearing in mind that education is a concern of everyone. We have to continue working to ensure that we manage our resources well for the benefit of the Kenyan people. I believe that this workshop should give us an opportunity to re-evaluate ourselves and dedicate our efforts towards minimizing resource leakages.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am aware that there are able and seasoned facilitators here who will be taking you through the topics. The facilitators have been sourced both internally and externally. The experiences from both international and local settings is critical to the course participants. We need to tap on the vast experience and knowledge of the facilitators to make the best of the time we will be here at Naivasha.

In conclusion, I would like to once again reiterate the importance of this workshop. I am convinced that after the one week programme we shall be in a position to reorient our implementation process and particularly strengthen the Monitoring and Evaluation framework which is very weak.

You are hereby called upon to put in more effort for the success of the programmes that you manage for the good of this nation. Let me once again thank our development partners for their support and particularly DfID for making it possible for us to hold this workshop. I thank the participants and all the other officials present for getting time to attend this important workshop.

With those remarks, I now declare this workshop officially open.
# CAPACITY BUILDING ON ENHANCED PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION FOR KESSP INVESTMENT MANAGEMERS FROM 28TH MAY – 3RD JUNE 2006

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/Department</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brown Onguko</td>
<td>MOE Policy &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Box 30040 Nairobi</td>
<td>0723934738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. David Masafu</td>
<td>MOE DHE</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>0733868843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Susan Kapule</td>
<td>MOE/Basic</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>0721599054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Francesca Opondo</td>
<td>MOE/DBE</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>0723400183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Edwina A.O. Magoha</td>
<td>MOE/INTERNAL AUDIT</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>0721778778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sammy N. Kagiri</td>
<td>KESI</td>
<td>Box 62592 Nairobi</td>
<td>0720549904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Charles M. Kanja</td>
<td>MOE/INSET</td>
<td>Box 30040 Nairobi</td>
<td>0722782399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Milton M. Mokah</td>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>Box 42264 Nairobi</td>
<td>0722239762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Muni Erastus D.K.</td>
<td>MOE/DHE</td>
<td>Box 30040</td>
<td>0722698607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. James Karukungu</td>
<td>MOE/DPP</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>0722795151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Isaac G. Thuita</td>
<td>MOE/DPP</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>318581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. S.M. Ole Kingi</td>
<td>MOE/BE</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Agnes Odaawa</td>
<td>MOE/DPP</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Paschal M. Makite</td>
<td>MOE/BASIC/NFE</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Alice W. Gichu</td>
<td>MOE/Finance</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Elizabeth W. Gitau</td>
<td>KIE</td>
<td>30231 Nairobi</td>
<td>3749900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Agnes W. Koori</td>
<td>MOE/CPU</td>
<td>Box 30040 Nairobi</td>
<td>318581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Clyde Castelino</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Box 30465</td>
<td>2844000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Louise Banham</td>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>“</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Zipporah Mutea</td>
<td>KNEC</td>
<td>Box 73598 Nairobi</td>
<td>0722775211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Shelmith Wanjoji</td>
<td>ADULT EDUCATION</td>
<td>Box 42264 Nairobi</td>
<td>220935 NBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department/School</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>KENNEDY NYONGESA</td>
<td>MOE/CPU</td>
<td>BOX 30040 NAIROBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PETER W. OKWANYO</td>
<td>MOE/ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>INVIOLATA N. WEKESA</td>
<td>MOE/CPU</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>D.G. WAIHIGA</td>
<td>KESI</td>
<td>BOX 62592 NAIROBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MERCY RINGA Wanjagi</td>
<td>KIE</td>
<td>BOX 30231 NAIROBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>KIBET N. LAGAT</td>
<td>MOE-HQS (DHE)</td>
<td>BOX 30040 NAIROBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>KIMATHI M'KANATA</td>
<td>MOE/DPP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>R. MOUNDE OMOSA</td>
<td>MOE/DHE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>SALOME MAINA</td>
<td>MOE/DPP</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>H.S. ABDI</td>
<td>MOE/DBE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>NUR J. GULEID</td>
<td>MOE/DBE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>JOSEPH R. MAHINDA</td>
<td>MOE/ACCOUNTS</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>MARIA CHERONO</td>
<td>MOE/DBE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>EZEKIEL K. MUTIE</td>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>PRIVATE BAG NAIROBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>KEVIN MWITI</td>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>WAITHAKA KABUGU</td>
<td>MOE/DQAS</td>
<td>BOX 30040 NAIROBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ELIUD BARASA</td>
<td>MOE/DPP-</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>BENVON MURGOR</td>
<td>MOE/DHE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>C. NYAMWANGE</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>L.J.O. SPIRA</td>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>PRIVATE BAG NAIROBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>G.O. LEWE</td>
<td>TSC</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>AMB. WAMBUA</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>BOX 60209 NAIROBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>DANIEL SIMIYU</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>BOX 30040 NAIROBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>HARRIET MUGAMBI</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>EUNICE WANJOHI</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>ALFRED NJOGU</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>THOMAS OMOYOJO</td>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>