

# TEACHERS SERVICE COMMISSION



## REQUEST FOR EXPRESSION OF INTEREST (CONSULTING SERVICES – FIRMS SELECTION)

**KENYA**

### SECONDARY EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (SEQIP)

**LOAN NO/CREDIT NO/GRANT NO: P160083**

### ASSIGNMENT TITLE: CONSULTANCY SERVICE FOR DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A SCHOOL BASED TEACHER SUPPORT SYSTEM (SBTSS) FOR ENGLISH SUBJECT

**Reference No: TSC/SEQIP/EOI/001/2017-2018**

The Government of Kenya has applied for financing from the World Bank toward the cost of the Kenya Secondary Education Quality Improvement Project (SEQIP), and intends to apply part of the proceeds for consulting services.

The consulting services (“the Services”) include enhancement of continuous Teacher Professional Development (TPD) and the consultancy is intended to provide technical

support to the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) to develop and implement a School Based Teacher Support System (SBTSS) for the English subject of two years with an expected start date of August 2018.

The Commission now invites eligible institutions to express their interest in providing the services.

**Objectives of the assignment:**

- i) Collaborate with TSC to develop and implement a School Based Teacher Support System for Teachers of English in targeted sub-counties<sup>1</sup>
- ii) As part of the SBTSS, develop and implement a professional development training program aimed at enhancing teachers' mastery of the subject and pedagogical matter content knowledge in English and improve the pedagogical skills of English teachers in targeted sub-counties.
- iii) Support TSC in monitoring and the evaluation of these activities including data collection, analysis and preparation of Reports.

The detailed Terms of Reference (TORs) for the assignment can be found at the following website: [www.tsc.go.ke](http://www.tsc.go.ke) or can be obtained at the address given below.

The Teachers Service Commission now invites eligible consulting firms ("Consultants") to indicate their interest in providing the Services. Interested Consultants should;

- (a) Provide information demonstrating that they have the required qualifications and relevant experience to perform the Services.
- (b) Demonstrate requisite qualifications and experience in rendering the services required.
- (c) Meet/provide the following minimum requirements:
  - i) Institution's background, governance structure, and registration: Registration by the Ministry of Education and recognized certificate of accreditation. Registration

---

<sup>1</sup>[The following are targeted sub-counties](#)

by Ministry of Education is not required for international bidders. International bidders are encouraged to partner with local organization.

- ii) Have a minimum of five years' experience in conducting similar assignments in developing and implementing school based teacher professional development. Familiarity with the use of digital contents for teacher professional development is preferable. Attach relevant documentation as evidence.
- iii) Have a minimum of five years' professional experience in collecting and analyzing data, documenting findings, preparing and presenting Reports.
- iv) Provide evidence of successful implementation of similar assignments at the national and/or international level.
- v) Evidence of financial ability to undertake the assignment. (attach copies of Audited financial statements for the last three years; (2014,2015,2016)
- vi) Provide details on how you will handle the assignment and explanations of your understanding of the objective of the assignment, approaches to the assignment, listing all the major activities and the proposed methodology for carrying out the assignment and obtain the expected output.
- vii) Demonstrate by way of proposal that they will adhere to the proposed timelines and TORs.
- viii) Submit original and copy of the Expression of Interest (EOI) documents.

The attention of interested Consultants is drawn to Section III, paragraphs, 3.14, 3.16, and 3.17 of the World Bank's "Procurement Regulations for IPF Borrowers" July 2016 ("Procurement Regulations"), setting forth the World Bank's policy on conflict of interest.

Consultants may partner with other firms to enhance their qualifications, but should indicate clearly whether the association/partnership is in the form of a joint venture and/or a sub-consultancy. In the case of a joint venture, all the partners in the joint venture shall be jointly and severally liable for the entire contract, if selected.

A Consultant will be selected in accordance with the Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) method set out in the Procurement Regulations.

Further information may be obtained from the Procurement Office, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Podium Wing, TSC House, and Kilimanjaro Road during the official working hours.

Completed Expression of Interest documents may be deposited in the Tender Box located at 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Podium Wing TSC House or delivered in written form to the address below in person or by mail on or before 20<sup>th</sup> March 2018, at 11.00am East Africa Time.

The Secretary/Chief Executive

Teachers Service Commission,

Attn: Head of Supply Chain Management Services

Private Bag,

00100, Nairobi, Kenya

Tel: +254202892000

Email: ddprocurement@tsc.go.ke

<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>CONSULTANCY FOR DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A SCHOOL BASED TEACHER SUPPORT SYTEM (SBTSS) FOR ENGLISH SUBJECT</b>
<b>CONTRACT NO:</b>	<b>TSC/SEQIP/001/2017/18</b>
<b>PROCUREMENT METHOD:</b>	<b>QCBS</b>

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToRs)**

#### **1. BACKGROUND.**

1.1 The Government of Kenya (GoK) through the Ministry of Education and The National Treasury has requested the World Bank for support to improve student learning in secondary education and transition from primary to secondary education, in targeted areas<sup>2</sup>. This is in

---

<sup>2</sup> See Annex 2 for the list of the targeted areas.

line with the aspirations of Kenya's Vision 2030. The Vision's Social Pillar singles out the education and training system as a vehicle to drive Kenya's efforts towards becoming an upper-middle income economy.

- 1.2 Kenya has made good progress in primary education completion and transition to secondary education compared to many other Sub-Saharan African countries. Participation in Early Childhood Education (ECD) increased from a net enrollment rate (NER) of 62.2 percent in 2012 to 74.9 percent in 2016, the primary school NER was 89 percent in 2016, and the transition rate from primary to secondary was 81 percent—a remarkable improvement from 55 percent in 2009. These achievements, among others, have been facilitated by the introduction of relevant policy frameworks such as the Universal Free Primary Education (FPE) and Free Day Secondary Education (FDSE).
- 1.3 In spite of these achievements, there is significant variation in school participation across counties, especially at the secondary level. Secondary school NER in 2014 was below 15 percent for the bottom 5 counties, while it was above 80 percent for the top 5 counties, out of 47 counties. Importantly, gender disparity in school participation is concentrated in the most educationally disadvantaged counties.
- 1.4 Kenya has made investments in improving quality and learning outcomes at the primary level; nevertheless, achievement on basic skills appears low in relation to countries in other regions. For example, 66 percent of Kenyan urban adults performed at level 1 or below out of a scale of 5 levels on the Skills toward Employability and Productivity (STEP) reading proficiency test in 2015, indicating very rudimentary skills which were lower than their peers' in 6 of the other 7 low- and middle-income countries surveyed in South East Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America.
- 1.5 At the secondary level, national assessment data indicate deficiencies and inequities in learning outcomes. For example, the 2014 national Monitoring Learner Achievement (MLA) assessment at Form 2 found that, in mathematics, almost 90 percent of students did not have minimum competency in algebra and geometry, and about 30 percent did not have minimum competency in measurement, numbers and statistics. The Form 2 MLA also revealed remarkable variation in student achievement between genders, between urban and rural areas, and across counties. For example, in algebra, geometry and trigonometry, the share of students with minimum competency in urban areas was twice that in rural areas. Both supply and demand-side factors contribute to inequalities in completion of primary education, and transition to and completion of secondary education, as well as in student learning outcomes.
- 1.6 The proposed Kenya Secondary Education Quality Improvement Project (SEQIP) will seek to address the supply and demand-side factors particularly in the most educationally and economically disadvantaged areas, as well as the poorest and most vulnerable children. SEQIP will employ a hybrid structure as an initial step towards more Results Based Financing (RBF) of the education portfolio in Kenya. This RBF provides an opportunity for a strengthened dialogue through closer monitoring of Government performance against selected Disbursement Linked Indicators (DLIs).

## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- 1.7 . The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to improve student learning in secondary education and transition from primary to secondary education in targeted areas. The PDO will be measured through three key project performance indicators namely: (i) average student test score in English subjects at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties; (ii) average student test score in English at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties; and (iii) transition from primary to secondary education in targeted sub-counties. Overall, implementation of the proposed project will be the responsibility of the Ministry of Education (MoE). Component 1 of the project, which is ‘Improving quality of teaching in targeted areas will be implemented jointly by MOE and TSC. The commission will implement sub component 1:1 and 1:2.
- 1.8 The project has four components: (i) Improve quality of teaching and learning in targeted areas; (ii) Improving retention in upper primary and transition to secondary in targeted areas; (iii) System reform support; and (iv) Project management, coordination and communication.
- 1.9 Component 1, Improving quality of teaching in targeted areas includes three sub-components namely: (i) Subcomponent 1.1: Reducing teacher shortage; (ii) Subcomponent 1.2: Enhancing teacher professional development; and (iii) Subcomponent 1.3: Provision of textbooks. These ToRs applies to Subcomponent 1.2, Enhancing teacher professional development.

## 3. OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

The overall aim of this assignment is to enhance continuous Teacher Professional Development (TPD) for teachers of English subject. The consultancy will provide technical support to the Teachers Service Commission (TSC) to develop and implement the school based teacher support system for the English subject in targeted sub-counties. The specific objectives of the assignment are to: (i) Support TSC to establish a **School Based Teacher Support System (SBTSS)** aimed at providing professional development training in subject matter as well as pedagogical content knowledge to teachers of English in the targeted sub-counties. (ii) Support TSC in monitoring and evaluation of these activities including data collection, analysis and preparation of reports. This activity is based on results based financing modality. The institution will therefore be required to support the TSC in collection and validation of the required data for the relevant Disbursement Linked Indicators (DLIs) and relevant indicators in the project’s results framework (see annex 1 of this ToRs). An independent firm will be recruited separately to review and verify results achieved under the SBTSS program for the English subject, and other DLIs under this project.

## 4. DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT AND WORK PLAN

The assignment will be undertaken over a six-year period between January 2018 and October 2022 and will have a total duration of 12 months per year. The first phase of this assignment will commence in January 2018 or shortly thereafter and will involve design of SBTSS

implementation plan and verification of TPAD data on teachers' performance gaps in English. A performance review of the selected institution will be conducted after each year. Remedial actions agreed upon must be executed within the agreed upon timelines, otherwise a contract termination will be considered. A payment schedule against major milestones will be agreed upon during contract negotiations and before contract finalization.

## 5. SCOPE OF WORK AND DELIVERABLES

The main task of this assignment involves the formulation and support of the delivery of an elaborate program for SBTSS for the English subject for teachers in target Sub-Counties as stipulated below. A list of target Sub-Counties is included in Annex 2 of these ToRs.

A third-party institution (independent verifier), will be recruited to independently review, analyze and verify, on a sample basis, the project's DLIs associated with this activity. Each DLI has a specific achievement level and timeline linked to it (see annex 1 of these ToRs).

### 5.1 Task 1: Development of a School based Teacher Support System (SBTSS) to support peer learning using Information, Communication Technology for teachers of English

Under this task, the institution is expected to:

- a) Formulate a detailed proposal, in the form of an inception report, for the proposed SBTSS program for discussion with TSC. The institution will only proceed with this task once the overall proposal is agreed upon with TSC.
- b) Prepare an elaborate program for the SBTSS program for teachers in target Sub-Counties. The program, as a minimum, **MUST** take **EACH** of the following aspects into account:
  - i. Conduct skills and competency diagnostics to identify teachers' training needs to improve classroom practices in English subject in target Sub-Counties. Build on data and reports from the Teacher Performance Appraisal and Development (TPAD) and on existing insights on implementing school based TPD in Kenya and globally, and analysis of the general and school-specific KCPE<sup>3</sup> and KCSE<sup>4</sup> reports, to identify training needs and modalities of school-based support. This analysis will be complemented with information collected during workshops with TSC CDs, SCDs, CSOs, Principals, Head teachers, senior masters/ teachers and teachers.
  - ii. Based on the identified needs above, develop teachers support materials, simplified teaching aids and other relevant instructional materials, and sample continuous student assessment tools. Existing and relevant teacher training materials, including digital ones, developed in Kenya by various partners could be assessed and adapted as necessary. An English subject matter expert panel

---

<sup>3</sup> Kenya Certificate of primary Education.

<sup>4</sup> Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education

will be constituted by TSC to review and approve the proposed materials before production and utilization. Any materials produced must be adapted for special needs education. The support materials will include e-learning materials, adequate samples of formative assessment tools to guide learners' progress, teachers' guides with learning resources related to each lesson, and a range of suggested activities that teachers can use to guide learners' practice. This will be within the established Curriculum.

- iii. Identification of teacher support facilitators/trainers. In collaboration with TSC, develop ToRs for the Teacher support facilitators/trainers and determine the number of trainers required. TSC will recruit the facilitators/trainers based on a set criteria and performance standards. The facilitators will include teachers, CSOs and TSC Sub-county Directors. The institution will be expected to train the facilitators using materials and assessment tools reviewed and approved by subject matter panels. For target primary schools, TSC sub-county directors and curriculum support officers will support the SBTSS as trainers. Where the workload requires they will be complemented by additional resource persons.
- iv. Develop and implement a program to promote peer learning and to support. Teachers' pedagogic support, including assistance on inquiry-based learning approaches for teaching English subject and integration of ICT in teaching and learning, and using technology for peer learning. To encourage peer learning, the institution will support the facilitators/trainers to assist participating teachers in establishing professional learning community/groups such as WhatsApp, google groups etc. Participating teachers will learn how to address and solve issues through collaboration, how to share knowledge and experience among them, and how to leverage this social group effectively to improve their lesson plans and pedagogical approaches. Facilitators will oversee and moderate the WhatsApp groups to ensure relevance and effectiveness.
- v. During the SBTSS initial phase, training will be provided for about 5,667 primary school teachers and 1,700 secondary school teachers for English in targeted sub counties at INSET school based centres. Based on the evaluation of the first two years of implementation of SBTSS, the intervention will be scaled up to cover all primary and secondary teachers of English in the over 5,500 primary schools and additional 1,500 secondary schools in the targeted sub- counties.

## **5.2 Task 2: Development of a costed and implementation plan for the School based Teacher Support System (SBTSS) in English**

Under this task, the institution is expected to:

- a) In collaboration with the TSC, develop a detailed and costed implementation plan for execution of the SBTSS program considering each activity described under Task 1

above. During the SBTSS' initial phase, training will be provided for about 5,667 primary school teachers and 1,700 secondary school English subject teachers in the targeted sub-counties. This phase 1 training will be conducted in selected Sub-Counties (from the target Sub-County) before scaling up to all the targeted Sub-Counties. An independent evaluation will be conducted to inform the scaling up exercise.

- b) For the institutions planning purposes, training will be conducted at the established CEMASTEAs<sup>5</sup> school-based INSET centers. Exceptions for the training Centers will be considered as need arises and upon justification of the same. The duration of each training event will vary depending on the skills and competencies identified based on the training needs assessment. Each training event will be followed by a series of coaching and mentoring visits to the targeted schools by the facilitator/trainers. The scope of the coaching and mentoring will be identified and outlined by each facilitator/trainer working together with the teachers participating in the respective training event and these aspects will be reflected in the program and its implementation plan.

### **5.3 Task 3: Assessing the effectiveness of English training**

Under this task, the institution is expected to:

- a) Conduct pre- and post-assessments to assess gains in teachers' proficiency in collaboration with TSC. The assessment tools and content will be developed in collaboration with KNEC<sup>6</sup> and KICD<sup>7</sup> to ensure validity and reliability (alignment to established curriculum and assessments), based on the methodology for tests development used by KNEC. The minimum knowledge indicators for the English subject and levels (upper primary and secondary schools) will be established by the institutions subject matter panel. This will be reviewed and cleared by TSC.

### **5.4 Task 4: Collection of data, analyses and reporting**

Under this task, the institution will be required to:

- Support TSC to collect, analyze and prepare reports based on the project's results indicators and DLIs relevant to the SBTSS training for the English subject (see Annex 1). The reporting formats will be agreed upon with the TSC.

---

<sup>5</sup> Centre for Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education in Africa

<sup>6</sup> Kenya National Examinations Council

<sup>7</sup> Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development

Prepare relevant power point presentation for the SBTSS training for the English subject for presentation to the National Project Steering Committee

## **5.5 Task 5: Monitoring and Reporting**

Under this task, the institution is expected to:

- a) Produce an inception report (proposal) detailing the understanding of this ToRs and proposed framework to approach this assignment.
- b) Based on the four tasks above, prepare a detailed and costed implementation plan for the SBTSS training program for the English subject
- c) Prepare monitoring reports as described under task 4 above.
- d) Prepare monthly progress reports to inform TSC on the status of this assignment and for TSC to determine any remedial actions that may be required.

## **6. Key Deliverables**

- a) Implementation plan for the SBTSS training program: Should give details of the training program including timelines, cost, input and output of all the activities.
- b) Training needs assessment
- c) SBTSS material
- d) Training of facilitators and teachers (be specific about target numbers)
- e) Monitoring and evaluation reports for the SBTSS program: This should be done in the format agreed upon with TSC.
- f) Monthly progress reports: This should give TSC an update on the status of the assignment.

## **7. KEY TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS**

7.1 The consulting institution must have the experience of conducting similar assignments or experience in developing and implementing school based teacher professional development. Evidence for this is required. The institution will put together a team with the necessary skills to undertake this assignment.

7.2 The minimum mandatory criteria for short listing of the institutions is:

- a) Have a minimum of five years of experience in conducting similar assignments or experience in developing and implementing school based teacher professional development. Attach relevant documentation as evidence.
- b) Have minimum of five years' professional experience in collecting and analyzing data, documenting findings, and creating and presenting reports.
- c) Provide evidence of a sound track record of successful implementation of similar assignments with relevant national and international organisations.
- d) Financial capacity. Audited financial statements for the past 3 years.

### 7.3 Staff requirements /Team Composition

- i. Team Leader who must be a holder of PhD in Education, Economics or Social Sciences with at least 5 years' experience in educational surveys at the school level
- ii. Education specialists particularly in English/Literature subject, teacher management and development, and in development and evaluation of instructional materials.
- iii. A Statistician who can also handle Monitoring and Reporting aspects
- iv. A finance specialist conversant with results-based financing
- v. A logistics coordinator

### 8. KEY DELIVERABLES AND TIME LINES

Key deliverables and indicative timeline for the assignment is provided in the table below

S/NO	Key deliverables	Timeline
i.	Inception report with interpretation of TOR and proposed methodology	Within 2 week from the date of award of contract
ii.	Validate TPAD data on needs assessment conducted by TSC on teachers performance gaps	By end of March 2018
iii.	Develop teachers support materials, simplified teaching aids and other instructional materials, and continuous assessment tools:	by end of March 2018
iv.	Identify facilitators/trainers:	By end of June 2018
v.	Training of facilitators/ trainers	End of August 2018
vi.	Train teachers	By end of August 2018
vii.	Promote peer learning	Continuous
viii.	Assess effectiveness of SBTSS training in English	By end of August 2018
ix.	Evaluate process	Year 2

### 9. MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS

The assignment will be managed by the Teachers Service Commission (TSC). The day-to-day management of this assignment will fall under the Directorate of Teacher Management. The specific roles and responsibilities for the Directorate in this assignment, at no cost to the institution include:

- a. Access to data. The Directorate will provide the institution with access to relevant information and data for development and implementation of this assignment.

Such data includes TPAD data, lists of target sub-counties, target schools and target teachers.

- b. Provision of Project documents such as Project Appraisal Document, Project Implementation Manual, Relevant TSC Documents on Teacher Professional Development and documents such as data on target Sub-Counties, target schools and target teachers.
- c. Facilitation of the institution's engagement with KNEC and KICD as required
- d. Facilitation of the institution's engagement with the relevant teachers. Where needed provide the institution with an introductory letter.
- e. Constituting a high level technical /subject panel to review the institution's outputs/deliverables at each stage of this assignment. All deliberations of this panel should be minuted and minutes signed by the Chair. This will include documentation of technical guidance given to the agency.
- f. Arranging Consultative meetings for the institution with relevant teachers, TSC County and Sub-County officials as may be required.
- g. In collaboration with World Bank team, review and clear all deliverables for this assignment

The responsibility for final clearance of the proposals, proposed program for the SBTSS training for the English subject, and the detailed and costed implementation plan for this program lies with the TSC.

#### **ANNEXES**

- a) Results Framework
- b) DLI and DLRs table
- c) DLRs and DLRs Verification protocols
- d) Target Sub-counties

#### **10. CONTACTS FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT:**

The Secretary Teachers Service Commission,  
Private Bag, Nairobi

Attn: Head of Supply Chain Management

Postal Address: Teachers Service Commission, Private Bag, Nairobi

Code: 00100

City: Nairobi, Kenya

Zip code: +254

Tel: 020 289 2000

Email: info@tsc.go.ke and be deposited in the tender box located at on second floor, Podium wing, TSC House, Kilimanjaro Road, on or before xxx



## ANNEX 1

### e) DLI and DLRs table

**DLI Matrix**

DLI	Indicative Time Line for DLI Achievement					
	2018 (Year 1)	2019 (Year 2)	2020 (Year 3)	2021 (Year 4)	2022 (Year 5)	2023 (Year 6)
<b>DLI 1: Reduced science, mathematics, and English teacher shortages in targeted sub-counties</b>	DLI TARGET 1.1: Detailed and costed strategic plan developed for addressing teacher shortages and baseline established  DLI Target Achievement Date (DTAD): FY18	DLI TARGET 1.3: 10% of new teacher posts, in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with high shortages per the established baseline and on duty	DLI TARGET 1.4: 10% of new teacher posts, in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with high shortages per the established baseline and on duty	DLI TARGET 1.5: 10% of new teacher posts, in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with high shortages per the established baseline and on duty	DLI TARGET 1.6: 10% of new teacher posts, in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with high shortages per the established baseline and on duty	DLI TARGET 1.7: 80% of the teachers recruited over the last five years continue to be on duty
	DLI TARGET 1.2: 10% of new teacher posts, in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with high shortages per the established baseline and on duty  DTAD: FY18	DTAD: FY19	DTAD: FY20	DTAD: FY21	DTAD: FY22	DTAD: FY23
	DLI TARGET 1.1 Value: <u>€ 450,000</u>	DLI TARGET 1.3 Value: <u>€ 875,000</u>	DLI TARGET 1.4 Value: <u>€ 875,000</u>	DLI TARGET 1.5 Value: <u>€ 875,000</u>	DLI TARGET 1.6 Value: <u>€ 875,000</u>	DLI TARGET 1.7 Value: <u>€ 2,190,000</u>
	DLI TARGET 1.2 Value: <u>€ 875,000</u>					

DLI	Indicative Time Line for DLI Achievement					
	2018 (Year 1)	2019 (Year 2)	2020 (Year 3)	2021 (Year 4)	2022 (Year 5)	2023 (Year 6)
<b>DLI 2: Share of science, mathematics, and English teachers in grades 7 and 8 and Forms 1–4 in targeted sub-counties that are certified based on Teacher Professional Development (TPD) modules or receive school-based support (SBTS)</b>	DLI TARGET 2.1: Baseline on teachers' performance gaps in science, mathematics, and English  DTAD: FY18	DLI TARGET 2.3: TPD training modules developed  DTAD: FY19	DLI TARGET 2.5: 10% of teachers completing six course units of a training module  DTAD: FY20  DLI TARGET 2.6: 3 additional TPD training modules developed  DTAD: FY20	DLI TARGET 2.8: 20% of teachers completing eight course units of a training module  DTAD: FY21	DLI TARGET 2.10: 30% of teachers certified  DTAD: FY22	DLI TARGET 2.12: Reduction in teachers' performance gaps in science, mathematics, and English over baseline  DTAD: FY23
	DLI TARGET 2.2: Design of SBTSS and implementation plan finalized  DTAD: FY18	DLI TARGET 2.4: Phase 1 of the SBTSS operational in 2,000 primary schools and 500 secondary schools  DTAD: FY19	DLI TARGET 2.7: Scaling up of the SBTSS based on Phase 1 evaluation to at least 5,000 primary schools and 1,500 secondary schools  DTAD: FY20	DLI TARGET 2.9: 30% of teachers engaged in virtual peer-to-peer learning  DTAD: FY21	DLI TARGET 2.11: 50% of teachers engaged in virtual peer-to-peer learning  DTAD: FY22	
	DLI TARGET 2.1 Value: <u>\$2.0M € 1,755,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.3 Value: <u>\$1.1M € 965,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.5 Value: <u>\$1.0M € 875,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.8 Value: <u>\$0.5M € 450,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.10 Value: <u>\$0.5M € 450,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.12 Value: <u>\$2.0M € 1,755,000</u>
	DLI TARGET 2.2 Value: <u>\$3.0M € 2,630,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.4 Value: <u>\$2.0M € 1,755,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.6 Value: <u>\$0.9M € 790,000</u> DLI TARGET 2.7 Value: <u>\$1.0M € 875,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.9 Value: <u>\$0.5M € 450,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.11 Value: <u>\$0.5M € 450,000</u>	

DLI	Indicative Time Line for DLI Achievement					
	2018 (Year 1)	2019 (Year 2)	2020 (Year 3)	2021 (Year 4)	2022 (Year 5)	2023 (Year 6)
<b>DLI 3:[1] Share of schools reporting student-textbook ratio of 1:1 in science, mathematics, and English at grades 7 and 8 and Form 1 in targeted sub-counties</b>	DLI TARGET 3.1 Selection of core textbooks through transparent and competitive process DTAD: FY18	DLI TARGET 3.2: 50% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio  DTAD: FY19	DLI TARGET 3.3: 60% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio  DTAD: FY20	DLI TARGET 3.4: 70% of schools with 1:1 studenttextbook ratio DTAD: FY21	DLI TARGET 3.5: 80% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio DTAD: FY22	
	DLI TARGET 3.1 Value: <u>€ 3,070,000</u>	DLI TARGET 3.2 Value: <u>€ 3,070,000</u>	DLI TARGET 3.3 Value: <u>€ 1,755,000</u>	DLI TARGET 3.4 Value: <u>€ 1,755,000</u>	DLI TARGET 3.5 Value: <u>€ 1,755,000</u>	
<b>DLI 4: Increased secondary school enrollment of poor and vulnerable students in targeted sub- counties</b>	DLI TARGET 4.1: Selection and contracting of partner agency(ies) to design and administer scholarships completed	DLI TARGET 4.2: At least 9,000 Form 1 students receiving scholarship[2]	DLI TARGET 4.3: At least 17,750 Form 1 and 2 students receiving scholarship	DLI TARGET 4.4: At least 17,500 Form 2 and 3 students receiving scholarship	DLI TARGET 4.5: At least 17,250 Form 3 and 4 students receiving scholarship	DLI TARGET 4.6: At least 8,000 Form 4 students receiving scholarship DTAD: FY23
						DLI TARGET 4.7: At least 17,000 students from cohorts 1 and 2 complete Form 4  DTAD: FY23

						<p>DLI TARGET 4.8: Program evaluated to inform options for scaling up</p> <p>DTAD: FY23</p>
	DTAD: FY18	DTAD: FY19	DTAD: FY20	DTAD: FY21	DTAD: FY22	

DLI	Indicative Time Line for DLI Achievement					
	2018 (Year 1)	2019 (Year 2)	2020 (Year 3)	2021 (Year 4)	2022 (Year 5)	2023 (Year 6)
	DLI TARGET 4.1 Value: <u>\$1 €875,000</u>	DLI TARGET 4.2 Value: <u>€ 3,000,000</u>	DLI TARGET 4.3 Value: <u>€ 5,800,000</u>	DLI TARGET 4.4 Value: <u>€ 5,800,000</u>	DLI TARGET 4.5 Value: <u>€ 5,800,000</u>	<p>DLI TARGET 4.6 Value: <u>€2,600,000</u></p> <p>DTAD: FY23</p> <p>DLI TARGET 4.7 Value: <u>€ 1,755,000</u></p> <p>DTAD: FY23</p> <p>DLI TARGET 4.8 Value: <u>€ 700,000</u></p> <p>DTAD: FY23</p>
<b>DLI 5: Increased retention of poor and vulnerable students in grades 7 and 8 in targeted sub-counties</b>	DLI TARGET 5.1: Advocacy strategies developed and implementation launched in at least 50% of targeted	DLI TARGET 5.2: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	DLI TARGET 5.3: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	DLI TARGET 5.4: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	DLI TARGET 5.5: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	DLI TARGET 5.6: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits  DTAD: FY23

	subcounties					DLI TARGET 5.7: 80% of program beneficiaries sitting for KCPE exam at the end of grade 8
	DTAD: FY18	DTAD: FY19	DTAD: FY20	DTAD: FY21	DTAD: FY22	DTAD: FY23
						DLI TARGET 5.8: Program is evaluated to inform options for scaling up
						DTAD: FY23
	DLI TARGET 5.1 Value: <u>€ 2,190,000</u>	DLI TARGET 5.2 Value: <u>€ 2,630,000</u>	DLI TARGET 5.3 Value: <u>€ 2,370,000</u>	DLI TARGET 5.4 Value: <u>€ 2,370,000</u>	DLI TARGET 5.5 Value: <u>€ 2,280,000</u>	DLI TARGET 5.6 Value: <u>€ 2,630,000</u>
						DLI TARGET 5.7 Value: <u>€ 2,630,000</u>
						DLI TARGET 5.8 Value: <u>€ 450,000</u>

## Annex 2

### f) Target Sub-counties

Table 1.1. Targeted Sub-counties

	County	Sub-county	CI Ranking	Primary						Secondary				
				Public			Private			Public		Private		
				No. of schools	Enrollment	Grade enrollment	Grade enrollment	No. of schools	Enrollment	No. of schools	Enrollment	No. of schools	Enrollment	
1	<b>Baringo</b> (3 sub-counties not selected)	Baringo North	75	150	28,148	7,199	0.49	13	1,646	29	6,819	0.51	3	374
2		East Pokot	60	90	15,523	1,790	0.40	--	--	6	1,444	0.31	--	--
3		Marigat	91	92	24,865	5,427	0.49	17	2,689	22	3,599	0.42	--	--
4	<b>Bomet</b> (2 sub-counties not selected)	Chepalungu	71	186	54,111	11,937	0.50	54	7,368	58	13,880	0.49	1	236
5		Sotik	102	175	53,456	13,286	0.51	70	9,776	68	16,762	0.48	--	--
6	<b>Bungoma</b> (6 sub-counties not selected)	Bungoma West	101	81	43,915	8,748	0.50	17	2,639	29	9,532	0.50	--	--
7		Cheptais	67	98	49,783	8,302	0.49	44	5,307	17	5,220	0.44	1	189
8		Mt Elgon	86	65	34,498	7,352	0.52	21	2,964	18	5,459	0.48	--	--
9	<b>Busia</b>	Bunyala	54	40	21,986	3,779	0.49	8	790	11	3,123	0.40	--	--
10		Busia	90	48	33,525	7,168	0.52	11	2,295	21	6,427	0.47	2	194
11		Butula	66	61	44,122	9,166	0.49	7	1,661	28	8,194	0.41	1	80
12		Nambale	69	52	30,903	6,194	0.51	41	3,597	21	5,946	0.45	2	150
13		Samia	77	65	28,732	5,639	0.51	16	1,955	19	7,110	0.47	--	--
14		Teso North	89	92	33,724	7,883	0.50	30	3,056	31	8,826	0.52	1	96
15		Teso South	68	77	45,026	8,740	0.50	20	2,407	24	7,434	0.49	--	--
16	<b>Elgeyo Marakwet</b> (2 subcounties not selected)	Marakwet East	52	84	25,871	5,324	0.49	9	1,256	18	2,968	0.38	--	--
17		Marakwet West	79	104	32,886	7,877	0.53	17	3,006	33	8,910	0.41	--	--
18	<b>Garissa</b> (1 subcounty not selected)	Balambala	23	30	7,031	785	0.30	1	142	2	540	0.38	--	--
19		Dadaab	65	26	8,174	965	0.28	25	42,008	4	1,291	0.27	6	4,329
20		Fafi	62	30	5,782	840	0.37	17	22,144	5	608	0.34	1	135
21		Hulugho	36	22	4,891	410	0.27			2	369	0.47	--	--

22		Ijara	50	30	6,251	1,227	0.42	7	468	5	1,211	0.40	--	--
23		Lagdera	41	25	6,355	942	0.31	--	--	3	604	0.21	--	--
24	<b>Homa Bay</b> (5 sub-counties)	Suba	94	97	29,051	6,291	0.48	22	2,999	34	6,652	0.53	3	296

	County	Sub-county	CI Ranking	Primary						Secondary					
				Public			Private			Public			Private		
				NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm en t	Gr ad En e 7rol an lm d 8en t	Gr Fe of ad maEn e 7le rol an Sh lm d 8ar en e t	NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm en t	NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm en t	Fe of maEn le rol Sh lm ar en e t	NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm en t	
	not selected)														
25	<b>Isiolo</b>	Garbatula	16	39	8,746	1,698	0.47	6	581	4	844	0.34	--	--	
26		Isiolo	58	44	15,299	3,216	0.49	26	5,684	15	2,491	0.43	4	504	
27		Merti	46	29	5,341	1,023	0.52	3	587	4	476	0.44	2	145	
28	<b>Kajiado</b> (3 sub-counties not selected)	Kajiado Central	72	117	29,922	5,437	0.44	35	5,860	17	4,208	0.33	8	827	
29		Loitokitok	93	83	35,778	6,841	0.50	29	5,107	20	5,157	0.41	6	860	
30	<b>Kakamega</b> (6 sub-counties not selected)	Butere	99	80	42,811	8,866	0.53	11	966	31	9,140	0.52	1	137	
31		Kakamega South	104	81	39,375	6,387	0.55	10	997	29	9,909	0.52	--	--	
32		Khwisero	84	61	31,138	6,082	0.53	7	1,246	22	6,241	0.51	1	113	
33		Likuyani	97	68	39,364	8,287	0.51	62	7,932	33	9,998	0.54	2	273	
34		Lugari	106	57	34,067	7,556	0.51	28	3,157	30	10,854	0.54	1	38	
35		Navakholo	107	69	51,480	10,023	0.51	35	3,412	30	9,527	0.41	--	--	
36	<b>Kilifi</b> (2 sub-counties not selected)	Ganze	26	125	44,545	9,407	0.51	8	541	21	5,537	0.43	1	25	
37		Kaloleni	81	66	38,643	8,869	0.49	33	5,026	22	8,212	0.49	6	645	
38		Magarini	21	108	45,766	9,363	0.47	35	3,285	19	4,268	0.39	7	1,293	

39		Malindi	87	75	48,978	12,378	0.49	64	11,358	19	8,245	0.34	16	2,476
40	Kisii (7 sub-counties not selected)	Marani	78	65	26,169	5,663	0.50	33	3,717	30	8,010	0.46	2	121
41		Nyamache	105	103	35,770	7,799	0.50	26	3,113	48	11,913	0.49	2	279
42	Kitui (7 sub-counties not selected)	Ikutha	40	127	27,795	5,530	0.52	6	347	28	4,345	0.51	1	9
43		Kyuso	27	96	20,108	3,951	0.53	17	1,256	22	3,626	0.44	--	--
44		Mumoni	28	89	16,315	3,086	0.52	17	1,106	21	2,756	0.50	--	--
45		Mutito	42	105	26,730	5,225	0.52	11	1,011	22	4,595	0.47	--	--
46		Mutomo	44	140	35,366	7,755	0.51	5	549	31	5,972	0.53	--	--
47		Mwingi Central	82	106	28,540	6,786	0.48	28	3,384	42	6,199	0.46	3	222
48	Mwingi East	37	107	28,944	6,157	0.51	12	1,089	30	4,210	0.52	--	--	

	County	Sub-county	CI Ranking	Primary					Secondary					
				Public			Private		Public		Private			
				NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm en t	Gr ad En e 7rol an lm d 8en t	Gr Fe of ad maEn e 7le rol an Sh lm d 8ar en e t	NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm en t	NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm en t	Fe of maEn le rol Sh ar en e t	NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm en t
49		Nzambani	55	49	13,215	3,270	0.50	6	347	15	3,954	0.51	--	--
50		Tseikuru	39	57	13,046	2,562	0.51	3	278	11	1,820	0.52	1	34
51	Kwale	Kinango	11	163	66,337	13,155	0.48	18	2,781	23	6,476	0.40	--	--
52		Kwale	92	97	39,154	8,420	0.49	24	3,492	28	11,200	0.51	2	238
53		Msambweni	49	157	61,685	11,992	0.48	72	10,142	35	8,901	0.54	6	732
54	Laikipia (4 sub-counties not selected)	Laikipia North	63	27	6,950	1,467	0.47	2	201	5	1,109	0.42	--	--
55	Machakos (6 sub-counties not selected)	Masinga	88	135	39,328	9,134	0.51	34	4,832	53	11,503	0.48	2	271
56		Yatta	103	134	41,519	9,984	0.51	37	4,222	55	13,191	0.50	8	1,412
57	Makueni (4 sub-counties not selected)	Kathonzweni	80	94	24,605	6,319	0.51	4	544	36	8,762	0.48	1	119

58	not selected)	Kibwezi	61	163	54,723	12,870	0.51	30	3,541	62	15,265	0.48	2	157
59		Makindu	59	66	22,558	5,386	0.52	20	2,015	24	5,237	0.53	5	325
60		Makueni	100	99	29,418	7,408	0.51	13	2,039	43	12,635	0.44	3	542
61		Nzau	83	121	34,105	8,197	0.50	7	848	52	13,066	0.53	1	49
62	Mandera	Banisa	25	30	10,047	878	0.27	1	292	2	664	0.21	--	--
63		Lafey	3	11	5,241	832	0.29	--	--	2	388	0.00	--	---
64		Mandera Central	22	41	16,994	2,050	0.37	4	483	9	2,264	0.30	--	--
65		Mandera East	56	37	26,537	4,720	0.36	24	6,142	15	5,297	0.34	4	1,481
66		Mandera North	45	40	14,986	1,520	0.38	3	268	7	2,169	0.32	1	183
67		Mandera West	31	41	17,527	1,539	0.28	3	545	6	1,477	0.26	--	--
68	Marsabit	Chalbi	24	17	4,142	775	0.54	--	--	3	626	0.30	--	--
69		Horr North	7	19	3,659	586	0.35	1	86	4	474	0.45	--	--
70		Loiyangalani	1	15	3,054	348	0.47	--	--	--	--	#DIV/0!	--	--
71		Marsabit	74	34	11,756	2,296	0.50	9	1,757	10	2,374	0.34	4	430
72		Marsabit South	10	30	6,990	1,207	0.41	3	625	5	444	0.43	1	47

	County	Sub-county	CI Ranking	Primary						Secondary					
				Public			Private			Public		Private			
				NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm ent	Gr ad En e 7rol an lm d 8ent	Gr Fe of ad maEn e 7le rol an Sh lm d 8ar en e t	NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm ent	NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm ent	Fe of maEn le rol Sh lm ar en e t	NoSc . ofho ols	En rol lm ent	
73		Moyale	17	34	13,985	2,518	0.49	23	5,738	7	1,469	0.37	1	140	
74		Sololo	5	23	4,747	903	0.46	10	1,400	4	434	0.51	--	--	
75	Migori (4 sub-counties not selected)	Kuria East	73	50	27,191	4,725	0.48	13	1,882	19	4,621	0.44	--	--	
76		Kuria West	95	91	40,554	7,785	0.50	39	7,039	28	8,315	0.43	5	659	
77		Uriri	98	76	32,723	7,458	0.48	33	4,478	33	7,824	0.34	2	130	
78	Murang'a (5 sub-counties)	Kandara		78	30,687	7,852	0.51	26	3,848	55	18,907	0.50	3	310	

79	not selected)	Kigumo		61	26,415	6,286	0.50	30	3,613	37	10,771	0.44	2	276	
80		Murang'A East		54	18,169	4,696	0.50	20	2,189	30	7,705	0.49	--	--	
81	<b>Nandi</b> (4 sub-counties not selected)	Tinderet	85	126	30,841	6,471	0.49	22	2,069	31	6,102	0.46	--	--	
82	<b>Narok</b> (3 sub-counties not selected)	Trans Mara East	96	70	33,647	6,368	0.48	23	4,152	23	4,102	0.40	--	--	
83	<b>Samburu</b>	Samburu Central	38	84	28,700	5,185	0.41	12	2,013	16	3,677	0.38	2	235	
84		Samburu East	34	40	10,070	1,797	0.42	8	573	6	1,448	0.26	1	170	
85		Samburu North	35	34	8,954	1,404	0.42	2	113	6	1,285	0.39	--	--	
86	<b>Taita Taveta</b> (3 subcounties not selected)	Taveta	64	38	17,511	4,363	0.51	16	2,312	10	2,820	0.53	--	--	
87	<b>Tana River</b>	Bura (Tana North)	29	47	13,023	2,452	0.44	16	1,994	5	1,866	0.34	2	156	
88		Tana Delta	32	63	20,150	3,784	0.47	4	335	10	2,623	0.39	--	--	
89		Tana River	33	51	15,164	2,875	0.47	4	785	6	1,524	0.45	1	298	
90	<b>Tharaka-Nithi</b> (2 subcounties not selected)	Tharaka North	51	60	15,562	2,639	0.52	13	1,390	9	1,471	0.46	1	111	
91		Tharaka South	70	104	23,870	4,830	0.51	11	1,034	25	4,025	0.43	3	954	
92	<b>Turkana</b>	Kibish	2	11	3,437	229	0.32	--	--	1	82	0.00	--	--	
93		Loima	8	57	16,509	1,911	0.44	--	--	6	1,330	0.56	1	71	
94		Turkana Central	30	73	34,806	5,228	0.40	16	3,989	9	4,330	0.27	1	38	
	<b>County</b>	<b>Sub-county</b>	<b>CI Ranking</b>	<b>Primary</b>						<b>Secondary</b>					
				<b>Public</b>			<b>Private</b>			<b>Public</b>			<b>Private</b>		
				<b>NoSc . ofho ols</b>	<b>En rol lm ent</b>	<b>Gr ad En e 7rol an lm d 8ent</b>	<b>Gr Fe of ad maEn e 7le rol an Sh lm d 8ar en e t</b>	<b>NoSc . ofho ols</b>	<b>En rol lm ent</b>	<b>NoSc . ofho ols</b>	<b>En rol lm ent</b>	<b>Fe of maEn le rol Sh lm ar en e t</b>	<b>NoSc . ofho ols</b>	<b>En rol lm ent</b>	
95		Turkana East	19	36	16,297	1,673	0.45	1	42	6	1,505	0.43	--	--	
96		Turkana North	15	40	12,016	1,064	0.39			4	1,048	0.44	--	--	
97		Turkana South	6	87	38,874	5,055	0.47	2	208	7	2,489	0.40	--	--	
98		Turkana West	43	70	63,773	8,420	0.26	26	31,217	9	3,928	0.34	6	5,959	

99	Wajir	Buna	13	21	4,214	397	0.33	--	--	3	513	0.20	--	--
100		Eldas	9	18	5,520	508	0.24	1	209	3	360	0.17	--	--
101		Habaswein	47	35	8,029	1,148	0.37	4	911	7	1,624	0.43	1	68
102		Tarbaj	14	28	7,936	1,023	0.28	--	--	4	659	0.28	--	--
103		Wajir East	53	36	20,257	3,439	0.44	19	4,070	12	5,419	0.32	4	830
104		Wajir North	4	22	4,053	582	0.34	--	--	3	613	0.34	--	--
105		Wajir South	12	22	4,678	500	0.33	1	97	2	341	0.22	--	--
106	Wajir West	20	37	11,528	1,622	0.32	1	204	6	1,359	0.25	--	--	
107	West Pokot	Pokot Central	48	158	53,682	8,263	0.49	9	758	29	6,165	0.41	1	38
108		Pokot North	18	122	33,674	3,605	0.43	5	865	11	1,850	0.34	--	--
109		Pokot South	57	81	28,161	5,146	0.50	10	1,121	21	3,138	0.47	--	--
110		West Pokot	76	177	67,066	11,679	0.49	17	4,541	41	11,541	0.42	2	263
	<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>7,852</b>	<b>2,839,648</b>	<b>557,454</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>332,153</b>	<b>2,147</b>	<b>548,240</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>30,772</b>

**Table 1.2. County-level Summary of Enrollment and Number of Schools in Targeted Sub counties**

County		Primary						Secondary				
		Public				Private		Public			Private	
		Sc ho ols of No	En rol lm en t	En rol lm en t	Sh ar Fe ma le of	En rol lm en t	Sc ho ols of No	En rol lm en t	Sh ar Fe ma le of	En rol lm en t	Sc ho ols of No	En rol lm en t
1	Baringo	332	68,536	14,416	0.48	30	4,335	57	11,862	0.46	3	374
2	Bomet	361	107,567	25,223	0.51	124	17,144	126	30,642	0.49	1	236
3	Bungoma	244	128,196	24,402	0.50	82	10,910	64	20,211	0.48	1	189
4	Busia	435	238,018	48,569	0.50	133	15,761	155	47,060	0.47	6	520

5	Elgeyo Marakwet	188	58,757	13,201	0.51	26	4,262	51	11,878	0.40	--	--
6	Garissa	163	38,484	5,169	0.33	50	64,762	21	4,623	0.33	7	4,464
7	Homa Bay	97	29,051	6,291	0.48	22	2,999	34	6,652	0.53	3	296
8	Isiolo	112	29,386	5,937	0.49	35	6,852	23	3,811	0.41	6	649
9	Kajado	200	65,700	12,278	0.47	64	10,967	37	9,365	0.37	14	1,687
10	Kakamega	416	238,235	47,201	0.52	153	17,710	175	55,669	0.51	5	561
11	Kilifi	374	177,932	40,017	0.49	140	20,210	81	26,262	0.41	30	4,439
12	Kisii	168	61,939	13,462	0.50	59	6,830	78	19,923	0.48	4	400
13	Kitui	876	210,059	44,322	0.51	105	9,367	222	37,477	0.49	5	265

County	Primary						Secondary					
	Public				Private		Public			Private		
	Schools of No	Enrolment	Enrolment	Share of Enrolment	Schools of No	Enrolment	Schools of No	Enrolment	Share of Enrolment	Schools of No	Enrolment	
14	Kwale	417	167,176	33,567	0.48	114	16,415	86	26,577	0.49	8	970

15	Laikipia	27	6,950	1,467	0.47	2	201	5	1,109	0.42	--	--	
16	Machakos	269	80,847	19,118	0.51	71	9,054	108	24,694	0.49	10	1,683	
17	Makueni	543	165,409	40,180	0.51	74	8,987	217	54,965	0.49	12	1,192	
18	Mandera	200	91,332	11,539	0.34	35	7,730	41	12,259	0.30	5	1,664	
19	Marsabit	172	48,333	8,633	0.47	46	9,606	33	5,821	0.37	6	617	
20	Migori	217	100,468	19,968	0.49	85	13,399	80	20,760	0.40	7	789	
21	Murang'a	193	75,271	18,834	0.50	76	9,650	122	37,383	0.48	5	586	
22	Nandi	126	30,841	6,471	0.49	22	2,069	31	6,102	0.46	--	--	
23	Narok	70	33,647	6,368	0.48	23	4,152	23	4,102	0.40	--	--	
24	Samburu	158	47,724	8,386	0.41	22	2,699	28	6,410	0.36	3	405	
25	Taita Taveta	38	17,511	4,363	0.51	16	2,312	10	2,820	0.53	--	--	
26	Tana River	161	48,337	9,111	0.46	24	3,114	21	6,013	0.39	3	454	
27	Tharaka-Nithi	164	39,432	7,469	0.51	24	2,424	34	5,496	0.44	4	1,065	
<b>County</b>		<b>Primary</b>						<b>Secondary</b>					
		<b>Public</b>			<b>Private</b>			<b>Public</b>			<b>Private</b>		

		Sc ho ols of No	En rol lm en t	En rol lm en t	En rol lm en t	Sc ho ols of No	En rol lm en t	Sc ho ols of No	En rol lm en t	En rol lm en t	Sc ho ols of No	En rol lm en t
28	Turkana	374	185,712	23,580	0.37	45	35,456	42	14,712	0.36	8	6,068
29	Wajir	219	66,215	9,219	0.36	26	5,491	40	10,888	0.31	5	898
30	West Pokot	538	182,583	28,693	0.48	41	7,285	102	22,694	0.42	3	301
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>7,852</b>	<b>2,839,648</b>	<b>557,454</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>1,769</b>	<b>332,153</b>	<b>2,147</b>	<b>548,240</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>30,772</b>

## ANNEX 3.....

Table 6. DLIs/DLRs Verification Protocol Table

DLI	Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)	Protocol to Evaluate Achievement of the DLI and Data/Result Verification		
		Data source/Agency	Verification Entity	Definition and Procedure
<b>DLI 1: Reduced science, mathematics, and English teacher shortages in targeted sub-counties</b>				
<u>2018 (Year 1)</u> DLR 1.1: Detailed and costed strategic plan developed for addressing teacher shortages and baseline established	No	TSC report endorsed by the CEO	Principal Secretary (PS), MoE	Detailed and costed plan by TSC to the PS, MoE, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 1.2: 10% of new teacher posts, <sup>8</sup> in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with inadequate teachers <sup>31</sup> per the established baseline and on duty	Yes. €0.18 million for every 100 new teachers recruited <sup>9</sup> and on duty, up to maximum of 500 teachers. Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 100 teachers.	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews  Report by the independent firm to the DPC&D, MoE, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2019 (Year 2)</u> DLR 1.3: 10% of new teacher posts, in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with inadequate teachers per the established baseline and on duty	Yes. €0.18 million for every 100 new teachers recruited and on duty, up to maximum of 500 teachers. Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 100 teachers.	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews  Report by the independent firm to the DPC&D, MoE, as acceptable to

---

<sup>9</sup> As defined in the GoK regulations.

DLI	Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)	Protocol to Evaluate Achievement of the DLI and Data/Result Verification		
		Data source/Agency	Verification Entity	Definition and Procedure
				IDA
<u>2020 (Year 3)</u> DLR 1.4: 10% of new teacher posts, in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with inadequate teachers per the established baseline and on duty	Yes. €0.18 million for every 100 new teachers recruited and on duty, up to maximum of 500 teachers. Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 100 teachers.	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews  Report by the independent firm to the DPC&D, MoE, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2021 (Year 4)</u> DLR 1.5: 10% of new teacher posts, in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with inadequate teachers per the established baseline and on duty	Yes. €0.18 million for every 100 new teachers recruited and on duty, up to maximum of 500 teachers. Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 100 teachers.	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews  Report by the independent firm to the DPC&D, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2022 (Year 5)</u> DLR 1.6: 10% of new teacher posts, in addition to annual pro rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with inadequate teachers per the established baseline and on duty	Yes. €0.18 million for every 100 new teachers recruited and on duty, up to maximum of 500 teachers. Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 100 teachers.	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews  Report by the independent firm to the DPC&D, as acceptable to IDA

<u>2023 (Year 6)</u> DLR 1.7: 80% of the teachers recruited cumulatively in	Yes. €0.44 million for every 20% of teacher posts filled in previous five years are still filled. Minimum	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC reported figures through teacher survey and key informant
--	---	-----	---	---

DLI	Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)	Protocol to Evaluate Achievement of the DLI and Data/Result Verification		
		Data source/Agency	Verification Entity	Definition and Procedure
previous 5 years are on duty	achievement to trigger disbursement is 20% of recruited teachers on duty.			interviews  Report by the independent firm to the DPC&D, as acceptable to IDA
<b>DLI 2: Share of science, mathematics, and English teachers in grades 7 and 8 and Forms 1–4 in targeted sub-counties that are certified based on TPD modules or receive school-based support</b>				
<u>2018 (Year 1)</u> DLR 2.1: Baseline on teachers' performance gaps in science, mathematics, and English	No	Directorate of Teacher Management (DoTM), TSC	Baseline report endorsed by the TSC CEO	Report by DoTM and endorsed by the TSC CEO, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 2.2: Design of SBTSS and implementation plan finalized	No	DoTM, TSC	Design and implementation plan prepared by DoTM endorsed by the TSC CEO	Detailed and costed implementation plan by TSC, as acceptable to IDA

<u>2019 (Year 2)</u> DLR 2.3: TPD training modules developed	Yes. €0.26 million for each module developed up to 5 modules <sup>10</sup> and US\$0.5 million for 6th module developed	DoTM, TSC	DoTM report endorsed by the TSC CEO	Training modules submitted by TSC, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 2.4: Phase 1 of the SBTSS operational in 2,000 primary schools and 500 secondary schools	No	DoTM, TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Report by TSC verified by independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2020 (Year 3)</u> DLR 2.5: 10% of teachers	Yes. €0.44 million for each additional 10% of teachers that are certified after	DoTM, TSC	TSC report verified by independent	Report by TSC verified by independent firm, as acceptable to

DLI	Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)	Protocol to Evaluate Achievement of the DLI and Data/Result Verification		
		Data source/Agency	Verification Entity	Definition and Procedure
completing six modules	completing a training module, up to a maximum of 30%		firm	IDA
DLR 2.6: TPD training modules developed	Yes. €0.26 million for each module developed up to 5 modules <sup>11</sup> and US\$0.5 million for 6th module developed	DoTM, TSC	DoTM report endorsed by the TSC CEO	Training modules submitted by TSC, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 2.7: Scaling up of the SBTSS based on Phase 1 evaluation to at least 5,000 primary schools and 1,500 secondary schools	No	DoTM, TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Report by TSC verified by independent firm, as acceptable to IDA

<sup>10</sup> A module consists of 10 course units.

<sup>11</sup> A module consists of 10 course units.

<u>2021 (Year 4)</u> DLR 2.8: 20% of teachers completing eight modules	Yes. €0.44 million for each additional 10% of teachers that are certified after completing a training module, up to a maximum of 30%	DoTM, TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Report by TSC verified by independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 2.9: 30% of teachers engaged in virtual peer-to-peer learning	Yes. €0.22 million for each additional 10% of teachers engaged in virtual peer-to-peer learning, up to a maximum of 50%	DoTM, TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Report by TSC verified by independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2022 (Year 5)</u> DLR 2.10: 30% of teachers are certified	Yes. €0.44 million for each additional 10% of teachers that are certified after completing a training module, up to a maximum of 30%	DoTM, TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Report by TSC verified by independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 2.11: 50% of teachers engaged in virtual peer-to-peer learning	Yes. €0.22 million for each additional 10% of teachers engaged in virtual peer-to-peer learning, up to a	DoTM, TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Report by TSC verified by independent firm, as acceptable to IDA

DLI	Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)	Protocol to Evaluate Achievement of the DLI and Data/Result Verification		
		Data source/Agency	Verification Entity	Definition and Procedure
	maximum of 50%			
<u>2023 (Year 6)</u> DLR 2.12: Reduction in teachers' performance gaps in science, mathematics, and English over baseline	No	DoTM, TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Report by TSC verified by independent firm, as acceptable to IDA

<b>DLI 3: Share of schools reporting student-textbook ratio of 1:1 in science, mathematics, and English at grades 7 and 8 and Form 1 in targeted sub-counties</b>				
<u>2018 (Year 1)</u> DLR 3.1: Selection of core textbooks through transparent and competitive process	No	DPC&D, MoE	PS, MoE	Report by the MoE endorsed by the PS, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2019 (Year 2)</u> DLR 3.2: 50% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio <sup>12</sup>	Yes. €0.18 million for each additional 10% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio, up to a maximum of 80%	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA  For the purpose of calculation and disbursement, at the primary level if each student has any two out of three textbooks and at the secondary level each student has any three out of the five textbooks, it will be considered as having student-textbook ratio of 1:1.
<u>2020 (Year 3)</u>	Yes. €0.18 million for each additional	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE	Report by the independent firm, as

<sup>12</sup> In grades 7 and 8, each student will have one core textbook in science, mathematics, and English. In Forms 1 to 4, each student will have one core textbook in the mathematics, English, and relevant science subjects.

DLI	Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)	Protocol to Evaluate Achievement of the DLI and Data/Result Verification		
		Data source/Agency	Verification Entity	Definition and Procedure
DLR 3.3: 60% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio <sup>13</sup>	10% of schools with 1:1 studenttextbook ratio, up to a maximum of 80%		verified by independent firm	acceptable to IDA
<u>2021 (Year 4)</u> DLR 3.4: 70% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio <sup>14</sup>	Yes. €0.18 million for each additional 10% of schools with 1:1 student textbook ratio, up to a maximum of 80%	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2022 (Year 5)</u> DLR 3.5: 80% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio <sup>15</sup>	Yes. €0.18 million for each additional 10% of schools with 1:1 student textbook ratio, up to a maximum of 80%	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<b>DLI 4: Increased secondary school enrollment of poor and vulnerable students in targeted sub-counties</b>				
<u>2018 (Year 1)</u> DLR 4.1: Selection and contracting of partner agency(ies) to design and administer scholarships completed	No	DPC&D, MoE	DPC&D	Contract issued by the DPC&D, shared with IDA

<sup>13</sup> In grades 7 and 8, each student will have one core textbook in science, mathematics, and English. In Forms 1 to 4, each student will have one core textbook in the mathematics, English, and relevant science subjects.

<sup>14</sup> In grades 7 and 8, each student will have one core textbook in science, mathematics, and English. In Forms 1 to 4, each student will have one core textbook in the mathematics, English, and relevant science subjects.

<sup>15</sup> In grades 7 and 8, each student will have one core textbook in science, mathematics, and English. In Forms 1 to 4, each student will have one core textbook in the mathematics, English, and relevant science subjects.

<u>2019 (Year 2)</u> DLR 4.2: At least 9,000 Form 1 students receiving scholarships	Yes. €0.31 million for each additional 1,000 of student beneficiaries, up to a maximum of 9,000 beneficiaries.	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
--	--	------------	--	--

DLI	Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)	Protocol to Evaluate Achievement of the DLI and Data/Result Verification		
		Data source/Agency	Verification Entity	Definition and Procedure
<u>2020 (Year 3)</u> DLR 4.3: At least 17,750 Form 1 and 2 students receiving scholarships	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2021 (Year 4)</u> DLR 4.4: At least 17,500 Form 2 and 3 students receiving scholarships	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2022 (Year 5)</u> DLR 4.5: At least 17,250 Form 3 and 4 students receiving scholarships	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2023 (Year 6)</u> DLR 4.6: At least 8,000 Form 4 students receiving scholarships	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 4.7: At least 17,000 students from cohorts 1 and 2 complete Form 4	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 4.8: Program evaluated to inform options for scaling up	No	Third-party consultant	DPC&D, MoE	Evaluation by the third-party consultant, as acceptable to IDA

<b>DLI 5: Increased retention of poor and vulnerable students in grades 7 and 8 in targeted sub-counties</b>				
<u>2018 (Year 1)</u> DLR 5.1: Advocacy strategies developed and implementation launched in at least 50% of targeted sub-counties	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA

<b>DLI</b>	<b>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Protocol to Evaluate Achievement of the DLI and Data/Result Verification</b>		
		<b>Data source/Agency</b>	<b>Verification Entity</b>	<b>Definition and Procedure</b>
<u>2019 (Year 2)</u> DLR 5.2: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2020 (Year 3)</u> DLR 5.3: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2021 (Year 4)</u> DLR 5.4: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2022 (Year 5)</u> DLR 5.5: At 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA

<u>2023 (Year 6)</u> DLR 5.6: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	No	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 5.7: 80% of program beneficiaries sitting for KCPE exam at the end of grade 8	Yes. €0.66 million for every 20% of beneficiaries completing grade 8, up to a maximum of 80%	DPC&D, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 5.8: Program is evaluated to inform options for scaling up	No	Third party consultant	DPC&D, MoE	Evaluation by the third party consultant, as acceptable to IDA

## ANNEXES 4

### g) Results Framework

**Results Framework**  
**COUNTRY : Kenya**  
**Kenya Secondary Education Quality Improvement Project**

#### Project Development Objectives

The project development objective (PDO) is to improve student learning in secondary education and transition from primary to secondary education, in targeted areas.

#### Project Development Objective Indicators

Indicator Name	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	End Target	Frequency	Data Source/Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection
Name: Average student test score in sciences subjects at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties		Number	0.00	0.00	Baseline, mid-term and end-term	Assessment data  Baseline MLA at Form 2 to be conducted at the end of 2017.  The project targets a 15% improvement in test score	Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC)

Indicator Name	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	End Target	Frequency	Data Source/Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection
						in each science subject by the end of the project period, which implies an annual average improvement of about 3%.	
Average student test score in biology at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties		Number	0.00	0.00			
Average student test score sub-counties		Number	0.00 0.00	in	chemistry at Form 2 at	public schools in targeted	
Average student test score in physics at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties		Number	0.00	0.00			
Average female student test score in biology at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties		Number	0.00	0.00			

Indicator Name	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	End Target	Frequency	Data Source/Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection
Average female student test score in chemistry at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties		Number	0.00	0.00			
Average female student test score in physics at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties		Number	0.00	0.00			
Description: Test scores from Monitoring Learning Assessment (MLA) at Form 2, provided separately for biology, chemistry, and physics.							
Name: Average student test score in mathematics at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties		Number	0.00	0.00	Baseline, mid-term and end-term	<p>Assessment data</p> <p>Baseline MLA at Form 2 to be conducted at the end of 2017.</p> <p>The project targets a 15% improvement in test score by the end of the project period, which implies an annual average improvement of about 3%.</p>	KNEC

Indicator Name	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	End Target	Frequency	Data Source/Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection
Average female student test score in mathematics at Form 2 at public schools in targeted sub-counties		Number	0.00	0.00			

Description: Test scores from MLA at Form 2

Name: Transition rate from primary to secondary education in targeted sub-counties		Percentage	77.20	86.00	Baseline, mid-term, end-term	EMIS	Ministry of Education (MoE)
Female transition rate from primary to secondary education in targeted sub-counties		Percentage	74.90	83.40			

Description: Number of students enrolled in Form 1, minus number of repeaters in Form 1, divided by number of students enrolled in Grade 8 in previous year

### Intermediate Results Indicators

Indicator Name	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	End Target	Frequency	Data Source/Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection
Name: Teachers recruited or trained	✓	Number	0.00	22500.00	Annual; bi-annual	Reports, administrative data, third-party validation data	Teachers' Service Commission (TSC), Centre for

Indicator Name	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	End Target	Frequency	Data Source/Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection
							Mathematics, Sciences, and Technology Education for Africa (CEMASTE), independent third party
Number of teachers recruited	✓	Number	0.00	2500.00			
		Number	0.00	750.00			
Teachers recruited or trained - Female (RMS requirement)	✓						
Number of teachers trained	✓	Number	0.00	20000.00			
Description:							

	Percentage	0.00	80.00	Annual	Reports	MoE
<b>Name:</b> Share of primary and secondary schools in targeted sub-counties with gender sensitization orientation conducted and with gender champions designated						

Indicator Name	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	End Target	Frequency	Data Source/Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection
----------------	------	-----------------	----------	------------	-----------	-------------------------	------------------------------------

Description: At least one structured gender sensitization program is conducted and a school-level gender champion designated at a given school

<b>Name:</b> Number of Grade-7 and -8 students receiving inkind and advocacy and mentoring support		Number	0.00	37500.00	Annual	Administrative data, thirdparty validation data	MoE; independent third party
Description:							
<b>Name:</b> Retention rate of student beneficiaries of scholarship and mentoring support		Percentage	80.00	90.00	Annual	Administrative data; thirdparty validation data	MoE; independent third party
Description: The numerator is the number of student beneficiaries enrolled in Form 4 in the current year. The denominator is the number of student beneficiaries enrolled in Form 1 four years prior.							
<b>Name:</b> Number of government primary schools in targeted sub-counties toilet and water facilities by project		Number	0.00	3000.00	Annual	EMIS; third-party validation data  (A question on the “functioning” quality of school facilities will be added to future EMIS rounds.)	MoE; independent third party

Indicator Name	Core	Unit of Measure	Baseline	End Target	Frequency	Data Source/Methodology	Responsibility for Data Collection
Description:							
<b>Name:</b> Number of government secondary schools in targeted subcounties provided with functioning toilet and water facilities by project		Number	0.00	1000.00	Annual	EMIS; third-party validation data	MoE, independent third party
Description:							
<b>Name:</b> Number of new classrooms/science laboratories/multi-purpose rooms added to government secondary schools by project		Number	0.00	2000.00	Annual	EMIS, third-party validation data	MoE, independent third party
Description:							
<b>Name:</b> Share of schools reporting student-textbook ratio of 1:1 at Grades 7 and 8 and Forms 1-4 in targeted sub-counties		Percentage	0.00	80.00	Annual	EMIS	MoE
Description: In grades 7 and 8, each student will have one core textbook in science, mathematics, and English. In Forms 1 to 4, each student will have one core textbook in the mathematics, English, and relevant science subjects.							