



**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
STATE DEPARTMENT OF BASIC EDUCATION**

KENYA SECONDARY EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (SEQIP)

TITLE: CONSULTANCY FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION OF RESULTS IN SAMPLED TARGET SCHOOLS-ALLOCATED TEACHERS, SCHOOL BASED TEACHER SUPPORT SERVICES, PROVISION OF TEXTBOOKS, AND BENEFICIARIES OF THE SCHOLARSHIP AND MENTORSHIP PROGRAM.

CONTRACT NO: MOE/SEQIP/NCB/01/2017-18

PROCUREMENT METHOD: QUALITY AND COST BASED SELECTION (QCBS)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND.

1.1 The Government of Kenya (GoK) has partnered with the World Bank to improve student learning in secondary education and enhance transition from primary to secondary education, in targeted areas. This is in 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 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 Kenya Secondary Education Quality Improvement Project (SEQIP) seeks 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. The SEQIP, described in detail in the World Bank's Project Appraisal Document (PAD), 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). Under SEQIP, the RBF with selected DLIs has been designed for the following four sub-components:
- a) Component 1: Improving quality of teaching in targeted areas:
 - *Sub-component 1.1*: Reducing teacher shortage
 - *Sub-component 1.2*: Enhancing teacher professional development
 - *Sub-component 1.3*: Provision of textbooks

b) Component 2: Improving retention in upper primary school and transition to secondary school in targeted areas:

- *Sub-component 2.2*: Improving retention in upper primary school and transition to secondary school of poor and vulnerable learners

1.7 Specific DLIs have been developed to monitor results for each of the four subcomponents above (see annex 1). Disbursements will follow verified achievement of annual targets based on the verification protocols (annex 2). Verification of data submitted by the respective project implementation agencies is therefore an essential undertaking in this project as disbursements linked to results necessitates quality data. In addition to facilitating payments, verification improves transparency, credibility and good governance for RBF approaches.

2. OBJECTIVE OF THE ASSIGNMENT

- i) The primary task of this exercise will be to carry out transparent and impartial verification of the DLIs as per annexes 1 and 2 that are sourced from the PAD. It will be executed free from the influence of the implementers. This is a requirement for reliable establishment of progress made on disbursement linked indicators (as per annexes 1 and 2). Some of the key activities in the process will include: (i) designing a sample based assessment methodology for verification of the progress made on Disbursement Linked Indicators (DLIs) by the implementers; and (ii) applying the methodology to verify the results reported by the implementers for each of the DLIs. The verification will be carried out in a transparent and independent manner to provide robust evidence for decision-makers to authorize the disbursements that are linked to the realization of indicators and achievement of results.

3. DURATION OF THE ASSIGNMENT AND WORK PLAN

The assignment will be undertaken at least once a year or as will be needed over a six-year period from 2018 to 2023. The Independent Third Party Verification Agency¹ (ITPVA) will propose a realistic time-bound work plan with a clear flow of activities and time from commencement to completion of the assignment.

4. SELECTION OF CONSULTING FIRM

One consulting firm will be contracted to undertake an independent verification of achievement of each of the DLIs in a representative sample drawn from targeted areas. The selection will be done through competitive evaluation of Expressions of Interest (EoI) submitted by interested firms and proposals submitted by shortlisted firms. The winning firm

¹ Agency refers to the body contracted to undertake the verification of achievement of the DLIs.

will be engaged as the ITPVA through a signed contract with the MoE. The first phase of verification activity is likely to commence in June 2018 or shortly thereafter.

5. SCOPE OF WORK AND DELIVERABLES

The ITPVA is required to independently analyse and verify on a sample basis, the SEQIP DLIs, each of which has a specific achievement level and timeline (see annexes 1 and 2). A list of the project target sub-counties is included in Annex 3.

4.1 Task 1: Independent verification of results (DLIs).

The ITPVA will collate relevant data and reports of results related to DLIs from relevant implementers, as per the indicator definition and data sources detailed in annexes 1 and 2² of this Terms of Reference (ToRs). The PAD, together with these ToRs will be the primary point of reference for the tasks of the ITPVA. The ITPVA is expected to:

a) Propose a verification methodology:

- Detail sampling procedures and generate a representative sample in relation to the DLIs and verification protocols outlined in annexes 1 and 2. The sampling procedure should highlight the minimum sample or actual percentage that is expected to be verified for each DLR. In addition, the procedure should include spot check verification and adequate representation of the targeted sub-counties (Annex3).
- Develop relevant data verification and assessment tools
- Develop the independent verifiers' verification protocols³ at the implementers and target sub-county levels

b) Prepare a detailed time-bound costed work plan.

- The work plan shall provide details of how all the various tasks, sub-tasks, and activities will be undertaken including specific timelines for each task; logistics and manpower resources for the entire period of the assignment.
- The work plan should include a chart of progress against each DLR that is expected to be achieved in any particular year.
- The ITPVA is expected to operate within the approved plan and budget and will not deviate without prior written approval from the MoE, Directorate of Project Coordination and Delivery (DPCAD).

²The independent verifier will have to adhere to the content of Annexes 1 and 2 which are sourced from the approved Project Appraisal Document (PAD).

³ A protocol refers to a written set of procedures on how verification would be conducted at the sub-county level.

- The proposed work plan should be consistent with the proposed methodology, and should reflect an understanding of the scope of work.
- c) Implement the verification using the agreed upon methodology and work plan. The methodology and work plan will be the basis for execution, supervision and progress monitoring. They will therefore not be modified or revised by the ITPVA without prior approval by the MoE.
- Follow the verification protocol provided in the PAD.
 - For each of the DLRs, the ITPVA will be required to independently verify the results reported by the implementer. This will among others involve checking correctness, completeness and consistency of data reported by implementers through actual site visits to sample target schools or institutions.
- d) In case of non-achievement of targets, the agency will be required to analyze the functioning of the implementers, and identify the major barriers and challenges which impede progress towards the desired DLRs. The implementer⁴ is expected to follow up on the findings and institute corrective actions and or measures to enhance the achievement of the DLIs and DLRs.

4.2 Task II: Reporting

The Independent verifier is expected to:

- i. To produce an inception report detailing the understanding of the ToRs; approach to desk and field/site verification, sampling procedures and proposed sample.
- ii. To produce a report outlining key findings from the independent verification exercise and recommendations. The report should present findings by Disbursement Linked Indicator and the respective Disbursement linked Results (DLRs) described in Annexes 1 and 2. It should describe any discrepancies between reported and verified data for each DLI and related DLRs, and confirm to whether agreed targets for DLRs have been met or not.
- iii. Present the report to the sub-component implementers including Ministry of Education (MoE) and the Teachers Service Commission (TSC)⁵. The TSC will disseminate the results to the Centre for Mathematics, Science and Technology Education in Africa (CEMASTE A) and the School Based Teacher Support System (SBTSS) Implementing Institution.

⁴ The implementer could be MoE, TSC and CEMASTE A who are all involved in implementation of the DLIs.

⁵ The presentation should be as guided by the timelines agreed in the contract. The report that is presented will not be subject to inputs or changes by the implementers.

4.3 General responsibilities of the ITPVA

- (i) Maintain regular communication with the DPCAD through the project Coordinator regarding all aspects of the verification procedure, including data collection, reporting framework etc.;
- (ii) Respond in a timely manner to any queries from the DPCAD on the ITPVA's activities/behavior of its personnel during implementation of the agreed verification work plan;
- (iii) Provide DPCAD and TSC with copies of the ITPVA's verification procedure, work flow and data collection methodology for review;
- (iv) Any changes in the lead/key personnel for this assignment along with clear justification, will require approval from DPCAD;
- (v) Seek guidance and or concurrence from DPCAD before troubleshooting any sensitive/complex problems that may arise during the verification process;
- (vi) Permit the DPCAD or its designated entities or individuals to monitor the verification processes. Monitoring may take the form of unannounced visits to firm offices and field area.

4.4 Key Deliverables

- a) Inception report to be submitted for review by the Ministry of Education. The inception report should include as a minimum: sampling procedures; relevant data; verification and assessment tools; proposed ITPVA's verification protocols; and the proposed detailed costed time bound implementation schedule for verification of the DLRs in the life of the project.
- b) Periodic independent verification reports with clear outline of:
 - Methodology and instruments used for verification exercise, findings per DLI and relevant DLRs, and recommendations.
 - Data entry template and coding scheme
 - An annexe of the detailed activity plan for conducting the verification exercise (based on the agreed upon overall work plan)
 - An annexe of the scanned copies of all completed questionnaires (in a separate file)
- c) Presentation of the verification report with a summary in the form of key findings during the National Project's Steering Committee (PSC) meeting.
- d) Present the independent verification report to the MoE.

6. KEY TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

5.1 The Consulting Agency or firm must have the experience of conducting similar assignments or experience in conducting national level educational surveys. A consortium of firms may partner and bid for the task. This may for example entail an international/regional firm partnering with an organization that has grassroots level network in the country. The ITPVA will be expected to put together a team with the necessary skills to undertake the assignment. Experience in implementing Results Based Financing and World Bank Projects will be an added advantage.

5.2 The minimum mandatory criteria for short listing of the agencies(verifier) is:

- a) Be a Tax Compliant registered agency/firm or partner with a local firm operating under Government of Kenya regulations.
- b) Have a minimum of five years of experience in conducting similar assignments or experience in conducting national level educational surveys at sub-counties or school levels.
- c) Have minimum of five years' professional experience in analyzing data, documenting findings, and creating and presenting reports.
- d) Provide evidence of a sound track record of successful implementation of similar assignments either alone or partnering with relevant national or international organisations.
- e) Evidence of availability of appropriate skills to carry out the verification exercise.

The required skills may include the following:

- Team Leader who must be a holder of PhD in Education, Economics or Social Sciences with at least 7 years' experience in educational surveys at the school level.
- Education specialists a holder of Masters in Education with 5years Experience.
- Social development specialists with a Masters in Social Sciences with 5years experience in scholarship administration/advocacy /mentorship programs.
- A Statistician/Economist with a minimum of a bachelor's degree in the relevant field with 3years experience.
- Monitoring and Evaluation expert with 5years experience.
- A logistics coordinator to train and deploy enumerators to the field.

5.3 Once agreed, the ITPVA may make changes to the team if clearly such change is geared to enhancing effective and efficient execution of the task. However, replacement of lead team/key staff member(s) will only be done with approval of the MoE, Directorate of Project

Coordination and Delivery (DPCAD). The replacement of a Key Expert shall have equal or better qualifications and experience than those of the originally proposed Key Expert.

5.4 The attention of interested firms is drawn to paragraph 1.9 of the World Bank's Guidelines: Selection and Employment of Consultants under the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) Loans and the International Development Association (IDA) Credits & Grants by World Bank Borrowers dated January 2011 and revised July 2014 ("Consultant Guidelines"), setting forth the World Bank's Policy on conflict of interest. A Consulting firm will be selected based on merit of the proposal submitted in accordance with the Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) method set out in the Consultant Guidelines.

5.5 Children's Rights, Safety and Privacy

This assignment may in some circumstances and contexts involve interaction of the ITPVA's staff with learners in schools. In every respect, the ITPVA's staff will be expected to observe high standards of integrity in moral conduct, etiquette, and upholding of the expectations of the socio-cultural values of the community where the school exists. Particular attention should be paid to avoid actions or presentations that compromise children's rights and safety/security as provided in policy and legal instruments.

5.6 Rejection of Methodology and data collection instruments

The MoE and World Bank reserves the right to reject the proposed methodology and tools or re-negotiate with the ITPVA about modifications to the proposed methodology or set of instruments.

5.7 Contract termination

A performance review of the ITPVA will be conducted after each year and as a result of this review, agreed upon remedial actions will have to be executed within specific timelines. If this is not complied with, contract termination will be considered.

5.8 Copyright and confidentiality

All verification material and data from the assignment will be sole property of the Ministry of Education. No information on the assignment and information collected for the verification will be shared with anyone without the written permission of MoE. The ITPVA shall carry out the above assignment in accordance with the highest standard of ethical competence, integrity and professionalism and having due regard to the nature and purpose of the assignment. The ITPVA will at all-time and for all purposes, regard as strictly confidential all knowledge and information not within public domain which may be acquired in the course of carrying out this assignment and shall not be directly or indirectly disclosed to any person whatsoever, except with the written permission of MoE.

5.9 Other terms on replacement of Experts or Sub-Consultants

- a) If the Client finds that any of the Experts or Sub-consultant has committed serious misconduct or has been charged with having committed a criminal action, or shall the Client determine that Consultant's Expert or Sub-consultant have engaged in corrupt, fraudulent, collusive, coercive or obstructive practice while performing the Services, the ITPVA shall, at the Client's written request, provide a replacement.
- b) In the event that any of the Key Experts, Non-Key Experts or Sub-consultants is found by the Client to be incompetent or incapable in discharging assigned duties, the Client, specifying the grounds there of, may request the ITPVA to provide a replacement.
- c) Any replacement of the removed Experts or Sub-consultants shall possess equal or better qualifications and experience and shall be acceptable to the Client.
- d) Except as the Client may otherwise agree, (i) the ITPVA shall bear all additional travel and other costs arising out of or incidental to any removal and/or replacement, and (ii) the remuneration to be paid for any of the Experts provided as a replacement shall not exceed the remuneration which would have been payable to the Experts replaced or removed.

7. PROPOSED PERSONNEL COST TABLE

In addition to technical expertise, the ITPVA shall be responsible for arranging and providing any additional resources required to carry out the work, including but not limited to the following:

- a) Ground transportation
- b) Communication
- c) Reports preparation
- d) Office Space and Equipment
- e) Translations/Interpretation in local language (if needed).

Table 1: Proposed Cost table

Descriptions	Quantity	Person days	Rate (USD)	Total (USD)
<i>Personnel</i>				
XXXXXXXXXXXXX	Fees			
	Local travel			
XXXXXXXXXXXXX	Fees			
	Local travel			
XXXXXXXXXXXXX	Fees			
	Local travel			
XXXXXXXXXXXXX	Fees			
	Local travel			
XXXXXXXXXXXXX	Fees			
	Local travel			
XXXXXXXXXXXXX	Fees (pilot)			
	Local travel (pilot)			
	Fees (main study)			
	Local travel (main study)			
<i>Other Expenses e.g</i>				
Training of Data Collectors				
Communication				
Other Transportation				
Printing of Instruments and reports				
Miscellaneous				
Total				

8. MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING ARRANGEMENTS

7.1 The assignment will be managed by the MoE. At the MoE, this responsibility will fall under the Directorate of Project Coordination and Delivery (DPCAD) which will include focal points from the TSC. The specific roles and responsibility for the DPCAD for this assignment, at no costs, includes:

- a. Coordination of implementation activities without interfering with the independence of the ITPVA. The Director, DPCAD, will be the key focal person for management and coordination.
- b. Access to data. The DPCAD will provide the independent verifier with access to all relevant information and data to assess progress against the DLIs and

respective DLRs. The independent verifier will have access to raw data for DLIs and DLRs indicated in Annexes 1 and 2.

c. Project documents

The DPCAD will provide the independent verifier with the following documents:

- Project Appraisal Document.
- Financial Management Manual.
- Disbursement letter.
- Project Implementation Manual.

d. Detailed sub-components work plans

- Avail to the ITPVA detailed sub-components work plans.
- Facilitate the verification exercise by issuing letters/communications to schools and necessary key informants.
- Convene in a timely manner, the PSC for discussions of the verification report.

e. Introductory Letter: The DPCAD will issue to the ITPVA a letter of introduction to facilitate collection of data from the Field Education Offices.

7.2 In undertaking the verification role, the ITPVA will work independently without undue interference or influence from any parties whatsoever. The findings and recommendations will be shared with the implementers in the first instance through the PSC where the implementers will work together to resolve any issues arising from the report and make final recommendations for endorsement by the PSC. The responsibility for final clearance of the independent verification report lies with the PSC.

9. TIMEFRAME

The ITPVA will prepare a detailed time-bound work plan specifying the timelines. Independent verification of the DLIs and DLRs will be in accordance with the approved schedules which must be harmonized with the PAD, Annual Work Plans and the Project Implementation Manual. However, the ITPVA may also be requested to do an interim verification of carryover DLIs as an exception. Such interim evaluations will be negotiated within the contract terms and conditions.

10. BUDGET.

The budget for the ITPVA is included under project management costs.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

The approved costed detailed time-bound annual work schedule of the ITPVA will give the overall cost of verification each year. A payment schedule, against major milestones, will be agreed upon in advance of contract commencement.

12. ANNEXES

1. DLI and DLRs table
2. DLRs and DLRs Verification protocols
3. Target Sub-counties

Application

Interested firms should submit their expressions of interest to:

The Principal Secretary (Att: Head of Supply Chain Management [HSCM]),
Ministry of Education,
State Department of Basic Education,
P.O Box 30040-00100
Nairobi, Kenya.
Jogoo House B, Harambee Avenue
Tel: +254-020-3318581
Email: scmsequip@education.go.ke

Annex 1: Disbursement Linked Indicators

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 1: Reduced science, mathematics, and English teacher shortages in targeted sub-counties	DLI TARGET 1.1: Detailed and costed strategic plan developed for addressing teacher shortages and baseline established	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 DTAD: FY19	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 DTAD: FY20	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 DTAD: FY21	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 DTAD: FY22	DLI TARGET 1.7: 80% of the teachers recruited over the last five years continue to be on duty DTAD: FY23
	DLI TARGET Target Achievement Date (DTAD): FY18					
	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					

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)
	DTAD: FY18					
	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 1.2 Value: <u>€875,000</u>					
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	DLI TARGET 2.1: Baseline on teachers' performance gaps in science, mathematics, and English DTAD: FY18	DLI 2.3: TPD training modules developed DTAD: FY19	DLI 2.5: 10% of teachers are certified DTAD: FY20	DLIR 2.8: 20% of teachers are certified DTAD: FY21	DLI TARGET 2.10: 30% of teachers are certified DTAD: FY22	DLI TARGET 2.12: Reduction in teachers' performance gaps in science, mathematics, and English over baseline DTAD: FY23
			DLI TARGET 2.6: 3 additional TPD training modules developed DTAD: FY20			

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)
or receive school-based support (SBTS)	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</u> <u>€1,755,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.3 Value: <u>\$1.1M</u> <u>€965,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.5 Value: <u>\$1.0M</u> <u>€875,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.8 Value: <u>\$0.5M</u> <u>€450,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.10 Value: <u>\$0.5M</u> <u>€450,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.12 Value: <u>\$2.0M</u> <u>€1,755,000</u>
	DLI TARGET 2.2 Value: <u>\$3.0M</u> <u>€2,630,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.4 Value: <u>\$2.0M</u> <u>€1,755,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.6 Value: <u>\$0.9M</u> <u>€790,000</u> DLI TARGET 2.7 Value: <u>\$1.0M</u> <u>€875,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.9 Value: <u>\$0.5M</u> <u>€450,000</u>	DLI TARGET 2.11 Value: <u>\$0.5M</u> <u>€450,000</u>	
DLI 3:[1] Share of schools reporting student-	DLI TARGET 3.1 Selection of core textbooks through	DLI TARGET 3.2: 50% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook	DLI TARGET 3.3: 60% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook	DLI TARGET 3.4: 70% of schools with 1:1 student-	DLI TARGET 3.5: 80% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook	

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)
textbook ratio of 1:1 in science, mathematics, and English at grades 7 and 8 and Form 1 in targeted sub-counties	transparent and competitive process DTAD: FY18	ratio DTAD: FY19	ratio DTAD: FY20	textbook ratio DTAD: FY21	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>	
DLI 4: Increased secondary school enrollment of poor and vulnerable students in targeted sub-counties	DLI TARGET4.1: Selection and contracting of partner agency(ies) to design and administer scholarships completed DTAD: FY18	DLI TARGET4.2: At least 9,000 Form 1 students receiving scholarship[2] DTAD: FY19	DLI TARGET4.3: At least 17,750 Form 1 and 2 students receiving scholarship DTAD: FY20	DLI TARGET4.4: At least 17,500 Form 2 and 3 students receiving scholarship DTAD: FY21	DLI TARGET4.5: At least 17,250 Form 3 and 4 students receiving scholarship DTAD: FY22	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
						DLI TARGET 4.8: Program evaluated to inform options for scaling up

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)
						DTAD: FY23
	DLI TARGET 4.1 Value: <u>\$1.0M €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>	DLI TARGET 4.6 Value: <u>€2,600,000</u> DTAD: FY23
						DLI TARGET 4.7 Value: <u>€1,755,000</u> DTAD: FY23
						DLI TARGET 4.8 Value: <u>€700,000</u> DTAD: FY23
DLI 5: Increased retention of poor and vulnerable students in grades 7 and 8 in targeted sub-counties	DLI TARGET 5.1: Advocacy strategies developed and implementation launched in at least 50% of targeted sub-counties DTAD: FY18	DLI TARGET 5.2: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits DTAD: FY19	DLI TARGET 5.3: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits DTAD: FY20	DLI TARGET 5.4: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits DTAD: FY21	DLI TARGET 5.5: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits DTAD: FY22	DLI TARGET 5.6: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits DTAD: FY23 DLI TARGET 5.7: 80% of program beneficiaries sitting for KCPE exam at the end of grade 8

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)
						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>

Note: DTAD* = DLI Achievement Date

ANNEX 2: 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
DLI 1: Reduced Science, Mathematics, and English teacher shortages in targeted sub-counties				

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
<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 CEO	Principal Secretary (PS), MoE	Detailed and costed plan by TSC to PS, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 1.2: 10% of new teacher posts ⁶ , in addition to annual pro-rata of teacher posts, recruited for schools with inadequate teachers ⁷ per the established baseline, and on duty	Yes.€0.18 million for every 100 new teachers recruited ⁸ and on duty up to maximum of 500 teachers. <i>Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 100 teachers.</i>	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC-reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews Report by independent firm to DPCAD, 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	Yes.€0.18 million for every 100 new teachers recruited and on duty up to maximum of 500 teachers. <i>Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 100</i>	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC-reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews Report by independent firm to DPCAD, as acceptable to

⁶ As defined per GoK regulations

⁷ As per TSC norms

⁸ As defined per GoK regulations

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
on duty	<i>teachers.</i>			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. <i>Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 100 teachers.</i>	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC-reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews Report by independent firm to DPCAD, 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. <i>Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 100 teachers.</i>	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC-reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews Report by independent firm to DPCAD, 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	Yes. €0.18 million for every 100 new teachers recruited and on duty up to maximum of 500 teachers. <i>Minimum achievement to trigger</i>	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC-reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews Report by independent firm

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
the established baseline, and on duty	<i>disbursement is 100 teachers.</i>			to DPCAD, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2023 (Year 6)</u> DLR 1.7: 80% of the teachers recruited cumulatively in previous 5 years are on duty	Yes. €0.44 million for every 20% of teacher posts filled in previous five years are still filled. <i>Minimum achievement to trigger disbursement is 20% of recruited teachers on duty.</i>	TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Independent firm confirms TSC-reported figures through teacher survey and key informant interviews Report by independent firm to DPCAD, as acceptable to IDA
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				
<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,	Detailed and costed implementation plan by TSC, as acceptable to IDA

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
			CEO	
<u>2019 (Year 2)</u> DLR 2.3: TPD training modules developed	Yes. €0.26 million for each module developed up to 5 modules ⁹ , and €0.44 million for 6 th module developed.	DoTM, TSC	DoTM report endorsed by the TSC	Training modules submitted by to TSC, as acceptable to IDA
DLR 2.4: Phase 1 of SBTSS implemented 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> DLI 2.5: 10% of teachers completing six 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 2.6: TPD training modules developed	Yes. €0.26 million for each module developed up to 5 modules ¹⁰ and €0.44 million for 6 th	DoTM, TSC	DoTM report endorsed by the TSC CEO	Training modules submitted by TSC, as acceptable to IDA

⁹ A module consists of 10 course units.

¹⁰ A module consists of 10 course units.

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
	module developed			
DLR 2.7: Scaling up of 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
2021 (Year 4) 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
<u>2021 (Year 4)</u> DLI 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	DoTM, TSC	TSC report verified by independent firm	Report by TSC verified by independent firm, as acceptable to IDA

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
	completing a training module, up to a maximum of 30%			
DLR 2.11: 50% of teachers engaged in virtual peer-to-peer learning	Yes. €0.22 million for each additional 10% 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>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
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				
<u>2018 (Year 1)</u> DLI 3.1: Selection of core textbooks through transparent and competitive process	No	DPCAD, MoE	PS, MoE	Report by MoE endorsed by PS, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2019 (Year 2)</u> DLI 3.2: 50% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook	Yes. €0.18 million for each additional 10% of schools with 1:1	DPCAD, MoE	Report by MoE verified by independent firm	Report by independent firm to DPCAD, as acceptable to IDA.

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
ratio ¹¹	student-textbook ratio, up to a maximum of 80%.			For the purpose of calculation and disbursement, at the primary level if each student has any two out of three textbooks and at secondary level each student has any three out of the five text books will be considered as having student-textbook ratio of 1:1.
<u>2020 (Year 3)</u> DLR 3.3: 60% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio ¹²	Yes. €0.18 million for each additional 10% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio, up to a maximum of 80%	DPCAD, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2021 (Year 4)</u> DLR 3.4: 70% of schools	Yes. €0.18 million for each additional 10% of	DPCAD, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA

¹¹ 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.

¹²In 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.

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
with 1:1 student-textbook ratio ¹³	schools with 1:1 student textbook ratio, up to a maximum of 80%		independent firm	
<u>2022 (Year 5)</u> DLR 3.5: 80% of schools with 1:1 student-textbook ratio ¹⁴	Yes. €0.18 million for each additional 10% of schools with 1:1 student textbook ratio, up to a maximum of 80%	DPCAD, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
DLI 4: Increased secondary school enrolment of poor and vulnerable students in targeted sub-counties				
<u>2018 (Year 1)</u> DLR 4.1: Selection and contracting of implementing agencies to design and administer scholarships completed	No	DPCAD, MoE	DPCAD	Contract issued by DPCAD, shared with IDA
<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	DPCAD, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA

¹³In 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.

¹⁴In 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.

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
	beneficiaries.			
<u>2020 (Year 3)</u> DLR 4.3: At least 17,750 Form 1 and 2 students receiving scholarships	No	DPCAD, 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	DPCAD, 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	DPCAD, 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	DPCAD, 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	DPCAD, 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	No	Third party consultant	DPCAD, MoE	Evaluation by the third party consultant , as

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
for scaling up				acceptable to IDA
DLI 5: Increased retention of poor and vulnerable students in Grades 7 and 8 in targeted sub-counties				
<u>2018 (Year 1)</u> DLR 5.1: Advocacy strategies developed and implementation launched in at least 50% of targeted sub-counties	No	DPCAD, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2019 (Year 2)</u> DLR 5.2: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	No	DPCAD, 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	DPCAD, 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	DPCAD, MoE	Report by the MoE verified by independent firm	Report by the independent firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2022 (Year 5)</u>	No	DPCAD, MoE	Report by the MoE	Report by the independent

<i>DLI</i>	<i>Scalability of Disbursements (Yes/No)</i>	<i>Protocol to Evaluate achievement of the DLI and data/result verification</i>		
		<i>Data source/Agency</i>	<i>Verification Entity</i>	<i>Definition and Procedure</i>
DLR 5.5: At least 7,500 primary students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits			verified by independent firm	firm, as acceptable to IDA
<u>2023 (Year 6)</u> DLR 5.6: At least 7,500 students (grades 7 and 8) receiving school kits	No	DPCAD, 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 end of grade 8	Yes. €0.66 million for every 20% of beneficiaries completing grade 8, up to a maximum of 80%	DPCAD, 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	DPCAD, MoE	Evaluation by third party consultant, as acceptable to IDA

ANNEX 3: Targeted Sub-counties

a)

Summary- school totals

			Primary	Secondary	TOTAL
	County	Sub-County	No. of Schools	No. of Schools	
1	Baringo	Baringo North	150	29	179
2		EAST POKOT	90	6	96
3		MARIGAT	92	22	114
4	Elgeyo Marakwet (2 subcounties not selected)	MARAKWET EAST	84	18	102
5		MARAKWET WEST	104	33	137
6	Bomet (2 subcounties not selected)	CHEPALUNGU	186	58	244
7		SOTIK	175	68	243
8	Narok (3 subcounties not selected)	TRANS MARA EAST	70	23	93
9	Bungoma (6 subcounties not selected)	BUNGOMA WEST	81	29	110
10		CHEPTAIS	98	17	115
11		MT ELGON	65	18	83
12	Busia	BUNYALA	40	11	51

			Primary	Secondary	TOTAL
	County	Sub-County	No. of Schools	No. of Schools	
13		BUSIA	48	21	69
14		BUTULA	61	28	89
15		NAMBALE	52	21	73
16		SAMIA	65	19	84
17		TESO NORTH	92	31	123
18		TESO SOUTH	77	24	101
19		Kakamega (6 subcounties not selected)	BUTERE	80	31
20	KAKAMEGA SOUTH		81	29	110
21	KHWISERO		61	22	83
22	LIKUYANI		68	33	101
23	LUGARI		57	30	87
24	NAVAKHOLO		69	30	99
25	Nandi (4 subcounties not selected)		TINDERET	126	31
26		Garissa (1 subcounty not selected)	BALAMBALA	30	2
27	DADAAB		26	4	30

			Primary	Secondary	TOTAL
	County	Sub-County	No. of Schools	No. of Schools	
28		FAFI	30	5	35
29		HULUGHO	22	2	24
30		IJARA	30	5	35
31		LAGDERA	25	3	28
32	Mandera	BANISA	30	2	32
33		LAFEY	11	2	13
34		MANDERA CENTRAL	41	9	50
35		MANDERA EAST	37	15	52
36		MANDERA NORTH	40	7	47
37		MANDERA WEST	41	6	47
38	Marsabit	CHALBI	17	3	20
39		HORR NORTH	19	4	23
40		LOIYANGALANI	15	--	15
41		MARSABIT	34	10	44
42		MARSABIT SOUTH	30	5	35

			Primary	Secondary	TOTAL
	County	Sub-County	No. of Schools	No. of Schools	
43		MOYALE	34	7	41
44		SOLOLO	23	4	27
45	Tana River	BURA (TANA NORTH)	47	5	52
46		TANA DELTA	63	10	73
47		TANA RIVER	51	6	57
48	Wajir	BUNA	21	3	24
49		ELDAS	18	3	21
50		HABASWEIN	35	7	42
51		TARBAJ	28	4	32
52		WAJIR EAST	36	12	48
53		WAJIR NORTH	22	3	25
54		WAJIR SOUTH	22	2	24
55		WAJIR WEST	37	6	43
56	Homa Bay (5 subcounties not selected)	SUBA	97	34	131
57	Kisii (7 subcounties not selected)	MARANI	65	30	95

			Primary	Secondary	TOTAL
	County	Sub-County	No. of Schools	No. of Schools	
58		NYAMACHE	103	48	151
59	Migori (4 subcounties not selected)	KURIA EAST	50	19	69
60		KURIA WEST	91	28	119
61		URIRI	76	33	109
62	Isiolo	GARBATULA	39	4	43
63		ISIOLO	44	15	59
64		MERTI	29	4	33
65	Laikipia (4 subcounties not selected)	LAIKIPIA NORTH	27	5	32
66	Samburu	SAMBURU CENTRAL	84	16	100
67		SAMBURU EAST	40	6	46
68		SAMBURU NORTH	34	6	40
69	Kajiado (3 subcounties not selected)	KAJIADO CENTRAL	117	17	134
70		LOITOKITOK	83	20	103
71	Machakos (6 subcounties not selected)	MASINGA	135	53	188
72		YATTA	134	55	189

			Primary	Secondary	TOTAL
	County	Sub-County	No. of Schools	No. of Schools	
73	Makueni (4 subcounties not selected)	KATHONZWENI	94	36	130
74		KIBWEZI	163	62	225
75		MAKINDU	66	24	90
76		MAKUENI	99	43	142
77		NZAU	121	52	173
78	Kitui (7 subcounties not selected)	IKUTHA	127	28	155
79		KYUSO	96	22	118
80		MUMONI	89	21	110
81		MUTITO	105	22	127
82		MUTOMO	140	31	171
83		MWINGI CENTRAL	106	42	148
84		MWINGI EAST	107	30	137
85		NZAMBANI	49	15	64
86		TSEIKURU	57	11	68
87	Kilifi (2 subcounties not selected)	GANZE	125	21	146

			Primary	Secondary	TOTAL
	County	Sub-County	No. of Schools	No. of Schools	
88		KALOLENI	66	22	88
89		MAGARINI	108	19	127
90		MALINDI	75	19	94
91	Kwale	KINANGO	163	23	186
92		KWALE	97	28	125
93		MSAMBWENI	157	35	192
94	Taita Taveta (3 subcounties not selected)	TAVETA	38	10	48
95	Murang'a (5 subcounties not selected)	KANDARA	78	55	133
96		KIGUMO	61	37	98
97		MURANG'A EAST	54	30	84
98	Tharaka-Nithi (2 subcounties not selected)	THARAKA NORTH	60	9	69
99		THARAKA SOUTH	104	25	129
100	Turkana	KIBISH	11	1	12
101		LOIMA	57	6	63
102		TURKANA CENTRAL	73	9	82

			Primary	Secondary	TOTAL
	County	Sub-County	No. of Schools	No. of Schools	
103		TURKANA EAST	36	6	42
104		TURKANA NORTH	40	4	44
105		TURKANA SOUTH	87	7	94
106		TURKANA WEST	70	9	79
107	West Pokot	POKOT CENTRAL	158	29	187
108		POKOT NORTH	122	11	133
109		POKOT SOUTH	81	21	102
110		WEST POKOT	177	41	218
	Grand Total		7,852	2,147	9999

b)

Detailed

	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	PRIMARY						SECONDARY					
				Public			private			public			private		
				# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grade s 7-8 female share of enrolment	# schools	enrollment	# schools	enrollment	female share of enrolment	# schools	enrollment	
1.	Baringo (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	
		EAST POKOT	60	90	15,523	1,790	0.40			6	1,444	0.31			
		MARIGAT	91	92	24,865	5,427	0.49	17	2,689	22	3,599	0.42			
2.	Bomet (2 sub-counties not selected)	CHEPALUNGU	71	186	54,111	11,937	0.50	54	7,368	58	13,880	0.49	1	236	
		SOTIK	102	175	53,456	13,286	0.51	70	9,776	68	16,762	0.48			
3.	Bungoma (6 sub-counties not selected)	BUNGOMA WEST	101	81	43,915	8,748	0.50	17	2,639	29	9,532	0.50			
		CHEPTAIS	67	98	49,783	8,302	0.49	44	5,307	17	5,220	0.44	1	189	

	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	PRIMARY					SECONDARY					
				# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grade share of enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	female share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	public	private	
		MT ELGON	86	65	34,498	7,352	0.52	21	2,964	18	5,459	0.48		
4.	Busia	BUNYALA	54	40	21,986	3,779	0.49	8	790	11	3,123	0.40		
		BUSIA	90	48	33,525	7,168	0.52	11	2,295	21	6,427	0.47	2	194
		BUTULA	66	61	44,122	9,166	0.49	7	1,661	28	8,194	0.41	1	80
		NAMBALE	69	52	30,903	6,194	0.51	41	3,597	21	5,946	0.45	2	150
		SAMIA	77	65	28,732	5,639	0.51	16	1,955	19	7,110	0.47		
		TESO NORTH	89	92	33,724	7,883	0.50	30	3,056	31	8,826	0.52	1	96
		TESO SOUTH	68	77	45,026	8,740	0.50	20	2,407	24	7,434	0.49		
5.	Elgeyo Marakwet (2 sub-counties not selected)	MARAKWET EAST	52	84	25,871	5,324	0.49	9	1,256	18	2,968	0.38		
		MARAKWET	79	104	32,88	7,877	0.53	17	3,006	33	8,910	0.41		

	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	PRIMARY				SECONDARY						
				# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grade s 7-8 female share of enrolment	# schools	enrollment	public	private	public	private	
		T WEST			6									
6.	Garissa (1 sub-county not selected)	BALAMBALA	23	30	7,031	785	0.30	1	142	2	540	0.38		
		DADAAB	65	26	8,174	965	0.28	25	42,008	4	1,291	0.27	6	4,329
		FAFI	62	30	5,782	840	0.37	17	22,144	5	608	0.34	1	135
		HULUGHO	36	22	4,891	410	0.27			2	369	0.47		
		IJARA	50	30	6,251	1,227	0.42	7	468	5	1,211	0.40		
		LAGDERA	41	25	6,355	942	0.31			3	604	0.21		
7.	Homa Bay (5 sub-counties not selected)	SUBA	94	97	29,051	6,291	0.48	22	2,999	34	6,652	0.53	3	296
8.	Isiolo	GARBATULA	16	39	8,746	1,698	0.47	6	581	4	844	0.34		
		ISIOLO	58	44	15,299	3,216	0.49	26	5,684	15	2,491	0.43	4	504
		MERTI	46	29	5,341	1,023	0.52	3	587	4	476	0.44	2	145
9.	Kajiado (3 sub-counties)	KAJIADO	72	117	29,92	5,437	0.44	35	5,860	17	4,208	0.33	8	827

			PRIMARY						SECONDARY					
			Public			private			public			private		
COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grades 7-8 female share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 female share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	
<i>not selected)</i>	CENTRAL			2										
	LOITOKITO K	93	83	35,778	6,841	0.50	29	5,107	20	5,157	0.41	6	860	
10. Kakamega (6 sub-counties not selected)	BUTERE	99	80	42,811	8,866	0.53	11	966	31	9,140	0.52	1	137	
	KAKAMEGA SOUTH	104	81	39,375	6,387	0.55	10	997	29	9,909	0.52			
	KHWISERO	84	61	31,138	6,082	0.53	7	1,246	22	6,241	0.51	1	113	
	LIKUYANI	97	68	39,364	8,287	0.51	62	7,932	33	9,998	0.54	2	273	
	LUGARI	106	57	34,067	7,556	0.51	28	3,157	30	10,854	0.54	1	38	
	NAVAKHOL O	107	69	51,480	10,023	0.51	35	3,412	30	9,527	0.41			
11. Kilifi (2 sub-counties not selected)	GANZE	26	125	44,545	9,407	0.51	8	541	21	5,537	0.43	1	25	
	KALOLENI	81	66	38,643	8,869	0.49	33	5,026	22	8,212	0.49	6	645	

	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	PRIMARY					SECONDARY					
				# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grade share of enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grade share of enrollment	public	private	public	private	
		MAGARINI	21	108	45,766	9,363	0.47	35	3,285	19	4,268	0.39	7	1,293
		MALINDI	87	75	48,978	12,378	0.49	64	11,358	19	8,245	0.34	16	2,476
12.	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
		NYAMACHE	105	103	35,770	7,799	0.50	26	3,113	48	11,913	0.49	2	279
13.	Kitui (7 sub-counties not selected)	IKUTHA	40	127	27,795	5,530	0.52	6	347	28	4,345	0.51	1	9
		KYUSO	27	96	20,108	3,951	0.53	17	1,256	22	3,626	0.44		
		MUMONI	28	89	16,315	3,086	0.52	17	1,106	21	2,756	0.50		
		MUTITO	42	105	26,730	5,225	0.52	11	1,011	22	4,595	0.47		
		MUTOMO	44	140	35,366	7,755	0.51	5	549	31	5,972	0.53		
		MWINGI	82	106	28,54	6,786	0.48	28	3,384	42	6,199	0.46	3	222

			PRIMARY						SECONDARY					
			Public			private			public			private		
COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grade share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	# schools	enrollment	grade share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	
	CENTRAL			0										
	MWINGI EAST	37	107	28,944	6,157	0.51	12	1,089	30	4,210	0.52			
	NZAMBANI	55	49	13,215	3,270	0.50	6	347	15	3,954	0.51			
	TSEIKURU	39	57	13,046	2,562	0.51	3	278	11	1,820	0.52	1	34	
14.	Kwale													
	KINANGO	11	163	66,337	13,155	0.48	18	2,781	23	6,476	0.40			
	KWALE	92	97	39,154	8,420	0.49	24	3,492	28	11,200	0.51	2	238	
	MSAMBWE NI	49	157	61,685	11,992	0.48	72	10,142	35	8,901	0.54	6	732	
15.	Laikipia (4 sub-counties not selected)													
	LAIKIPIA NORTH	63	27	6,950	1,467	0.47	2	201	5	1,109	0.42			
16.	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	
	YATTA	103	134	41,519	9,984	0.51	37	4,222	55	13,191	0.50	8	1,412	

	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	PRIMARY					SECONDARY					
				# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grades 7-8 female share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	public	enrollment	female share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment
17.	Makueni (4 sub-counties not selected)	KATHONZWENI	80	94	24,605	6,319	0.51	4	544	36	8,762	0.48	1	119
		KIBWEZI	61	163	54,723	12,870	0.51	30	3,541	62	15,265	0.48	2	157
		MAKINDU	59	66	22,558	5,386	0.52	20	2,015	24	5,237	0.53	5	325
		MAKUENI	100	99	29,418	7,408	0.51	13	2,039	43	12,635	0.44	3	542
		NZAU	83	121	34,105	8,197	0.50	7	848	52	13,066	0.53	1	49
18.	Mandera	BANISA	25	30	10,047	878	0.27	1	292	2	664	0.21		
		LAFEY	3	11	5,241	832	0.29			2	388	0.00		
		MANDERA CENTRAL	22	41	16,994	2,050	0.37	4	483	9	2,264	0.30		
		MANDERA EAST	56	37	26,537	4,720	0.36	24	6,142	15	5,297	0.34	4	1,481
		MANDERA NORTH	45	40	14,986	1,520	0.38	3	268	7	2,169	0.32	1	183

	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	PRIMARY				SECONDARY						
				# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grades 7-8 female share of enrollment	public	private	public	private			
		MANDERA WEST	31	41	17,527	1,539	0.28	3	545	6	1,477	0.26		
19.	Marsabit	CHALBI	24	17	4,142	775	0.54			3	626	0.30		
		HORR NORTH	7	19	3,659	586	0.35	1	86	4	474	0.45		
		LOIYANGA LANI	1	15	3,054	348	0.47					#DIV /0!		
		MARSABIT	74	34	11,756	2,296	0.50	9	1,757	10	2,374	0.34	4	430
		MARSABIT SOUTH	10	30	6,990	1,207	0.41	3	625	5	444	0.43	1	47
		MOYALE	17	34	13,985	2,518	0.49	23	5,738	7	1,469	0.37	1	140
		SOLOLO	5	23	4,747	903	0.46	10	1,400	4	434	0.51		
20.	Migori (4 sub-counties not selected)	KURIA EAST	73	50	27,191	4,725	0.48	13	1,882	19	4,621	0.44		
		KURIA WEST	95	91	40,554	7,785	0.50	39	7,039	28	8,315	0.43	5	659
		URIRI	98	76	32,72	7,458	0.48	33	4,478	33	7,824	0.34	2	130

	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	PRIMARY				SECONDARY						
				Public		private		public		private				
			# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grades 7-8 female share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 female share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	
				3										
21.	Murang'a (5 sub-counties not selected)	KANDARA		78	30,687	7,852	0.51	26	3,848	55	18,907	0.50	3	310
		KIGUMO		61	26,415	6,286	0.50	30	3,613	37	10,771	0.44	2	276
		MURANG'A EAST		54	18,169	4,696	0.50	20	2,189	30	7,705	0.49		
22.	Nandi (4 sub-counties not selected)	TINDERET	85	126	30,841	6,471	0.49	22	2,069	31	6,102	0.46		
23.	Narok (3 sub-counties not selected)	TRANS MARA EAST	96	70	33,647	6,368	0.48	23	4,152	23	4,102	0.40		
24.	Samburu	SAMBURU CENTRAL	38	84	28,700	5,185	0.41	12	2,013	16	3,677	0.38	2	235
		SAMBURU EAST	34	40	10,070	1,797	0.42	8	573	6	1,448	0.26	1	170
		SAMBURU NORTH	35	34	8,954	1,404	0.42	2	113	6	1,285	0.39		
25.	TaitaTaveta (3 sub-	TAVETA	64	38	17,51	4,363	0.51	16	2,312	10	2,820	0.53		

	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	PRIMARY					SECONDARY					
				# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grades 7-8 female share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	public	enrollment	public	enrollment	# schools
	<i>counties not selected)</i>				1									
26.	Tana River	BURA (TANA NORTH)	29	47	13,023	2,452	0.44	16	1,994	5	1,866	0.34	2	156
		TANA DELTA	32	63	20,150	3,784	0.47	4	335	10	2,623	0.39		
		TANA RIVER	33	51	15,164	2,875	0.47	4	785	6	1,524	0.45	1	298
27.	Tharaka-Nithi (2 sub-counties not selected)	THARAKA NORTH	51	60	15,562	2,639	0.52	13	1,390	9	1,471	0.46	1	111
		THARAKA SOUTH	70	104	23,870	4,830	0.51	11	1,034	25	4,025	0.43	3	954
28.	Turkana	KIBISH	2	11	3,437	229	0.32			1	82	0.00		
		LOIMA	8	57	16,509	1,911	0.44			6	1,330	0.56	1	71
		TURKANA CENTRAL	30	73	34,806	5,228	0.40	16	3,989	9	4,330	0.27	1	38
		TURKANA EAST	19	36	16,297	1,673	0.45	1	42	6	1,505	0.43		

	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	PRIMARY				SECONDARY						
				# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grade s 7-8 female share of enrolment	# schools	enrollment	public	private	# schools	enrollment	
		TURKANA NORTH	15	40	12,016	1,064	0.39			4	1,048	0.44		
		TURKANA SOUTH	6	87	38,874	5,055	0.47	2	208	7	2,489	0.40		
		TURKANA WEST	43	70	63,773	8,420	0.26	26	31,217	9	3,928	0.34	6	5,959
29.	Wajir	BUNA	13	21	4,214	397	0.33			3	513	0.20		
		ELDAS	9	18	5,520	508	0.24	1	209	3	360	0.17		
		HABASWEIN	47	35	8,029	1,148	0.37	4	911	7	1,624	0.43	1	68
		TARBAJ	14	28	7,936	1,023	0.28			4	659	0.28		
		WAJIR EAST	53	36	20,257	3,439	0.44	19	4,070	12	5,419	0.32	4	830
		WAJIR NORTH	4	22	4,053	582	0.34			3	613	0.34		
		WAJIR SOUTH	12	22	4,678	500	0.33	1	97	2	341	0.22		
		WAJIR WEST	20	37	11,528	1,622	0.32	1	204	6	1,359	0.25		

			PRIMARY						SECONDARY					
			Public			private			public				private	
	COUNTY	SUB_COUNTY	CI ranking	# schools	enrollment	grades 7-8 enrollment	grade share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment	# schools	enrollment	female share of enrollment	# schools	enrollment
30.	West Pokot	POKOT CENTRAL	48	158	53,682	8,263	0.49	9	758	29	6,165	0.41	1	38
		POKOT NORTH	18	122	33,674	3,605	0.43	5	865	11	1,850	0.34		
		POKOT SOUTH	57	81	28,161	5,146	0.50	10	1,121	21	3,138	0.47		
		WEST POKOT	76	177	67,066	11,679	0.49	17	4,541	41	11,541	0.42	2	263
	Grand Total			7,852	2,839,648	557,454	0.49	1,769	332,153	2,147	548,240	0.46	164	30,772