

**ARE PUBLIC FUNDS MAKING A DIFFERENCE FOR PUPILS
AND TEACHERS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN MALAWI?**

A Report On
Civil Society Basic Education Budget Monitoring For
Financial Year 2003/4
...Overview of 2004/5 Budget Estimates

**PREPARED BY CIVIL SOCIETY COALITION FOR QUALITY
BASIC EDUCATION (CSCOBE)**

Edited by Limbani Nsapato

**ARE PUBLIC FUNDS MAKING A DIFFERENCE
FOR PUPILS AND TEACHERS IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN MALAWI?**

A Report On
Civil Society Basic Education Budget Monitoring
For Financial Year 2003/4

**PREPARED BY CIVIL SOCIETY COALITION FOR QUALITY BASIC
EDUCATION (CSCQBE)**

Edited by Limbani Nsapato

CSCQBE Budget Monitoring Series: No 3
PRINTERS

Montfort Media, Box 280, Balaka.

Type Setting By Dave Sapuwa

PUBLISHED AND DISTRIBUTED BY

Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education (CSCQBE)
Arwa House, City Centre, Box 30736, Lilongwe, 3, Malawi.
Tel: +265 1 773 624, +265 1 770 713
Fax: +265 1 770 229.
Email: cscqbe@sdp.org.mw

Printed and distributed in March 2005

DATA ANALYZED BY

Dr. Joseph Chimombo
Mr. Demis Kunje
University of Malawi
Centre for Education Research and Training (CERT),
P.O. Box 280, Zomba, Malawi
Tel: +265 1 524 490
Fax: +265 1 524 046
jogchimombo@chirunga.sdp.org.mw

EDITED BY

Limbani Nsapato

FUNDED BY

Commonwealth Education Fund (CEF)
Department for International Development (DFID)

<p>COPYRIGHT 2005 All right reserved. Plagiarism is not allowed. All quotations from this report must be duly acknowledged.</p>
--

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publishers would like to acknowledge all the support, material, financial, technical and moral that has been rendered by various people, institutions and organisations towards the production of this report.

Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education (CSCQBE) is specifically grateful to the CEF and DFID for all the financial support provided to carry out the budget monitoring exercise, data analysis, and printing and publishing of this report.

CSCQBE Secretariat also thanks all member organisations for all the field work meant to collect data from schools, colleges, and government offices and departments. Similarly we thank all the respondents to the questionnaires for their willingness and sincerity in making information available.

We look forward to your continuing support in the future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents	Pages
Acknowledgements.....	4
Acronyms.....	6
Executive Summary.....	7
1.0 Introduction.....	9
2.0 Main Findings from the 2003/4 Budget Monitoring.....	13
3.0 Overview of the 2003/4 Budget Estimates and actual expenditure.....	14
4.0 Enrolment.....	18
5.0 Special Needs Education.....	19
6.0 News Schools.....	20
7.0 Teaching materials.....	21
8.0 Learning Materials.....	23
9.0 Teachers.....	28
10.0 Summary of key recommendations from the Budget Monitoring Exercise.....	36
11.0 Overview of the 2004/5 Budget Estimates and Expenditure.....	37
12.0 Conclusion.....	40
Appendix I Education Divisions and Zones Sampled.....	41
Appendix II Divisions, Districts and Number of Schools Sampled.....	41
Appendix III Names of Organisations that Collected Data.....	42
Appendix IV Expenditure details in four divisions.....	43
Appendix V: Questionnaire used in the Budget Monitoring Exercise.....	45
References.....	65

ACRONYMS

CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSCQBE	Civil society Coalition for Quality Basic education
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DEM	District Education Manager
DFID	Department for International Development
EFA	Education for All
EMIS	Education Management Information System
FPE	Free Primary education
ICT	Information Communication Technologies
MEJN	Malawi Economic justice Network
MGD	Millennium development Goals
MoE	Ministry of Education
MPRS	Malawi Poverty reduction Strategy
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NSO	National Statistics Office
PEA	Primary Education Advisor
PETS	Public Expenditure Tracking Survey
PIF	Policy and Investment Framework
PPE	Priority Poverty Expenditure
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
TTC	Teacher Training College

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is third in a series of Budget Monitoring Reports produced since 2002 by Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education (CSCQBE). The reports come out of CSCQBE's major strategic activity, the basic education government budget monitoring and expenditure tracking exercise.

CSCQBE was formed in July 2000 and its activities are focused on the basic education sector with the aim to achieve measurable change in the quality of basic education for all through supporting and influencing the implementation and monitoring of government education policies, strategies and plans.

Civil Society conducts the budget monitoring and expenditure tracking exercise for two main reasons. The first reason is to establish whether resources allocated to the basic education sector are sufficient to achieve measurable change in equitable access, quality and relevance of basic education as a right for all children in Malawi in line with existing government policies and international commitments on Education for All (EFA). Internationally, proponents of EFA recommend that no nation can hope to achieve level of access and quality education unless the government allocates 26% of the national budget to education, 50% of which should be allocated to basic (primary) education.

The second reason for doing budget monitoring is to hold government accountable, by finding out whether the national budget is being implemented in line with existing policy guidelines and whether resources are reaching the intended beneficiaries as planned and in consonance with the pro poor economic policies.

Overall, civil Society would like to find answers to the question: are public funds making a difference for pupils and teachers in primary schools? Thus, the initiative equips civil society with data to firstly advocate for increased funding of the basic education sector and secondly to advocate for prudent use of public funds in the basic education sector, in line with principles of transparency, accountability and sound economic governance.

This report presents data analysed from 322 primary schools out of a sample of 420 schools from all the six educational divisions across Malawi. Data was also collected from District Education Managers' Offices, and teacher training colleges. The information relates to education budgetary allocations in the 2003/2004 fiscal year and highlights the issues which require attention. Key areas of focus are the priority poverty expenditures (PPEs) in basic education and expenditures which have direct connection to improving the access, quality and relevance of primary education in the country in line with Ministry of Education (MoE) priorities as outlined in the education policy and investment framework (PIF) and the Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy (MPRS). These priority areas are: Teaching and learning materials (TLMs), special needs education, teachers' salaries, teacher training and recruitment, supervision and inspection of schools, and school rehabilitation and construction.

In 2003/4 parliament approved total budget of MK56.5 billion out of which MK41.1 billion was for recurrent budget and MK15.4 billion for development budget. The Ministry of Education's revised budget estimate for the year was MK6.5 billion recurrent budget and MK2.3 billion development budget. This represented around 14.6% of the total budget, which is below the recommended 26%.

In this report the focus is mainly on recurrent budget figures. Out of the MK6.5 billion recurrent budget MK4.7 billion was estimated for personal emoluments broken down into MK1.9 billion for salaries and wages, MK2.7 billion for allowances, and MK1.8 billion for other recurrent transactions (ORT). The ORT MK1.8 billion budget was shared between the Headquarters administration and support services (MK338.5 million), primary education (MK609.7 million), secondary education (MK 608.9 million), tertiary education services (MK 245.4 million) and memorandum items (MK617.5 million). Later in the year ORT funding was revised down to MK1, 574, 027, 670.

Data sourced from the Director of Planning's office at the Ministry of Education Headquarters shows that the actual expenditure for 2003/4 was MK6, 663, 109, 554, which is more than the approved MK6, 532, 889, 000. In addition, the actual expenditure for primary education including teachers' salaries is at MK5, 564, 330, 669, which is more than the approved MK4, 301, 007, 000.

According to information from Ministry of Finance, expenditure for ORT amounted to MK2, 497, 921, 126 out of which MK1, 854, 116, 306 was for PPEs from a PPE revised budget of MK1, 423, 954, 563. Primary education spending amounted to MK847, 918, 729 out of the revised budget of MK629, 892, 440 from MK609, 781,863. There is ORT total over expenditure of MK923, 893, 456 slightly over 50% revised budget, which raises questions as to whether the budgeted figures are realistic and whether government is serious in controlling over expenditure. However the resources reaching the people on the ground do not tally with this expenditure pattern and one wonders where the finances go to.

CSCQBE would like to appreciate the commitment of government Ministry of Education in particular, for providing increased funding and resources to the education sector in 2003/4 financial year. Compared with 2002/3 the 2003/4 figures show that there was increased funding to the primary education sector in areas like special needs education, teacher salaries, school construction and rehabilitation, teacher supervision and school inspection. In addition there was a general increase in terms of enrolment number and number of teaching and learning materials supplied to schools.

However CSCQBE would like to put it straight here that some crucial areas received less money in 2003/4 compared to 2002/3. Such areas are teaching and learning materials and teacher training. In addition, during implementation of the budget, in many cases increased funding did not translate to increased outputs or service delivery. This raises fears of mismanagement through diversion of funds and resources to other budget areas than those approved as well as fears of corruption. For instance, results of the budget monitoring exercise show that despite increased funding to teachers salaries, teachers did not get a pay rise in the 2003/4 financial year. We have failed to find an explanation on the disparity in funding figures for Mzimba North and Dowa which did not receive funding in April 2004 and yet there is a claim that they were funded MK493, 351.20 and MK204 606 respectively. Government increased funding for school rehabilitation and construction and yet there are no records of how many new schools were rehabilitated or constructed by government apart from those funded by donors. The increase in distribution of teaching and learning materials is largely attributed to funding from donors rather than arising from the MK321 million allocated. Moreover figures of TLMs actually received in Divisions tend to be lower than those said to have been delivered. Data from Most of the divisions shows a leakage of TLMs ranging from 4.8% to 12%. Salary leakage of up to 13% from divisions to schools is also a critical area of concern.

The other area of concern is that there are huge disparities in terms of allocation of resources across education divisions and schools and between urban schools and rural schools, in all cases favouring urban schools, which is against the pro poor economic policy of government intimated in the MPRSP. This trend is a repetition of the 2002/3 financial year where rural areas received fewer resources than urban areas.

The report also gives an overview of the 2004/5 budget estimates. The education sector received MK10.6 billion, 12.63 % of the total budget of around MK85.6 billion. In Education sector out of the other recurrent transactions (ORT), with overall MK1.8 billion, the Primary Education got K916, 958,000. This is almost 30% increase over the approved K609, 782,000 allocated in 2003/4, which is positive, but still falls short of the internationally recommended 50% required to achieve education for all goals.

Based on the findings Civil Society through this report draws on key advocacy issues and suggests recommendations to MoE, donors, parliament, civil society, and other relevant stakeholders in education on what could be done to improve all aspects of basic education in Malawi. One major issue is that while nominal budget figures show a yearly increase in allocations to the education sector, in real terms or as percentage of the total budget the allocations are diminishing from around 28% in the 1990s to 12% in 2004/5. Moreover there is need for government to show that budget allocations are tallying with international budgetary commitments required to achieve quality education for all; the education sector is negatively affected and this leads to disgruntledness among pupils, teachers and parents. In addition increases in budgets do not translate to corresponding increases in service delivery or outputs. In addition, there are huge disparities in resource allocations like TLMs and female teachers across divisions and schools with evidence favouring urban rather than rural schools. Issues of salary leakages and loss of TLMs need to be thoroughly investigated. These issues are making it hard for government to adequately address prop poor expenditures (PPEs) as provided for in the MPRS.

Civil Society therefore calls on donors and government to increase financial allocations to education to be in line with international commitments, and calls on the Ministry of Education to exercise good finance management so that resources allocated to the sector bring about the desired change in schools. Moreover distribution and supply of resources should be done equitably among divisions and schools to address the disparities that exist in rural and urban schools and also to promote the pro poor spirit sanctioned by the MPRS. Civil Society Organisations, Communities also need to intensify activities advocating for increased enrolment and discipline in schools.

Limbani Nsapato
Coalition Coordinator. September 2004.

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background to CSCQBE and Budget Monitoring Exercise

Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education (CSCQBE) started in 2000 and has 54 diverse, independent and voluntary organizations (non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, teachers union, religious based organizations, and District Networks), each having its own activities and constituencies.

The aim of CSCQBE is to achieve measurable change in the quality of basic education for all through supporting and influencing the implementation and monitoring of government education policies, budgets, strategies and plans.

The Coalition started its activities to respond to a lot of challenges affecting the quality of education since the introduction of Free Primary Education in 1994. The challenges include shortage of well qualified teachers, teaching and learning materials, classrooms, and teachers' houses, low salaries of teachers, poor maintenance of infrastructures, and lack of adequate community support to school governance, among others. The problems lead to absenteeism, high dropout, and in general poor quality of education.

One of the key strategic activities for CSCQBE is to monitor and track government budget expenditure in the basic education sector.

There are two main reasons why Civil Society conducts the budget monitoring exercise. The first reason is to establish whether resources allocated to the basic education sector are sufficient to achieve measurable change in equitable access, quality and relevance of basic education as a right for all children in Malawi in line with existing government policies and international commitments on Education for All (EFA). The second reason is to hold government accountable, by finding out whether the national budget is being implemented in line with existing policy guidelines and whether resources are reaching the intended beneficiaries as planned and in consonance with the pro poor economic policies. This helps to determine commitment of government to its budget obligations related to the basic education sector. Overall, civil Society would like to find answers to the question: are public funds making a difference for pupils and teachers in primary schools?

This initiative equips civil society with data to firstly advocate for increased funding of the basic education sector and secondly to advocate for prudent use of public funds in the basic education sector, in line with principles of transparency, accountability and sound economic governance.

The mandate for civil society to monitor government's plans, and budgets is also enshrined in the Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy (MPRS).

The development of the MPRSP, which involved the participation of various actors outside of government, and the identification of Priority Poverty Expenditures (PPE), created the opportunity for civil society to become involved in monitoring the implementation of the Government's budget. In the MPRS government commits itself to encourage the development of other external monitoring systems, for example through civil society institutions.

CSCQBE's first round of budget monitoring took place in 2002 when it monitored the 2001/2 budget. The second round happened last year and the Coalition monitored expenditures for the 2002/3 financial year.

1.2 About this 2003/4 Budget Monitoring Report

The 2003/4 budget monitoring exercise report is the third one after the two rounds of monitoring in 2002 and 2003. This report carries on the momentum of the two previous year reports in providing insight into whether government is committed to spending more on priority areas in education and whether such expenditure is resulting in improvement in the quality of education.

1.3 Global and Local Priorities In Education

1.31 Global Priorities

At the global level the key education priorities are reflected in the Education for All (EFA) goals and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). EFA goals were developed in Dakar, Senegal at the World Education Forum where representatives from government and civil society from all over the world including Malawi committed themselves to recognise that education is a basic human right and that basic education should be provided freely to all children, youths and adults. In sum they agreed to increase access, quality and relevance of education at all levels. In Dakar six EFA goals were developed. These are outlined in the table 1 below.

Table1: The six EFA Goals

1. Expanding and improving comprehensive early childhood care and education especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged children.
2. ensuring that by 2015 all children particularly girls, children in difficult circumstances and those belonging to ethnic minorities have access to complete free and compulsory primary education of good quality.
3. Ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life skills programmes.
4. Achieving a 50% improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially for women and equitable access to basic and continuing education for all adults.
5. Eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005 and achieving gender equality in education by 2015, with a focus on ensuring girls' full and equal access to (and achievement in) basic education of good quality.
6. Improving all aspects of the quality of education and ensuring excellence of all so that recognized and measurable learning outcomes are achieved by all, especially in literacy, numeracy and essential life skills.

Similarly, Millennium Development Goals recognize the significance of basic education for all. Two of the goals, Goal one and three refer to education as follows:

Goal 2: Achieve Universal primary education

Target 3: Ensure that by 2015 children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.

Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women

Target 4: Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and at all levels of education no later than 2015.

To achieve these goals it was agreed that rich nations and governments needed to increase annual budgetary funding to the primary education sector. Proponents of EFA recommend that no nation can hope to achieve level of access and quality education unless the government budget allocates 26% of the national budget to education, 50% of which should be allocated to basic (primary) education.

1.32 Priorities in Education in Malawi

In relation to the global priorities Malawi recognizes in its policy and strategic documents, the need to promote access, equity, quality and relevance of education. Government's commitment is placed in both the policy and investment framework (PIF) and the MPRS. The provision of basic education in Malawi is entrusted to the Ministry of Education whose mission is to provide accessible, quality and relevant education to all children so that they acquire essential skills and knowledge for survival and competent performance as citizens in socio-economic development. Collaterally, the main goal is thus to increase overall levels of literacy and numeracy in an effort to reduce poverty.

CSCQBE's budget monitoring exercise is particularly concerned with the Ministry's specific objectives dealing with:

- Increasing access
- Improving quality
- Improving equity
- Improving the school inspection system
- Improving the quality and quantity of teachers
- Improving financing of the system

Both the PIF and MPRS put priority on the following expenditure activities:

1. Enrolment of boys and girls in rural and urban schools
2. Enrolment of special needs pupils
3. Construction of new schools
4. Teacher welfare: training, recruitment, salaries and promotion.
5. Provision of text books
6. Provision of other learning materials
7. Provision of other teaching materials
8. Provision of supervisory visits by PEAs
9. Increase of teachers salaries by 10 percent each year

These expenditure lines are also articulated in vote 250 of the Government Budget Statement which focuses on allocations to the Ministry of Education.

The methodology used in registering budget related data to come up with this report is based on these local expenditure priorities, which in the view of civil society are vital in the bid to improve access, quality, equity and relevance of education in Malawi.

1.4 Sampling

All the districts in Malawi except Likoma were selected in the exercise. From the sampled districts, 42 zones out of the possible 314 zones were targeted. Ten schools per zone were selected to participate in data provision. This means that 420 schools were sampled. However only data from 322 schools was available representing 76.7% response rate. This was a higher response rate than in 2002/3 in which data from 264 schools out of the same sample size was used. Table 2 below shows the number of schools per zone per division in the sample.

Table 2: Number of Zones and schools per division

Division	No. Of Zones	Total number of schools sampled	No. of schools responding	Proportion of Schools responding
Northern	6	82	45	54.9
Central East	2	50	25	50

Central West	10	90	66	73.3
South East	5	64	36	56.3
South West	12	87	98	112.6
Shire Highlands	5	60	50	83.3
Total	40	433	322	73.9

The analysis in this report gives much attention to differences between rural and urban schools. This focus is vital to see if pro poor policies under which the MPRS is framed are being reinforced at implementation level. The assumption is that if there is change in services for the better in rural areas which are poor zones then the pro poor policies are at play. In the sample it turned out that out of the 322 schools 81 (25%) were designated as urban schools and 241 were rural schools.

1.5 Instruments

The report is based on a basic education school questionnaire which purported to capture enrolment, teacher provision, teacher training, teacher supervision, provision of teaching and learning materials and teachers' salary progression. The head teacher, pupils and school committees were required to respond to the questionnaire in order to provide supporting evidence to each other's claims. Back up evidence was extracted from District Education Managers and Teacher Training Colleges (TTCs) questionnaires. Only 13 out of the 33 DEMs responded to the questionnaire and only 3 out of the 6 TTCs also responded to the questionnaire.

1.6 Data collection

Member organisations which form the Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education administered the questionnaires to target schools, Districts and Teacher Training Colleges in the months of June and July 2004. While there was an improvement in the total number of schools responding compared to the previous years, there is great need for improving the quality of the data collected. This is particularly in the area of completeness of the returned questionnaires. More accurate and complete information was lacking especially for textbooks. The Coalition also sourced data from officials at MOE headquarters, from Ministry of Finance and from unpublished results of the Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS) in Education commissioned by the Ministry of Finance Economic Planning and development.

1.7 Limitations

The response rate from District Education Managers and Teachers' Training Colleges was very low. The respondents in many cases did not have the data at hand. Data from District Education Managers and Teachers' Training Colleges were used mainly for verification purposes.

It is also important to note that all this was done in the absence of credible Education Management Information System (EMIS) data from the Ministry of Education Headquarters, which has not been available since 2001. Therefore there was little opportunity to verify our data with that from the Ministry's database. Indeed, it is very difficult to obtain any meaningful data from the ministry and this inhibits our attempt at isolating the expenditures per targeted items. On the positive note, at the compilation of this data however, the Ministry of Education was updating its EMIS and it is possible that as this report gets public such data would be available.

2.0 Main Findings from the 2003/4 Budget Monitoring

The sections that follow present the findings from the 2003/4 monitoring exercise. The findings in this report are based on the data collected from 322 schools sampled in 40 zones in the six Educational Divisions. The Six Education divisions are: Northern Division, Central East Division, Central West Division, South East Division, South West Division, and Shire Highlands Division. Details of schools and zones in each division are found in the appendix section.

The findings presented in this report give proxy indications of the provision of educational services in the country in line with education priorities for the country as outlined in policy documents. Wherever possible, reference is made to the provision levels of the 2002/3 financial year to give an indication of how things have changed.

It should be noted that due to difficulties in obtaining budgeted expenditure related data from MoE the emphasis in the findings is more on outcomes and outputs rather than on actual expenditure figures per budget line item.

In addition Civil Society is of the view that it is outputs and outcomes rather than actual expenditure figures that show indicators for progress or no progress in government's bid to promote the quality equitable access and relevance of education although actual expenditure figures line by line speak volumes about expenditure discipline. In any case, attempts are made to provide expenditure figures for divisions and districts.

Sub headings that matter under this section are:

- a. Overview of the 2003/4 Budget estimates and expenditure
- b. Enrolment
- c. Special Needs Education
- d. Teacher Salaries
- e. Teacher Training
- f. Supervision
- g. School Rehabilitation and Construction

3.0. Overview of the 2003/4 Budget Estimates and Actual Expenditure

3.1 2003/4 Approved and Revised Budget Estimates

Parliament approved around MK8.8 billion for the education sector out of overall of close to MK52 billion, representing around 14% of budget to education. The nearly 14% of the budget fell below the international recommendation of 26% required to achieve education for all goals. Out of this MK6. 5 billion was allocated to Total Recurrent Budget, and MK2.3 billion was for Development Budget.

From the Total recurrent Budget, MK4.7 billion was estimated for personal emoluments broken down into MK1.9 billion for salaries and wages, MK2.7 billion for allowances, and MK1.8 billion for other recurrent transactions (ORT).

The approved ORT MK1.8 billion budget was shared between the Headquarters administration and support services (MK338.5 million), **primary education (MK609. 7 million)**, secondary education (MK 608. 9 million), **tertiary education services (MK 245. 4 million)** and memorandum items (MK617. 5 million). Note that primary education received nearly 30% of ORT and around 7.5% of total education budget, which is less than 50% of the total education budget recommended internationally to achieve education for all goals.

Later in the year the budget figures were revised. For example, ORT allocation was revised down from MK1, 810, 149, 001 to MK1, 574, 027, 670. PPE allocations were revised from MK1, 463, 954, 563 to MK1, 423, 954, 563. Primary education budget was revised from MK609, 781, 863 to MK629, 892, 440.

Approved and revised estimates (Recurrent and ORT) for the 2002/2003 fiscal year for Ministry of Education as well as the 2003/2004 estimates have presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Approved and revised estimates for 2002/03 and estimates for 2003/04

Approved 2002/3	Revised 2002/03	Estimate 2003/04	Change
Total recurrent MK5,051,920,700	MK5,968,288,000	MK6,532,889,000	26.9%
Salaries and wages (MK2,184,029,000)	MK2,643,366,000	MK1,955,248,000	-10.5%

The 2003/04 estimates represented 26.9 percent increase from the previous approved budget while salaries and wages decreased by 10.5 percent.

3.2. Funding and Expenditure

Table 4 contains ORT funding and expenditure figures for 2003/4 financial year from July 2003 to June 2004. From the figures some generalisations can be made with regard to government's commitment towards the budget. On the positive note CSCQBE observed that in general government was committed to fully funding the revised budget allocations to provisions for Ministry of Education. In addition cumulative funding was more than the revised estimates which means government overspent. The over expenditure means that there was pressure on the ground for resources which needed more

funds than originally allocated. However it is yet to be seen whether the over expenditure was reflective of the situation on the ground in terms of demand and supply of services. Table 4 sourced from PETS 2004 summarises the trend for ORT and PPE in particular.

Table 4: ORT and PPE trends.

ITEM	APPROVED (MK)	REVISED(MK)	CUMULATIVE FUNDING(MK)	DIFFERENCE(MK)
TOTAL ORT	1, 810, 149, 001	1, 574, 027, 670	2, 497, 921, 126	-923, 893, 456
PPE TOTAL	1, 463, 954, 563	1, 423, 954, 563	1, 854, 116, 306	-430, 161, 743
Primary education-PPE	609, 781, 863	629, 892, 440	847, 918, 729	-218, 026, 289
Teaching & learning Materials—PPE	320, 708, 863	373, 711, 320	576, 961, 317	-203, 249, 997
Teacher education-PPE	118, 640, 900	115, 399, 245	115, 399, 240	5
Teacher Development- PPE	59, 177, 000	57, 560, 092	57, 560, 090	2

Our interviews with the ministry's officials revealed that it is very difficult to get a clear idea about the actual expenditure breakdown for the PPEs. This is because, when budgeting, there is no demarcation between ORT and PPE and as such, monthly allocations are given in lump sum. Consequently, to spend on PPEs is purely at the discretion of controlling officers in the ministries. This is an area that needs to be changed.

Data sourced from the Director of Planning's office at the Ministry of Education Headquarters shows that the actual overall ministry expenditure for 2003/4 was MK6, 663, 109, 554, which is more than the approved MK6, 532, 889, 000. In addition, the actual expenditure for primary education (Recurrent and ORT) including teachers' salaries was at MK5, 564, 330, 669, which is more than the approved MK4, 301, 007, 000. Table 5 provides more details.

Table 5: MOE Expenditures 2003/4

<i>Cost centre</i>	Primary (MK)	Secondary (MK)	Teacher Education (MK)	Inspectorate (MK)
MoE Headquarters	1, 507, 956, 786	7, 479, 745	213, 614, 131	5, 552, 017
Northern Division.	735, 812, 428	211, 329, 640	28, 092	1, 734, 561
Central west	1, 082, 737, 794	145, 443, 115	-	1, 471, 894
Central East	672, 798, 374	99, 019, 340	-	3, 041, 581
South West	553, 930, 078	125, 323, 193	-	1, 334, 906
South East	521, 555, 354	114, 730, 833		1, 584, 703
Shire highlands	489, 539, 855	64, 466, 397	-	1, 655, 578
MCDE	-	47, 982, 744	-	-
Total	5, 564, 330, 669	815, 875, 016	266, 528, 629	16, 375, 240

Source: Director of Planning, Ministry of Education.

3.3. Funding & spending in Divisions and Districts

Divisions get direct funding from the treasury and these in turn provide funding to districts, which do not have a vote in the national budget. Each of the divisions got monthly funding in 2003/4. Funding levels were not uniform for every division but varied according to needs. However in the 2003/4 financial year

in some months some divisions got less funding. For example, in July 2003 South West Division got as less as MK368, 596 compared with MK795, 190 in May 2003 and MK3, 920, 293 in June 2003. The Northern Division got lowest funding in November 2003 with MK166, 529. 00. The little funding affected the operations of the divisions. Refer to table 6 which features ORT received in four divisions for more comparisons. The table has been sourced from PETS 2004.

Table 6: ORT Received by Divisions by Month

ORT RECEIVED BY DIVISION BY MONTH

MONTH	NAME OF DIVISION			
	Northern	Central East	South East	South West
May-03	1,024,465.93	6,800,000.00	5,740,165.00	795,190.00
Jun-03	3,009,509.59	2,993,689.00	4,753,590.00	3,920,293.00
Jul-03	1,412,821.05	2,799,818.00	2,610,405.00	368,596.00
Aug-03	1,367,763.45	6,866,559.00	7,400,405.00	7,871,454.00
Sep-03	2,054,767.27	9,081,787.00	5,825,874.00	517,650.43
Oct-03	777,576.10	8,012,475.00	6,026,868.00	8,523,187.40
Nov-03	166,529.45	6,459,017.00	4,937,524.00	414,459.00
Dec-03	2,600,000.00	6,459,017.00	5,209,860.00	4,489,589.48
Jan-04	218,287.32	7,573,429.00	4,028,083.00	4,194,227.08
Feb-04	218,287.32	6,276,643.00	5,144,005.00	5,125,789.86
Mar-04	367,206.23	5,889,923.00	4,846,382.00	5,223,914.66
Apr-04	5,499,427.95	7,091,798.00	4,946,375.00	7,396,878.05

Spending patterns in the divisions show general over expenditure in some divisions and under expenditure in other districts. For example in February 2004 Northern Division received MK 218, 287. 32 and spent MK3, 906, 905. 77, while Central East division received MK6, 276, 634. 00 and spent MK9, 092, 909. 00. South East Received MK5, 144, 005. 00 and spent only MK1, 680, 011.00 while South West Received MK5, 125, 789. 86 and spent MK 4, 792, 321. 06. Read further details in Appendix IV.

While there were no major complications in release of funding to divisions, district funding posed a big challenge.

One major anomaly that was found by data collectors for the PETS exercise by was that in some cases divisions claimed to have provided funding to districts which the districts did not receive. For example Mzimba North and Dowa, as presented in the table below, did not receive funding in April 2004 and yet there is a claim that they were funded MK493, 351.20 and MK204 606 respectively.

It was also discovered that there were no proper written support documents or vouchers to confirm release of funds as well as receipt of funds from the divisions to the districts and this made it difficult to follow up on payments. Compare and contrast the figures of expenditure for Mzimba, Mzuzu, Dowa, Zomba and Chikwawa, presented in the table that follows.

Table 7: ORT Expenses (MK) in Districts

District	April 03	December 03	January 04	April 04
Mzimba North	439, 351. 17	522, 163. 39	148, 860. 13	0

Mzimba South	526, 678. 38	579, 453. 4	165, 189. 4	526, 678. 38
Mzuzu Urban	136, 303. 09	161, 997. 64	46, 183. 95	244, 303. 09
Dowa	204, 206	258, 995	231, 481	0
Zomba urban	240, 000		336, 585	240, 000
Zomba Rural	290, 000	287, 810	466, 582	336, 746
Chikwawa	392, 481. 81	359, 349	703, 346. 13	20, 000

3.4. A Closer Eye on PPES

The approved amount allocated to PPEs in primary education was MK4.3 billion. Table 8 shows protected pro-poor expenditure allocations for 2002/03 and 2003/04 as prescribed by Pillar 2 of the MPRSP.

Table 8: Approved and revised protected pro-poor expenditure for 2002/03 and 2003/04

Activity	Approved 2003/2004	Revised 2003/4	Estimate 2003/04
Education	MK4,953,808,000	MK4,301,007,000	MK6,145,985,700
Primary Education	MK3,825,611,000	MK4,576,429,000	MK4,269,813,000

These figures show a general increase in the allocation for PPEs for the whole ministry of education but there is a decline for initial allocations to the primary education sector. For instance, the protected pro-poor expenditure (PPE) estimate for teaching and learning materials in primary/ basic education for 2003/2004 fiscal year was MK320, 708, 863. 00 later revised to MK 373, 711, 320. This however was less than the MK436 million approved and revised in the previous 2002/2003 fiscal year. Donor funding on teaching and learning materials amounted to MK 322, 553, 000.

Similarly the protected pro-poor expenditure on personal emoluments or salaries for basic education for the 2003/2004 fiscal year was estimated at MK3, 691,225,000 while the revised and approved allocation in 2002/2003 was MK3, 934, 542,000

Therefore the provision of teaching and learning materials in 2003/2004 would be expected to be less than that made in 2002/2003. In the case of teachers' salaries the assumption was that fewer teachers would be expected to receive their salaries, be recruited or promoted than in 2002/2003 fiscal year.

This situation raises some eyebrows especially if the bulk of the pro-poor activities are found in the primary sector and yet PPEs approved budget remain low.

Funding and expenditure figures emphasize need for increased and realistic budget estimates for PPEs. This is clearly illustrated under sections 3.2 and 3.4 where PPE funding and expenditure exceeded the approved and revised estimates by a big difference where for example total expenditure for TLMS amounted to MK576 961 317 from approved budget of MK320, 708, 863. Civil Society is therefore concerned that the funding to the PPEs for the primary education sector is decreasing by the year and there is a danger that spirit of pro poor sanctioned in the MPRS is being flouted.

4.0 Enrolment

Enrolment data was disaggregated into urban versus rural, girls versus boys and standard (std) 1 versus std 8. This was done to highlight the discrepancies that are prevalent in the basic education system in Malawi. Comparisons were also made between the fiscal years 2003 and 2004 to monitor progress towards the achievement of PIF, MPRSP, MDG, EFA goals and MoE's planned outputs. Table 9 below shows the enrolments in 2003/4.

Table 9: Enrolment by gender in 2003 and 2004

2003					
Location	No. of schools	Boys	Girls	Total	% girls
Urban	81	89531	92494	182025	50.8
Rural	241	79647	76862	156509	49.1
2004					
Urban	81	90684	92465	183149	50.4
Rural	241	82833	79599	162432	49.0

These results represent an increase in enrolment by 2.1% in 2004 as compared to the enrolment in 2003. This indicates a slight increment in enrolment which is consistent with the population growth rate in Malawi. The results also indicate that the percentage of girls in urban schools was 50.8% in 2003 and 50.4% in 2004 showing that overall girls outnumber boys in enrolment in the urban area. In rural areas girls constitute 49% of the enrolment meaning that there is still some work to be done to reach the 50% parity level between boys and girls. However analyses for specific classes reveal bigger discrepancies between boys and girls in std 1 and std 8. Table 10 below shows enrolments of boys and girls in Std 1 and Std 8 in 2004.

Table 10: Proportion of boys and girls in Std 1 and Std 8 in urban and rural schools.

Std 1					
Location	No. of schools	Girls	Boys	Total	% girls
Urban	81	14771	14310	29081	50.8
Rural	241	23042	22098	45140	51.0
Std 8					
Urban	81	5797	6290	12087	47.9
Rural	241	3068	4380	3448	41.2

In Std 1 girls make up about 50.8 % in urban and 51% in rural of class enrolment showing that girls outnumber boys both in urban and rural schools. In contrast in Std 8 only 47.9 % of the class are girls in urban schools while in rural schools girls make up only 41.2 % of the class. These results show that less girls than boys are able to reach Std 8 in both urban and rural schools and that there more attrition of girls in rural schools compared to urban schools.

Overall the results show that urban schools have much greater enrolments than rural schools. In 81 schools in urban areas, the enrolment in 2004 was 18149 giving an average of 2261 pupils per school. In contrast 241 rural schools registered 162432 pupils giving an average of 674 pupils per school. What is obvious here is that schools in rural areas are not attracting as many pupils as those in urban areas. Enrolments in rural areas are low and this cast doubts on whether rural communities have been sensitised adequately regarding the benefits of basic education.

The implications of the results above are that problems of schooling and indeed of EFA are about the poor and the disadvantaged. The government needs to seriously think about the strategies that should eventually equalize the differential schooling patterns of the urban and rural areas. What is still worrying to the Coalition is the fact that despite the many attempts aimed at improving the education of girls the girls still have a higher propensity to leave school earlier than boys

5.0 Special Needs Education

Recently special needs education has come into the limelight because of the increasing social, physical and mental stress that children are being subjected to, especially children with physical disabilities, are visual and hearing impairments. At first it was only churches which were supporting children with special needs like at the Catholic Church run Montfort Demonstration School, but government in its draft EFA plan (July 2004) makes special mention of special education and makes it a priority in the national budget.

Children with special needs have learning difficulties and in order to assist them to acquire quality basic education, teachers should be equipped with the skills to identify such disabilities in children and be able to work with them using special methodologies. To effectively implement these programme activities, the government needs to develop relevant and appropriate curriculum; to train the special teachers; to use appropriate teaching methods; provide adequate and suitable classrooms and other infrastructure, provide relevant instructional materials for all groups; ensure that the programme has access to appropriate technology and that adequate financial and other resources are made available so as to provide good quality special education. Table 11 below shows the prevalence of pupils with special needs in the sample schools.

Table 11: Number of pupils with special needs in 2004.

Local	No. of schools	Total boys	Total no. of girls	Total	Pupils per school
Urban	81	618	504	1122	13.9
Rural	241	715	595	1310	5.4
Total	322	1333	1099	2432	7.6

Pupils with special needs have been identified in both rural and urban schools across all standards. However their proportions in schools ranging from 5.4 to 13.9 pupils per school are on the lower side. According to the Output based Draft estimates of expenditure on recurrent and capital accounts for the fiscal years 2004/2005 published by the government, the amount of money allocated to special needs education was as follows:-

Approved estimates for 2002/2003 = MK3, 696,000.00

Approved estimates for 2003/04 = MK7, 974,000.00

Revised estimates for 2003/04 = MK11, 004,000.00.

However these figures do not show the breakdown of how the money was to be spent. In terms of allocation for school level teaching and learning materials evidence from our sample shows that out of the 322 schools which indicated that they had such children only 14 said they had some materials for them. This represents a meagre 5.3%. This shows that the majority of the schools have not yet benefited directly from the funding for teaching and learning materials for special needs education. In conclusion, about 10% of the children have special learning difficulties.

Only about 5% of the schools which indicated the presence of these children received special teaching and learning materials. It is therefore imperative for government to extend its budgetary allocation to the rest of the 95% of the schools. It is also important to have well-trained teachers who can identify such disabilities and be able to work with the children using appropriate teaching and learning materials. One other important point is that DEMs do not seem to have information about the issue of pupils with learning difficulties in their schools. There is an apparent lack of information sharing systems between the District Education Offices and schools. Yet this is at a time when the DEMs have been supplied with computers and other modern Information Communication and Technology (ICT).

6.0 New Schools Construction and Rehabilitation

As indicated in previous paragraphs school enrolment increased in the 2003/04 by 2.6% in the sample schools. Most pupils learn outdoors creating a need for more schools. According to the output based estimates, rehabilitation of schools and construction of schools were planned and executed as follows:-

Approved estimates for rehabilitation of schools for 2002/03 = MK4, 057, 000.00
Approved estimates for rehabilitation of schools for 2003/04 = MK11, 130, 000.00
Revised estimates for rehabilitation of schools for 2003/04
and the construction of one school. = MK15, 359, 000.00

In the 13 sample Districts only 5 indicated that new schools totalling 8 in all had been constructed in the fiscal year 2003/04. Only two Districts indicated that there were new schools under construction during the same fiscal year.

However, all these schools had been constructed or were being constructed under the auspices of donors or other organisations. Government activity in this venture seem to be invisible. The out-put based Draft Estimates on Recurrent and Capital Accounts for the Fiscal year 2003/4 shows that one school had been constructed under the ADF iii and iv as targeted.

This is indicative of very weak project monitoring systems as well as questionable accounting procedures. The sum of MK15, 359,000.00 meant for rehabilitation of primary schools needs to be accounted for. Certainly this kind of reporting achievements against targets gives unnecessary loopholes for misdirecting funds to other uses. However the number of schools which had been rehabilitated using the money which was budgeted for this task is not known. The government budget does not give targets nor does it indicate what the achievement in this task has been. The need for rehabilitation of schools need not be over-emphasised. There are many school buildings out there which are in dilapidated forms requiring urgent attention. Moreover many children learn under trees because schools are not being constructed. This situation poses a great to the lives of many of our children. For instance in October 2003 a tree fell on children who were learning under a tree at Mkomachi School in Lilongwe killing two wounding several.

7.0 Teaching materials

This section presents the amounts of materials available to teachers and pupils in the sample schools. It also compares the materials received in 2002/2003 to those received in 2003/2004 to see whether there have been changes in supplies corresponding to changes in budgetary allocations. We first look at teaching materials. The teaching materials which are discussed in this report are chalk boxes, chalk boards and teachers' guides.

7.1.0 Chalk

A comparison between the number of chalk boxes received in the 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 shows that more chalk boxes were made available in 2003/2004 than in the previous year. The table below indicates the distribution of chalk boxes per teacher in the six educational divisions. It can be observed that in terms of chalk boxes per teacher, the schools received 5.7 chalk boxes per teacher in 2002/2003 while 7.6 chalk boxes per teacher were provided in 2003/2004. This shows that in 2003/2004 each teacher received almost 2 more chalk boxes than in 2002/2003.

Table 12: Number of Chalk Boxes Delivered per Year

Educational Division	No. of Teachers 2003	Chalk Boxes in 2003	Chalk Boxes/Teacher	No. of Teachers 2004	Chalk Boxes in 2004	Chalk Boxes/teacher
Northern	818	4456	5.4	782	9585	12.3
Central East	185	332	1.8	156	544	3.5
Central West	1099	4813	4.4	1301	7166	5.5
South East	629	4790	7.6	644	6150	9.5
South West	2289	12661	5.3	2220	10845	4.9
Shire Highlands	484	4760	9.8	477	8505	17.8
Total	5504	31812	5.7	5580	42795	7.6

While total figures are quite substantial there is evidence of uneven distribution among the Divisions. Shire Highlands received almost 18 chalk boxes per teacher while Central Eastern Division received only about four chalk boxes per teacher. Three issues emerge from this. The first is that provision of chalk to teachers increased in 2003/2004 as compared to 2002/2003 showing increased funding for this teaching material and the second is that there is inequitable distribution of chalk to Divisions. In real terms a teacher in Central East received only 1.1 chalk boxes each term and this is far from being adequate. The third issue is the seemingly unplanned nature of provision of the materials. One District Education Manager pointed out that oversupplying schools with materials is bound to lead to misuse or abuse by Head Teachers.

7.1.2 Chalk Boards

The number of Chalk Boards supplied to the sample schools in 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 are shown in Table 13 below.

Table 13: Number of chalk boards per school

Educational Division	N	No. of Boards in 2003	Chalk Boards /School	No. of Boards in 2004	Chalk Boards/ School
Northern	47	98	2.1	185	3.9
Central East	25	8	0.3	26	1.04
Central West	66	97	1.47	160	2.4
South East	36	84	0.86	238	6.6
South West	98	641	6.5	819	8.4
Shire Highlands	50	123	2.46	149	3.0
Total	322	1051	3.27	1577	4.9

In total the schools received 1051 and 1575 chalkboards in 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 respectively. These figures represent 3.3 chalkboards per school in 2002/2003 and 4.9 chalkboards per school in 2003/2004 indicating an increase in the provision. Again as shown from the table there is a wide disparity in the provision between Divisions with as many as 8.4 chalkboards per school in South West Division and as few as 1.04 chalkboards per school in the Central Eastern Division in 2003/2004.

However there were more chalkboards distributed to schools in all Divisions in 2003/2004 than in 2002/2003.

From our perspective we need to know whether these provisions have reached a level when we can say there are now adequate number of chalkboards or not. This is important because the next supply should be based on school needs and not random supply of materials. This then points to the need for the establishment of appropriate norms for the supply of teaching and learning materials.

7.1.3 Teachers' guides

Teachers' guides are crucial in the planning lessons and their availability on a one to one teacher basis is the most desirable situation. The position in the 2003/2004 is that schools in general have more than one teacher's guides per subject per standard. This improvement has been possible through the support of donors who provided more than half of the guides. Table 14 below shows the number of teachers' guides available per school in five subjects from standard one to standard 8.

Table 14: Mean number of Teachers' guide in stock per subject per standard per school

Subject	Standard							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Maths	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.1
English	1.9	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.4
Chichewa	2.0	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.3
G/S	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.3	-	-	-	-
S/S	-	-	-	-	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2

Overall in 2003/2004 Std 1 has nearly two teachers' guides per subject per school while Std 8 has the worst ratio ranging from 1.1 to 1.4 guides per subject per school. Schools with more than two teachers per subject need more teachers' guides. In general the number of teachers' guides supplied to the schools by government in the fiscal year 2003/2004 increased substantially when compared to the supply in the fiscal year 2002/03. This is true in all standards except standard 1 and Chichewa in Standards 1,3,4,6 and 7 where the supplies were lower in 2003/04 than in 2002/03. Table 15 below depicts these changes in the supply of teachers' guides.

Table 15: Total number of teachers' guides supplied by government in 2002/03 and 2003/04.

Subject	Standard															
	1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
	03	04	03	04	03	04	03	04	03	04	03	04	03	04	03	04
Maths	97	93	100	109	116	184	84	154	58	162	75	163	69	116	64	67
English	123	93	70	86	79	104	85	91	61	91	78	83	67	75	57	82
Chichewa	126	92	78	90	106	102	98	86	87	109	99	88	103	100	85	92
G/S	95	72	49	96	66	102	60	97	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
S/S	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50	91	49	73	54	75	60	78

It appears then that the government increased its budgetary allocation to teachers' guides in 2003/04 in comparison to its allocation in 2002/03.

8.0 Learning Materials

The learning materials considered in this report are textbooks, exercise books, pens and pencils which are used by pupils. A comparison of enrolment and the materials supplied gives us an indication of the level of resources available to each pupil.

8.1 Text books

The report focuses on textbooks in four main subjects namely: Mathematics, English, Chichewa and General Studies or Social Studies in all the standards. The availability of textbooks per subject per pupil in the fiscal year 2003/2004 is given in Table 16 below.

Table 16: Number of pupils per Textbook in 2003/2004

Subject	Standard							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Maths	1.39	1.5	1.75	1.85	1.36	1.52	1.37	1.30
English	1.63	1.82	1.55	2.68	1.56		1.43	1.31
Chichewa	1.64	2.24	2.75	2.49	2.44	2.63	2.62	2.20
G/S	1.47	1.84	2.46	2.38	-	-	-	-
S/S	-	-	-	-	1.43	1.61	1.58	1.2

Ideally each pupil should have one textbook in each subject. However as shown in the table above, across the subjects and standards there are more than one pupils to a text book. The pupil-text book ratio is the worst in Chichewa where there are more than two pupils to a textbook in all standards except standard 1. What these figures show is that for example there are 10 books to 12 pupils in social studies in Std 8 while there are 27 pupils to 10 books in English in Std 4. In Chichewa close to 28 pupils must share 10 books in Std 4. Overall we have not reached a stage where each pupil can be given a book to carry home. The table below shows schools with short supply of text books.

Table 17: Schools with short supply of some text books.

Division	School	Zone	District	No. of Textbooks
North	Nakabanjira	Sosola	Chitipa	0 std 1 Chichewa
	Kavuzi	Kavuzi	Nkhata Bay	0 std 1 English
Central East	Tadwe	Kasangadzi	Nkhotakota	0 std 6 English
	Mpalankhwali	Boma	Dowa	0 std 6 Chichewa
Central West	Chitimbe	Maonde	Dedza	0 std 4 English
	Mkandabwa	Nsiyaludzu	Ntcheu	0 std 4 English
South East	Machereni	Chimwalira	Zomba Rural	0 std 2 Chichewa
	Namazizi	Monkey Bay	Mangochi	0 std 2 English
South West	Mpingwe	Bangwe	Blantyre City	0 std 3 Chichewa
	Mawira	Mbewe	Chikwawa	0 std 3 English
Shire Highlands	Mpeni	Mpinji	Thyolo	0 std 8 Chichewa
	Nansomba	Mulombe	Chiradzulu	0 std 8 English

It is obvious from the above data that the teaching and learning process in many schools is hampered by this lack of adequate materials. MoE should strive to speed up the provision of these books because any delays will find the existing materials in different state of disrepair and this will mean that the goal of one book to one pupil can

never be reached. What will happen is that MoE will always be replacing torn books instead of providing all pupils with books at one and the same time. At present Government figures show one to one and two to one provision in most classes and in most subjects. Comments from head teachers show that the situation on the ground is far from ideal as depicted. The main explanation for this state of affairs is that the books supplied to schools were of very low quality and therefore do not last longer. This problem is compounded by lack of storage facilities in most schools. Communities also indicate that selling of textbooks is rampant.

Table 18: Percent contribution of textbooks by donors in 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 fiscal year.

Standard	Maths		English		Chichewa		General Studies	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
1	72.5	68	67.7	65.6	68.5	68.7	69.3	71.1
2	72.3	72.3	71.1	100	95.4	76.7	73.0	74
3	73.1	79.2	55.5	81.7	75.9	80.9	73.9	79.9
4	55.2	79	69.6	82.1	69.7	80.9	74.1	81.4
5	69.8	74.4	73.1	79.9	71.7	73.6	67.9	77.5
6	74	75.6	71.5	78.3	73.6	77.7	71.5	80.6
7	72.1	76.3	60.9	73.2	65.6	76.2	73.7	74.3
8	69	71.6	67.8	73.8	68.09	75.6	73.1	75.8

The supply of the bulk of textbooks in the fiscal years 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 was carried out by donors, such as CIDA. As shown in Table 18 donors have been supplying most books while government has been supplying less than 35 percent of the textbooks to schools and at times supplying almost none in some subjects. In all subjects across all standards the contribution of donors in 2003/2004 increased substantially as compared to 2002/2003 and that the contribution of the government in textbook supply decreased in 2003/2004 fiscal year as compared to the contribution in 2002/2003. Surprisingly it appears that donors who spent less money for TLMs supplied more materials to schools than government. If PETS data 2004 is something to go by donor funds for TLMs amounted to MK322, 553, 000 with which they supplied over 70% of all materials, while government funds amounted to MK576 961, 317 and they supplied less than 35%. This makes us believe that either government was purchasing very expensive materials or that there is need to investigate if there were any cases of theft fraud, and corruption.

8.2 Exercise books, pens and pencils

Basic learning materials such as exercise books, pens and pencils are essential for pupil participation in classroom work. Note taking and practice enable children to assimilate and internalise new work and therefore are important activities in the acquisition of knowledge. It is thus imperative that government provides these learning materials in adequate quantities. At the end of the fiscal year 2003/04 schools in the sample had exercise books, desks and plastic chairs in stock as shown in Table 19 below.

Table 19: Exercise books, desks and plastic chairs in stock in June 2004.

Educational Division	N	Enrolment	Exercise Books in stock	Exercise/ Pupil	Desks in stock	Pupil/ Desk
Northern	47	41888	213030	5.1	2942	14.2
Central East	25	11951	15867	1.3	1902	6.3
Central West	66	66818	125876	1.9	3060	21.8

South East	36	40942	217051	5.3	1499	27.3
South West	98	139242	131255	0.9	7629	18.25
Shire Highlands	50	44740	128407	2.9	3388	13.2
Total	322	345,581	831486	2.4	20420	16.9

Table 19 above shows that overall the schools had in stock 2.8 exercise books per pupil at the end of the 2003/04 fiscal year. This means that schools were remaining with less than 3 notebooks per pupil to distribute. In South West, Central West and Central East Divisions, the schools had less than two books per pupil to distribute in the last term. These would not be adequate for all the subjects. If the next supply of notebooks was not delivered in time, pupils were going to have to fend for themselves at the beginning of subsequent fiscal year.

In terms of desks the overall stock indicates a ratio of 16.9 pupils per desk with the worst ratio of 27.3 pupils per desk in South Eastern Division and a less serious situation of 6.3 pupils to a desk in Central Eastern Division. A further supply of desks to the schools in the 2004/05 fiscal year would improve the current stock of desks.

The provision of sitting places remains in very serious short supply. The importance of desks especially for the retention of girls in schools has been highlighted in other studies. We therefore urge the government to make the supply of desks a priority in the next fiscal year. This is important for the achievement of some of the EFA goals.

New learning materials to improve the quality of education in the 2002/03 and the 2003/04 fiscal years were plastic chairs and chalkboard sets. Our data indicate an overall supply of 16.2 plastic chairs per school with Shire Highlands receiving an overall of 31.5 chairs per school and Central Eastern Division getting 3.6 chairs per school. Data on chalkboard sets is sparse.

A comparison of the supply of exercise books, pens, and pencils received in 2002/03 and 2003/04 is given in the Table 20 below.

Table 20: Exercise books, pens and pencils per pupil in 2002/03 and 2003/04

Educational Division	Exercise/Pupil		Pens/pupil		Pencils/pupil	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Northern	7.8	17.1	1.6	2.6	0.8	2.5
Central East	4.3	5.9	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.4
Central West	6.3	10.4	0.86	0.6	6.0	0.6
South East	12.0	27.2	3.08	1.0	1.3	1.0
South West	16.8	10.2	1.38	0.7	0.4	1.2
Shire Highlands	13.0	26.1	1.56	0.5	0.8	0.5
Total	12.0	15.24	1.52	0.9	0.65	6.2

In 2002/03 the overall supply of exercise books was 12 exercise books per pupil while in 2003/04 the overall supply was 15.2 exercise books per pupil indicating an increase of 3.2 exercise books per pupil in 2003/04. Similarly the overall supply of pencils in 2002/03 was one pupil to 0.65 pencils. In contrast the supply of pencils in 2003/04 on average was 6.2 pencils per pupil again showing an increase of 5.6 pencils per pupil than in the previous fiscal year. The situation was different for pens. In 2002/03 the overall supply of pens was 1.5 pens per pupil while in 2003/04 it was 0.9 pens per pupil.

In terms of desks, the overall supply in 2003/04 was 21.3 desks per school while the overall supply in 2002/03 was only 13.3 desks per school. This was an increase of 8 desks per school in 2003/04 compared to the supply in 2002/03. Similarly there was an increase in the supply of plastic chairs in 2002/03. In 2003/04, on average the schools received 10 chairs per school indicating an increase of 5.4 chairs per school. Table 21 shows the supply of desks and plastic chairs in the two fiscal years.

Table 21: Supply of Desks and Plastic Chairs in 2002/03 and 2003/04

Division	Desks /school		Plastic chairs/school	
	2003	2004	2003	2004
North	9.9	15.6	9	18.4
Central East	6.4	20.8	0	0.12
Central West	1.7	15.6	1.9	7.4
South East	13.2	9.4	14.1	20.6
South West	19.6	31.0	10.4	12.3
Shire Highlands	22.7	24.1	3.2	33.2
Total	13.3	21.3	10.0	15.4

8.3. Concerns on Accountability

During the exercise the Coalition was also concerned with issues of accountability of TLMs in terms of verifying whether the numbers of TLMs supplied from the Supplies Unit for MOE Headquarters actually reached the divisions. While in some cases exact numbers sent from supplies unit were delivered to the districts, in many cases some materials were lost on the way due to reasons not clearly explained. For example in Northern division, it was discovered that materials like notebooks, chalk, dusters, ball pens were lost on the way to districts. Table 22 has details.

Table 22: Northern Division, Primary

TLMs	Items Received in Districts	Items Claimed to have been delivered	Unaccounted Items	% Unaccounted items
Notebooks	144, 573	150, 440	5, 867	3.9
Chalk	1033	1144	111	9.7
Dusters	86	138	52	37.68
Ball pens	643	700	57	8.14

Source, PETS, 2004

From the table up to 5, 896 notebooks were unaccounted for, while 52 dusters did not find their way to the districts. Similarly in other divisions leakage of TLMs was also noted. In South East division the leakage was up to 12.3 %, 5.3% in Central East Division while South West Division's leakage was 4.8%. This situation is a threat to the teaching and learning process looking at shortage of items in schools. There is therefore need for strict controls to avoid such unwarranted loss. The loss in teaching and learning materials point to the fact that some of the resources meant for pupils, teachers and schools do not reach the intended beneficiaries. Civil society suspects cases of corruption, theft or fraud involved which needs to be investigated around the supply of teaching and learning materials in primary schools.

The general trend in terms of supplies of teaching and learning materials was one of increasing between 2002/3 and 2003/4. This is commendable work indeed by the government. While these levels of supply might have been influenced by the politics of 2004 (being an election year), we hereby encourage the government to keep this momentum so that our schools continue to enjoy good supplies of teaching materials. We suggest that there has to be proper coordination of the supply of the TLMs so that other divisions do not get undersupplied or oversupplied with materials. In addition to ensure security of teaching and learning materials Civil Society suggests that there is need to reinforce community participation so that community structures like parents teacher associations and school management committees can monitor supply of these and track down culprits who sell text books and note books, and can plan on how to have constant supply of the teaching and learning materials in the schools.

In sum the fiscal year 2003/04 saw the following changes in basic education with regard to enrolment, and supply of teaching and learning materials:-

1. Total enrolment in 2003/04 increased by 2.6% but std 8 enrolment decreased reflecting national trends.
2. Teacher supply increased by 6.7% although there is no evidence of recruitment by government.
3. Chalk supply increased from 6.7 chalk boxes per teacher to 8.5 chalk boxes per teacher.
4. Chalk boards increased from 3.3 boards per school to 4.9 boards per school.
5. Donors' contribution to the supply of core text books increased in 2003/04 meaning government contribution decreased.
6. Supply of exercise books by government increased from 12.0 exercise books per pupil in 2002/03 to 15.2 exercise books per pupil in 2003/04.
7. Supply of pencils by government increased from 0.65 pencils per pupil in 2002/03 to 6.2 pencils per pupil in 2003/04.
8. The supply of desks increased from 13.3 desks per schools in 2002/03 to 21.3 desks per school in 2003/04.
9. The supply of plastic chairs increased from 10 chairs per school in 2002/03 to 15.4 chairs per school in 2003/04.
10. The supply of pens by government decreased from 1.5 pens per pupil in 2002/03 to 0.9 pens per pupil in 2003/04.

Although these figures do indicate a general increase in supplies, but in real terms the supplies are generally far from reaching the levels of adequacy required for free primary education.

Here are some examples:-

Core text books suffer similar inadequacy of supply. As indicated earlier 27 to 28 pupils must share 10 textbooks in Std 4 in English and Chichewa. The supply of other books in other standards is yet to reach the desired one to one ratio. In the case of pens, a supply of 1.5 pens or 0.9 pens per pupil translates into a pen per term or that only 30% of the pupils get one pen each per term. Here again pupils need to supplement this learning materials with their own money. One important thing that should be highlighted here is the irrationalised way in which the books are distributed. Some schools receive books they do not need, for example junior schools receiving Std 5 to Std 8 books.

These examples point to the need for the Supplies Unit to adhere to the approved requirements supplied by individual schools. Of great concern in budget monitoring is that DEMs' offices seem not to have detailed information or data on the various teaching and learning materials that are delivered directly to schools by the Supplies Unit. Records of such deliveries are not readily available at the DEMs office. This means that DEMs have little say on what and how much of the teaching and learning materials are sent to schools. In addition, this practice leaves a lot to be desired in terms of transparency. That's for example why there have been high percentages in loss of materials delivered to schools. Head teachers may be tempted to misuse or abuse this practice. We suggest that a copy of what has been delivered to schools should be made available to the DEMs.

9.0 Teachers

The CSCQBE was concerned to find out about teacher; pupil ration, teacher salaries, promotion, distribution and supervision in line with recommendations from the Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) for the education sector. The PIF target for teacher (T): pupil (P) ratio is 1:60. There is also a target of recruiting 6000 teachers and training 6000 teachers every year. Our data show that from the sample there were 5580 teachers in 2004 compared to 5504 teachers in 2003. This represents a meagre 1.4% increase which is attributed to schools taking in volunteer teachers and not to MoE's deliberate effort to increase the teaching force. The main reason for this state of affairs is that MoE did not recruit any new teachers in 2004 despite the need which has been echoed in different fora. At the national level the Ministry of Education has a vacancy of around 7, 000 qualified teachers, and our data shows that there could more shortage number than the one reported. According to our data for 2004 urban schools have teacher pupil ratios averaging 1:51 which is desirable. However teacher pupil ratios of 1:82 in rural schools indicate the desired PIF targets are far from being achieved. Table 23 below shows teacher pupil ratios in urban and rural schools in 2004.

Table 23: Teacher pupil ratios and number of teachers per school

Location	No. of schools	Total no. of pupils	Total no. teachers	T/P ratio	No. of teachers/school
Urban	81	183149	3583	1:51	44.2
Rural	241	162432	1997	1:82	8.2
Total	322	345581	5575	1:62	17.3

The table above reveals that overall, a T: P ratio of 1:62 is approaching the PIF target. However this masks the dire situation in rural areas and also the uneven distribution of teachers between urban and rural areas which eventually takes its toll on the overall quality of teaching in schools. Rural schools bear the brunt of this imbalance because they have an average of only 8.2 teachers per school while urban schools boast 44.2 teachers per school.

Table 24 Distribution of Qualified Teachers by Location

Location	2003				2004			
	Qualified	%	Unqualified	%	Qualified	%	Unqualified	%
Urban	3111	81.8	692	18.2	3233	85.6	543	14.4
Rural	1464	68.2	683	31.8	1519	73.8	538	26.2

In table 24 information about the distribution of teachers by qualification and location has been presented. It can be noted from the table that in both 2003 and 2004, the percentage of qualified teachers in urban areas was far greater than in the rural areas. On the contrary, there were more untrained teachers in rural areas than they were in urban areas in both 2003 and 2004. More qualified teachers were in urban areas in 2004 than they were in 2003. The table that follows shows the schools with the qualified teachers numbering 1 or less.

Table 25: Schools with least number of qualified teachers

Division	School	Zone	District	No. of Qualified Teachers
North	Chendasi	Kavuzi	Nkhata Bay	1
	Makeye	Sokola	Chitipa	1
	Kanyazuka	Kavuzi	Nkhata Bay	1
Central East				
Central West	Kaputu	Mkanda	Mchinji	0
South East	Namatapa	Boma	Mangochi	1
	Nankhwali	Monkey Bay	Mangochi	0
South West	Chitimbe	Chidoole	Mwanza	0
	Kanjedza	Mchere	Nsanje	1
	Kawaye	Boma	Chikwawa	1
	Biasi	Boma	Chikwawa	1
Shire Highlands	Mankhamba II	Folopesi	Thyolo	1

	Mchenga Namwali	Folopesi	Thyolo	1
	Nkokachombwe	Folopesi	Thyolo	1
	Puteni	Folopesi	Thyolo	1

9.1 Female Teachers

The distribution of female teachers clearly stands out as one of the areas of great concern. In Table 26, information about the proportion of female teachers in urban and rural schools has been presented.

Table 26 : Number of female teachers in rural and urban schools

Location	No. of schools	No. of male teachers	No. of female Teachers	% of female teachers
Urban	81	1088	2495	69.6
Rural	241	1439	558	27.9
Total	322	2527	3053	54.7

Overall female teachers comprise 54.7% of the teaching force in the schools visited. However urban schools are oversubscribed with female teachers who comprise 69.6% of the teaching force. In stark contrast only 27.9% of the teaching force in rural schools is female and in general, only 22.4% of the female teachers are in rural schools. Putting it bluntly there are 30.8 female teachers per school in urban schools while there are only 2.3 female teachers per school in rural schools. This has huge implications on girls' education, which partly rests on role models for motivation. Girls in rural areas are denied the important factor of role models even by the education system itself.

The table below shows the schools without any female teacher from the sample of schools.

Table 27 Schools without Female Teachers

Division	School	Zone	District	No. of Qualified Teachers
North	Chikali	Sosola	Chitipa	0
	Chendasi	Kavuzi	Nkhata Bay	0
Central East	Tadwe	Kasangadzi	Nkhotakota	0
	Tsache	Boma	Dowa	0
Central West	Chitimbe	Maonde	Dedza	0
	Namanyenje	Msiyaludzu	Ntcheu	0
South East	Sabola	Chimwalira	Zomba Rural	0
	Mtimawoyera	Chimwalira	Zomba Rural	0
South West	Mawira	Mbewe	Chikwawa	0
	Natchengwa	Mbewe	Chikwawa	0
	Chidokowe	Chidoole	Mwanza	0
Shire Highlands	Mitawa II	Mtata	Mulanje	0
	Natchengwa	Mpinji	Thyolo	0
	Chidokowe	Litchenza	Chiradzulu	0

In concluding this section on teachers, we note that as observed in the previous two years, there are still serious imbalances in the distribution of teachers between urban and rural areas. This gross imbalance of distribution of teachers as a whole and of female teachers in particular is unjustified and unacceptable by all planning standards. There is need to review policy on distribution of teachers and to abide by it in implementation. The Coalition suggests that in the policy, especially the Education Act which is under review, the Ministry needs to have established posts specific to districts and primary schools, so that when one is applying or being recruited they know where the posts exist. This will help reduce cases of follow husband syndrome and unapproved transfers. If this policy is approved then the Ministry needs to decentralise recruitment to districts rather than the case now when recruitment is done centrally.

9.2 Teacher Training

Funding

One of the objectives of the Ministry of Education is to improve the quantity and quality of teachers. The approved budget allocation for protected pro-poor expenditure for teacher training/tertiary education for the 2002/03 fiscal year was MK 350, 983, 000.00 while the estimate for the 2003/04 was MK 313, 031, 000.00 representing a scaling down of activities in this area of the sector.

College managers were invited to the budget formulation exercise. The approved budget for St. Joseph College in Dedza for example is in the range of MK17, 000,000.00 per year. However the college gets MK400, 000.00 per month and at this rate the college would receive MK4, 800,000.00 per annum. According to the out put based estimates published by the government the approved budget for St Josephs in the 2003/04 fiscal year was Mk3, 696, 000.00 and the revised estimates was MK5, 063, 000.00. The funding that the college gets is used for boarding and lodging and some administrative costs. Some months the MoE buys food stuff directly and delivers it to the college instead of funding the college. There is no direct funding for teaching and learning materials.

Funding to the college is erratic with the college going without funding during some months. It is also difficult to understand why the ministry opts for buying the food stuff for the college instead of letting the college buy the food stuff from their own sources which may also be cheaper.

The colleges in the sample indicated that they received Student Teacher Hand Books and too many Teachers' Guides. These are distributed to trainees who take them to their schools after training. These books are provided by GTZ and CIDA

9.3 Untrained Teachers

Table 28 below shows the number of untrained teachers in the sample schools in 2002/03 and 2003/04. In total there were 648 untrained teachers in 2002/03 while there were only 336 untrained teachers in 2003/04. This represented a 48.1% decrease in the number of untrained. However Central Eastern Division registered a 72% increase in the numbers of untrained teachers in their schools. Overall it can be said that the decrease in untrained teachers in schools was due to their being absorbed into teacher training or completing their training.

Table 28: Number of untrained teachers in training in 2002/03 and 2003/04.

Educational Division	No. of schools	Untrained Teachers in 2003	Untrained teachers in 2004	%age change
Northern	47	48	10	-79%
Central East	25	11	19	+72%
Central West	66	166	72	-56.7%
South East	36	100	59	-41.0%
South West	98	230	121	-3.9%
Shire Highlands	50	93	55	-40.9%
TOTAL	322	648	336	-48.1%

9.4 Teachers in Training

Overall there is a small increase in teachers who went for training in 2003/04 compared to the situation in 2002/04. In most cases schools registered less people in training in 2003/04 than they did in 2002/03. Only Shire Highlands and the Northern Division indicated increases in teachers who were in training. This seems to suggest that there is not much difference between intake of trainees in 2003/04 and that of 2002/03. Therefore the conclusion could be that teacher training intake or capacity remained more or less the same in the two fiscal years. This seems to be borne out by the decrease in budgetary allocation cited above. Table 29 shows the teachers in training in the two fiscal years.

Table 29: Teachers in training

Educational Division	N	No of Teachers in 2003	No. of teachers in 2004	Percent change
Northern	47	89	115	+29.2%
Central East	25	40	37	-7.5%
Central West	66	271	255	-5.9%
South East	36	84	65	-22.6%
South West	98	205	201	-2.0%
Shire Highlands	50	46	68	+47.8%
TOTAL	322	735	741	1%

The Revised estimates for teacher training for St Joseph for example was MK5, 063, 000.00 compared to the approved estimates of MK3, 669, 000.00 for the 2003/04 but the number of teachers in training did not increase. More money seemed to have been spent but in real terms we did not get any gains in numbers. 2004 also saw the final cohort (11th) under MIITEP and it is possible that most of the districts have had completed the training of their untrained.

In addition, Civil Society is of the view that the cohort system has not helped in promoting quality training for teachers. We suggest that the Ministry bounces back to the two year comprehensive training so that trainees receive quality continuous training. We are pleased that as a move towards this direction, the Ministry has adopted a one plus one system, in which trainees will be going for a one year course go to teach then get back to college for another one year to complete the full training course.

9.5 Teacher Promotion and Teacher Salaries

Teachers' salaries are a protected pro-poor expenditure. According to the MPRSP giving incentives to teachers is the number one priority in Basic education. Specifically teachers' salaries are expected to increase by 10% each year.

The Financial Statement for Financial Year 2003/04 (MG, 2003) shows that the approved protected pro-poor expenditure allocation for Primary Education salaries for 2002/03 was MK3184773, 000.00 and revised to MK3934, 542,000.00. According to MEJN (2004) the estimates for the protected pro-poor expenditure on primary teachers salaries is MK369, 225, 000.00 (Draft given as MK3, 969,813,000.00) representing a 15.9% increase.

It was thus expected that teachers basic salaries would increase in keeping with the provisions in the MPRSP and the national budget. Furthermore it is expected that more and more teachers would be promoted thereby increasing their annual salaries. The evidence in the questionnaires indicates these increased estimates did not translate into increased teachers' salaries. Refer to Table 30.

Table 30: Basic salaries and allowances for different grades

Grade	Basic Salary	Professional Allowance	Housing	Total
P8	5680	1000	12,000	18680
PO				
PT1	4956	1000	9,000	15,596
PT2	4443	800	9,000	14,243
PT3	3325	800	6000	10,125
PT4	2182	800	2500	5482
Temporary	1954 (1897) (1669)	-	1500	3454

As shown in the table 30, housing allowance far exceeds the basic salary indicating that there is recognition that the basic salary is an embarrassment to the teaching profession. Further at P8 head teachers receive a headship allowance of K200 only. It is difficult to fathom what this K200 can do to cover all the extra energy which head teachers spend in doing their work. In sum the figures show that basic salary allocation was decreased in 2003/04 compared to 2002/03 and therefore basic salaries were deliberately not meant to increase. Despite the declaration by Government that teachers will be given incentives by an annual salary increase of 10% the basic salaries at all primary teaching grades have remained static for over four years. Housing allowance and professional allowance have been recently introduced but these do very little to motivate teachers because the gross salaries remain low.

9.6. Salary loss/ leakages

The Coalition sourced information on whether teachers' salaries reach schools, in time and in full. This was against a background of public outcry and media reports about salary delays, salary theft, and teachers not paid salaries for months.

While there were reported improvements in time payments were made in most of the districts a key finding experienced was salary leakage. According to research, salaries decrease from divisions to districts and from districts to schools. Up to 13% of salaries were unaccounted for. In Mzimba in Northern Division, for example nearly 2 % of salaries do not reach schools, while in Chikwawa in South West Division, nearly 13 % were lost. According to PETS 2004 (unpublished), "salary records at the South West Division show that a total of MK411, 098, meant for teachers was distributed to Chikwawa District. However it comes out only MK368, 068 was recorded at the district for the same schools indicating that 6.8% of the initial disbursement was unaccounted for. Sample school records indicate that in aggregate MK358, 571 were received with a resultant leakage of 7.1%." This means 13.4% of salaries were lost.

Some of the contributing factors to this salary leakage which need to be sorted out include existence of ghost teachers due to poor updating of teacher records; inconsistent teacher grades as well as delays in funding which results in arrears. The salary leakage adds to the fact that some of the money allocated to the education sector does not reach the intended beneficiaries.

9.7 Promotion of Teachers

The establishment in primary schools allows for the following positions starting with the base:- Primary Teacher 4 (PT4), Primary Teacher 3 (PT3), Primary Teacher 2 (PT2) Primary Teacher 1 (PT1), Professional Officer (PO), and Super Scale Grade 8 (P8). All teachers start at the base PT4 level albeit at different salaries depending on academic qualification. Table 31 shows the number of teachers at different levels in 2002/03 and 2003/04.

Table 31: Number of Teachers at different grades

Grade	PT4		%	PT3		%	PT2		%
	2003	2004		2003	2004		2003	2004	
Female	1905	1778	-6.7	625	856	+37%	201	225	12
Male	962	904	-6.0	503	572	14%	146	187	28
Total	2867	2682	-6.5	1128	1428	26%	347	412	18.7

Grade	PT1		%	PO		%	P 8		%
	2003	2004		2003	2004		2003	2004	
Female	60	58	-3.3	2	0	-100	13	10	-23%
Male	57	58	1.8	0	5		14	15	7.1%
Total	117	116	-1	2	5	150	27	25	7.4

At PT4 level the number of teachers in 2003/04 decreased to 2682 from 2867 in 2002/03 representing a 6.5% decrease. This means either that all the 6.5% were promoted to PT3 or that some of them were promoted while others left. The rates of movement for males and females are almost similar. At PT3 the number of teachers increased from 1128 in 2002/03 to 1428 in 2003/04 representing a 26.6% increase. This could mean that teachers in these schools were promoted to PT3 or that there is a combination of teachers promoted within the schools and those that are transferred into the schools from elsewhere. However this is a substantial increase or promotion of teachers to the category. In addition almost 60% of the teachers in this grade are female.

At PT 2 the schools had 18.7% more teachers in 2003/04 than in 2002/03. This shows that teachers had been promoted into this category or that some had been transferred into the schools. At this grade 54.6% of the teachers are female. At PT 1 the overall number of teachers decreased slightly by about 1%. There are two possibilities for this. Firstly, the missing 1% had left or been promoted to other levels and secondly where there are increases such as in South West Division, more teachers had been promoted to this level or came from elsewhere. In terms of gender females comprise 50% of the teachers at this grade.

At the PO level, there were only 5 teachers in 2002/03. Therefore only 3 people had been promoted to this category in 2003/04 and none of them was female. At the P8 level there was a 7.4% decrease in 2003/04 compared to 2002/03 meaning that the teachers had left even when in some Division these numbers increased. This time only 40% of the teachers at this grade are females.

In sum, the figures show movement from one level to another through promotion. This is more pronounced in the lower levels and less visible in the upper scales. It is understandable that each scale, level or category has its own establishment and therefore high promotion rates depend on the availability of vacant positions which does not seem to be the case. Introducing substantial annual salary increments within a scale could be one way of getting round the issue of promotion where the establishment does not permit it. Given the budget allocation for teachers' salaries in comparison to previous year's allocation promotion was not expected to be widespread. With static basic salaries, the incentives meant for teachers do not seem to be visible. Female teachers seem to feature more in grades PT4, PT3, PT2 and not in the higher PT1, PO and P8 grades which could be a result of our sample.

9.8. Teacher Performance and Supervision

Another important factor which affects teaching and learning is teacher performance. Generally there is dissatisfaction with the way teachers are performing at the classroom level. Head teachers, school management committees and pupils who responded in this exercise indicate that there is an appreciable proportion of stakeholders who think teachers are not teaching well in class. Table 32 shows the percentage of the respondents and their satisfaction with teachers.

Table 32: % of Head teachers, School management Committees and Pupils and their satisfaction with teachers

Respondents	Number responded	% Satisfied or Not satisfied	
		Yes	No
Head teachers	307	45.3	54.7
Pupils	289	64.7	35.3
SM Committees	285	53.1	44.9

More than 50% of the head teachers indicate that they are not satisfied with teacher performance while more than 50% of pupils and School Management Committees seem satisfied with their teachers. However in order to improve teacher performance one strategy laid out by MPRSP is to promote a more effective supervisory and inspection service to schools. The target for the 2003/04 fiscal year was to achieve at least three supervisory and inspection visits to each school.

The output based Draft estimates of expenditure on recurrent and capital accounts for the Fiscal year 2004/05 indicate that for the Methods and advisory services the budget estimate were as follows:-

Approved estimates for 2002/03 = MK22, 879, 000.00
 Approved estimates for 2003/04 = MK33,216, 000.00
 Revised estimates for 2003/04 = MK45, 837, 000.00.

Clearly this is an increase in funding by MK23,000,000.00. The expectation is that the Advisory and inspection Service would increase its activities in the 2003/04 in comparison to those in 2002/03. The results of this report points to some anomaly. Table 33 below shows the percentage of schools and the corresponding numbers of visits by PEAs in 2002/03 and 2003/04.

Table 33: Percentage of schools visited by PEAs

No. of Visits	Visits		Delivering materials		Inspection		Advisory	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
None	18.9	11.5	60.2	60.6	26.4	35.7	27.6	34.8
Once	7.8	10.6	13.4	13.4	25.2	27.3	26.4	27.3
Twice	10.2	13.0	9.3	8.7	16.5	16.8	16.8	16.5
Three	11.8	12.4	5.6	3.7	11.5	7.5	12.7	8.1
More than 3	51.3	52.5	11.5	13.6	20.4	12.7	16.5	13.3

In 2003/04, 64.9% of the schools had three or more visits by PEAs as compared to 63.1% of the schools in 2002/03. There was a decrease in the schools which did not receive any visits from PEAs in 2003/04 compared to 2002/03. However these are small gains considering the priority status which has been accorded to the inspection and advisory services. As shown in Table 22 above, 35.7% of the schools in the sample were not inspected at all and 34.8% of the schools had not received advisory services from PEAs. Only 20.2% of the schools received at least three inspection visits while 21.4% received at least three advisory visits. Around 45% of the schools received one or two inspection or advisory visits. These figures suggest that around a third of the schools have not received inspection or advisory visits in the 2003/04. The figures also show that more schools did not receive inspection and advisory visits in 2003/04 in comparison to the number of schools which did not in 2002/03. More importantly only a fifth of the schools received at least three inspection or advisory visits as required by MPRSP. The fiscal year 2003/04 saw less schools receiving at least three such visits than the previous year.

In addition interviews with District education Managers (DEMs) pinpointed that one major problem affecting the schools visits is shortage of transport. Very few DEMs have motor vehicles, and few still have motor cycles for supervision, and the majority have no form of transport. Three DEMs from the Northern Division complained that lack of official transport was making it hard for them to do their work, as they could not use public transport to complete their supervisory tasks in time.

In sum the increased funding of MK23, 000,000.00 in 2003/04 did not result in increased coverage of schools in real terms as compared to 2002/03. On the one hand if the budgeted money was used as required then the system is suffering from gross inefficiency. But if the system is under achieving because of less funds then the allocated money was used for something else and not the inspection and advisory services meant to support schools and teachers.

10.0 Summary of Key Recommendations From Issues Identified from the 2003/4 Budget Monitoring Exercise

Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic education (CSCQBE) would like to make these recommendations to improve the funding and accounting levels for the basic education sector.

- a) **Overall Budget:** Government needs to make education a first priority in its budget allocations. But above all percent increases should reflect international commitments and recommendations and the many problems affecting the quality of education in Malawi. Government should enforce proper accounting procedures and internal controls to avoid unnecessary overspending, and leakages of salaries and teaching and learning materials from divisions to schools
- b) **Enrolment:** Community Sensitisation and mobilisation efforts should be stepped up to increase enrolment and completion rates in rural areas especially of girls to balance enrolment and completion levels in terms of gender, standard and geographical location. Civil society organizations could support such efforts.
- c) **Special Needs Education:** Government needs to account for money allocated for special needs education. Increase budget allocation to special needs education and distribute resources evenly to reach the 95% of the pupils not reached so far. MoE need to document data on children with special needs, and develop a transparent system showing expenditure breakdown for the sector. Budget allocation also required for training and recruitment of special teachers. Parliament approved MK7, 974, 000 (compared to MK3, 696, 000 for 2002/3), later revised upwards to MK11, 004, 000. The increase in budgetary allocation displays govt commitment to spend more in this special needs education.
- d) **Teacher's salaries and Promotion:** For 2003/4 increased estimates did not translate to increased teacher's salaries and promotions in line with promised and budgetary allocations. Govt needs to increase teacher's salaries. More females need to be promoted to higher grades of PT1, PO and P8. Teachers also need to work hard to be promoted.
- e) **Rehabilitation and Construction of Schools:** Govt has to account for MK15, 359, 000 approved for rehabilitation and construction of schools. Government budget should have indicators for number of schools to be rehabilitated and constructed in a given year for easy monitoring.
- f) **Text books:** There is need to increase textbook supply to schools especially for key subjects like English and Chichewa. Strengthen storage facilities in schools to ensure security of textbooks with support of communities. There is also need for a clear book policy to be put in place to facilitate increased and equitable distribution of text books and exercise books in all primary schools.
- g) **Teacher Training:** Increase funding for teacher training in general and especially to individual colleges, and revert to the two year teaching programme by end of 2005. Funding situation to Colleges has to improve and government must allow colleges to buy own food, and introduce direct funding for TLMs.
- h) **Teacher Recruitment:** Government needs to recruit teachers as committed in PIF and MPRSP to train 6, 000 teachers yearly. There is need for the Ministry of Education to have established posts in districts and schools, decentralize teacher recruitment, and introduce bush allowance.
- i) **Inspection and supervision:** PEAs need to inspect and supervise all schools in their divisions; Value for money has to be displayed- increased funding should lead to increased activity or people will not see need to allocate more funds to a ministry which does not deliver. DEMs also need to be considered to respond to pressing issues which require proper transport in their districts.
- j) **Data Management:** Ministry needs to improve its data management by enhancing the human and material capacity of its EMIS Department at the Ministry of Education headquarters so as to be able to update data on regular basis. Ministry of Education should also publicize budget related data on a monthly basis as recommended by the MPRS.

11.0 Overview of the 2004/5 Education Budget Estimates

11.1 Introduction

In September 2004 parliament approved estimated K85.6 billion as total expenditure for the 2004/5 financial year. The Ministry of Education was allocated the largest expenditure estimate of K10.6 billion, K8 billion for recurrent operations while K3 billion for development expenditure. The allocation to the Education Ministry represents 12.63% of total expenditure. Above all, K2.2 billion has been allocated as a subvention to the two Universities (of Malawi and Mzuzu). Government also hopes to acquire US\$32 million loan from the World Bank for the teacher training institutions and rehabilitation of old boarding secondary schools.

11.2. Expectations Prior to 2004/5 Budget Approval

As the budget was being presented in Parliament by Finance Minister Goodall Gondwe on 3rd September 2004, Civil society and the general public had expectations arising from international commitments made on quality education for all, the Ministry's of Education's strategic plans, priorities in the Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, and pressing problems affecting the quality of education. Civil society expected increased allocation to the education sector in such areas as teacher incentives, teacher training, recruitment of teachers, teaching and learning materials (TLMs), supervision of teachers and schools, absenteeism and dropouts, and children with special needs.

Other areas include construction of new classrooms, teacher's houses and sanitary facilities and maintenance of these; as well as crosscutting issues of HIV/AIDS, Gender and science and technology.

Specifically the 2004/5 budget needed to reflect a substantial increase in these areas as follows:

a. Overall allocation to Education: Percentage allocated to education needed to be more than the 2003/4 18% to be near the recommended 26%.

b. Teacher incentives: Government was expected to seriously consider providing salary arrears for all teachers and promoted teachers, and meet the 10% annual increase requirement as stipulated in the MPRS. More teachers need to be promoted and more houses for teachers constructed.

c. Teacher Training: Substantial allocations were supposed to be made for teacher training. Civil society expected that the 2004/5 teacher training budget would reflect the need to bounce back to the 2 year teacher course which would necessitate an increase in allocation to Teacher Training Colleges.

d. Teacher Recruitment: More funds were supposed to be allocated for salary increases, more recruitment and promotion of teachers

e. Teaching and learning materials (TLMs): A substantial allocation had to be made for purchase of adequate Teaching and Learning materials. Moreover a lot of funds were supposed to be made available to improve on logistics for distributing these materials or at least answer to the more decentralized zone distribution system. Increased funding was also supposed to be allocated to TLMs for children with special needs.

f. Supervision of Schools/Teachers by PEAs: Budget should reflect more funds to ensure that all schools especially rural ones are visited by the PEAs the required three times a year or more.

g. Infrastructure (Classroom blocks, schools): - The 2004/5 budget was supposed to allocate more funds for construction of new schools and classroom blocks to avert dangers of pupils learning in an open space or under trees in districts and schools where there is an acute shortage of schools and classroom blocks.

g. Rehabilitation of Schools/Boarding facilities: Adequate funds were needed for rehabilitation of and provision of facilities for schools. Malawi also needs more secondary schools in order for the large numbers of Primary schools pupils to be fed into the secondary school.

h. Address High Dropout/Absenteeism Rates: Increased funding was expected for Community and General public sensitisation and mobilization to address issues of absenteeism and dropout in schools. Moreover more funds were expected to build the capacity of school governance structures – training of head teachers, training school management committee and Parents Teacher Associations.

i. Cross Cutting Issues: Gender/HIV: There are high gender disparities and increased cases of HIV/AIDS resulting in death of a number of teachers. Funding is therefore required for activities that will address gender disparities and the AIDS Pandemic. The planned activities for HIV/AIDS intervention like poster competitions and open air drama shows need to be fully implemented.

11.3 Do 2004/5 Figures Reflect Public Expectations?

11.31 General Allocation Budget 2004/5

The Ministry of Education was allocated 12.63% of the total budget, K10.6 billion which is well over the 2003/4 allocation in nominal terms. As a percentage over the overall budget there is a sharp decrease from last year's 14% and is half the internationally recommended 26% required to achieve the quality of education for all.

In Education Sector Other Recurrent Transactions (ORT), which has overall MK1.8 billion, the Primary Education was allocated K916,958,000. This is almost 30% increase over the approved K609,782,000 allocated in 2003/4, which is positive, but still falls short of the internationally recommended 50%.

Specific allocations within the primary sector also reflect repetition of the past trends whereby over 70% was allocated to administration rather than core activities as these have been allocated nearly 20% of the total education budget. Moreover reliance on a US\$32 million yet to-be-approved loan from World Bank for teacher training and rehabilitation is not strategic especially with the possibility that the loan might fail to materialize.

11.32 Specific allocations: 2004/5 (Priorities Only)

Teacher Incentives (Salary increase, houses, promotion)

Government has announced a general salary increase of 20% for civil servants including teachers. However the education budget has an increase of 4.8% for salaries which will bring in a logistical problem as either at one time teachers may go without salaries or they will get salary arrears meaning the adjustment not automatic. Moreover, the budget presents unclear picture as to whether teachers salary arrears accumulated for the past years will ever be paid. In addition the budget has not taken into account teachers promotions and the corresponding salary increases. It is important to note teachers salaries are a protected expenditure.

Teacher Training

Teacher training has been allocated K694,952,000 this year compared with K313,031,000 for 2003/4. This over 100% increase is realistic considering the high demand for qualified teachers. We hope that the funds, once approved will prepare ground for the re-introduction of a 2 year teaching program.

Teacher Recruitment

The 2004/5 does not indicate where funds for recruiting and paying for newly recruited salaries for teachers will come from. In fact Management and Support service has been allocated less funds (K106,424,000) than the allocations for 2003/4 (of K112,054,000). The assumption here is that the ministry is unlikely to recruit more teachers despite stating a vacancy of over 25,000 teachers created due to AIDS and other illnesses.

TLMs

The budget allocated K483,629,000 for Tuition, Teaching and Learning materials which is a slight increase over the approved K320,709,000 for the previous year. Last year the education minister failed to reach a target of 73,000,000 TLMs

by only acquiring 14, 000, 000, which was less than 25%. The shortage meant the Ministry required at least three times the allocated amount for 2003/4. Civil Society fears that the primary sector will continue to experience acute shortage of TLMs.

Special Needs Education

This area has been allocated less (K6,887,000) than the 2003/4 allocation of K7,974,000. The assumption is that the government is less interested in supporting this area which cares for the disadvantaged minority.

HIV/AIDS Interaction

This area has been allocated more money (estimated K3, 138,000) than 100% of last year's budget of K1, 054,000 which is consistent with the commitment for the sector to fight HIV/AIDS. What is important is for the ministry to implement planned HIV/AIDS activities. We hope that more funds will come from donors after the Ministry launches its strategic plan in the 2004/5 financial year.

Rehabilitation of Schools

This sector has been allocated K17, 670,000 this year as compared to K11, 130,000 for 2003/4. The increase is good news as it will respond to the growing demand for new classroom blocks, maintenance of school property and construction of water and sanitary facilities.

Other Crucial Areas

The budget does not specify funding for other crucial areas like Gender Awareness, Reducing dropout rates/absenteeism, as well as finalization and implementation of policies such as the Policy and Investment Framework, the Education for All Plan, the Devolution Plan, the Education Act the National Strategy for Strengthening Community Participation in Primary School Management etc. This gives an impression that the Ministry still requires funds to achieve implementation of other crucial items. It also gives impression that the government does not have the political will to identify funds to implement all key activities that will ensure improvement in quality of Education.

Recommendations arising from the 2004/5 budget estimates

Civil society would like to make recommendations as follows:

- a. Donors, Private Sector and Civil Society need to realize that the activities (especially development ones) of Ministry of education have been under budgeted especially teacher salaries, teacher training and recruitment, TLMs, Special Education, Gender Awareness; Policy awareness and implementation/reducing dropouts and absenteeism in schools. These areas require additional funds and all well wishers must play a part so that Ministry of Education delivers to the desired standard.
- b. The Ministry of Education needs to display political will and commitment to timely implement policies and address the factors that are leading to the deteriorating standards of education. The Ministry also needs to be transparent and accountable in implementation of the budget by dealing with red tape, corruption and theft of public funds. A repeat of the K187 million fraud scan would deal a heavy blow to the education sector.
- c. The Ministry also needs to control over expenditure by exercising budget discipline when implementing the budgeted activities.
- d. Future budgets should allocate a higher percentage to education in relation to the overall national budget closer to the 26% international recommendation. The ministry of finance therefore needs to reduce unnecessary cuts to the Education budget.

12.0 Conclusion

Government continues to prioritise education in its budgetary allocations by allocating more funds and a higher percentage to education than other sectors such as health and agriculture which have been allocated less than 10% of the total budget in the past two years. But this higher percentage in increase is only sound in nominal terms because in real terms the percentages have been decreasing from 28% in 1990s to around 12 % in 2004. Moreover the allocations to the sector fall short of the international recommendation of 26% required for achieving education for all and it means that the sector is under funded. In addition, the 2003/4 findings from the budget monitoring exercise have shown that despite the increase in budgetary allocation, there is little that has been achieved to make a difference to primary school pupils and teachers. Indeed there is little that has been achieved to improve the quality, access and relevance of education to primary school going boys and girls.

Where as there is an enrolment increase of around 2% there is need for increased efforts to deal with problems of absenteeism and drop outs especially for girls. In most schools teaching and learning materials are inadequate, and classrooms are sufficient to accommodate the large numbers of pupils in all the standards. While government is commuted to improve the education of children with special needs, material resources and lack of specialised mean that it remains a dream to cater for the neglected children.

As for teachers, Malawians still have to see the promised 10% annual increase being actualised. Moreover, other incentives such as teacher's houses, promotions and allowances are yet to be offered to the teachers to make them do their job with a peace of mind. Since government is introducing a new salary structure in the 2004/5 financial year the Ministry of Education will be compelled to pay huge sum of money in arrears, of not less than MK300 million for teachers salaries and benefits. In addition, government has under performed in the areas of teacher training and recruitment raising questions as to what the money allocated to such expenditure items is used for. Above all the disparities in terms of enrolment, allocation of TLMs, and distribution of teachers, male and female, which favour urban schools is a great concern that is against the government pro poor policy. Efforts need to be made to balance the gap that is so wide between rural and urban schools. If data gathered from the PETS exercise 2004 is something to go by civil society is concerned with high percentages of leakages in salaries and teaching and learning materials across divisions and schools.

The Ministry of education also has to improve in its data management. Comprehensive statistics about the situation in basic education have not been available for over two years. Detailed financial reports are sparse. The few that are available tend to lump several activities under one heading and it is difficult to unpack them into expenditures for specific activities such as desks, notebooks and others. It is also note worthy that there is a tendency for different sources of information to report different figures for the same item and this renders various analyses cumbersome. Again, the data gathered indicates that the officials from government are unable to account for money allocated to certain expenditure lines such as school rehabilitation and construction as well as funding for special needs education.

Despite all these hustles compared to 2002/3 figures, there is general improvement in terms of resources getting to schools especially teaching and learning materials, plastic chairs and desks, in the financial year 2003/4. We ask the government to maintain this trend in the ensuing financial years.

The 2004/5 budget estimates show that education sector has again received the lions share from the annual budget to the tune of close to K11 billion, which translates to around 12 % of the annual budget. But again just like for the 2003/4 financial year this falls short of the 26% international recommendation to achieve education for all. Actually in real terms the budget allocations have been decreasing from about 28% in the 1990s to 12.63 percent in the 2004/5 financial year. Again, the sectoral allocations follow the past trends in which more money is spent on personal emoluments than other recurrent transactions. Unless government is committed to the international obligations of allocating 26% of national budget to education and put strict measures to manage the finances, and ensure proper transparency and accountability, CSCQBE does not expect significant improvement in the quality of education in the country.

APPENDIX SECTION:

Appendix 1: Divisions and Name of Zones Sampled

Educational Division	Zones Sampled
Northern Division	Katoto, Sokola, Kavuzi, Zolozolo, Mwazisi
Central East Division	Kasangazi, Boma
Central West Division	Nsiyaludzu, Maonde, Chimutu, Boma, Chiwoko, Nathenje, Kaufulu, Mkanda, Mdzobwe, Matapila.
South East Division	Mponda, Monkey Bay, Boma, Nkope, Chimwalira
South West Division	Lirangwe, Mchere, Chidoole, South Lunzu, Chilomoni, Boma, Mbewe, Zingwangwa, Ndirande, Bangwe, Boma
Shire Highlands Division	Mlomba, Mpinji, Folopeni, Mtata, Luchenza

Appendix II: Districts in the Divisions and number of schools

North	Chitipa (6), Rumphi (10), Mzuzu City (21), Nkhata Bay (10)
Central East	Nkhotakota (15), Dowa (10)
Central West	Mchinji (10), Lilongwe City (17), Lilongwe Rural East (10), Lilongwe Rural West (10), Dedza (9), Ntcheu (10)
South East	Mangochi (19), Zomba Urban (7), Zomba Rural (7)
South West	Blantyre City (36), Blantyre Rural (10), Mwanza (11), Chikwawa (32); Nsanje(9)
Shire Highlands	Chiradzulu (10), Thyolo (20), Mulanje (9), Phalombe (10)

Appendix III: Organisations Involved in Collecting Budget Monitoring Data

S/N	NAME OF ORGANISATION	DISTRICT
1	Private Schools Association of Malawi (PRISAM)	Chitipa, Rumphi, Mzimba
2	Creative Centre for Community Mobilisation (CRECCOM)	Mzimba South, Kasungu
3	Association for Elimination of Child Labour (AECL)	Nkhota Kota, Lilongwe City
4	Teachers Union of Malawi (TUM)	Nkhata Bay, Lilongwe
5	Participatory Rural Development Organisation (PRDO)	Kasungu, Dowa
6	Ntchisi District Network	Ntchisi
7	Centre for Youth and Children's Affairs (CEYCA)	Mchinji
8	Circle for Integrated Community Development (CICOD)	Lilongwe Rural
9	Youth and Children's Life Shield (YOCRIS)	Dedza
10	Ntcheu District Network	Ntcheu
11	Mangochi District Network	Mangochi
12	PAMET	Machinga
13	YONECO	Balaka
14	Zomba District Network	Zomba
15	Youth Arm Organisation	Thyolo, Chiradzulu
16	MASPA	Mulanje (Ntata), Zomba urban
17	Phalombe District Network	Phalombe, Mulanje (Ulongwe)
18	YARD	Blantyre Rural, Mwanza, Nsanje, South Lunzu,
19	Chikwawa District Network	Chikwawa
20	CCAP Livingstonia Synod	Mzuzu City
21	EveryChild	Mzuzu (Zolozolo)
22	NAMISA	Lilongwe City
23	Association of Christian Educators in Malawi (ACEM)	Lilongwe
24	FAWEMA	Blantyre-Bangwe, Limbe, Zingwangwa.
25	Chisomo Children's Club	Blantyre-Chilomoni
26	CERT	Zomba-Mponda
27	Adolescent Girls Literacy project	Blantyre
28	Muslim Association of Malawi	Blantyre
29	Chiyanjano orphan Care	Blantyre

Appendix IV: Expenditure details in four Divisions (Source: PETS 2004)

1. NORTHERN DIVISION

Items	Month		
	Sep-03	Dec-03	Feb-04
Fuel	0.00	499,400.00	667,910.00
Motor Vehicle/Bike maintenance	269,468.00	550,015.29	147,464.58
Subsistence allowance	2,669,750.00	592,115.34	425,017.83
Security	34,840.00	0.00	0.00
Phones	434,720.00	352,681.75	36,009.99
Electricity	11,516.00	198,746.89	29,625.00
Water	607,820.00	214,343.47	3,351.67
Coffins	1.00	0.00	0.00
Stationery	0.00	166,276.05	10,210.18
Other	0.00	8,017,656.63	3,402,691.10
Total	3,758,647.00	9,541,820.13	3,906,905.77
	2,054,767.27	2,600,000.00	218,287.32

2. CENTRAL EAST DIVISION

Items	Month		
	Sep-03	Dec-03	Feb-04
Fuel	0.00	613,275.00	624,418.00
Motor Vehicle/Bike maintenance	1,194,572.00	737,259.00	197,866.00
Subsistence allowance	1,466,330.00	1,167,267.00	563,620.00
Security	53,850.00	37,400.00	58,520.00
Phones	0.00	7,400.00	4,617,010.00
Electricity	154,068.00	83,666.00	1,013,810.00
Water	26,592.00	41,344.00	2,839,949.00
Coffins	1.00	0.00	0.00
Stationery	1,417,291.00	0.00	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	3,118,132.00	1,337,077.00	9,092,909.00
	9,081,787.00	6,459,017.00	

3. SOUTH WEST DIVISION

Items	Month		
	Sep-03	Dec-03	Feb-04
Fuel	0.00	390,800.00	469,040.00
Motor Vehicle/Bike maintenance	124,807.00	180,955.00	1,016,058.28
Subsistence allowance	504,565.00	676,220.00	435,550.00
Security	55,411.62	123,420.00	19,680.00
Phones	742,076.07	165,873.27	828,755.24
Electricity	747,708.87	199,596.06	2,864,585.48
Water	103,213.76	509,416.88	298,162.23
Coffins	131,541.62	89,825.56	271,088.11
Stationery	0.00	519,690.13	74,500.00
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	2,284,516.94	2,284,041.90	4,792,321.06

4. SOUTH EAST DIVISION

Items	Month		
	Sep-03	Dec-03	Feb-04
Fuel	0.00	203,837.00	346,800.00
Motor Vehicle/Bike maintenance	166,015.00	198,596.00	103,800.00
Subsistence allowance	342,990.00	262,130.00	643,651.00
Security	7,680.00	45,120.00	0.00
Phones	123,873.00	7,350.00	7,700.00
Electricity	27,995.00	0.00	1,013,810.00
Water	71,339.00	0.00	0.00
Coffins	71,339.00	0.00	14,850.00
Stationery	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	645,216.00	314,600.00	1,680,011.00

Appendix V: Questionnaire used in the monitoring Exercise

E1. SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

GENERAL INFORMATION

a) To be completed based upon discussions with Head teacher and senior staff/section heads. Stress that this questionnaire is confidential. The monitor needs to check that the information is obtained from the school register unless there is none at the school. If there is none find out the reasons.

1.1	School Name	
1.2	Zone	
1.3	District	
1.4	Date	

Enrolment in 2003

1.5	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Enrolment in 2004

1.6	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of pupils with special needs in 2003

1.7	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of pupils with special needs in 2004

1.8	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of teachers in each standard in 2003

1.9	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	

Number of teachers in each standard in 2004

1.10	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Number of teachers teaching children with special needs in each standard in 2003

1.11	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of teachers teaching children with special needs in each standard in 2004

1.12	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of teachers at the grade levels indicated in 2003

1.13	PT 4		PT3		PT2		PT1		PO		P8		Untrained		In training	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

Number of teachers at the grade levels indicated in 2004

1.14	PT4		PT3		PT2		PT1		PO		P8		Untrained		In training	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

Note: B=Boys, G=Girls; M=Male teachers, F=Female teachers

PT4 to PO= Teachers grades from lowest qualified to highest qualified.

E 1. 15 Are you satisfied with the teacher's performance as per grade?

Yes/No.....

E1. 16 If not, in what ways could the performance be improved?

.....

E1. 17. Comments from the respondent on the information put in the tables

above:.....

b) This section is to be completed based upon discussions with one of the pupils at the school preferably a head boy or head girl. Stress that this questionnaire is confidential.

E1.18 Number of boys and girls in Std 7 in 2003

<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>

E1.19 Number of boys and girls in Std 8 in 2004

<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>

E 1.20 Are you satisfied with the teacher's performance in the school?

Yes/No.....

E1.21 If not, how could the performance be improved?

.....

E1.22 Comments from the respondent on the information put in the table

above.:.....

RESPONDENT'S POSITION

RESPONDENT'S SIGNATURE

c) The monitor must complete this section based on discussions with a member of School Management Committee (SMC)

Enrolment in 2003

E1.23	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Enrolment in 2004

E1.24	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of pupils with special needs in 2003

E1.25	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of pupils with special needs in 2004

E1.26	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of teachers in each standard in 2003

E1.27	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of teachers in each standard in 2004

E1.28	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of teachers teaching children with special needs in each standard in 2003

E1.29	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of teachers teaching children with special needs in each standard in 2004

E1.30	Std1		Std2		Std3		Std4		Std5		Std6		Std7		Std8	
	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G

Number of teachers at the grade levels indicated in 2003

E1.31	PT 4		PT3		PT2		PT1		PO		P8		Untrained		In training	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

Number of teachers at the grade levels indicated in 2004

E1.32	PT4		PT3		PT2		PT1		PO		P8		Untrained		In training	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

E 1. 33 Are you satisfied with teachers' performance in this school?

Yes/No.....

E1. 34. If not, how could the performance be improved?

E1. 35. Comments from the respondent on the information put in the tables above:.....

RESPONDENT'S POSITION RESPONDENT'S SIGNATURE

TEACHING AND LEARNING MATERIALS (Text Books, Teacher's Guides And Others)

This section must be completed upon discussions with the Head Teacher, Deputy Head Teacher or any senior teacher at the school.

(Each school is supposed to have a Stock Book detailing when new materials are received and in what quantity, as well as the condition of existing stock. (The school also should have a Visitors Book, indicating visits by educational officers distributing teaching and learning materials (TLMs)).

E1.36 Does your school have a stock book? Please tick appropriate box?

YES	NO

If no, then use the existing exercise book where materials received are recorded. If yes, use the Stock Book to answer the following questions:

Textbooks and Teachers' Guides

a) Text books

E1.37. How many of the following textbooks have you received from July 2003 to June 2004? How many were from Government, and how many from donors?

Govt or Donor?	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies ¹		Social Studies ²		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
Std. 1												
Std. 2												
Std. 3												
Std. 4												
Std. 5												
Std. 6												
Std. 7												
Std. 8												

E1.38 Are there materials for children with special needs? Yes/No
 If YES indicate them.....

¹ Only for Standards 1 - 4
² Only for Standards 5 - 8

Comments:

.....

E1.39. How many of the following textbooks did you receive between June 2002 and July 2003? How many were from Government, and how many from donors?

	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies ³		Social Studies ⁴		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
Std. 1												
Std. 2												
Std. 3												
Std. 4												
Std. 5												
Std. 6												
Std. 7												
Std. 8												

Comments:

.....

E1.40. What is the number of the following textbooks that you have in stock, as of today?

	Maths	Chichewa	English	General Studies ⁵	Social Studies ⁶	Other Subjects
Std. 1						
Std. 2						
Std. 3						
Std. 4						
Std. 5						
Std. 6						
Std. 7						
Std. 8						

Comments:

.....

³ Only for Standards 1 - 4

⁴ Only for Standards 5 - 8

⁵ Only for Standards 1 - 4

⁶ Only for Standards 5 - 8

b) Teacher's Guides

E1.41. How many of the following teacher's guides have you received from July 2003 and June 2004 ? How many were from Government, and how many from donors?

	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies ⁷		Social Studies ⁸		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
Std. 1												
Std. 2												
Std. 3												
Std. 4												
Std. 5												
Std. 6												
Std. 7												
Std. 8												

E1.42 Are there materials for children with special needs? Yes/No

E1.43 If yes indicate them

Comments:

.....

E1.44. How many of the following teacher's guides did you receive between June 2002 and July 2003? How many were from Government, and how many from donors?

	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies ⁹		Social Studies ¹⁰		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
Std. 1												
Std. 2												
Std. 3												
Std. 4												
Std. 5												
Std. 6												
Std. 7												
Std. 8												

⁷ Only for Standards 1 - 4

⁸ Only for Standards 5 - 8

⁹ Only for Standards 1 - 4

¹⁰ Only for Standards 5 - 8

Comments:

.....

E1.45. What is the number of the following teacher's guides that you have in stock, as of today?

	Maths	Chichewa	English	General Studies ¹¹	Social Studies ¹²	Other Subjects
Std. 1						
Std. 2						
Std. 3						
Std. 4						
Std. 5						
Std. 6						
Std. 7						
Std. 8						

Comments:

.....

E1.46 How many other Teaching and Learning Materials have you received since July 2003? How many were from Government and how many from other donors?

Materials	Total Received since July 2003	Source	
		Government	Other Donor
Exercise Books			
Slates			
Pens			
Pencils			
Chalk			
Chalk Boards			
Desks			
Others (Please Specify)			

Comments:

.....

E1.47. How many other Teaching and Learning Materials did you receive between July 2002 and June 2003? How many were from Government and how many from other donors?

¹¹ Only for Standards 1 - 4

¹² Only for Standards 5 - 8

Materials	Total Received between July 2002 and June 2003	Source	
		Government	Other Donor
Exercise Books			
Slates			
Pens			
Pencils			
Chalk			
Chalk Boards			
Desks			
Others (Please Specify)			

Comments:

.....

E1.48. What is the number of other Teaching and Learning Materials that you have in stock to date?

Materials	Number
Exercise Books	
Slates	
Pens	
Pencils	
Chalk	
Chalk Boards	
Desks	
Others (Please Specify)	

Comments:

.....

TEACHERS' SALARIES

This data should be based on pay vouchers. It will be crosschecked with the data collected at the District level.

For each grade of teacher (P8, P0, PT1, PT2, PT3, PT4), record the salary for the lowest paid teacher in that grade. Also record the lowest salary for a temporary teacher. Record their gross salary (including all allowances and before any deductions) at the end of July 2003.

E1.49. What was the lowest gross salary before any deductions for the following grades at the end of June 2003?

Grade	Gross Salary including all allowances at end of June 2003				
	Basic	Professional Allowance	Housing	Other (Please state)	Total
P8					
P0					
PT1					
PT2					
PT3					
PT4					
Temporary					

Comments:

.....

E1.50 What is the current (June 2004) lowest gross salary before any deductions for the following grades?

Grade	Gross Salary including all allowances in June 2004				
	Basic	Professional Allowance	Housing	Other (Please state)	Total
P8					
P0					
PT1					
PT2					
PT3					
PT4					
Temporary					

Comments:

.....

.....

SCHOOL LEVEL INSPECTION

In this section the monitor must find out the number of visits that the Primary Education Adviser (PEA) makes to the school for various purposes with the aim of improving school performance. To determine the number of visits, the monitor needs to look at the school visitor's book and confirm the number of times that the PEA had visited the school.

E.51 How many times did the PEA visit this school between July 2002 and June 2003? _____

E.52 What was the purpose of the above-mentioned visit? For each purpose, count the number of times the PEA visited.

<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Number of times</i>
a. Inspection	_____
b. Delivery of Materials	_____
c. Advisory	_____
d. Others (Please specify)	

E1.53 What is the number of times you have received the following types of feedback from a PEA between July 2002-June 2003?

Type of feedback	Number of times
Oral report or feedback	_____
Written report or feedback	_____

E1.54 How many teachers from this school attended training conducted (including school level training and training conducted elsewhere) by the PEA between July 2002-June 2003? _____

E1. 55 How many times did the PEA visit this school between July 2003 and June 2004? _____

E1.56 What was the purpose of the above-mentioned visit? For each purpose, count the number of times the PEA visited.

<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Number of times</i>
a. Inspection	_____
b. Delivery of Materials	_____
c. Advisory	_____
d. Others (Please specify)	

E1.57 What is the number of times you have received the following types of feedback from a PEA between July 2003-June 2004?

Type of feedback	Number of times
Oral report or feedback	_____
Written report or feedback	_____

E1.58 How many teachers from this school attended training conducted (including school level training and training conducted elsewhere) by the PEA between July 2003-June 2004? _____

RESPONDENT'S POSITION

RESPONDENT'S SIGNATURE AND STAMP

E2. DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE

To be completed upon discussions with the District Education Manager (DEM), Stores Manager and Coordinating Primary Education Advisor (PEA). Stress that this questionnaire is confidential.

a) This Section is to be completed based on discussions with the District Education Manager (DEM) or his Deputy. The Monitor must crosscheck the data with the Stores manager after discussions with the DEM.

E2.1	<i>District</i>	
E2.2	<i>Division</i>	
E2.3	<i>Respondent's position</i>	
E2.4	<i>Respondent's signature and official stamp</i>	
E2.5	<i>Date</i>	

E2.6 Enrolment figures in the district in 2003

Std 1		Std 2		Std 3		Std 4		Std 5		Std 6		Std 7		Std 8		Total
B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	

E2.7 Enrolment figures in the District in 2004

Std 1		Std 2		Std 3		Std 4		Std 5		Std 6		Std 7		Std 8		Total
B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	

E2.8 Number of pupils with special needs in 2003

Std 1		Std 2		Std 3		Std 4		Std 5		Std 6		Std 7		Std 8		Total
B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	

E2.9 Number of pupils with special needs in 2004

Std 1		Std 2		Std 3		Std 4		Std 5		Std 6		Std 7		Std 8		Total
B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	B	G	

E2.10 Number of teachers in the District in 2003

PT4		PT 3		PT 2		PT 1		PO		P 8		Untrained		In training		Total
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	

E2.11 Number of teachers in the District in 2004

PT4		PT 3		PT 2		PT 1		PO		P 8		Untrained		In training		Total
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	

Comments:

.....

NEWLY CONSTRUCTED SCHOOLS

E2.12. By referring to the table below, can you list the number of new primary schools that have been constructed in the district between July 2002/June 2003 and July 2003/June 2004? Also mention the source of funding for the construction of the new schools. (Indicate by marking (X) in the table whether from donors or government.)

ZONE	Number of new schools constructed between July 2002 and June 2003	Funding from Donors	Funding from Govt.	Number of new schools constructed between July 2003 and June 2004	Funding from Donors	Funding from Govt.	Number of new schools under construction

Comments:

.....

Teaching and Learning materials

Each District has a stores officer who should record the deliveries of teaching and learning Materials that they receive from the supplies unit in Blantyre, together with any other materials they receive from other sources such as donor or NGOs

Textbooks

E2.13 How many of the following textbooks have you received between July 2003-June 2004? How many were from government, and how many from donors?

Govt or Donor?	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies ¹		Social Studies ²		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
Std. 1												
Std. 2												
Std. 3												
Std. 4												
Std. 5												
Std. 6												
Std. 7												
Std. 8												

Comments:

E2.14 How many of the following textbooks did you receive between July 2002 and June 2003? How many were from the government, and how many from donors?

Govt or Donor?	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies ³		Social Studies ⁴		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
Std. 1												
Std. 2												
Std. 3												
Std. 4												
Std. 5												
Std. 6												
Std. 7												
Std. 8												

Comments:

Teachers' Guides

E2.15 How many of the following teachers' guides have you received between July 2003-June 2004? How many were from Government, and how many from donors?

	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies ⁵		Social Studies ⁶		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
Std. 1												
Std. 2												
Std. 3												
Std. 4												
Std. 5												
Std. 6												
Std. 7												
Std. 8												

Comments:

.....

5 Only for standard 1-4

6 Only for standard 1-4

E2.16 How many of the following teachers' guides have you received between July 2002-June 2003? How many were from Government, and how many from donors?

	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies ⁷		Social Studies ⁸		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
Std. 1												
Std. 2												
Std. 3												
Std. 4												
Std. 5												

3 Only for standard 1-4

4 Only for standard 5-8

Govt or Donor?	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies ⁷		Social Studies ⁸		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
Std. 6												
Std. 7												
Std. 8												

Comments:

.....

7 Only for standard 1-4

8 Only for standard 1-4

Other Teaching and learning Materials (TLM)

E2.17 What other Teaching and Learning Materials have you received since July 2003? Were they from government or Donors?

Materials	Total received since July 2003	Source	
		Government	Donor
Exercise Books			
Slates			
Pens			
Pencils			
Chalk			
Chalk Boards			
Desks			
Others (Please Specify)			

Comments:

.....

E2.18 What other teaching and learning materials did you receive between July 2002 and June 2003? Were they from government or from donors?

Materials	Total Received between July 2002 and June 2003	Source	
		Government	Donor
Exercise Books			
Slates			
Pens			
Pencils			
Chalk			
Chalk Boards			
Desks			
Others (Please Specify)			

Comments:

.....

b) Teachers' Inspection

The following questions should be addressed to the Coordinating Primary Education Adviser (CPEA) if available or to the District Education Manager if the CPEA is not available.

E.2.19 In the table below, for each zone indicate name of PEA(s), the PEA: Teacher ratio, and the location of the PEA (i.e. indicate the number of KM from the PEA's home to the centre of the Zone under him/her.). Also indicate the sex (Male or Female) for the PEA.

ZONE	NAME OF PEA	SEX	PEA TO TEACHER RATIO	LOCATION OF PEA'S HOME

E2.20 What resources (e.g bicycle, motor cycle, motor vehicle, phones, house etc) are available for the PEA's well being? List them below.

RESPONDENT'S POSITION

RESPONDENT'S SIGNATURE/STAMP

E3 PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

To be completed upon discussion with the Principal, deputy Principal or any Senior Management personnel from the Teacher's Training College.

GENERAL INFORMATION

E3.1	Name oof College	
E3.2	District	
E3.3	Division	
E3.4	Date of interview	
E3.5	Respondent's signature and office stamp	

E3.6 Number of Tutors and Their qualifications in 2003

Certificate		Diploma		!st Degree		Masters Degree		Ph.D		Others	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

E3.7 Number of tutors and their qualifications in 2004

Certificate		Diploma		!st Degree		Masters Degree		Ph.D		Others	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

E3.8 Number of trainees in different cohorts in 2003

Cohort		Cohort		Cohort		Cohort	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

E3.9 Number of trainees who graduated in the different cohorts in 2003

Cohort		Cohort		Cohort		Cohort	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

E3.10 Number of trainees in different cohorts by June in 2004

Cohort		Cohort		Cohort		Cohort	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

E3.11 Number of trainees in different cohort who graduated by June in 2004

Cohort		Cohort		Cohort		Cohort	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

E3.12 How many times do you conduct teaching practice in one cohort?

.....

Comments:

COLLEGE FUNDING

Each College is given funds by the Government to carry out its activities in each academic year.

E3.12. How much money did you receive from the govt/donor in the academic year 2002/03?

Source	Amount	Actual Budget
Government		
Donor		
Other Sources (Specify)		

Comments.....

E3.13. How much money did you receive from the govt/donor in the academic year 2003/04?

Source	Amount	Actual Budget
Government		
Donor		
Other Sources (Specify)		

Comments.....

E3.14. Of the money received in 2002/3 and 2003/4 how much did you use for TLMs, Boarding and lodging and General Administration?

ITEM	Amount used in 2002/3	Amount used in 2003/4	BUDGET 2004/5
TLMs			
Boarding /Lodging			
General Administration			
Other (specify):			

E3.15 Does your College receive teaching and learning materials?

Yes	No

E3.16 If yes (in E3.15 above), how many from donors/govt in 2002/3 and 2003/2004 ?

Materials	Total in 2002/3	Total in 2003/4	Source 2002/3		Source 2003/4	
			Govt	Govt	Donor	Donor
Exercise books						
Teacher guides						
Writing Materials						
Computers						
Others (Specify)						

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

E3.17 Are these materials enough and relevant to the College?

E3.18 To what extent does the College participate in budget formulation with the ministry headquarters?.....

E3.19 Do you have any comments to make regarding the above information?

END OF QUESTIONNAIRE

(Remember to thank the respondents for the information they have supplied for completion of the questionnaires)

MONITOR'S DETAILS

MONITOR'S NAME	SIGNATURE
MONITOR'S ORGANISATION NAME	MONITOR'S ORGANISATION STAMP
DATE QUESTIONNAIRE COMPLETED	

REFERENCES

- Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic education (CSCQBE), Budget Monitoring Exercise 2001 Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic education (CSCQBE), Budget Monitoring Exercise 2003
- Government of Malawi (May 2002) Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Vol. 1.
- Government of Malawi, Ministry of Education, Policy and Investment Framework 2001.
- Government of Malawi, Ministry of Education, Department of Planning, Paper on Actual Expenditure 2003/4
- Government of Malawi, Ministry of Finance (2003/4), Financial Statement for 2003/4
- Government of Malawi, Ministry of Finance (2003/4), Budget Document No 4 A. Draft Estimates of Expenditure on Recurrent and Capital Accounts for Financial Year 2003/4 (Output Based).
- Malawi Economic Justice Network: Overview of 2003/4 Budget
- Public Expenditure Tracking Survey in Education (PETS), Government of Malawi, NSO/EP & D, 2004 (unpublished)

About the Education Budget Monitoring Report

The report on Civil Society Basic Education Budget Monitoring Financial Year 2003/4 report has been produced and published by the Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education (CSCQBE). The report is the third one after two rounds of budget monitoring in 2002 and 2003. It carries on the momentum of the two previous reports in providing insight into whether government is committed to spending more on priority areas in education in line with the Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy (MPRS), the Education Policy and Investment Framework (PIF), and International Commitments on Education For All (EFA). The report also follows up on whether the expenditure in education is resulting in improvement in the quality of primary education in Malawi. Funding for the budget monitoring exercise was provided by DFID and CEF.

About CSCQBE

CSCQBE, which started in July 2000, is a Coalition of 54 local and international Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs), Faith Based Organisations (FBOs), Community Based organisations (CBOs), and 10 District networks active in basic education sector in Malawi. The Mission of CSCQBE is to achieve measurable change in the quality of basic education by 2015 through supporting and influencing the implementation and monitoring of government policies as outlined in the policy and investment Framework (PIF) and the Education for all (EFA) plan. The Coalition is a member of Africa Network Campaign for Education for All (ANCEFA) and the Global Campaign for Education (GCE), both of which promote quality education.

About CSCQBE Management

CSCQBE is managed by a competent nine man executive committee drawn from within its membership and a Secretariat. Members of the Executive Committee who steered activities of the Coalition in the 2003/4 year as the budget monitoring exercise was being conducted include: Prof. Anaclet Phiri from ACEM, Mr. Norman Tembo from CARE, Mrs Chikondi Mpokosa from VSO, Mr. Amos Tizora from CICOD, Mrs. Margaret Ali from Save the Children Malawi, Mr. George Jobe from CRECCOM, Mr Moses Kamanga from CCAP Livingstonia Synod, Mr. Bright Kampaundi from YOCRIS, and Mr. Henry Kumwenda from PRISAM. New members have joined the executive in the 2004/5 financial year these are Mrs Abigail Suka from Sight savers international and Mr. Innocent Chitosi from NAMISA replacing Mrs Chikondi Mpokosa and Mr Amos Tizora.

The Secretariat of CSCQBE comprises six members of Staff as follows:

Mr. Limbani Nsapato	Coalition Coordinator
Mr. Donald Kebabe	Assistant Coordinator
Mrs. Tereza Nkoka	Finance/Administration Officer
Mrs Clara Chindime	Research, Monitoring and evaluation officer
Miss Ndusye Mbeye	Secretary
Mr. Fredrick Mnenula	Driver

The Secretariat can be contacted through the Coalition Coordinator by the following address:
Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education, Arwa House, City Centre, Box 30736, Lilongwe 3. Malawi.
Tel. +265 (0)1 773 624, +265 (0)1 770 713. Fax: +265) (0) 1 770 229. Email: cscqbe@sdp.org.mw