

## **Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education**

---



### **BUDGET MONITORING EXERCISE 2003**

**Produced by the Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education,  
C/o TUM, P/Bag 11, Lilongwe, Malawi  
Tel / Fax: + 265 – 1 – 727006**

**Cover photograph** – schoolgirls dancing in rural Malawi

**Picture by** Rhino Chipiko, Lilongwe

This report is © Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education, Lilongwe, Malawi.

All rights reserved. Readers are encouraged to quote from or reproduce this paper, but as holders of the copyright CSCQBE requests due acknowledgement and notification

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
List of Tables.....	i
Executive Summary.....	ii
Introduction .....	1
Methodology.....	1
Sample.....	2
Budget Background.....	2
Findings: Enrolment Rates .....	5
Findings: Teachers and Teacher’s Training .....	7
Findings: Textbooks and Teachers Guides .....	13
Findings: General Teaching and Learning Materials .....	16
Findings: Inspectorate.....	19
Annex 1: Priority Poverty Expenditures as % of GDP .....	22
Annex 2: Questionnaire Used in Budget Monitoring Exercise .....	23

## List of Tables

Table 1: Number of Responses by District .....	2
Table 2: PPEs (in MK 000s) for Primary Education 2000-1 to 2002-3.....	3
Table 3: Number of Pupils per school by Education Division .....	5
Table 4: Transition Rates between various Standards.....	5
Table 5: Number of Teachers per school by Education Division .....	7
Table 6: Teacher’s level expressed as total qualified teachers per division (%) .....	7
Table 7: Students per Teacher (Pupil-Teacher) Ratio by Education Division .....	8
Table 8: Female teachers, by grade, per education division (%).....	9
Table 9: Numbers Enrolled and Graduating from TTCs .....	10
Table 10: Future % of teachers untrained at current recruitment and training levels.....	10
Table 11: Untrained teachers currently undergoing training (by division) .....	11
Table 12: % of teachers untrained at current training and targeted recruitment levels .....	11
Table 13: % of teachers untrained at targeted recruitment and training levels .....	12
Table 14: Schools not receiving Textbooks and Teachers Guides between July and December 2002 (%) .....	13
Table 15: Schools not receiving Textbooks and Teachers Guides in FY 2001-2 (%).....	13
Table 16: Textbooks and Teachers Materials coming from Government between July and December 2002 (%).....	14
Table 17: Textbooks received per child currently enrolled by subject since July 2002 .....	14
Table 18: Total number of Textbooks and Teachers Guides in stock per child enrolled .....	14
Table 19: Schools not receiving various Teaching and Learning Materials between July 2002 and December 2002 (%) .....	16
Table 20: Schools not receiving selected TLM in FY 2001-2.....	17
Table 21: Deliveries of TLM in 2002/3 and 2001/2 .....	17
Table 22: Quantities of various Teaching and Learning Materials received per Child enrolled in school, between July 2002 and December 2002.....	18
Table 23: Number of Visits to the School by the PEA.....	19
Table 23: Incidence of Report and Feedback from the PEA.....	20

## Executive Summary

Malawi's approval of a Poverty Reduction Strategy in April 2002 also saw the government adopt a somewhat new approach towards the budget involving the identification of Priority Poverty Expenditures, to be protected in times of financial stress. Various civil society organisations and coalitions have welcomed this move and are keen to observe the implementation of this approach and monitor the results and impacts these have on the country. Within primary education the PPEs are identified as teaching and learning materials, teacher's salaries, teacher training and teacher housing. In total, MK 1,049 million was allocated to these PPEs in financial year 2002-3. However, changes in what has been included as PPEs from year to year make temporal comparisons difficult, the two PPEs for which information is available for all three financial years, teaching and learning materials and teacher training, have both registered declines in real terms in 2002-3 compared to 2001-2.

In an effort to track how much of the allocated money actually makes it to frontline service delivery institutions, the CSCQBE have carried out a survey of primary schools. This looked at enrolment rates, numbers of teachers in school, the amount of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials received by the school and the frequency of visits by the primary educational adviser (PEA).

In terms of the number of students enrolled in school, the study reveals that the number of pupils in Standard 8 are only 30 per cent the number of students in Standard 1. While this is in line with the PIF target survival rate of 30 per cent by 2002, it is much worse than the target rate of 50 per cent contained in the budget document for 2002-3. Further, this disguises major urban rural imbalances, a point that is made on a number of occasions throughout the report.










The study also found that, amongst all the schools sampled, there are 57.3 pupils per teacher, and 69.4 pupils for each trained teacher – this is wholly in line with the targets of 60 pupils to each teacher, and reducing the number of unqualified teachers. However, this disguises some major discrepancies – some divisions have pupil to total teacher ratios of over 100 to one, and a pupil to trained teacher ratio of 146 to one. Rural schools fare much worse than urban schools in this, and is an area the coalition feels particularly strong about. In terms of training teachers, the study also finds that the government targets of recruiting 6,000 new teachers a year and training 6,000 unqualified teachers are not being met – something which has to be reversed if the quality targets in primary education are to be met. The fact that these targets are not being met needs further explanation as funds are being allocated under PPEs to this.

Over half of the schools visited had not received textbooks in the first six months of the current financial year, this compares unfavourably to the twelve month period of financial year 2001-2, when three quarters of all schools surveyed received textbooks. The study also draws attention to the fact that most textbooks are provided by donors (86.5 per cent). The amount of textbooks in stock per child greatly exceeds the original targets set of one book for every two children in the PIF – the survey finds that in all schools sampled, the average is closer to three books per child.

In terms of other teaching and learning materials, 14 per cent of all schools surveyed did not receive any exercise books; one in three did not receive any pens and slightly more than this did not receive any pencils. Less than one in ten schools have received deliveries of desks in the first six months of the financial year and over 60 per cent of schools have not received chalkboards.

The schools inspectorate has been included as a PPE for the first time in 2002-3, the study found that, on average a PEA visits each school 4.3 times a year (2001-2), above the recommended three visit per year, but 32 per cent of schools are visited less than the recommended number of times.

In particular the study makes the following recommendations:

-  Efforts need to be made to address the issues of retention and progression of students – especially amongst girls and in rural areas
-  Concerted action to remove discrepancies in allocations between urban and rural areas needs to be undertaken, particularly in the following areas:
  -  progression rates
  -  pupil teacher ratio
  -  the number of qualified teachers
  -  the delivery of teaching and learning materials
-  The status of women teachers needs to be improved, both in terms of providing better promotion opportunities and in offering better incentives to work in rural areas
-  Teaching and Learning materials needs to be delivered in a timely manner to ensure that the most is gained from them
-  Teacher training and recruitment targets need to be met

## Introduction

Since the introduction of Free Primary Education (FPE) in Malawi, access to education has greatly improved for most children, with enrolment levels rising from 1.9 million in 1993-4 to a rate consistently above three million. The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology's (MoEST) Policy and Investment Framework (PIF) of February 2001 identifies the provision of primary education as "*the main contribution of the education sector to poverty alleviation*".

At the same time, however, persistent concerns over quality are raised. The budget document for 2002-3 attributes the reasons for the deteriorating quality and internal efficiency to inadequate teaching and learning materials, inadequate qualified teachers and inadequate teacher's incentives. Similarly, the Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (MPRSP) is committed to improving the quality and relevance of primary education through four main strategies: teacher recruitment, training and incentives; development of relevant curriculum; teaching and learning materials; and supervision and inspection.

Resulting from concerns connected to the quality of education the current Civil Society Coalition for Quality Basic Education (CSCQBE) emerged out of a merger in May 2002 between an existing organisation of the same name, established in June 2000, and the NGO / Government Alliance for Quality Basic Education. The CSCQBE is an umbrella grouping of Civil Society Organisations (CSO) active in advocacy for improved education in Malawi, focussing on three particular areas – teacher training, community mobilisation and budget monitoring.

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

This budget monitoring exercise is a direct follow on to one carried out in the first quarter of 2002, which addressed issues connected to the implementation and delivery of the government budget for 2001-2. The 2003 exercise benefits from a considerably larger sample size, the results of which are outlined in the following sections, and makes frequent reference to the report from the previous year.

## Methodology

The findings contained in this report are based on a nationwide survey carried out at school level. A simple questionnaire was used to collect information on a variety of issues, including the number of pupils and teachers in the schools and the availability and delivery of teaching and learning materials (a copy of the questionnaire is included as Annex 2). The results emerging from the analysis of the questionnaire have been supplemented by secondary sources of data collected on enrolment in teacher training colleges and budget information. The areas for investigation were selected based on the identified PPEs contained in the MPRSP and the Government's *Draft Estimate of Expenditure on Recurrent and Capital Accounts for the Financial Year 2002/3*.

The confidential questionnaires were administered on a voluntary basis by a number of Civil Society Organisations<sup>1</sup>, under the supervision of the CSCQBE.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Civil Society Organisations involved in administering the questionnaire are Teachers Union of Malawi (TUM), CRECCOM, Every Child, Action Aid (Malawi), PRDO, Malawi Economic Justice Network (MEJN), CEYCA, Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO), DSU, PAMET, MASPA, Oxfam, ELDP, Christian Services Committee (CSC), Youth Arm, YARD, Synod of Livingstonia, CARE, Fresh Water, Story Workshop, YARD, Save the Children (Malawi) and GTZ.



Questionnaires were distributed to CSOs in January 2003, after a meeting in December 2002 and a deadline of 30th of March 2003 was set to ensure the analysis of the questionnaires could be completed in time to present the results as part of a pre-budget advocacy campaign.

## Sample

The initial sampling for the exercise was done with the assistance of the National Statistical Office (NSO). In this, 411 schools were randomly selected. The sampling framework covered all education divisions and administrative districts of the country, allowing comparison between the various divisions and comparison on an urban-rural basis.

This report is based on the information generated from 264 schools, for which questionnaires had been returned before the 16th April. The number of schools responding is outlined in Table 1. Due to the large number of schools sampled in urban areas, 30 per cent of the total, the report refrains from making assessments at the national level, rather drawing attention to differences between the various divisions in the country and referring to the "entire sample" rather than Malawi.

**Table 1: Number of Responses by District**

Education Division	Total Number of Schools	Number of Schools Sampled	Number of Responses	Proportion of Schools Responding
<b>Rural</b>	<b>4,631</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>62.5</b>
Northern	1099	46	41	89.1
Central Eastern	895	50	47	94.0
Central Western	986	50	28	56.0
South Eastern	683	50	28	56.0
Shire Highlands	476	50	30	60.0
South Western	492	50	11	22.0
<b>Urban</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>68.7</b>
Blantyre	58	38	26	74.2
Lilongwe	67	41	25	60.9
Mzuzu	25	23	21	91.3
Zomba	17	13	7	53.8
<b>Malawi (Total)</b>	<b>4,798</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>64.2</b>

While every effort was made to ensure that all schools sampled were visited, the fact that members of CSOs were to do this on a voluntary basis meant this was not always possible. Further, some organisations that managed to collect information did not manage to return their questionnaires in a timely manner, meaning they have not been included in this round of analysis, but have been retained for future analysis.

One further difficulty encountered during the analysis phase was the fact that slightly different questionnaires were used to collect the information – differences occurred in the way questions on Textbooks and Teachers Guides were phrased. This meant that information from all 264 questionnaires could not be compared, the results for this section are therefore only from 145 questionnaires. Information on the enrolment rates, teacher's qualifications and general teaching and learning materials is correct for the 264 questionnaires. Similarly, questions on the Primary Education Adviser were only asked in 119 schools.

## Budget Background

The letter of intent, forwarded to the IMF and World Bank as part of the MPRSP, contains a commitment from the Minister of Finance on the PPEs, which states that they will be protected should shocks require adjustments to the budget. In this document the PPEs in education are highlighted as – Primary Education, which is subdivided into teaching and learning materials and teacher's salaries, teacher training and teacher housing. A further allocation is made for secondary education.

The 2002 *Draft Estimates of Expenditure for the Financial Year 2002-03* are described as a tool for translating “plans and strategies into action”, and are the first expenditure estimates released under the MPRS, adopted in April of 2002. The estimate document commits itself to continuing with the system of PPEs, which are “related to high priority MPRSP activities” and states that the estimated allocations for these PPEs are protected to ensure uninterrupted service delivery. Notwithstanding these laudable commitments, actually tracing the education PPEs in the budget document from the **PPE allocations** (Table 4 page 6), through to the **Summary of 2002/3 Estimates** (Table 2 page 183) and the **Activity Based Budget 2002/3 – ORT only** (Table 5 page 190), is almost impossible as the same classification are not used from table to table.

The following figures show the summary allocation for the PPEs in primary education for the past number of years. The fact that Teacher’s Salaries were dropped as a PPE, while allocations for the inspectorate have been included makes comparison between the years in question very difficult (it can perhaps also be viewed as government renegeing on earlier commitments to protect these expenditures). The justification for removing teacher’s salaries as a PPE initially was the level of the increase in the salaries in the previous year, suggesting there was no longer any need to include them (as personal emoluments are highlighted elsewhere in the budget).

**Table 2: PPEs (in MK 000s) for Primary Education 2000-1 to 2002-3**

	2000 – 1 Allocation Year 1 (Actual)	2001 – 2 Allocation Year 2 Approved	2002 – 3 Allocation Year 3	% Increase Year 1 – Year 2	% Increase Year 2 – Year 3	Year 2 Figures Deflated to Year 1 <sup>2</sup>	Year 3 Figures Deflated to Year 1	Real % Increase Year 1 – Year 2	Real % Increase Year 2 – Year 3
Teaching and Learning Materials	370,000 (146,000)	628,900	455,960.3	70.0	-27.5	504,330.4	316,199.9	36.3	-37.3
Teacher Salaries	1,421,733	1,925,560	--	35.5	--	1,544,154.0	--	8.6	--
Teacher Training	89,739 (81,100)	347,600	394,488.0	287.3	13.5	278,749.0	273,570.0	210.6	-1.9
Inspectorate	--	--	89,146.6	--	--	--	61,821.5	--	--
Teachers Houses	--	--	110,000.0	--	--	--	76,282.9	--	--
Total Amount for PPEs in Primary Education	1,881,462	2,902,060	1,049,594.9	54.2	-63.8	2,327,233.4	727,874.4	23.7	-68.7

**Source:** Malawi Government (2002) “Draft Estimates of Expenditure on Recurrent and Capital Accounts for the Financial Year 2002 – 2003”, Ministry of Finance, Lilongwe and CSCQBE (2002) “Education Budget Monitoring – Detailed Findings”, Lilongwe  
-- Data Not Available

In addition to the figures included here, allocations to teaching and learning material and teacher training at secondary level have also been included as PPEs<sup>3</sup>.

These figures show that after substantial budgeted increases from 2000-1 to 2001-2 the allocations for teaching and learning materials and teacher training will fall in 2002-3 to differing degrees. At the same time, allocations for the Inspectorate and Teacher’s Housing have been included.

<sup>2</sup> The year 2 and year 3 figures have been deflated using the following rates of inflation - June 2000 to June 2001 = 24.7 %; June 2001 to June 2002 = 15.6 %; June 2000 – June 2002 44.2 %.

<sup>3</sup> A table produced by the IMF where the planned expenditure on each of these PPEs as a proportion of GDP is included as Annex 1.



**In this regard, the Coalition calls on the Ministry of Finance to stick to the Priority Poverty Expenditures identified at the start of the PRS cycle to allow for the full impact of these to be felt in the time frame planned for. It also calls on the government to speed up the movement towards an Activity Based Budget that has clear and meaningful targets directly related to the PPEs, which are in turn consistent with the targets established in the MPRSP.**

Further to the MPRSP commitment, the budget documents for 2002-3 the following are identified as the major objectives in the primary education sub-sector

- (1) Help to increase the completion rate from 32 per cent to 50 per cent
- (2) Reduce absenteeism, dropout and repetition
- (3) Provide adequate teaching and learning materials
- (4) Review and develop curricula to incorporate cross-cutting issues and practical skills;  
and
- (5) Increase the number of trained teachers.

The following sections include the general findings from the questionnaires on enrolment rates and pupil – teacher ratios in the schools visited, and then focuses on a number of these priority areas – namely teaching and learning materials (divided by text books and teachers guides and other learning materials) and teacher training.

## Findings: Enrolment Rates

The results of the analysis of the returned questionnaires show marked differences in the average number of pupils enrolled in a school across regions. Most notable is the difference between school sizes in urban and rural areas (2,023 against 745). Across the regions, schools in the Northern Division generally have the lowest number of students enrolled (457), while Blantyre Urban has the largest number (2,474).

### Targets – Enrolment and Transition Rates

The PIF highlights that equal access for all children to quality primary education shall be the main thrust of government policy on basic education. The Net Enrolment Rate is to rise to 95 per cent by 2007 and the survival rate to standard 8 shall increase from 20 per cent in 1997 to 30 per cent in 2002. The budget document for 2002-3 further targets increasing the completion rate from 32 % to 50 %.

**Table 3: Number of Pupils per school by Education Division**

	Std 1	Std 2	Std 3	Std 4	Std 5	Std 6	Std 7	Std 8	Average per School
<b>Rural</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>745</b>
Northern	89	68	69	59	50	43	38	41	457
Central Eastern	143	140	94	70	56	43	32	28	605
Central Western	251	187	166	123	109	82	69	54	1038
South Eastern	272	195	171	127	106	76	59	46	1051
Shire Highlands	231	135	137	109	72	56	41	39	821
South Western	171	114	122	77	75	53	39	32	682
<b>Urban</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>203</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>2,023</b>
Blantyre	385	360	420	334	350	257	216	153	2,474
Lilongwe	418	326	361	279	265	189	168	125	2,130
Mzuzu	244	197	222	189	173	162	145	139	1,470
Zomba	300	251	232	210	180	176	151	129	1,629
<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>1,127</b>

Source: Survey Results from 264 Schools

From Table 3 it is apparent that there is a steady decline in the numbers of children enrolled in school from one standard to the next. Table 4 (below) illustrates this point further.

**Table 4: Transition Rates between various Standards<sup>4</sup>**

	Std 2 Enrolment as percentage of Std 1	Std 4 enrolment as Percentage of Std 1	Std 8 enrolment as Percentage of Std 1
<b>Rural</b>	<b>74.9</b>	<b>49.7</b>	<b>21.3</b>
Northern	76.4	66.3	46.1
Central Eastern	97.9	49.0	19.6
Central Western	74.5	49.0	21.5
South Eastern	71.7	46.7	16.9
Shire Highlands	58.4	47.2	16.9
South Western	66.7	45.0	18.7
<b>Urban</b>	<b>84.6</b>	<b>76.3</b>	<b>39.4</b>
Blantyre	93.5	86.8	39.7
Lilongwe	78.0	66.7	29.9
Mzuzu	80.7	77.5	57.0
Zomba	83.7	70.0	43.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>79.4</b>	<b>61.8</b>	<b>29.6</b>

Source: Survey Results from 264 Schools

<sup>4</sup> The figures presented here are a single point in time snapshot – it is recognised that this is not the most appropriate way of calculating the transition rates, and that the reconstructed cohort analysis method does the job better, but for illustrative purposes this is considered adequate.

From this it is apparent that there are almost 20 per cent less pupils in standard two than standard one. Comparisons between standards 4 and 1 show a further worsening situation where the number of students enrolled in Standard 4 is only 61.8 per cent of those enrolled in Standard 1. The comparison between Standard 8 and Standard 1 is even starker – there are over 70 per cent less students in the higher grade than the lower one (however this is somewhat in line with the PIF targets of a survival rate of 30 per cent by 2002).

Bad as these figures appear on first reading, they hide a situation that is even worse – that is the considerable difference between urban and rural areas. In rural areas, the numbers enrolled in Standard 8 are slightly over one-fifth the numbers enrolled in Standard 1 – in urban areas, the figures are double this. The reasons behind this situation require considerably more investigation, even though there are indications that the environment in which pupils entering school, when not welcoming, contributes to pushing them away, as infant classes in rural areas are subjected to some of the worst learning conditions in the country.

The figures emerging from the study imply a very urgent need to examine issues connected to retention rates of children in school and highlight definite action to address these. Future rounds of the budget monitoring exercise will strive to disaggregate this information between boys and girls.

This attention to gender aspects of retention is necessary, as considerable evidence has shown that even if boys and girls enter the infant classes in the same number, the pendulum swings towards boys as pupils progress through the standards. For example, while girls in Malawi schools constituted 50.4% in standard one in 2000, they were only 42.5% of the total in standard eight. Others have argued that there are higher opportunity costs associated with girls' education given the prevailing sexual divisions of labour that assign women reproductive and domestic tasks. There are also different parental expectations of female and male children in the performance of household chores with girls being responsible for the bulk of duties. In dealing with both opportunity cost and the perceived net benefits of education the attitudes of the parents, the principal decision makers at the household level, must be stressed. There also appears to be a strong bias against girl's education at the cultural level. Most societies still look at females in terms of their reproductive roles, thus diminishing their understanding of the importance of education. In the case of parents, studies have shown that parental background, especially their level of education, significantly influences their decision to enrol and retain the child in school<sup>5</sup>.

**The dismal retention rates between the various standards are of immense concern for the Coalition – more emphasis needs to be placed on efforts to improve these figures. The coalition welcomes the target of increasing the completion rate from 32 per cent to 50 per cent and looks forward to specific budgetary allocations towards this target being identified in future rounds of the budget, particularly addressing the problem in rural areas and amongst the girl child.**

---

<sup>5</sup> The area of girls education and retention rates in school has been well researched in Malawi, further information can be obtained in the following reports - Chimombo J.P.G. (1999) *Implementing Educational Innovations: A study of Free Primary Education in Malawi*. Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Sussex; Davison J. & Kanyuka M. *An Ethnographic study of Factors Affecting the Education of Girls in Southern Malawi*. Chancellor College, Zomba; Hyde K. & Kadzamura E C. (1994) *GABLE Knowledge Attitudes and Practice Pilot Survey*. University of Malawi. Centre for Social Research. Zomba; and Kadzamura E. and Chibwana M, *Gender and Primary Schooling in Malawi*. Partnership for Strategic Resource Planning for Girls' Education in Africa. FAWE and IDS.

## Findings: Teachers and Teacher's Training

From the analysis of the questionnaires it emerges that there are a greater number of teachers in schools in urban areas than rural areas, however this is not unexpected bearing in mind the number of pupils in rural schools. Table 5 below shows the average number of teachers by teaching grade in each school in the division.

### Targets – Pupil Teacher Ratios

The PIF highlights that by 2002 the – Pupil-Teacher ratio should be 60:1 and the Pupil – Qualified Teacher ratio should be 68:1. The document also draws attention to difficulties in rural areas stating that *The proportion of rural schools meeting the 60:1 pupil:teacher ratio will increase from 15% in 1997 to 25% in 2002*

**Table 5: Number of Teachers per school by Education Division**

	PT4	PT 3	PT 2	PT1	P0 / P8	Total		Total
						Trained	Untrained	
<b>Rural</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>9.3</b>
Northern	4.4	1.1	0.4	0.2	0.0	6.0	1.3	7.3
Central Eastern	3.1	0.6	0.3	0.0	0.0	4.1	1.9	6.0
Central Western	9.2	1.5	1.0	0.4	0.1	12.2	2.9	15.1
South Eastern	5.9	0.9	0.8	0.2	0.0	7.8	4.9	12.6
Shire Highlands	6.0	1.4	0.4	0.1	0.0	7.8	1.6	9.4
South Western	2.1	1.8	0.6	0.4	0.3	5.2	2.7	7.9
<b>Urban</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>5.9</b>	<b>43.9</b>
Blantyre	32.7	5.3	4.0	1.0	0.2	43.3	5.9	49.2
Lilongwe	31.0	5.4	3.4	1.9	0.1	41.8	9.8	51.6
Mzuzu	16.9	7.7	2.7	1.1	0.4	28.8	2.8	31.5
Zomba	17.0	11.9	2.3	0.4	0.3	31.9	2.0	33.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>11.6</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>19.7</b>

Source: Survey Results from 264 Schools

One important point to emerge from Table 5 is that a greater proportion of teachers in rural areas are unqualified than in urban areas (the issue of teachers training is taken up further later in the report). Further to the fact that there are more unqualified teachers in rural areas, there are also a greater proportion of qualified teachers in the lower teaching grades, even though these differences do not appear to be particularly large (See Table 6 below).

**Table 6: Teacher's level expressed as total qualified teachers per division (%)**

	PT 4	PT 3	PT 2	PT1	P0 / P8	Total
<b>Rural</b>	<b>73.6</b>	<b>15.7</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>100</b>
Northern	72.2	18.5	6.0	2.8	0.4	100
Central Eastern	76.3	14.4	8.2	1.0	0.0	100
Central Western	75.4	12.6	8.2	3.2	0.6	100
South Eastern	75.7	11.5	10.6	2.3	0.0	100
Shire Highlands	76.6	17.4	4.7	1.3	0.0	100
South Western	40.4	35.1	12.3	7.0	5.3	100
<b>Urban</b>	<b>70.0</b>	<b>17.2</b>	<b>8.8</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>100</b>
Blantyre	75.5	12.3	9.3	2.4	0.4	100
Lilongwe	74.3	12.8	8.1	4.5	0.3	100
Mzuzu	58.8	26.7	9.4	3.8	1.3	100
Zomba	53.4	37.2	7.2	1.3	0.9	100
<b>Total</b>	<b>71.1</b>	<b>16.8</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Survey Results from 264 Schools

For the data contained in Tables 5 and 6 to be truly meaningful, however, there is a need to combine it with that contained in Table 3 on Enrolment Rates to provide information on Pupil-Teacher Ratios. In total, the questionnaires returned showed that there are 57.3 pupils per teacher in the primary schools surveyed, and that there are 69.4 pupils for each trained teacher (See Table 7 below). When this is compared to the target set in the PIF and

reiterated in the MPRSP, which is to reduce the qualified pupil teacher ratio to 60: 1, it appears that progress is being made.

**Table 7: Students per Teacher (Pupil-Teacher) Ratio by Education Division**

	Pupil to Trained Teachers	Pupil to Total Teachers
<b>Rural</b>	<b>106.6</b>	<b>79.7</b>
Northern	75.5	62.4
Central Eastern	146.6	100.9
Central Western	85.3	68.9
South Eastern	134.9	83.1
Shire Highlands	104.8	87.0
South Western	131.6	86.2
<b>Urban</b>	<b>53.3</b>	<b>46.1</b>
Blantyre	57.1	50.3
Lilongwe	51.0	41.3
Mzuzu	51.1	46.6
Zomba	51.1	48.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>69.4</b>	<b>57.3</b>

Source: Survey Results from 264 Schools

The figures in Table 7 also represent an historical improvement in terms of pupil to trained teacher ratios (these were 132:1 in rural areas and 65:1 in urban areas in 2000 according to MoEST official statistics). At the same time, there has been a worsening in the overall pupil to teacher ratio (from 65:1 in rural areas and 46:1 in urban areas in 2000). This may be a reflection of the fact mentioned below that while no teachers have been employed, a number have been trained in recent years.

The bottom line figures disguise some startling discrepancies across the country. Firstly, there is a much better pupil-teacher ratio in urban areas, where there are 53 pupils per qualified teacher and in total 46 pupils per teacher, than in rural areas, where on average there are over 106 pupils per qualified teacher and just under 80 pupils per teacher of any description. In some rural areas, such as Central Eastern and South Eastern divisions this is even more pronounced, where there are 146.6 and 134.9 pupils for every qualified teacher.

**While slight progress appears to have been made in addressing pupil-teacher ratios, more needs to be done. In particular, the inequitable distribution of teachers across the country is of concern to the coalition, especially if children in rural areas are to be given the same opportunity to access quality education as children in urban areas. Initiatives to rectify this imbalance must be part of the focus of government action in the future.**

One of the contributing factors to the imbalance in pupil teacher ratios between urban and rural areas is the number of women teachers who are present in urban areas. The budget document for 2002-3 identifies this and highlights the fact that it is important to continue to improve the terms of service for teachers, including incentives for women teaching in rural areas. Attracting female teachers to rural areas has a further advantage in that they serve as role models for girls in these areas. Table 8 quite clearly shows that while women account for almost 70 per cent of teachers in total in the sample of schools, they only account for 41.7 per cent in rural areas, but 83.5 per cent in urban areas, suggesting that progress is not being made on this area yet.

While more research needs to be carried out on the phenomenon it appears that women teachers are unwilling to move to rural areas, particularly if they are married and their husbands are employed in the cities and because of the conditions they are expected to work

in (including having no access to running water and poor quality housing). **To address this it is recommended that improving the terms and conditions of teachers in rural areas, particularly women, should be targeted in next years budget, and would justify reintroducing teacher's salaries as a PPE. The possibility of providing a hardship allowance, or providing better living conditions needs to be considered if it is to become attractive for urban based teachers to move to rural areas.**

**Table 8: Female teachers, by grade, per education division (%)**

	PT 4	PT 3	PT 2	PT1	P0 / P8	Total		Total
						Trained	Untrained	
<b>Rural</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>42.9</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>16.7</b>	<b>39.4</b>	<b>48.7</b>	<b>41.7</b>
Northern	39.1	23.9	26.7	0.0	0.0	34.3	26.9	33.0
Central Eastern	32.4	28.6	12.5	0.0	--	29.9	39.8	33.0
Central Western	60.7	55.8	42.9	27.3	0.0	57.2	67.9	59.2
South Eastern	38.8	60.0	17.4	20.0	--	38.5	57.4	45.8
Shire Highlands	23.3	39.0	45.5	0.0	--	26.8	37.5	28.6
South Western	17.4	65.0	71.4	25.0	33.3	42.1	40.0	41.4
<b>Urban</b>	<b>84.9</b>	<b>75.8</b>	<b>79.1</b>	<b>75.0</b>	<b>27.8</b>	<b>82.1</b>	<b>92.3</b>	<b>83.5</b>
Blantyre	84.8	74.1	74.3	81.5	20.0	82.1	93.5	83.5
Lilongwe	88.9	82.8	87.1	74.5	33.3	87.2	92.7	88.2
Mzuzu	76.6	77.0	80.7	69.6	25.0	76.2	87.9	77.2
Zomba	83.2	65.1	62.5	66.7	50.0	74.4	92.9	75.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>71.0</b>	<b>66.5</b>	<b>66.1</b>	<b>60.6</b>	<b>25.0</b>	<b>69.2</b>	<b>71.4</b>	<b>69.6</b>

-- No teachers of this grade identified in schools in this division

Source: Survey Results from 264 Schools

Of further concern is the fact that women teachers are located predominantly in the lower and unqualified grades – they account for 71.4 per cent of untrained teachers and 71 per cent of all teachers at PT4 level, but only 25 per cent of those at P0 / P8 level.

In an effort to improve the proportion of qualified teachers working in schools, and to achieve the ratios set out in the PIF attention has to be placed on ensuring unqualified teachers are trained. Further to this, teacher training is one of the crucial areas identified in the budget documents as requiring urgent attention to address the question of quality in education. The amount of money approved in the budget for 2002-3 for this PPE was Mk 394.5 million an increase in nominal terms (but a slight decrease in real terms), on the amount approved in the previous financial year.

Despite having a target of 6,000 graduates from Teacher Training Colleges in the budget documents (Table 5, page 190 of the Budget Estimates), it appears that the numbers enrolled each year will not permit this to be reached (Table 9 below).

This statement is based on the reality of recent experiences, when on average just over 3,100 teachers are enrolled for training in any one financial year, graduating the following

#### Targets and Initiatives to Train Untrained Teachers

To meet the shortfall in the number of qualified teachers since the introduction of FPE, paraprofessional teachers have been recruited. These unqualified teachers were to be enrolled in Teacher Training Colleges (TTCs). This issue of teacher training is one of the PPEs included in the budget. The PIF quite clearly states (page 20) that "The MoEST shall put in place a quality teacher education and development program for all teachers in the system. The percentage of unqualified teachers shall reduce from the estimated 50% in 1997 to 30% in 2002 and to 10% by 2012". Past attempts to train these teachers have included the Malawi Special Teacher Education Programme (MASTEP) and the Malawi Integrated In-Service Teacher Education Programme (MIITEP), which is a one-year crash programme, using a mixture of residential courses for three months and distance education for nine months. The budget document for 2002-3 sets targets for the recruitment of 6,000 teachers and the graduation of 6,000 teachers from the Teacher Training Colleges.



year. A simple review of the enrolment and graduation dates supports this assertion - cohort 7 was received into the TTCs in June 2001 (the final days of F/Yr 2000-1 and therefore financed by resources from that year). This was the first cohort received into the TTCs since September 1999, these are recorded as graduating in 2001. The training for Cohort 7 ended in October of 2001, and therefore their graduation falls under F/Yr 2001-2. Cohort 8 entered the TTCs in January 2002 (F/Yr 2001-2) and graduated during F/Yr 2002-3. While Cohort 9 is expected to enter the TTCs in May 2003 (F/Yr 2002-3), the earliest they will be able to graduate is during F/Yr 2003-4.

**Table 9: Numbers Enrolled and Graduating from TTCs**

	Enrolled	Graduated
2000-1	2849 - Cohort 7	3233 – Cohorts 5 and 6
2001-2	3156 - Cohort 8	2164 - Cohort 7
2002-3	3300 - Cohort 9	3156 - Cohort 8 <sup>6</sup>

This implies that clarity is required in the budget document concerning the various outputs from the resources allocated to teacher training – in any one year it appears that approximately 3,200 students on average are enrolled, and between 2,000 and 3,000 teachers graduate, having been trained in an earlier financial year.

As regards the impact that this is having on the proportion of qualified teachers, the actual figures are somewhat misleading – as there have been no teachers recruited since 2000<sup>7</sup>. With an attrition rate of 11 per cent, the current situation shows that the government target of reducing the proportion of unqualified teachers to 10 per cent by 2012 is more than achievable (see Table 10). However, this would have major negative impacts on other elements connected to quality, for instance the Pupil:Teacher ratio would rise to about 142:1, as the actual number of teachers would be reduced by 42 per cent by 2006-7.

**Table 10: Future % of teachers untrained at current recruitment and training levels**

	Number of Teachers	Numbers Lost Through Attrition	New Teachers Recruited	Number of Unqualified Teachers	Number of Teachers Trained	Proportion of Teachers Untrained (%)
2000-1	47,840 <sup>8</sup>	5,262	0	23,920	2849	50.0
2001-2	42,578	4,684	0	18,440	3156	43.3
2002-3	37,894	4,168	0	13,255	3300	35.0
2003-4	33,726	3,710	0	8,497	3300	25.2
2004-5	30,016	3,302	0	4,263	3300	14.2
2006-7	26,714	2,939	0	494	3300	1.8
2007-8	23,776	2,615	0	0	3300	-12.0

The fact that no new teachers have been recruited helps to explain the surprisingly low proportion of unqualified teachers in the sample - 17.4 per cent. As with other results from the study, there are large differences between urban and rural areas – with one in four teachers in rural schools having no training, a considerably greater proportion than the 13.6 per cent in urban areas. Table 11 (below) further shows that slightly more than 60 per cent of unqualified teachers in the schools sampled are currently undergoing training. However, this again masks an urban rural difference – slightly over half of the unqualified teachers in

<sup>6</sup> Figures for the amount of students due to graduate from Cohort 8 in May 2003 are not available at present – for now we have over optimistically assumed the whole class will graduate.

<sup>7</sup> In fact it is difficult to discern the actual numbers of teachers because some community's have employed voluntary teachers of their own accord, who are unqualified, and a number of retired teachers have been re-hired. This is further complicated by the fact that the number of teachers included in the payroll is considerably higher than the actual numbers in the field.

<sup>8</sup> Number of teachers are taken from Education Basic Statistics. Attrition rate of 11 per cent and unqualified rate of 50 per cent in 2000 are taken from the PIF

rural areas are receiving further training, while just under 70 per cent of unqualified teachers in urban area are receiving training.

**Table 11: Untrained teachers currently undergoing training (by division)**

	Untrained Teachers (number)	Untrained Teachers as % of Total	Untrained Teachers Undergoing Training (number)	% of Untrained Teachers Undergoing Training
<b>Rural</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>25.2</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>50.8</b>
Northern	52	17.3	16	30.8
Central Eastern	88	31.2	56	63.6
Central Western	81	19.2	81	100.0
South Eastern	136	38.4	39	28.7
Shire Highlands	48	17.0	26	54.2
South Western	30	34.5	3	10.0
<b>Urban</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>69.6</b>
Blantyre	153	12.0	78	51.0
Lilongwe	245	19.0	166	67.8
Mzuzu	58	8.8	68	117.2
Zomba	14	5.9	15	107.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>548</b>	<b>60.6</b>

Source: Survey Results from 264 Schools

Of course, the existing situation whereby no new teachers have been recruited cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely, particularly with the existing high rates of attrition. The budget document has set a target of recruiting 6,000 teachers a year. At current levels of training however, this means that by 2020, over 45 per cent of teachers will still be untrained – giving an appearance of always trying to catch-up with the situation at hand (see Table 12)

**Table 12: % of teachers untrained at current training and targeted recruitment levels**

	Number of Teachers	Numbers Lost Through Attrition	New Teachers Recruited	Number of Unqualified Teachers	Number of Teachers Trained	Proportion of Teachers Untrained
2000-1	47840	5,262	0	23,920	2,849	50.0
2001-2	42,578	4,684	0	18,440	3,156	43.3
2002-3	37,894	4,168	6,000	19,255	3,300	50.8
2003-4	39,726	4,370	6,000	19,837	3,300	49.9
2019-20	51,646	5,681	6,000	23,624	3,300	45.7

However, if government can meet the targets that it has set itself, for recruitment (6,000 new teachers a year) and training of teachers (6,000) then the target for 2012 will almost be reached (15.8 per cent of teachers will be unqualified as opposed to the target of 10 per cent). If any attempt is made to increase enrolment in the TTCs for the coming years to compensate for the poor numbers of graduates over the past two year the figures will be achieved.

**Table 13: % of teachers untrained at targeted recruitment and training levels**

	<b>Number of Teachers</b>	<b>Numbers Lost Through Attrition</b>	<b>New Teachers Recruited</b>	<b>Number of Unqualified Teachers</b>	<b>Number of Teachers Trained</b>	<b>Proportion of Teachers Untrained</b>
2000-1	47,840	5,262	0	23,920	2,849	50.0
2001-2	42,578	4,684	0	18,440	3,156	43.3
2002-3	37,894	4,168	6,000	19,255	6,000	50.8
2003-4	39,726	4,370	6,000	17,137	6,000	43.1
2004-5	41,356	4,549	6,000	15,252	6,000	36.9
2006-7	42,807	4,709	6,000	13,574	6,000	31.7
2007-8	44,098	4,851	6,000	12,081	6,000	27.4
2008-9	45,247	4,977	6,000	10,752	6,000	23.8
2009-10	46,270	5,090	6,000	9,570	6,000	20.7
2010-11	47,180	5,190	6,000	8,517	6,000	18.1
2011-12	47,990	5,279	6,000	7,580	6,000	15.8

The figures in the last two tables show just how important meeting the targets set in the budget are for attaining a body of teachers who are qualified. **In this regard, because the number of teachers to be trained is not being reached, explanations should be provided as to what is being done with the resources allocated towards Teacher Training. If it is not possible to train the 6,000 students a year as budgeted, this should be made apparent and either the structural constraints preventing this training or the unrealistic estimates should be addressed. However, the Coalition feel that greater emphasis needs to be placed on ensuring the targets set are achieved.**

## Findings: Textbooks and Teachers Guides

The MPRSP highlights that one of the major “quality” issues to emerge from the increased enrolment as a result of FPE is the serious shortage of teaching and learning materials such as textbooks. The most noticeable recent development in this field, however, has been the provision of 11.4 million textbooks through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), which should mean that every primary school pupil now has a textbook, well in excess of the targets set in the PIF of two pupils per textbook by 2002.

### Targets – Textbooks and Teachers Guides

The PIF highlights that *the MoEST shall ensure that each school has an adequate supply of instructional and teaching / learning materials...The Pupil – Textbook ratio shall improve from an average of 24 pupils per textbook in 1997 to two pupils per textbook by 2002.*

Of the 264 questionnaires returned, 145 provided comparable information on Textbooks and Teachers Guides received. Unfortunately, this means that the information is only reliably comparable on an urban / rural divide, rather than by division.

The main finding is that over half the schools visited did not receive textbooks for a variety of subjects in the first six months of the financial year. The proportion of schools not receiving textbooks is higher in rural areas than in urban areas for all subjects (See Table 14), a point attributed to the poor condition of the road network in rural areas and that a large number of schools are inaccessible for large parts of the year.

**Table 14: Schools not receiving Textbooks and Teachers Guides between July and December 2002 (%)**

	Maths	Chichewa	English	General and Social Studies	Other Subjects
Rural	52.2	54.8	47.8	54.8	58.3
Urban	46.7	46.7	46.7	46.7	56.7
Total	51.0	53.1	47.6	53.1	57.9

Source: Survey Results from 145 Schools

This compares unfavourably to the figures for proportion of schools not receiving textbooks and teachers guide in the 12 months of the Financial Year 2001-2, when 26 per cent of schools did not receive Maths books, 23 per cent Chichewa books, 25 per cent English and 27 per cent general and social studies. However, as this is a year long figure, it is reasonable to assume that a large number of schools, particularly in rural areas, receive textbooks and teachers guides in the second half of the financial year. **This area requires attention and offers the opportunity for improved efficiency, as schools will benefit more if all textbooks can be delivered before the start of the school year.**

**Table 15: Schools not receiving Textbooks and Teachers Guides in FY 2001-2 (%)**

	Maths	Chichewa	English	General and Social Studies	Other Subjects
Rural	20.0	17.4	19.1	21.7	30.4
Urban	46.7	46.7	46.7	46.7	50.0
Total	25.5	23.4	24.8	26.9	34.5

Source: Survey Results from 145 Schools

A total of 185,454 schoolbooks were received by the 145 schools for which information was provided. Of this, 20.5 per cent were Maths Books, 19.6 per cent Chichewa, 20.4 per cent English, and 23.4 per cent General and Social Studies. The deliveries to a handful of schools accounts for a sizable proportion of these books – five schools received 35 per cent of all maths books delivered, 34 per cent of all Chichewa books, 36 per cent of all English books and 31 per cent of general and social studies books.

Interestingly, government has only provided 13.5 per cent of all textbooks received in the various schools in the first half of this financial year. This is almost exactly the same

proportion as during the whole of Financial Year 2001-2 when it was 13.8 per cent. This figure may well be due to the CIDA programme of textbook and teacher's materials provision under the Grant Support to the Education Sector (GSES) project. As this project is entirely outside the existing budget, government commitments to the provision of teaching and learning materials and textbooks are supposed to be in addition to the GSES provision. **This may suggest an over-reliance on donor funds for the provision of textbooks, a point of major concern for the coalition, particularly as the donor funded project is scheduled to come to an end this year.**

**Table 16: Textbooks and Teachers Materials coming from Government between July and December 2002 (%)**

	Maths	Chichewa	English	General and Social Studies	Other Subjects
Rural	15.5	15.2	17.9	12.6	4.2
Urban	20.7	15.3	13.0	12.5	5.0
Total	17.5	15.2	15.9	12.6	4.6

**Source:** Survey Results from 145 Schools

Of particular note is the fact that the difference in the amount of books delivered in urban and rural areas, per pupil is negligible (see Table 17), with slightly more going to children in rural areas than in urban areas. It is suspected that this is because of head teachers in rural areas occasionally overestimate the numbers of pupils in their schools. However, the coalition wishes to pay credit to those involved in the distribution programme for achieving such an equitable distribution.

**Table 17: Textbooks received per child currently enrolled by subject since July 2002**

	Maths	Chichewa	English	General and Social Studies	Other Subjects	Total
Rural	0.29	0.28	0.29	0.35	0.18	1.39
Urban	0.25	0.24	0.25	0.27	0.26	1.26
Total	0.27	0.26	0.27	0.31	0.21	1.33

**Source:** Survey Results from 145 Schools

**Due to the amount of donor support received in the provision of textbooks, government should be commended for attempting to shift expenditure to other areas – however, the areas selected need to be clearly highlighted. In this regard, the Coalition requests government to provide clear information on where the resources initially allocated to the PPE of textbook provision has been spent.**

Further to the equitable distribution of books, there is however, a marked difference between the amount of books held in stock for each subject between urban and rural areas. While the average number of textbooks per child is almost three (well above the targeted of one per two children), in this instance, rural schools seem to have the advantage, with more than twice as many books per pupil for each of the subjects in question.

**Table 18: Total number of Textbooks and Teachers Guides in stock per child enrolled**

	Maths	Chichewa	English	General and Social Studies	Other Subjects	Total
Rural	0.86	0.78	0.81	0.86	0.64	3.95
Urban	0.38	0.35	0.35	0.33	0.19	1.60
Total	0.65	0.59	0.61	0.63	0.44	2.93

**Source:** Survey Results from 145 Schools

It is proposed that this is directly attributable to poorer security in schools in urban areas, where there is a greater incidence of vandalism and theft of schoolbooks. Further, there is a lesser opportunity for schoolbooks to be stolen and resold in rural areas, which also contributes to this inequity. **As a direct means of overcoming this, it is recommended that each school be provided with a secure area in which to store books and**

**teaching and learning materials. In particular, when new schools are being constructed they need to include a strong room / library and existing schools should be provided with cabinets.**



## Findings: General Teaching and Learning Materials

The Budget Draft Estimates provide a target of nine units of teaching and learning materials per pupil and 15 units per teacher and provides a budget to achieve this of MK455 million. However, despite being a PPE the amount of money allocated varies considerably from year to year – the figure 2002-3 represents a decline in both real and nominal terms on the amount allocated in the previous financial year (see Table 2), which was itself a major increase on the amount allocated for 2000-1.

### Targets – Teaching and Learning Materials

The PIF does not supply specific targets for school materials and supplies, saying only that *the MoEST shall improve the distribution of school materials and supplies. It is hoped that by 2002 that the distribution of these materials will have improved such that all pupils will be supplied with exercise books and writing materials.* The 2002-3 budget document does provide a target, although it is not particularly clear, providing targets of 9 units of teaching materials per pupil and 15 per teacher. The setting of targets for TLM would benefit from greater specificity in terms of what is covered and what the specific targets for each of these are. For instance agreeing on specific numbers of exercise books per pupil would assist.

In the school survey, everything other than textbooks and teachers guides was incorporated under the heading General Teaching and Learning Materials. The major findings are that 14 per cent of all schools surveyed did not receive any exercise books; one in three did not receive any pens and slightly more than this did not receive any pencils. Less than one in ten schools have received deliveries of desks<sup>9</sup> in the first six months of the financial year and over 60 per cent of schools have not received chalkboards.

**Table 19: Schools not receiving various Teaching and Learning Materials between July 2002 and December 2002 (%)**

	Exercise Books	Slates	Pens	Pencils	Chalk	Chalk Boards	Desks
<b>Rural</b>	<b>9.2</b>	<b>98.4</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>34.6</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>65.4</b>	<b>89.7</b>
Northern	14.6	97.6	58.5	41.5	17.1	82.9	85.4
Central Eastern	12.8	100.0	38.3	46.8	19.1	78.7	83.0
Central Western	7.1	100.0	35.7	39.3	21.4	82.1	100.0
South Eastern	7.1	96.4	10.7	10.7	7.1	57.1	82.1
Shire Highlands	0.0	96.7	20.0	33.3	6.7	30.0	100.0
South Western	9.1	100.0	18.2	9.1	9.1	18.2	100.0
<b>Urban</b>	<b>25.3</b>	<b>92.4</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>53.2</b>	<b>96.2</b>
Blantyre	19.2	96.2	26.9	23.1	26.9	50.0	96.2
Lilongwe	36.0	100.0	48.0	56.0	32.0	36.0	100.0
Mzuzu	23.8	76.2	23.8	23.8	23.8	81.0	90.5
Zomba	14.3	100.0	14.3	14.3	14.3	42.9	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>14.0</b>	<b>96.6</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>34.1</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>61.7</b>	<b>91.7</b>

Source: Survey Results from 264 Schools

At first reading these figures may appear less than satisfactory, however they do compare favourably to the findings from a similar exercise carried out by the Coalition at the same time in 2002. The earlier exercise found that between July and December 2001, 49 per cent of schools had not received exercise books, 59 per cent had not received pens and 71 per cent had not received pencils, suggesting that progress is being made, even if slowly.

The questionnaires administered between January and March 2003 also looked at the quantities of teaching and learning materials received by the schools throughout financial

<sup>9</sup> The lack of desks is particularly detrimental to the enrolment of girls – other research has shown that girls do not participate fully in class when there are no desks, as they fear being peeped at by both boys and teachers.

year 2001-2. When this information for the entire 12 month period generated is combined with that from the previous years' exercise – the number of schools not receiving exercise books falls considerably from 49 per cent to 17 per cent – similar improvements are apparent for schools not receiving pens or pencils.

**Table 20: Schools not receiving selected TLM in FY 2001-2**

	<b>2001-2 (All Year)</b>	<b>2001-2 (First 6 Months)</b>
Exercise Books	17 %	49 %
Pens	30 %	59 %
Pencils	44 %	71 %
Chalk	22 %	53 %
Chalk Boards	62 %	88 %
Desks	88 %	98 %

Based on the results of 119 questionnaires administered between January and March 2003 and 51 questionnaires administered between January and March 2002.

Further to this, the quantities of teaching and learning materials delivered to the 264 schools in the first six months of the year are in line with the quantities delivered in the entire previous 12 months (See Table 21).

**Table 21: Deliveries of TLM in 2002/3 and 2001/2**

	<b>Exercise Books</b>			<b>Pens</b>			<b>Pencils</b>		
	2002/3 (First 6 Months)	2001/2	2002/3 to date as % of 2001/2	2002/3 (First 6 Months)	2001/2	2002/3 to date as % of 2001/2	2002/3 (First 6 Months)	2001/2	2002/3 to date as % of 2001/2
<b>Rural</b>	<b>634,306</b>	<b>742,055</b>	<b>85.5</b>	<b>127,947</b>	<b>99,086</b>	<b>129.1</b>	<b>73,322</b>	<b>53,432</b>	<b>137.2</b>
Northern	98,627	82,138	120.1	19,762	6,360	310.7	16,029	5,296	302.7
Central Eastern	107,902	114,146	94.5	23,215	12,091	192.0	18,582	7,620	243.9
Central Western	95,758	142,106	67.4	20,316	19,940	101.9	12,268	13,121	93.5
South Eastern	140,779	182,691	77.1	26,517	34,374	77.1	11,098	19,182	57.9
Shire Highlands	121,614	156,098	77.9	27,828	17,222	161.6	9,934	6,532	152.1
South Western	69,626	64,876	107.3	10,309	9,099	113.3	5,411	1,681	321.9
<b>Urban</b>	<b>910,703</b>	<b>920,824</b>	<b>98.9</b>	<b>192,229</b>	<b>136,989</b>	<b>140.3</b>	<b>73,782</b>	<b>80,134</b>	<b>92.1</b>
Blantyre	398,927	557,209	71.6	72,999	66,969	109.0	25,730	42,111	61.1
Lilongwe	275,370	155,641	176.9	81,955	19,918	411.5	31,059	3,865	803.6
Mzuzu	202,659	159,450	127.1	26,978	32,233	83.7	10,021	12,187	82.2
Zomba	33,747	48,524	69.5	10,297	8,935	115.2	6,972	5,918	117.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,545,009</b>	<b>1,662,879</b>	<b>92.9</b>	<b>320,176</b>	<b>236,075</b>	<b>135.6</b>	<b>147,104</b>	<b>133,566</b>	<b>110.1</b>

**Source:** Survey Results from 264 Schools

As with the discussion on textbooks, it is apparent that advances are being made in the delivery of teaching and learning materials to school, however issues of timeliness need to be considered. Students may benefit more from the programme, if these materials are delivered to the school before the start of the school year. **In this regard, the Coalition calls for financial allocations to Teaching and Learning materials to be made in the first quarter of the financial year to ensure that these can be in schools as students start the school year. To further facilitate this, the allocations should be made towards remote schools that may become inaccessible during the rainy season first. Subsequently, allocations to more central and urban-based schools should be made, as these may be more accessible throughout the year. In this regard, the**

**coalition also calls for an overhaul of the supplies unit to ensure that the materials get to the school in time.<sup>10</sup>**

Similar to previous comments made there is a discrepancy between urban and rural schools, though in this instance this is not as clear-cut. For instance, over 90 per cent of rural schools have received exercise books, whereas in urban schools one in four have not received. The differences between the two areas for number of schools receiving pens and pencils is minimal. It is also important to note that across these three major teaching and learning materials over one quarter of all deliveries have been received by the top ten recipient schools (27 per cent of exercise books, 25 per cent of pens and 28 per cent of pencils are received by only ten schools).

However for the information in the earlier tables to be truly meaningful, there is a need to show the amount distributed by child – this information is contained in Table 22, which shows that the apparent earlier bias in favour of rural schools in the receipt of exercise books is turned on its head. Children in urban schools receive, on average 5.7 exercise books a year, whereas their counterparts in rural areas receive only 4.6. Nationwide the average is 5.2 books per child – a slight decrease on the level recorded in last year's exercise when the amount received was six exercise books per child. There has however been an improvement in terms of the urban – rural imbalance between the two sets of data collection – last year we found that *"the main urban district surveyed received 10 books per pupil while one rural district received none and another four per pupil"*.

**Table 22: Quantities of various Teaching and Learning Materials received per Child enrolled in school, between July 2002 and December 2002**

	Exercise Books	Slates	Pens	Pencils	Chalk	Chalk Boards	Desks
<b>Rural</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.01</b>
Northern	5.3	0.00	1.06	0.86	0.08	0.00	0.04
Central Eastern	3.8	0.00	0.49	0.65	0.07	0.00	0.03
Central Western	3.3	0.00	0.51	0.42	0.03	0.00	0.00
South Eastern	4.8	0.01	1.12	0.38	0.03	0.00	0.01
Shire Highlands	4.9	0.00	1.14	0.40	0.09	0.00	0.00
South Western	9.3	0.00	1.21	0.72	0.07	0.00	0.00
<b>Urban</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>0.46</b>	<b>0.16</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.01</b>
Blantyre	6.2	0.00	1.04	0.40	0.10	0.00	0.00
Lilongwe	5.2	0.00	1.51	0.58	0.07	0.01	0.01
Mzuzu	6.6	0.01	1.04	0.32	0.48	0.00	0.00
Zomba	3.0	0.00	0.90	0.61	0.07	0.00	0.03
<b>Total</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>0.49</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.01</b>

Source: Survey Results from 264 Schools

In marked contrast to the delivery of textbooks, government is the predominant source for teaching and learning materials, accounting for 96 per cent of all exercise books, 94 per cent of all pens, 89 per cent of all pencils and 98 per cent of all chalk received. It is only in the supply of desks that government does not provide the majority – in this instance, it is only 30 per cent, which may be a reflection of the low levels of desks provided altogether.

This figure is wholly consistent with the proportions of teaching and learning materials received in the previous year – again almost all coming from government.

<sup>10</sup> Recent research by the Centre for Education Research and Training (CERT), one of the coalition members, has found that the Supplies Unit suffers from problems connected to logistics, levels of funding, capacity as well as lack of database for effective monitoring.

## Findings: Inspectorate

The inclusion of the inspectorate as a PPE is a new departure in the budget for 2002-3. A total amount of MK89,146,000 was allocated, and a target of three school visits per school was set. During the school survey, 119 schools were asked how many time a Primary Education Adviser (PEA) visited the school in the 12 months between July 2001 and June 2002 and the six months between July and December 2002.

### Targets – Inspectorate

The 2002-3 budget document (page 191) sets a target of three school visits per school per year.

In the 12 month period the schools visited, were visited on average 4.3 times a year, even though one third (32 per cent) were visited less than the recommended three times. In the first six months of the current financial year (July to December 2002), the average number of visits is already over three (3.3 per school). However, again there are a large number of schools (47 per cent) not having received the recommended three visits.

**Table 23: Number of Visits to the School by the PEA**

Number of Visits	Frequency (July 2001 - June 2002)	Frequency (July - December 2002)
0	2	4
1	16	15
2	15	20
3	17	14
4	13	9
5	7	9
6	8	5
7	7	3
8	11	1
9	9	2
23	0	1
Missing	14	36
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>119</b>

Source: Responses from 119 Schools

At the same time, schools were asked about the frequency with which they received written reports or feedback from the PEA. On average, the school receive an oral report or feedback 2.9 times between July 2001 and June 2002. In the same time, they received an average of 2.7 written reports or feedback. In the first six months of the current financial year (July – December 2002), each school that responded positively had received 3.6 oral feedback and 3.8 written feedbacks. However, as with so much in the whole area of education this manages to hide a great deal of diversity and inequity. For instance, 23 per cent of schools who responded positively received no written report or feedback between July and December 2003, a further 39 per cent of schools received only one, while one school is responsible for just under eight per cent of all written reports and feedbacks received so far this year. Similar figures are apparent for F/Yr 2001-2 when 44 per cent of schools received two or less written reports or feedback, and three schools accounted for 13 per cent (See Table 24 on the following page).

**As with the recommendations made elsewhere in this report, the Coalition calls on the government to ensure greater equity in the way that services within education are administered. This applies as much to supervisory visits of the PEA to each school as in the distribution of teaching and learning materials. It is recognised that there are times of the year when accessing certain schools may prove difficult, however the coalition does not see this as a reason to neglect and abandon these schools at these times, rather alternative means of ensuring they are adequately supervised are required.**

**Table 23: Incidence of Report and Feedback from the PEA**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Oral Report or Feedback (July 2001 - June 2002)</b>	<b>Oral Report or Feedback (July - December 2002)</b>	<b>Written Report or Feedback (July 2001 - June 2002)</b>	<b>Written Report or Feedback (July - December 2002)</b>
0	3	6	6	11
1	23	27	26	19
2	23	20	12	6
3	18	9	11	5
4	13	7	6	4
5	6	4	4	2
6	7	1	5	1
7	3	1	2	0
8	2	2	0	0
9	1	3	1	0
Missing / No definite answer given	20	39	46	71
<b>Total</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>119</b>

**Source:** Responses from 119 Schools

## Conclusions and Recommendations

A number of issues cut across the findings to emerge from the analysis contained in this report, and which require concerted government action and specific attention during the upcoming budget formulation. In particular these are

- (1) Efforts to address the issues of retention and progression between the various different grades, particularly the declining trends from standard 1 to 8, caused by poor quality of education. In particular, attention needs to be made to areas that can influence girls to stay in school when agreeing on future budgetary allocations. This includes ensuring that there are role models for them, particularly in rural areas, that toilet facilities are provided within the school blocks and that desks are available.
- (2) Concerted action to remove discrepancies in allocations between urban and rural areas, evident particularly in the progression rates, pupil teacher ratio, the number of qualified teachers, and the delivery of teaching and learning materials. Most importantly, efforts need to be made to address the disparity between rural and urban areas in the pupil teacher ratio. The fact that textbooks have been delivered in a more equitable manner between the two areas shows that this can be achieved.
- (3) The status of women teachers – this needs at least a two-pronged approach – firstly, more incentives for them to work in rural areas are needed, while at the same time greater promotion opportunities need to be provided. The situation where only one in four teachers in higher grades are women, as opposed to seven in ten in total is an area that needs rectification.
- (4) Teaching and learning materials, and textbooks must be delivered to schools in a timely manner – the situation that exists at present where a large proportion of schools are receiving these materials after the start of the school year should be avoided. In addition to delivering materials, schools need to be provided with a secure means of storing them.
- (5) Continued efforts to improve the level of training amongst untrained teachers, and increasing the number of teachers recruited. As the number of teachers to be trained is not being reached, explanations should be provided as to what is being done with the resources allocated towards Teacher Training. If it is not possible to train the 6,000 students a year as budgeted, this should be made apparent and either the structural constraints preventing this training or the unrealistic estimates should be addressed. However, the Coalition feels that it is imperative that these targets are met if any improvement in the quality of education delivered is to be met.



## Annex 1: Priority Poverty Expenditures as % of GDP

### Pro-Poor Current Expenditure (PPEs), 2000-01 – 2002-03 (% of GDP)

Ministry / Department	2000/1 Actual	2001/2 Apprvd Budget	2001/2 Revised Budget	2001/2 Annual Change	2002/3 Budget	2002/3 Annual Change
Education	2.2	3.0	2.6	0.4	3.1	0.5
Primary Education	1.8	2.1	2.3	0.5	2.5	0.2
<i>Of which: Teaching Materials</i>	0.1	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	-0.2
<i>Of which: Teacher's Salaries</i>	1.6	1.1	1.7	0.1	1.6	-0.1
Secondary Education	0.4	0.6	0.2	-0.2	0.2	0.1
Teacher's Training	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2
Teacher's Housing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1

Source: IMF (2002) "IMF - Malawi 2002: Article IV Consultation and Economic Program for 2002"  
IMF, Washington DC. Page 40.

## Annex 2: Questionnaire Used in Budget Monitoring Exercise

### E1. Education -- School Questionnaire

To be completed based upon discussions with Headmaster and senior staff/section heads. Stress that this questionnaire is confidential.

E1.1	Monitor's Name, Organisation														
E1.2	District														
E1.3	School														
E1.4	Number of pupils in your school	Std. 1	Std. 2	Std. 3	Std. 4	Std. 5	Std. 6	Std. 7	Std. 8						
E1.5	Total number of teachers in your school	PT4	PT3	PT2	PT1	P0/P8	Trained	Untrained	Undergoing training						
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

**Comments:**

.....

.....

.....

### Teaching and Learning Materials (TLMs)

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 TLMs.)

**E1.6.** Does your school have a stock book? Please tick appropriate box.

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

### Textbooks and Teachers' Guides

**E1.7.** How many of the following textbooks and teachers' guides have you received since July 2002? How many were from Government, and how many from donors?

	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies <sup>11</sup>		Social Studies <sup>12</sup>		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
<b>Govt or Donor?</b>												
<b>Std. 1</b>												
<b>Std. 2</b>												
<b>Std. 3</b>												
<b>Std. 4</b>												
<b>Std. 5</b>												
<b>Std. 6</b>												
<b>Std. 7</b>												
<b>Std. 8</b>												

**Comments:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

<sup>11</sup> Only for Standards 1 - 4  
<sup>12</sup> Only for Standards 5 - 8

**E1.8.** How many of the following textbooks and teachers' guides did you receive between July 2001 and June 2002? How many were from Government, and how many from donors?

	Maths		Chichewa		English		General Studies <sup>13</sup>		Social Studies <sup>14</sup>		Other Subjects	
	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor	Govt	Donor
<b>Govt or Donor?</b>												
<b>Std. 1</b>												
<b>Std. 2</b>												
<b>Std. 3</b>												
<b>Std. 4</b>												
<b>Std. 5</b>												
<b>Std. 6</b>												
<b>Std. 7</b>												
<b>Std. 8</b>												

**Comments:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

<sup>13</sup> Only for Standards 1 - 4  
<sup>14</sup> Only for Standards 5 - 8

**E1.9.** What is the number of the following textbooks and teachers' guides that you have in stock, as of today?

	<b>Maths</b>	<b>Chichewa</b>	<b>English</b>	<b>General Studies<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>Social Studies<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Other Subjects</b>
<b>Std. 1</b>						
<b>Std. 2</b>						
<b>Std. 3</b>						
<b>Std. 4</b>						
<b>Std. 5</b>						
<b>Std. 6</b>						
<b>Std. 7</b>						
<b>Std. 8</b>						

**Comments:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

---

<sup>15</sup> Only for Standards 1 - 4  
<sup>16</sup> Only for Standards 5 - 8

**E1.10.** How many other Teaching and Learning Materials have you received since July 2002? How many were from Government and how many from other donors?

Materials	Total Received since July 2001	Source	
		Government	Other Donor
Exercise Books			
Slates			
Pens			
Pencils			
Chalk			
Chalk Boards			
Desks			
Others (Please Specify)			

**Comments:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....



**E1.11.** How many other Teaching and Learning Materials did you receive between July 2001 and June 2002? How many were from Government and how many from other donors?

Materials	Total Received between July 2000 and June 2001	Source	
		Government	Other Donor
Exercise Books			
Slates			
Pens			
Pencils			
Chalk			
Chalk Boards			
Desks			
Others (Please Specify)			

**Comments:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**E1.12.** What is the number of other Teaching and Learning Materials that you have in stock todate?

<b>Materials</b>	<b>Number</b>
<b>Exercise Books</b>	
<b>Slates</b>	
<b>Pens</b>	
<b>Pencils</b>	
<b>Chalk</b>	
<b>Chalk Boards</b>	
<b>Desks</b>	
<b>Others (Please Specify)</b>	

**Comments:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

### ***Teacher Salaries***

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

For each grade of teacher (PO, P1, P2, P3, P4), 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 2002, and then for November 2001.

**E1.13.** What was the lowest gross salary before any deductions for the following grades at the end of July 2002?

Grade	Gross Salary including all allowances at end of November 2001				
	Basic	Professional Allowance	Housing	Other (Please state)	Total
<b>P8</b>					
<b>P0</b>					
<b>PT1</b>					
<b>PY2</b>					
<b>PT3</b>					
<b>PT4</b>					
<b>Temporary</b>					

**E1.14** What was the lowest gross salary before any deductions for the following grades at the end of November 2001?

Grade	Gross Salary including all allowances at end of November 2001				
	Basic	Professional Allowance	Housing	Other (Please state)	Total
<b>P8</b>					
<b>P0</b>					
<b>PT1</b>					
<b>PY2</b>					
<b>PT3</b>					
<b>PT4</b>					
<b>Temporary</b>					

**Comments:**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**E1.15** Does the training your teachers receive sufficiently prepare them for their professional duties?

Yes	No

**E1.16** If not, how could it be improved?

*Thank you very much for your assistance.*