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Executive summary

The Girls' Education South Sudan (GESS) programme aims a six-year programme aiming to transform the lives of a generation of South Sudanese children – especially girls – through education. GESS is an initiative of the Ministry of General Education and Instruction (MoGEI) of South Sudan, and is funded by the UK Government. One of the strategic objectives of the Ministry of General Education and Instruction (MoGEI) is to eliminate barriers to girls’ education and promote gender equality throughout the education system.

Knowledge, Evidence and Research component

The Knowledge, Evidence and Research (KER) component of the Girls’ Education South Sudan (GESS) programme aims to generate increased knowledge and evidence for policymakers of what works to promote girls’ education in South Sudan, about programmatic causality and impact, and to provide evidence about what may be applicable, scaleable and transferable to other contexts. KER seeks to develop an evidence base for the project interventions, linking inputs to outcomes and impacts, as well as gathering broader information about what works in girls’ education.

KER research is based on the following two overarching questions, which have been developed from the outcome of the programme:

1. Has there been a change in enrolment and retention for girls and boys P5-P8 and S1-S4, and which aspects of the programme contributed towards this?
2. Has there been a change in quality of education, as demonstrated by improved learning for P5-P8 and S1-S4? What changes in the learning and teaching environment have contributed to this?

The programme gathers data continuously through SSSAMS, twice yearly through LQS, yearly through school sample survey, and then has set piece Baseline (2014), Midline (2016), and Endline (2018) survey waves.

This report summarises the findings from the Midline School Survey. For the sake of comparability, the structure of the comparable survey remains very similar to that of the baseline. However, following the pilot study of the School Sample Survey in 2015, which asked questions specifically on accountability for, and impact of, Capitation Grants (CG) and Cash Transfers (CT), the decision was made to merge these two surveys in Midline and Endline years (the school sample survey will then occur on its own in 2017). As a result, questions on CG and CT impact and effectiveness, as well as use of daily attendance registers (DARs) are
also included in the midline. Further School Sample Surveys will be conducted annually.

**Structure**

This Midline report presents the combined findings of eight survey types, conducted with head teachers, teachers, primary students at P5 and P8 levels, secondary students at S2 level (the same levels covered by the learning assessment), and members of School Management Committees, as well as lesson observations and building facility observations. The report presents findings by School and Classroom Practice (Section 3.1), outlining classroom organisation, teaching methods, teacher qualifications, absenteeism, and commenting on the experiences within class and the broader school environment. Section 3.2 presents findings on the educational choices by households and girls and outlines some of the societal and physical barriers girls face in attending school. Section 3.3 presents findings on school management capacity and structures and addresses the roles and responsibilities of school bodies as well as touches upon local government interactions with schools. To the greatest extent possible, data has been disaggregated by gender so as to better measure the impact of the programme on girls, and boys.

**Methodology**

Fieldwork was conducted by Charlie Goldsmith Associates staff who began data collection on 27th June 2016 and concluded on 20th September 2016. In total, n=75 primary schools and n=18 secondary schools were surveyed. If a school could not be surveyed (e.g. because of insecurity, closure, or poor weather) it was been replaced at random with another school from the same stratum.

Events of 8th-11th July 2016 in Juba interrupted data collection already underway in (former) Warrap, Lakes, Upper Nile, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Central Equatoria, Eastern Equatoria, Western Equatoria and Jonglei.

CGA were able to move research teams back into action within a week and were able to visit schools, SMoGEIs, County Education Departments and Payam Education Offices across all 10 (former) States.

It was still possible to scale up the School Survey, including the School Sample Survey and conduct research in Greater Upper Nile and, despite continued insecurity in Unity and insecurity in new locations of Western Bahr el Ghazal, Eastern Equatoria and Central Equatoria, we were able to conduct research for the surveys from at least one County per (former) State.
The results of the School Survey were presented and discussed at the Education Transfers Monitoring Committee (ETMC) on 30/9/16.

Key findings

School and classroom practice

- Learners continue to report shortages of basic school equipment, with reading books (56%), chalk (49%) and computers (44%) the most frequently cited items.
- In a change from the baseline, lab equipment is cited by a majority of S2 students, indicating that learners’ expectations are higher than in 2014 (and potentially that some other shortages have been met, e.g. with Capitation Grants or Cash Transfers resources).
- Growth in the proportion of lessons observed which took place in a permanent classroom, and fall in proportion held in the open air. Potentially linked to Capitation Grant spending on building and maintaining permanent structures over the last three years.
- Teacher-student interactions are still dominated by ‘front-of-class’ time, although there is evidence that learners speak out more in class now than they did in 2014.
- Average reported number of classes taught per week has increased since the baseline, as well as an increase in the proportion of teachers reporting preparing lesson plans and schemes of work, suggesting potential growth in teacher productivity and capacity linked to GESS training.

Teaching

- Average number of teachers per school has increased since the baseline, potentially as a result of GESS Capitation Grant funding.
- Correlation between the areas in which head teachers feel overworked, and the areas in which they would like further training.
- Average reported qualification levels of primary and secondary school teachers have dipped since the baseline: a lower proportion of primary school teachers report having teacher training certificates and fewer secondary school teachers have Bachelor’s degrees than in 2015. Potentially linked to much-diminished effective value of teachers’ remuneration.
- Payment of salaries is sporadic and 17% of teachers report having been on strike in the past year due to lack of salaries.
- Teaching profession remains overwhelmingly male.

Examinations
• Girls’ reported PLE pass rate was higher than reported male pass rate in 2015,
• The number of girls sitting for the School Certificate Examination in 2015, as reported by Head Teachers, has increased from the figures recorded in the baseline, although overall pass rate has declined slightly since the baseline.

### Attendance

• Personal sickness remains the most common reason for missing school, especially for girls. Whilst the question did not specifically cover menstruation, findings from the Household Survey which asked specific follow up questions on this topic, found that menstruation was not commonly cited by girls as a reason for missing schools.
• Increased proportion of children, especially girls, citing insecurity as a reason for absence since the baseline, particularly from ‘new’ conflict areas such as (former) Western Bahr el Ghazal and Western Equatoria.
• Overall increase in proportion of schools with policies on pupil absences.
• High proportion of schools visited have daily attendance registers (DARS), of these a relatively high number are being used regularly. DAR usage appears relatively more common in secondary schools than primary.

### Quality education

• Head Teachers report that they would like more training in how to prepare a school development plan and budget.
• Evidence to suggest that the Mentor programme has not yet had a tangible impact.

### Attitudes and aspirations

• Attitudes towards girls’ education have progressed since the Baseline in 2014, with more teachers and Head Teachers disagreeing with the statement that boys are better suited to higher education than girls.
• State level disaggregation of teacher and Head Teacher responses indicates that parents in Lakes, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Upper Nile and Jonglei are perceived to assign relatively less value to sending girls to school, although this is gradually improving.
• Aspirations remain high, with 89% of learners aiming to reach S4 and 66.5% reporting ambitions to attend university.
• The cost of school fees remains the biggest perceived obstacle to reaching their desired grade, cited by 47% (n=258) of primary and secondary students, although evidence suggests that Cash Transfers are reducing the overall impact of school costs on girls.

### Capitation Grants
• According to Head teachers, Capitation Grants are having a significant impact in schools for improving the number of teachers and environment of instruction
• Capitation Grant money tends to be used for immediate needs of school, such as payment of volunteer teachers and maintenance of classrooms, in order to ensure continued functioning. This is at the expense of purchasing items that would have a more direct impact on quality education, such as maths and science kits or musical instruments
• Use of Capitation Grants to pay volunteer teachers was the most common usage in both 2014 and 2015
• Secondary schools more likely to spend Capitation Grant funds on textbooks and infrastructure items such as water points and latrines, whilst more primary schools spend Capitation Grants on volunteer teachers and classroom construction and maintenance.
• There is a good level of evidence of Capitation Grant use and accountability at schools for both 2014 and 2015, including showing observable evidence and proof of purchase

Cash Transfers

• Increase in the number of schools receiving Cash Transfers in 2015, compared with 2014, as reported by Head teachers
• In schools where girls did not receive Cash Transfers there appears to be a lack of understanding as to why
• Number of 2014 and 2015 Cash Transfer recipients found attending high in comparison to national enrolment and attrition rates – evidence of Cash Transfer impact
• Significantly lower number of Cash Transfer recipient girls were marked present on DAR than were actually present on the day of survey, indicating that DARS may not be being used correctly/fully
• The majority of girls report making decisions for themselves on Cash Transfer uses and are choosing education enabling items.
• Shoes, exercise books, stationary and soap are the most common uses of Cash Transfers reported by girls. Evidence that some girls are also using the money to purchase household items such as food.

Recommendations

• Corporal punishment is a barrier to education, that could be addressed, at no cost, by regulation: this should be a priority for development partners and MoGEI.
• Female students lack role models: targeted cash support and training to encourage women to enter and remain in the teaching profession to address gender imbalance among teaching staff.
• Personal sickness is listed by both learners and teaching staff as the most common reason for missing school days, colocation of health services at schools – whether at the basic level of ‘School Mothers’/Matrons, Community Health Workers/Boma Health Initiative, or full-scale colocation of Primary Health Care Units, and join-up of education and health administration at County level, is an obvious priority.

• Insecurity is a growing barrier to education, that is not primarily within the control of education actors: local authorities should be encouraged to provide ‘crossing patrols’ (if and only if they can be confident that police and other organised forces involved will do no harm) and more to protect children on the way to school; where schools still don’t have fences, they are an obvious, and cost-effective, measure.

• The practical effectiveness of Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers is proven: it would now be logical to take advantage of diminishing marginal costs to scale.

• Further research at Endline will provide information on the specific impact that the 2016 change in the proportion of Capitation Grant money which can be spent on teacher salaries has had on the number and attendance of teachers in school.

• Areas in which head teachers feel overworked directly linked to areas in which they would like further training. Future GESS training should logically focus on preparing a school development plan and budget, and reporting and administration – and this has already been actioned in trainings delivered in Q4 2016. It may also be helpful to explore ways to reduce the burden on head teachers in fulfilling these roles.

• The high proportion of schools reporting mentor or counsellor on site as a local initiative, by contrast with the low apparent impact of GESS mentoring, suggests a possible refocusing.

• Despite becoming more determined to complete Secondary School the longer they stay in school, there is evidence to suggest that girls become less sure that they are suited to education, in comparison to boys, at secondary level. Greater efforts should therefore be made with upper primary and secondary girls to instil confidence in their academic ability. ways to build it could include academic enrichment activities and recognition of achievements: summer schools, essay prizes, even as simple as commendations for good work to take home.

• Communications about cash transfer, particularly, but not only, payment, should be improved at programme level, and more and quicker feedback should be provided to individual schools.

• Further guidance and training on accountability and record-keeping would be helpful for school management structures, including correct storage, to ensure improvements continue and more consistent levels of accountability are achieved and maintained. GESS plans to distribute suitable plastic
document folders (which will also deal with the issue of more prominent branding for UK Aid).

- More support and training for County and Payam officials to enable regular school inspections and visits. If County an Payam officials are to supervise schools, they need to be paid a viable wage, and have operational funding to do so.

- Refresher training on DAR usage in schools [the last round of training on DARs was done with State Anchors in 2015]; GESS has programmed this for early 2017.

- Further study into the costs of education for families and individuals and reasons behind reports by Head Teachers of fewer girls sitting for PLE exams than boys.
1. Background

1.1 An update on the South Sudanese context since the Baseline Report

The wider context in which GESS operates has deteriorated since 2014, as the dynamics of the conflict which broke out in December 2013 have shifted and the economy has collapsed. Fighting was initially concentrated in the Greater Upper Nile region, but GRSS has since spread the conflict to previously relatively stable areas, in particular, from 2015, the Equatorias and Western Bahr el Ghazal, resulting in mass displacement both within South Sudan and into bordering countries and making it increasingly difficult for schools to function. The implementation of the Agreement on the Resolution of the Conflict in South Sudan (ARCISS), signed by both parties to the conflict in August 2015, has faced numerous obstacles, the most significant being the fighting that erupted in Juba in July 2016 which led to the expulsion of the SPLA-IO from the capital and the intensification of the conflict elsewhere. As at September 2016, the number of South Sudanese seeking refuge in neighbouring countries has surpassed 1 million - including more than 195,000 who have fled the country since the outbreak of violence in July - 1.6 million are internally displaced and more than 4.8 million people face food insecurity.

The deterioration in the security and humanitarian situation has taken place against a backdrop of economic collapse. The fall in oil production and decline in global oil prices has severely eroded the Government of South Sudan’s chief source of revenue; meanwhile inflation has accelerated, with the effective USD:SSP exchange rate increasing from 4.61 in September 2014 to 76 in September 2016. This has had a serious negative impact on education delivery as a whole, eroding the value of teachers’ salaries, who, unlike health workers, have mostly been on the Government payroll since 2005, and negatively affecting the ability of schools to execute their budgets as planned.

While the education sector has continued to operate, its ability to do has been hampered by the difficult security and economic context. As at September 2016, there were 3,551 schools open in South Sudan, with 1,318,415 pupils enrolled, taught by around 30,000 full-time teachers, according to data on www.sssams.org

---

1 UN OCHA Humanitarian bulletin, 22 September 2016: http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/SS_160922_OCHA_SouthSudan_humanitarian_bulletin14.pdf
(the real-time management information system developed as part of GESS). Given the current estimated population of >10m, the cohort of school-age children is of the order of 4million, meaning that South Sudan has one of the highest rates of school-age children out of school in the world. An introduction to the GESS programme

1.2 The Girls’ Education South Sudan (GESS) programme

The Girls’ Education South Sudan (GESS) programme seeks to transform the lives of a generation of children in South Sudan – especially girls – through education. GESS is an initiative of the Ministry of General Education and Instruction of South Sudan and funded by the UK Government. The Ministry of General Education and Instruction (MoGEI) leads the GESS programme, supported by implementing partners who provide technical advice. At State and County level the State Ministries of General Education and Instruction (SMoGEI) take the lead in programme implementation, supported by partner NGOs, or ‘GESS State Anchors’. Implementing partners include BMB Mott MacDonald (lead), BBC Media Action, Charlie Goldsmith Associates and Winrock International.

Girls’ Education South Sudan is a practical programme that implements activities that tackle financial, cultural and quality barriers to education for the girl child, while boys will also benefit from an improved learning environment.

The activities are structured along three main outputs:

1. Enhanced household and community awareness and empowerment for supporting girls’ education through radio programmes and community outreach.

2. Effective partnerships between GRSS and local organisations to deliver a community-based school improvement programme which will include:
   a. Cash Transfers to girls and their families;
   b. Capitation Grants to schools;
   c. provision of practical support to schools, teachers and education managers to improve the quality of education.

3. Increased knowledge and evidence of what works to promote girls’ education in South Sudan.
2. Purpose of Survey & Methodology

2.1 Overall GESS Research Objectives

The Knowledge, Evidence and Research (KER) sub-output of the GESS programme seeks to generate knowledge and evidence about education in South Sudan, and what works to get girls in school, staying in school, and learning in school. The research is focused on:

- Whether the programme is achieving expected outcomes
- How outcomes are being achieved
- Wider areas of interest about what’s happening in schools

The overall GESS research is based on the following two overarching questions, which have been developed from the outcome of the programme:

- Has there been a change in enrolment and retention for girls and boys P5-P8 and S1-S4, and which aspects of the programme contributed towards this?
- Has there been a change in quality of education, as demonstrated by improved learning for P5-P8 and S1-S4? What changes in the learning and teaching environment have contributed to this?

The overall objectives of the GESS project surveys are:

- To monitor changes currently occurring in schools, particularly changes related to the GESS project;
- To identify aspects of the GESS programme contributing towards changes in the enrolment rate among girls and boys P5-P8 and S1-S4;
- To identify aspects of the GESS programme that will contribute toward the future measurement of girls’ and boys’ retention rates between P5-P8 and S1-S4.

The overall KER component of GESS seeks to:

- Develop National and State capacity for research and use of evidence;
- Develop knowledge about the impact of project interventions;
- Develop broader information about what works in girls’ education;
- Incorporate process monitoring into learning about successes and failures in design and implementation, protect against doing harm and monitor value for money;
- Inform policymaking: budget priorities and targeted support.
- The programme outcomes are directly concerned with improvements in enrolment, retention, and learning. Alongside the school survey, three other areas of research were developed to enquire in more depth about relationships, activities, and processes linking programme interventions to the outcomes were
proposed. These are school and classroom practice, educational choices by households and girls, and management capacity and structures.

- Complementary to the school survey:
  - In-depth Household Surveys were conducted in June - September 2016, using a subset of schools selected for the School Survey to obtain a detailed picture of the sensitive and complex nature of household decisions on money, gender relationships and power structures, as well the experience of pupils and their households in and out of school. The Household Report provides contextual background that will help inform future changes in education patterns by providing details of household level decisions that affect enrolment and retention of girls in schools.
  - A Learning Assessment, designed to enquire in more depth about relationships, activities and processes linking programme interventions to the outcomes, was conducted in the same time frame. The assessment is a series of mathematics and English tests given to male and female pupils in P5, P8, and S2. The results of these tests, and how they compare to the original Baseline results, are presented in a separate report.
  - County and Payam Surveys were also conducted between June and September 2016 with the purpose of gathering information regarding the management structure and capacities of Education Offices and County Education Departments. All data has been compared with the findings from the 2014 Baseline in order to measure the theory of change.
3. Methodology

3.1 Sampling strategy

For consistency, and to allow like-for-like comparison with the Baseline findings, the Midline methodology continued to use the (former) ten State system for the purposes of sampling, to achieve practical national coverage.

The sampling frame was based on the list of schools previously identified during the Baseline school survey. The list included all schools registered in the South Sudan School Attendance Monitoring System (SSSAMS), set up as part of the GESS project, excluding those owned by private individuals. The sample was based on a random, stratified sample, where clusters included all students within the relevant classes of selected schools. The stratification variables were ‘state’ and ‘highest grade’ (for primary only; up to P5, P7, and P8). Where possible, the Midline surveys revisited the same schools used during the baseline, with replacements made from the sample where schools were reported to be non-operational.

In addition to the list of schools identified during the baseline, which focused on seven (former) states, an additional sample was drawn up for Greater Upper Nile, to be included in the midline. The total number of schools to be surveyed was 250. However, the outbreak of conflict in Juba in July 2016, and the subsequent unrest in other parts of the country had two implications; firstly, temporary pull back (one week) of enumerators and disruption of logistics, and secondly, more seriously, school closures, particularly in Central Equatoria and Western Bahr el Ghazal. The available amount of time for data collection was reduced. Ongoing insecurity in many parts of the country limited the extent to which enumerators could travel to schools. As a result, the sample size was reduced to 100 schools.

In total n=75 primary schools and n=18 secondary schools were sampled: this is closer to the actual proportions of primary schools to secondary, but undershoots the over-representation of secondary schools, on a 60:40, sought in the overall GESS strategy.
It was important that the sample be robust to the non-availability of schools. If a school could not be surveyed (e.g. because of insecurity, closure, or poor weather) during this survey it was replaced at random with another school from the same stratum.

### TABLE 1 LIST OF ALL SCHOOLS VISITED AS PART OF THE MIDLINE SCHOOL SURVEY (N=93)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Pri/Sec</th>
<th>SSSAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atla Bara East Basic School</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>TLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlabara West</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>AWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buluk Model</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>BUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba Commercial Secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>JCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba Diocesan Model</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>JMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba Girl Secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>JGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabu Basic School</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>KAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajaf West B</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>RWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock City Nursery and Primary School</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>RCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usratuna Primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>WLU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukudum Progressive Secondary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Garang Secondary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>DRZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotome Primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>BYS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Lamb</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>ACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopua Memorial Secondary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>LPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakwathom Heritage Academy</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>NHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agor Bar Mixed Primary School</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>MMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doronj Secondary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>DSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongor Primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>KON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makol Cuei Boys Primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>MKN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakour Primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>PKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panyagor Primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>LBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acigor Girl's Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>AGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adirdir Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>DRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akoljal Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>KJL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botoy Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>BTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gol Meen Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>GLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loreto Maker Kuei Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>LRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamer Boys Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>MME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mingkaman Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>MSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyang Secondary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>ZZI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacong Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>PCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragau Boy's Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>PAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panekar Girl's Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>PNV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roordit Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>ROC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumbek National Secondary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>RTN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayou Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>TYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thon Achaak Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>TAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiit marier Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>TMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom-rok Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>TMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yirol Girl's Primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>YRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loreto Secondary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>LIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amar Jal</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>MAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apei Goi Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>PEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariathdit Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>RTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awoda Upper Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>AWO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dok Kul Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>DKK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majak Muocdit Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>MJM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majok Yinh Thiou</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>MYT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malith Buol Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>MBZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maper East Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>MST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyoc-Anoon Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>WKJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bakhita Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>WYJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>STY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Aheer Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>WRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warawar Primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>WWP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bander Girl’s Primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>BGB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jok Yusuf Ngor</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>JYN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najkur Chol Primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>NCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazer Lul Deng Kak Primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renk Girl's Secondary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasmala Basic</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banjalle Primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangji Primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panyang Primary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panyang Secondary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael's Primary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parieng Secondary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yida Primary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achet Primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buserre Primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gieric B Basic</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Family Basic</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Paul Secondary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Faith based</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokoloko Basic</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazereth Secondary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngisa Basic</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngolhalima Primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangasi Academy</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karika Primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renzi Primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tambura Primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tii-Ndoka Primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yabong Evening Secondary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yambio Primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammy Robbin 2</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angui Primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuajok National Secondary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majakaher Primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangar Primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngap Athian Primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panliet Primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Quantitative Surveys

Enumerators aimed to conduct quantitative surveys with Head Teachers, Teachers, members of Senior Management Committees, and students, including girls who had received cash transfers, in each school surveyed.

The head teacher from each school was surveyed in order to capture information on the following points:

- Data on pupil enrolment and attendance, school opening;
- Information teacher background, recruitment and attendance;
- Number of teachers and pupil:teacher ratio;
- Financial and administrative management systems;
- Teaching and learning material availability and use;
- Challenges in providing quality education;
- School improvement planning, budgeting and experience of Capitation Grant (received, spent etc.);
- Knowledge and experience of the GESS programme interventions at school level;
- Perceived barriers to pupil (especially girls’) retention; knowledge, expectations or experiences of pupils receiving cash transfers;
- Systems in place for reporting violence or abuse, levels to which reporting is taking place; and
- Gender sensitive protocols, anti-discrimination procedures and teacher codes of conduct.

One member of a Senior Management Committee (SMC) per school was to be surveyed to capture information on:

- PTA structure and systems – membership, history, meetings, roles and responsibilities, rotation;
- Knowledge of financial and administrative management systems in the school;
- Teaching and learning material availability and use;
- School improvement planning, budgeting and experience of Capitation Grant (received, spent etc.);
- Knowledge and experience of the GESS programme interventions at school level;
- Perceived barriers to pupil (especially girls’) retention; knowledge, expectations or experiences of pupils receiving cash transfers;
- Systems in place for reporting violence or abuse, levels to which reporting is taking place; and
- Gender sensitive protocols and teacher codes of conduct.

Two to three teachers for grades P5, P8, and S2 were to be surveyed per school, in order to ascertain the following points:

- Teacher qualifications and experience;
- Challenges for teachers; need to supplement income;
- Perceived challenges for pupils;
- Teacher: pupil ratio; class size;
- Textbook availability and use;
- Curriculum – understanding and use;
- Levels of support received: appraisal systems, grievance procedures;
- Attitudes towards girls’ and boys’ capacity to learn, attitudes towards diverse communities; and
Attitudes towards or awareness of violence in schools, reporting procedures and codes of conduct.

Six learners (three male and three female) each for grades P5, P8, and S2 were to be surveyed for triangulation purposes, in order to provide a level of accountability and verification of teacher activities and in particular to capture data on:

- Teacher time in the classroom;
- Textbook and other material availability and use;
- Awareness of school based violence, consequences, reporting mechanisms (corporal punishment, gender-based violence, etc.);
- Attitudes towards girls’ and boys’ capacity to learn;
- Challenges to attendance and learning for girls and boys;
- Perceived value of education – opportunities beyond school for girls and boys; and
- Distance to school and mode of travel.

Up to 8 Cash Transfer recipients, one from each grade who had received CTs in 2014, 2015 or both years. An additional girl in S1 was interviewed to explore the impact that CTs have had on the transition from Primary to Secondary school. These interviews captured data on:

- Spending preferences of CT recipients, including whether these change over time
- Whether girls are receiving the correct amount of cash transfer
- Whether girls who received CTs are still attending school regularly

A Building Facilities Observation was supposed to be carried in each school in order to allow comparison of changes to schools’ physical facilities over the period of the programme. These took record of the following aspects of infrastructure and facilities:

- Toilets
- Water Sources
- Classrooms
- Laboratories
- Library
- Playground/Sports fields
- Staff room
- Administrator’s Office
- Head Teacher’s Office

The final aspect of data collection was a Lesson Observation, during which enumerators monitored a lesson over a period of 32 minutes (or however long the class lasted, if shorter) to assess classroom activities and pupil-teacher interaction. Every four minutes, the enumerator recorded information on classroom activities, student behaviour, and student/teacher communication in the classroom. The behaviours to be recorded were selected by education quality experts to capture classroom organisation, learner and teacher communication, pedagogic activities or teachers, and the learning activities of pupils.
3.3 Limitations

The outbreak of conflict in Juba in early July 2016 had significant ramifications for the degree of enumerator access to schools in rural locations, as well as limiting the overall number of schools that enumerators were able to visit. Following the July violence, the decision was made to base data collection out of the (former) State capitals, and several other key locations such as Maban and Renk (as teams were unable to reach Malakal, the State capital of (former) Upper Nile). As a result, the number of accessible schools was limited.

Additionally, some areas of the country were more accessible than others, for example Lakes State was relatively more accessible, which resulted in an uneven spread of the number of schools per location. Given that the logistical circumstances had already limited the sample size, the KER team made the decision to include all schools surveyed, despite not having similar numbers of schools per state. All findings have therefore been presented as percentages so as not to skew the results.

The smaller sample size, particularly in states such as (former) Unity (5 schools), Eastern Equatoria (6 schools) and Jonglei (6 schools), reduces the accuracy and representativeness of findings. To mitigate against this results were compared across the (former) states to verify any conclusions made on national trends.

Finally, a general note of caution should be provided when interpreting responses from teachers and pupils. As questions were asked relating to the effectiveness and efficiency of teachers work and relating to knowledge of and adherence to their duties, as well as pupil and teacher attendance and opinions on school, it is possible that some respondents were inclined to give responses that showed themselves in the best light, at the expense of accuracy. Pupils in particular may have provided the answers that they most thought enumerators wanted, therefore giving a more positive picture than reality. This has been accounted for in analysis but is an important consideration to bear in mind.
4. School and classroom practice

4.1 Text books and school materials

There are still shortages of basic classroom equipment and furniture, including chalk, tables and chairs.

Similarly, to the Baseline findings, head teachers, teachers and learners all identified chalk (for writing on chalkboards) as the most required material in schools. 51% (n=42) of head teachers, 59% (n=72) of teachers and 47% (n=270) of learners said that their school was short of chalk. Computers were the second most reported needed item, as identified by 43% (n=36) of head teachers and 48% (n=58) of teachers.

However, in comparison to the baseline, which identified sports equipment as the third most needed item in schools, data from 2016 indicates that text books are now more in demand. Text book shortages appear to be a particular issue in the Greater Bahr el Ghazal with 100% of head teachers in Warrap identifying this as the most needed item. This may reflect the time elapsed from the DFID-funded distribution of 9 million textbooks earlier in the decade.

FIGURE 1 PERCENTAGE OF HEAD TEACHERS WHO IDENTIFY CHALK, COMPUTERS AND TEXT BOOKS AS MOST NEEDED ITEMS

When disaggregating reported school needs by grade, as displayed in the below graph, the same general trends emerge; chalk, computers and text books all score highly across P5, P8 and S2. Additionally, reading books were identified as a priority, particularly amongst younger children. In a change from the baseline, lab equipment is cited by a majority of S2 students, indicating that learners’ expectations are higher than in 2014 (and potentially that some other shortages have been met, e.g. with Capitation Gants or Cash Transfers resources).
Chairs, desks and chalkboards remain the items of furniture most in demand. 100% (n=83) of head teachers in Eastern Equatoria, Western Equatoria, Jonglei, and Upper Nile chose desks as one of the three most needed items in school, and the same number reported chairs, in Western Equatoria, Western Bahr el Ghazal, Warrap and Upper Nile.

Average number of pupils sharing one text book has increased at upper primary and secondary levels.

The issue of text book shortages is corroborated by data from head teachers who identified that an average of 2.9 learners share one textbook in lower primary, 3.3 in upper primary and 3.7 in secondary. Furthermore, an average of 49% of
secondary schools surveyed reported having no text books at all, as opposed to 16% of primary schools.

The average number of pupils per textbook are notably higher than those in the Baseline and interestingly appear to show a reversed trend; whereas the Baseline findings identified that levels of sharing were higher among lower grades, data from 2016 indicates the opposite. There was an average of 2.4 pupils per text book at secondary level in 2014, in 2016 this number has jumped to 3.7. The introduction of the South Sudanese national curriculum, which was launched first at primary level, but without associated teaching and learning materials being funded, may account for this shortage. Still more materially, a large number of text books were distributed with funding from UK Aid in 2013-14, an exercise that has not been repeated since. While those books were meant to remain with schools, in practice, attrition, and the time elapsed, and the significant increase in enrolment between 2014 and 2016, are likely to have resulted in fewer textbooks per pupil.
Growth in the proportion of lessons observed which took place in a permanent classroom, and fall in proportion held in the open air. Potentially linked to Capitation Grant spending on building and maintaining permanent structures over the last three years.

74% (n=69) of lessons observed took place in permanent classrooms, this is an increase from the 54% (n=123) found in the baseline. Additionally, the proportion of open air classrooms observed seems to have reduced from 18% (n=40) in the baseline, to 1% (n=1) in the midline. This is despite the widening of the sample to include GUN States.

The increased number of lessons taking place in permanent classrooms is evident in all [former) states of South Sudan, most notably in Eastern Equatoria where the proportion of lessons observed in permanent structures increased from 31% in 2014 to 100% in 2016.

Clearly, there may have been a selection effect arising from the constrained sample in the midline.
This could be linked to the two years of Capitation Grant payments to schools. 11% (n=37) of teachers surveyed reported that they had spent part of their 2014 and/or 2016 Capitation Grant on maintaining and improving classrooms, and a further 2% (n=6) reported using the money to build permanent classrooms.

4.2 Curricula and language

The average claimed number of lessons in the school day is 8 (primary=7, secondary=10), as reported by head teachers, and the average length of lesson is 40 minutes, which remains in-line with MoGEI standards.

The majority of schools now report using the South Sudanese curriculum, although a small percentage still use the Kenyan. Significant reduction in the proportion of secondary schools using the Sudanese curriculum.

96% (n=55) of primary school head teachers, and 85% (n=11) of secondary school head teachers surveyed reported that they primarily use the South Sudanese curriculum whilst 4% of all schools surveyed said they use a mixture of the South Sudanese and the Kenyan curriculum, particularly for upper classes. The proportion of schools using the South Sudanese curriculum is consistently high across 9 or the 10 (former) states: 100% of teachers and head teachers in Central Equatoria, Jonglei, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Upper Nile and Warrap said that they use the South Sudanese curriculum, whilst 96% (n=44) of teachers and head teachers in Lakes, 94% (n=15) in Western Bahr el Ghazal, 93% (n=14) in Western Equatoria and 91% (n=10) said the same. The exception appears to be in Unity, where only 57% (n=4) of teachers and head teachers said that they were using the South Sudanese curriculum. However, the small sample size in Unity means that these results may not be as reliable as in other states.
0% of secondary school head teachers surveyed in the Midline reported using the Sudanese curriculum, a notable decrease from the 30% who reported the same in the baseline.

**Language of instruction overwhelmingly reported to be English**

Head teachers reported that English was the dominant language of instruction, particularly at upper primary and secondary level. 96% (n=47) of head teachers said that upper primary classes were taught in English, and 92% (n=12) said the same of secondary classes. Lower primary classes are more commonly taught in mother tongue: 71% (n=32) of head teachers reported that this was the case, whilst a further 27% (n=12) said that lower primary classes were taught in English. Similarly, to the baseline, Arabic is not reported to be prevalent at primary or secondary level; 95% of teachers surveyed in 2014 reported using English as the language of instruction and 98% (n=117) of teachers reported the same in 2016. Our suspicion is that there may be some over-reporting of use of English.

Head teachers reported that 51% (n=597) of all their teachers are able to teach in English. However, data collected in lesson observations indicated that 95% (n=90) of all lessons observed were taught in English, suggesting that either the language skills of English and Maths teachers are considerably higher than the average, or that there is a disconnect between head teachers’ opinions of teachers, and teachers’ actual capabilities – or that there is a disconnect between the various reports.

**FIGURE 8 LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION DURING LESSON OBSERVATIONS**

Teacher-student interactions are still dominated by ‘front-of-class’ time, although there is evidence that learners speak out more in class now than they did in 2014.

Textbooks are the most commonly used material in the classroom throughout the duration of the lesson – on average 57% of the time – although approximately one
fifth (21%) of the time teachers were observed to use improvised materials. This draws attention to the relative lack and narrow range of teaching resources available in schools.

In the lesson observations conducted for this survey, the vast majority of the time learners were observed to be listening to the teacher talk (39% of the time), or copying from the blackboard (37% of the time). Interactive activities such as singing or playing games, group presentations and group discussions were observed less than 10% of the time. There did not appear to be much variation in these activities as the lesson progressed.

FIGURE 9 KINDS OF ACTIVITY THAT LEARNERS WERE DOING DURING LESSONS (OVERALL)
However, a closer look at how learners were speaking reveals that there are relatively high levels of student-teacher interaction, particularly at the beginning of the lesson. This implies that although teacher activity remains largely confined to the front of the class (for example talking at the blackboard), learners do actively engage in the lesson by asking questions. This differs from the findings of the baseline, which indicated that students were silent 87% of the time during lessons, suggesting that lessons may gradually be becoming more interactive.
4.3 Reported Exam pass rates

Girls equal to boys in reported Primary Leaving Exam pass rate, but girls’ reported pass rate at Secondary Certificate much lower than boys’

As the above table demonstrates, the reported pass rate for Primary Leaving Examination (PLE) was almost identical for boys and girls. However, the overall reported pass rate appears to have declined from the figures provided in the Baseline [which related to the 2012 PLE and SCE results, as reported by head teachers]. In 2012 boys were reported to have a PLE pass rate of 95%, whilst in 2015 head teachers report a 79% pass rate. Unfortunately, the corresponding data
for girls was too inaccurate to be useful in the baseline, so we are unable to compare the figures with the reported 2015 pass rate.

Reported Secondary School Certificate Examinations (SCE) pass rates for both girls and boys remain largely consistent with those of the baseline; the pass rate in 2015 for girls was 31%, as opposed to 32% in 2012, and the rate for boys was 69% in 2015, a drop of 3% points from the 2012 figures, as reported by head teachers.

**FIGURE 13 PROPORTION OF PUPILS REPORTED TO HAVE PASSED THE PLE EXAM, DISAGGREGATED BY STATE AND GENDER**

More systematic analysis of exams data is currently being done alongside the KER component.

### 4.4 Absenteeism

**Increase in the number of pupils reporting that they have not missed any days of school in the past year.**

There has been a notable increase since the Baseline in the number of learners who report no absences for the past year. The below table indicates that the proportion of pupils who claimed they had not missed a day of school has increased across every state. Furthermore, there is very little reported difference between the proportion of girls (43%, n=118) and boys (44%, n=268) who claim this. Given that we would expect to find a higher proportion of girls reporting absences than boys, based on national attendance figures, this paints a surprisingly positive picture of attendance by gender.

As these figures are self-reported they are likely to show a more positive picture of school attendance than there is.
Sickness (own and, separately reported, of family) is the most common reported reason for missing school, for girls and boys. Increased proportion of children citing insecurity as a reason for absence since the baseline, particularly from ‘new’ conflict areas such as WBG and WES.

While more girls cited childcare as a reason for absence than boys (16%, n=45 compared to 7%, n=19), slightly more boys (13%, n=35) reported missing school because they were required to perform domestic tasks than girls (12%, n=34). Evidence from the Household Survey suggests similar findings, but adds further nuance by distinguishing between agricultural and domestic tasks. These figures remain similar to those in the baseline.
The proportion of both primary and secondary learners who report having missed at least one day of school in the last year because of insecurity has risen dramatically since the baseline. In 2016, 45% of secondary male learners and 30% of secondary female learners reported that they had missed at least one day of school due to insecurity over the last year, compared to 0.9% of secondary male and 0% of secondary female learners who reported doing so in 2014. At primary level, 28% of boys and 25% of girls report missing school due to insecurity in 2016, compared to 1.9% of boys and 1.6% of girls in 2014. The inclusion of schools in Greater Upper Nile in the Midline will have had an impact on the significant difference in these figures. However, of the students that had missed school in the past year due to insecurity, the highest proportions were found in Western Equatoria (80%) and Western Bahr el Ghazal (45%), which reflects the upsurge in violence in those areas.

There were no obviously significant differences in the reason for absence between year groups.

As with learners, the most common cause of teacher absence was reported to be personal ill-health or the ill-health or death of a relative, followed by insecurity.
Although 18% (n=21) of teachers surveyed said that they had been on strike in the last year due to lack of payment, and 20% (n=17) of head teachers said that some teachers were on strike on the day of the survey, the data above indicates that no teachers reported that they had been absent because of unpaid salaries. This discrepancy may be a result of the phrasing of the question; when talking directly about reasons for absence, teachers may have been less willing to admit that they had missed school because of unpaid salaries/other remuneration.

Head teachers reported an average of 12.1 days and teachers reported an average of 6 days missed in the 2015 school year. Similar to findings for reasons learners missed school, sickness (both personal and sickness of a relative) remains the most common reason for teaching staff absence. Whilst insecurity was cited as the third most common reason, the proportions were relatively low and predominantly from teaching staff in (former) Lakes, Jonglei and Upper Nile. It should be remembered when considering these findings that the question asked was referring to absences in the previous school year (2015) and it could reasonably be expected that the number of absences due to insecurity would have increased in line with upsurges in violence as a result of events in Juba in July 2016 when the data was being collected.
Overall increase in proportion of schools with policies on pupil absences

57% (n=47) of schools reported that they had a policy on pupil absences, which is an increase of 11% since the baseline. Although the proportion of schools reporting having this policy has increased in most states, the figures have reduced in (former) Lakes and Western Equatoria. No data was recorded for Unity.

**FIGURE 18 PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS WITH A PUPIL ABSENCE POLICY, AS REPORTED BY HEAD TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EES</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WES</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Discipline and punishment

Clearing compound and slashing grass are most common forms of punishment, although half of learners also report that beating was used as a punishment in 2015.
There has been very little change in the forms of punishment reportedly used in schools since the baseline; physical punishments, including beating, kneeling, clearing the school compound and other physical work, remain the most common forms of discipline. As in the Baseline physical punishment seems more common in primary schools than secondary schools, as the below table demonstrates.

Generally, both genders reported to be punished equally, although some respondents report that boys are more likely to be punished than girls.
All schools report that they would take some form of action if a teacher had an inappropriate relationship with a student, with the suggested consequences for accused teachers relatively supportive of students.

41% (n=33) of head teachers went on to say that the teacher in this scenario would be banned from all schools, whilst the second most common response was to
suspend the teacher for a period of time before allowing them to return to the same school. Although the severity of proposed punishment varied considerably, with 15% (n=12) of head teachers saying that the teacher would be dismissed from their current school, and 13% (n=10) saying that the teacher would only be given a warning, only one head teacher said that there would be no consequences for the teacher. This suggests that most schools have some form of system, albeit informal, in place for dealing with situations of abuse.

Only a small number of head teachers said that they would take no action on behalf of the learner in this scenario (9%, n=7). A larger number said that the learner would continue at school as normal (17%, n=13). The majority of head teachers recognised the need to address the situation directly with 38% (n=29) saying that the learner would continue at school but would receive extra support. However just under a third (34%, n=26) reported that the learner in this scenario would be made to leave the school, suggesting that understanding of the need for child protection mechanisms remains limited. There was no significant variation in responses between head teachers, teachers and members of school governing bodies, or across states.

Of the 93 schools visited, only 6% (n=6) reported that this situation had occurred at their school in the past; one in (former) Eastern Equatoria, Central Equatoria, Warrap and Western Bahr el Ghazal, and two in Upper Nile (according to teachers and head teachers).

### 4.6 Teacher workload

Average number of teachers per school has increased since the baseline, potentially as a result of GESS Capitation Grant funding

Despite the reduction in the effective value of government teacher wages, from around $60 per month in 2014 to barely $3 per month in 2016, and long delays in payment, if it occurs at all in 2016, which is addressed in more depth elsewhere in this report, head teachers report that the average number of teachers, both permanent and volunteer, per school has increased since 2014. The exception to this is the average number of female volunteer teachers, which has marginally decreased. The lack of government-funded teacher salary payment in 2015 and 2016, and the high proportion of schools reportedly using their Capitation Grant to pay teachers in 2014 and 2015, suggests that the school Capitation Grants are play a role in sustaining, and even increasing, the number of teachers per school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent Male</th>
<th>Permanent Female</th>
<th>Volunteer Male</th>
<th>Volunteer female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to issues with teacher salaries, the rules for Capitation Grant spending changed in 2016. Schools are now permitted to use up to 60% of the grant on teacher payment, and to pay incentives to both volunteer teachers and government-salaried teachers; prior to this they were only able to commit 20%, and were not allowed to pay incentives to government-salaried teachers.

The change in reported numbers of teachers is striking given the relatively low level of the incentive provided by school capitation grants: 200 SSP per month (c.$3) in 2016. This suggests the significant difference could be that school Capitation Grants from GESS flow direct to schools, by contrast with government teacher salaries.

It would be helpful to carry out additional research on the impact that this shift has had on the number of teachers per school, as well as on teacher’s attendance at school, and a follow-up ‘drill-down’ study is planned in early 2017.

Average reported number of classes taught per week has increased since the baseline

Teachers report a higher average number of classes taught per week in 2016 than in 2014. This increase is striking given i) that the average number of teachers per school has increased since 2014 and ii) the problems of teachers’ remuneration described above.

The rise in the number of reported classes taught per week suggests that more teachers are teaching more classes per week. It is possible that this is a result of growth in overall school enrolment figures (recorded on www.sssams.org), which have meant bigger class sizes, as well as multiple classes per grade (see section 4.1). This may also be linked to a rise in teacher productivity and capacity, potentially as a result of the training and support provided from GESS over the last three years.
Increase in proportion of teachers preparing lesson plans and schemes of work

65% (n=78) of teachers surveyed said that they had prepared lesson plans for all the lessons in the previous week, which is an increase of 15% from the Baseline findings.

Of the teachers who reported having prepared lesson plans for only some (20%, n=24) or none (13%, n=16) of their lessons in the previous week, 35% (n=14) said that it was due to a lack of appropriate teaching resources and 30% (n=12) said it was due to a lack of adequate time to prepare.

There has also been an increase in the proportion of teachers who reported preparing a scheme of work. In the baseline, 56% (n=162) of teachers reporting...
having prepared a scheme of work for the whole term, whilst the findings from the Midline indicate that 67% (n=80) had done so. The increase in teachers self-reporting preparing lesson plans and schemes of work may in part be due to the GESS training and support provided over the past three years. For example, of the teachers who reported that they had received GESS training in 2015 and 2016, 43% (n=52) said that they were trained on how to prepare a scheme of work.

Clearly, we need to take into account the inherent bias of self-reported data; as teachers were commenting on their own behaviour it is likely that they will have painted a relatively positive picture.

Marginal decline between 2015 and 2016 in number of teachers reporting that they have received help to improve their teaching

Overall an average of 31% teachers reported that they had received some form of support to improve their teaching in 2016, which is marginally less than the support reported received in 2015 (36%). Lesson observations by head teachers and Payam Education Supervisors were the most common forms of support teachers received. Annual and termly appraisals were much less common, suggesting that reviews of teacher performance are done more on an ad hoc basis, rather than as a formalised process.

FIGURE 25 PROPORTION OF TEACHERS WHO REPORTED RECEIVING HELP TO IMPROVE THEIR TEACHING IN 2015 AND 2016

Correlation between the areas in which head teachers feel overworked, and the areas in which they would like further training

Preparing a school development plan and budget was the top area in which head teachers reporting feeling overworked, as well as the area in which they would like further training. As preparation of an SDP and budget are requirements for
schools applying to receive Capitation Grants we can say with some confidence that this is as a direct result of the GESS programme. This tells us firstly that the programme is having a positive effect, in the sense that head teachers are clearly taking time to engage with the Capitation Grant application process, and that GESS may need to look at strengthening the training provided at school level on SDP and budget development.

FIGURE 26 TOP FIVE AREAS IN WHICH HEAD TEACHERS FEEL OVERWORKED, AND AREAS IN WHICH THEY WOULD LIKE FURTHER TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Overworked</th>
<th>Further training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing SDP and budget</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and administration</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of teaching and learning</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher management</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of school activities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Teacher qualifications and training

As in the baseline, head teachers generally hold higher qualifications than class teachers, although by a relatively narrow margin.
Although the male: female teacher ratio remains low (91% n=109 teachers surveyed were male, 9% n=9 women), female teachers appear to generally hold higher qualifications than male.

Whilst over half of male teachers (52%, n=59) report secondary certificate as their higher qualification, only 11% (n=12) reported themselves to have a BA in education. In comparison 36% (n=4) of women reported to have a BA in education and a further 9% (n=1) said they had an MA – clearly, a relatively small sample Findings from the Baseline study (9% of male teachers and 12% of female teachers held a BA) suggest that this is an ongoing trend, perhaps indicative of the difficulties that lower qualified women have in becoming teachers, as opposed to men.

The number of teachers with teacher training certificate (at primary level) and bachelor’s degree (at secondary level) has reduced since the baseline.

There appears to be a downward trend in the reported highest qualifications held by teachers at both primary and secondary level. The below chart demonstrates a decrease in the proportion of primary school teachers reporting holding a bachelor’s degree or teacher training college certificate. There has been a 5% increase in teachers who hold a BA, as well as a decrease in the number with primary school certificates: logically, the majority of teachers now have a secondary certificate as their highest qualification.

Similarly, there has been a drop in the percentage of secondary school teachers who reporting holding a bachelor’s degree from 57% in 2014, to 30% in 2016. Meanwhile the proportion of teachers reporting holding a teacher training certificate and a secondary certificate have increased from 1%-20% and 7%-20% respectively.
The reduced reported level of teachers’ qualifications is likely to be linked to the rise in volunteer teachers as a result of high numbers of salaried staff, who may have tended to have higher qualifications, leaving schools due to absent or late salary payment. The below graph indicates that 66% (n=27) of volunteer teachers surveyed had a secondary school certificate as their highest qualification, whilst only 7% (n=3) reported that they held a bachelor or master’s degree. In comparison 38% (n=18) of all senior teachers surveyed had a secondary certificate and 29% (n=14) had a BA or MA.
The downwards trend in qualified teachers identified here is corroborated by evidence from the Household Survey, in which guardians report a drop in the number of qualified teachers at their children’s school.

Decline in number of teachers who have received training since Baseline

FIGURE 30 PROPORTION OF TEACHERS WHO REPORT RECEIVING TRAINING IN 2013, 2015 AND 2016
The three most common topics of GESS training reported by head teachers were lesson observation (n=22), management of school activities (n=31), and School Development Plan and Budget (n=33). 55% of Head Teachers surveyed said they received GESS training in 2015, and 32% received in 2016. The drop in the number of trainings reported may be for two reasons; firstly, because a significant number of training sessions on budget development and developing a school development plan were done towards the beginning of the project (when schools were first submitting applications for Capitation Grants). Although refresher training has taken place since then, it is on a smaller scale – since the processes they related to have stayed relatively constant. Data collection was done halfway through the school year in 2016: the number of GESS trainings is likely to be higher by the end of the year.
The three most commonly requested areas for further training were resource management, reporting and administration, and preparing the SDP and budget.

### 4.8 Gender sensitive school environment

**Evidence to suggest that teachers treat boys and girls equally in the classroom**

![Figure 33 Responses to the statement 'Teachers at this school treat boys and girls the same'

77% of lesson observations found that teachers spoke to boys and girls equally, with only 12% observing that teachers spoke to boys more than girls, and 9% observing teachers spoke to girls more than boys.

**Figure 34 Who is the teacher talking to, as identified in lesson observations**

- Boys more than girls
- Girls more than boys
- Boys and girls equally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head teacher</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Learners</th>
<th>SMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As in the baseline, 71% (n=197) of girls and 70% (n=188) of boys said that they never felt scared to speak out in class, whilst 65% (n=182) of girls and 66% (n=177) of boys said that their teacher always encouraged them in class.

Evidence from the lesson observations suggests that there is not a notable difference between the physical position of boys and girls in the classroom. The majority of lesson observations (69%, n=60) found that all children worked on the same task equally, whilst only 1% (n=1) found that girls sat at the back of the classroom.

FIGURE 35 HOW THE CLASSROOM IS ORGANISED, AS IDENTIFIED IN LESSON OBSERVATIONS

Both boys and girls reported high levels of security in most parts of school, although approximately half said that they did not feel safe when using the latrines.

There is little change from the Baseline in the feelings of safety that male and female pupils have at school. Between 80 and 88% of all male and female pupils said that they feel quite safe or very safe in the classroom, the playground and on the journey to and from school.
As in the baseline, toilets remain the place where pupils feel the least safe; 40% (n=216) of all learners surveyed reported that they feel quite unsafe or very unsafe when visiting the latrine, as opposed to 36% (n=1120) in the baseline. Overall a higher proportion of girls report feeling unsafe in school than boys, particularly in Western Equatoria. There was no significant variation in feelings of security between upper and lower primary, and secondary school classes.

Drop in proportion of schools reportedly with gender–segregated latrines

Just under half (43%, n=31) of schools surveyed reported that they had separate latrines for girls and boys, which is a drop from the 67% (n=82) in the baseline. Whilst the smaller sample size of the Midline does limit the reliability of this data
the table below indicates that this drop is universal across all states except WRP, which has seen a 6% increase.

Given that the data presented in section 4.2 suggests relatively high levels of gender equality in the classroom we can tentatively conclude that external factors, such as the lack of gender-segregated latrines, play a greater role in determining the disparity of school attendance between boys and girls.

47% (n=24) of SMC/PTA/BoG members, and 43% (n=51) of teachers reported that their schools had a gender policy document in place, almost double the number who claimed the same in the Baseline (25%, n=50). This suggests that institutional awareness of gender issues is gradually growing.
4.9 Mentor programme

53% (n=40) of head teachers report having a mentor or counsellor, most commonly for girls only or for boys and girls together.

Just over half of all head teachers surveyed reported that there was a mentor or counsellor for learners at their school. Of these, 18% (n=14) were for girls only, and 30% (n=24) were for both girls and boys. Lakes was the only State in which head teachers said they had a mentor or counsellor specifically for boys.
Given that the GESS Mentoring programme has only targeted 200 schools nationally (and the school survey sample did not prioritise them), the high proportion of schools reporting that they have a mentor or counsellor suggests that this is a local initiative of the schools themselves.

Schools that have taken part in GESS mentoring programme report positive response, although several head teachers were unaware of the programme. Seven schools that are part of the GESS mentoring scheme were surveyed. Of these, two reported that the programme had been beneficial to their school by:

- Helping girls make healthy choices in their personal lives
- Creating a peer network to support other girls at school
- Helping teachers to interact with girls more positively

However, head teachers from four of the seven schools that were, according to GESS, part of this mentoring programme, said they were not aware of the programme or of any of its components, suggesting that further attention needs to be paid to awareness and sensitisation of the mentor programme.

---

ii Dr John Garang Secondary (EES), Kuajok National Secondary (WRP), Nazereth Secondary (WBG), Nyoc Anoon Primary (NBG), Renk Girl’s Secondary (UNS), Rumbek National Secondary (LKS), Yabongo Evening Secondary (WES)
5. Educational choices by students

Attitudes towards girls’ education amongst teachers have progressed since the Baseline Study in 2014.

Overall, 72.5% of teachers and Head Teachers (n=148) either disagree or strongly disagree that boys are better suited to higher education than girls, compared to 66.9% in 2014. The proportion of teachers and Head Teachers who either agree or strongly agree with the statement has fallen by 9.1%.

As in the Baseline, there was broad disagreement amongst pupils that boys were better suited to higher education than girls (64%, n=354). However, learners demonstrate more conservative educational expectations for girls and boys than teachers, with 29% agreeing or strongly agreeing that boys were better suited. These attitudes are more entrenched among boys; 35% agree or strongly agree that girls are less suited to higher education, an attitude that is shared by 23% of girls.

When this is disaggregated by grade/year-group, the results indicate some falling back since the Baseline, particularly in the attitudes of girls. Whilst in 2014 levels of female agreement decreased the further they progressed in school, data collected in 2016 indicated that girls in secondary school were less confident of their fitness for higher education than their more junior peers.
In 2016, the levels of disagreement with this statement amongst girls dropped as they moved through the grades, from 73% in P5 to 70% in P8 and just 59% in S2. Secondary school girls also exhibited a much higher level of uncertainty about the issue, with 14% giving a neutral response. This suggests that as the number of girls in school reduces as they progress through school, they become less certain of their position in school. As such, greater efforts should be made with upper primary and secondary girls to instil confidence in their academic ability.

In total, 67% of teachers and Head Teachers (n=137) disagreed with the statement that girls were less likely than boys to need an education in their future lives. Disagreement with this statement was particularly pronounced in (former) Eastern Equatoria (92%) and Warrap (93%), in contrast to Western Equatoria, where only 53% of those surveyed disagreed, Jonglei, where the figure was 58%,
and Lakes, where 60% of teachers and Head Teachers disagreed. (In Unity 57% disagreed, but this should be treated with a note of caution as the sample size was the smallest by some margin.) In addition to being an indication of less progressive attitudes towards gender and education, these responses can also be interpreted as realistic perceptions of the opportunities available to girls and women in some areas with strong pastoralist traditions, and/or where early marriage is often still the norm.

**FIGURE 44 LEVELS OF TEACHER AND HEAD TEACHER AGREEMENT THAT GIRLS ARE LESS LIKELY TO NEED AN EDUCATION IN THEIR FUTURE LIVES, BY STATE**

Amongst girls, levels of disagreement were higher at 71% (n=197) than boys, 61% of whom disagreed. However, as with the question about suitability for higher education, while the proportion of girls who agreed with the statement remained fairly stable as they progressed through school, levels of disagreement dropped among female secondary school learners; 72% of girls in P5 and 75% of girls in P8 disagreed that they were less likely to need an education in the future, falling to 67% of girls in S2, where a higher proportion of girls registered a neutral view.
However, teacher responses indicate that parents continue to prioritise boys over girls when it comes to educational investment.

56% of teachers and Head Teachers (n=114) either agree or strongly agree that parents in their community prioritise sending boys to school over girls. This figure has barely changed since the Baseline, when 54.4% of teachers and Head Teachers gave this response.

State level disaggregation of teacher and Head Teacher responses, with all due caveats re sample size, indicates that parents in Lakes, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Upper Nile and Jonglei are perceived to assign less value to sending girls to school. This may be linked to the prevalence of pastoralist communities in these areas, which tend to have more conservative attitudes to gender roles. In Lakes, 66% (n=31) of teachers and Head Teachers either agreed or strongly agreed that
the opportunity cost of sending girls to school is considered to be higher than that of boys. In (former) Northern Bahr el Ghazal (n=22) and Upper Nile (n=9), 64% of teachers and Head Teachers either agreed or strongly agreed that boys are prioritised, while 63% of teachers and Head Teachers in Jonglei gave this response (n=12). (In Unity, the proportion of teachers and Head Teachers in agreement was 86% (n=6), but the small sample size requires this finding to be treated with a degree of caution). While Lakes recorded the highest proportion of teachers who feel that boys are prioritised over girls, as in the Baseline, the findings suggest that there has been some attitudinal change amongst parents, as the proportion of teachers who agree or strongly agree that boys are prioritised has dropped from 91% to 66%.

Responses suggest that parents in Western Bahr el Ghazal and Central Equatoria have the most progressive views; 25% (n=4) of teachers in Western Bahr el Ghazal agreed or strongly agreed that parents valued boys’ education over girls, as opposed to 63% (n=10) who did not, while in Central Equatoria 34% (n=8) of teachers agreed or strongly agreed versus 52% (n=12) who did not.

Compared to the Baseline findings, parental behaviour in Eastern and Western Equatoria, as reported by teachers, appears to have taken a backward step, as 58% and 54% respectively agreed or strongly agreed that boys’ education was prioritised over that of girls. It is possible that the deteriorating humanitarian and security situation in these parts of the Equatorias since 2014, in tandem with the worsening economic crisis, has placed more families in a position in which they are compelled to choose which of their children they can afford to send to school.

Students across the country registered more positive perceptions about their parents’ attitudes and behaviour in relation to girls’ education than teachers. A total of 44% of all learners surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that parents prioritise boys over girls (n=238), compared to 51% who expressed the opposite view (n=281).

Perceptions of parents favouring boys over girls are higher amongst secondary learners than primary, and particularly amongst secondary girls, 52% of whom either agree or strongly agree that boys are prioritised (n=23), suggesting that parents are less likely to prioritise sending girls to school the older they are.
Findings from the Learner Survey corroborate the teachers’ reports that the behaviour of parents has progressed since the Baseline when it comes to valuing girls’ education. This was particularly noteworthy in Lakes, where parents’ opinions on girls’ education were lower than the national average. Whereas in the Baseline 65.5% of learners in Lakes strongly agreed that parents prioritised sending boys to school, in 2016 the proportion was just 16% (n=18) while 33% (n=38) agreed. However, the figures from Lakes remain the least progressive nationally. The (former) State with the highest proportion of students agreeing with the statement, with the exception of Unity which had a very low sample size, was Northern Bahr el Ghazal, where 58% of learners (n=53) either agreed or strongly agreed that boys were prioritised when it came to education. This included 59% of girls (n=29) and 56% of boys (n=24).
Aspirations among learners are consistently high, with 89% of all students aiming to reach Senior 4 before they leave school. The proportion of girls wishing to complete secondary school increases as they progress through the grades, and more girls in S2 wish to reach S4 than boys (91%, n=40) compared to 90% (n=28), indicating that girls become increasingly ambitious the longer they stay in school. In total, 91% of boys (n=244) and 87% of girls (n=241) said they wanted to reach Senior 4 before leaving school.

In the Baseline, learners in Lakes stood out as being the least ambitious, with just 54% of those in P5 citing S4 as the highest grade they wanted to reach. Findings from 2016 indicate something of a turnaround, with 94% of P5 students stating their desire to do so (n=63), compared to an average of 91% across all ten (former)states. This apparent positive change in attitudes in Lakes is consistent with other findings on attitudinal change presented earlier in this section.

The least ambitious P5 students were found in Northern Bahr el Ghazal, where 81% said S4 was the highest grade they wanted to reach (n=79), Unity, where the response was given by 80% of pupils (n=4), and Western Bahr el Ghazal, where 78% of P5 learners interviewed wished to reach S4 (n=21).

Learners expressed a slightly higher degree of confidence that they would reach the grade they wished to than in the Baseline, with 94.3% of all learners saying they thought they would achieve their stated aim, compared to 90.3% in 2014. Although responses were positive across the country, learners in Northern Bahr el Ghazal and Upper Nile were the least confident; 86% of all learners in Northern Bahr el Ghazal thought they would reach the grade they wanted to (n=79) and 89% of learners in Upper Nile gave the same response (n=41). Similarly, of P5 learners, the proportion expressing certainty that they would reach the grade they wanted to dipped below 90% in only two (former) states: Northern Bahr el Ghazal, where the proportion was 87% (n=60) and Upper Nile, where the same proportion gave this response (n=20).
Of all learners, boys are marginally more confident that they will reach the grade they want to before leaving school; 93.5% of girls (n=260) and 95.1% of boys (n=255) express confidence that they will do so.

Amongst pupils in P5, boys and girls are equally confident that they will reach the grade they want to before leaving school, with 93% of both genders expressing confidence that they would do so (n=138 of girls and n=148 of boys). Some divergence comes in upper primary: at P8 92% of girls said they thought they would reach the grade they wanted to (n=66) compared to 99% of boys (n=66). This could tentatively support the theory that upper primary is a critical stage in ensuring girls make the transition to secondary level and complete their education.

At secondary level, 100% of boys (n=31) and 100% of girls (n=44) were confident that they would reach the grade they wanted to before leaving school, again pointing to the importance of ensuring that pupils of both genders make the transition into secondary school.

**The cost of school fees remains the biggest perceived obstacle to reaching their desired grade, cited by 47% of primary and secondary students (n=258).**

Despite the fact that the cost of education had found to increase in the Household Survey, the costs associated with school – both school fees and other items – are reportedly a less prohibitive factor than reported in the Baseline. In 2014, 66% of students said being unable to afford school fees could prevent them from reaching their desired grade and 38% cited the cost of other items required for school, compared to 22% in 2016 (n=118). A link can potentially be drawn with the impact of GESS Cash Transfers on alleviating the burden of school costs, a conclusion supported by the Household Survey, which found that Cash Transfers are
reducing the burden of school fees at the household level and have reduced pressure on guardian spending on both education-related and non-related items, including food and medicine.

FIGURE 51 A COMPARISON OF THE REASONS THAT MIGHT PREVENT LEARNERS FROM REACHING THEIR DESIRED GRADE, AS REPORTED IN 2014 AND 2016

When the data is disaggregated by gender, it also supports the conclusion that GESS Cash Transfers are reducing the impact of costs associated with school on girls, as a significantly higher proportion of boys cite the difficulty of affording school-related items as a factor that could prevent them from remaining in school as long as they want: 24% (n=65) as opposed to 19% of girls (n=53). In 2014, the difference was less than one percentage point.

The proportion of girls and boys who consider school fees to be an inhibiting factor is fairly even across learners in P5 and P8, although slightly lower amongst girls, potentially suggesting that Cash Transfers are relatively effective in supporting girls in upper primary. Among P5 girls, 48% (n=71) said that the cost of school fees could prevent them from reaching their desired grade, compared to 52% of P5 boys (n=83). For learners in P8, lower proportions of both girls and boys felt that school fees could prevent them from progressing: 40% of girls (n=29) and 42% of boys (n=28). However, at secondary level, while the proportion of boys with this concern remains the same at 42% (n=13), school fees were a more frequent concern for girls in S2, 55% of whom think that the cost of school fees could prevent them from completing secondary school. Although the sample sizes here clearly are too low to be statistically significant, possible explanations could be that the direct costs of secondary schooling (fees, books, uniform etc.) are materially higher, and/or that, as girls get older, the opportunity cost of sending
them to school is higher as the potential for receiving a dowry increases, and therefore the risk that their parents will refuse to spend money on their school fees becomes more pressing. This matches the significantly stronger growth in P5-P8 enrolment seen, as compared to S1-S4, over the last three years. A logical and cost-effective response to the data, consistent with those hypotheses, could be to increase CT rates for girls in secondary, and/or to prioritise early payment of secondary school CTs, to mitigate the risk of ‘losing’ pupils at transition from primary to secondary.

**TABLE 3 REASONS WHY LEARNERS MIGHT LEAVE SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason why learners might leave school</th>
<th>Girls (n=278)</th>
<th>Boys (n=268)</th>
<th>P5 girls (n=149)</th>
<th>P5 boys (n=159)</th>
<th>P8 girls (n=72)</th>
<th>P8 boys (n=67)</th>
<th>S2 girls (n=44)</th>
<th>S2 boys (n=31)</th>
<th>Total (n=546)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot afford school fees</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot afford other items needed for school</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid work</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibilities at home</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends/classmates have left or will leave</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents want me to leave</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long distance to school</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor performance/poor test results</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No secondary school in the area</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-age for grade</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 52** A COMPARISON OF THE REASONS THAT MIGHT PREVENT LEARNERS FROM REACHING THEIR DESIRED GRADE, BY GENDER
For both girls and boys, in 2016 a much higher proportion of students said there was nothing that could stop them from reaching their desired grade, suggesting that both aspirations and learners’ confidence in their ability to fulfil them have risen, as indicated in the previous section (Table 10).

**Girls remain concerned that marriage and pregnancy may cause them to drop out of school, although numbers are lower than in the baseline**

Marriage remains a concern for girls, particularly at primary level, with 14% of P5 girls (n=21) and 13% of P8 girls (n=9) citing it as a factor that could prevent them from reaching their desired grade. These figures are marginally lower than in the Baseline, when 17% of girls in P5, 15% of girls in P8 and 13% of girls in S2 said it could prevent them from achieving their educational goals. However, pregnancy is a significantly lower cause of concern for female learners than at the Baseline – just 4% (n=12) of all girls list it as a factor that could cause them to drop out before reaching their desired grade, compared to 30% in 2014, suggesting that behaviour change and awareness raising interventions since 2014 may have had some effect.

**Learners report strong desire to stay in education, and to move on to university**

Going to university remains the most prevalent aspiration for pupils surveyed in 2016, with 70% of all boys (n=187) and 63% of all girls (n=174) citing it as their desired destination after finishing school. There is a significant disparity between the high educational ambitions of learners and the number who actually attend university. The high rate of attrition from school to university suggests a possible need for alternative post-school options, such as vocational training centres.
Disaggregation of these results by grade shows that, broadly, the reported desire to stay in education increases as learners move through school. It is actually strongest amongst learners in P8, again highlighting the importance of the transition from primary to secondary level. The proportion of female and male learners who want to go to university after finishing school increases from 51% of girls at P5 (n=76) to 74% of girls at P8 (n=53), and 63% of boys at P5 (n=100) to 82% of boys at P8 (n=55).

FIGURE 54 PREFERRED POST-SCHOOL DESTINATION, DISAGGREGATED BY GRADE

[Graph showing the preferred post-school destinations for boys and girls across grades P5, P8, and S2.]
6. Management capacity and structures

6.1 School development plan

86% (n=44) of the SMC/PTA/BoG respondents and 63% (n=62) of head teachers confirmed that they had a school development plan at the school.

Eastern Equatoria, Jonglei and Northern Bahr el Ghazal had the highest number of head teachers claiming that they had created a school development plan for 2016, although a smaller percentage were actually able to show enumerators proof of the document. Unity and Upper Nile had some of the lowest figures with only 29% (n=2) of head teachers able to produce a copy of the SDP in Upper Nile, and no head teachers reporting developing an SDP in Unity. This pattern may reflect difficulties schools in Unity and Upper Nile had in accessing school Capitation Grants in 2014 and 2015 – and/or simply the small sample size in these States.

The majority of the respondents said that the SMC and PTA have some responsibility in establishing of the school development plan. Respondents from the BoG also agreed that they are involved in formation of the school development plan.

6.2 Management and oversight

Evidence suggests that GESS has had a significant impact on school leadership capacity. As from the results from 2014, we note better management practices such as formation of these school management bodies as well as coming up with better methods for improvement of school such as use of school development plans.
School management bodies are present in schools across the (former ten) states. Data on SSSAMS indicates that 3500 schools have either a SMCs, BOGs and/or PTAs, which have been set up to assist in the management of schools alongside the school administration. However, in the Midline survey some states appeared not to have any form of school management body, reflecting the small sample size and the difficulty in accessing some schools. SMCs were most common in (former) Western Bahr el Ghazal with 57% (n=5), and Warrap with 100% (n=3) of schools reporting that they had one. PTAs were common in Western Equatoria with 75% (n=3), Northern Bahr el Ghazal with 58% (n=7) and Unity with 100% (n=1).

FIGURE 56 PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS WITH BOG/SMC/PTA, DISAGGREGATED BY STATE

Across the country, there was an average of 4.4 (26%) women per SMC, with an average of 8.1 (74%) men. BoGs (typically used for secondary school management bodies) had 3.3 (40%) female members and 7.9 (60%) men per group, whilst 4.0 (24%) women and 7.7 men (76%) made up the PTAs.

TABLE 4 AVERAGE NUMBER OF MALE AND FEMALE MEMBERS IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT BODIES, AS REPORTED BY HEAD TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Governors</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Management Committee</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Teacher Association</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers and parents were the most common members across all three school management bodies, with traditional leaders/Boma Chiefs and learners being the third and fourth most common stakeholders respectively. Local government officials were less typically reported as members.

**FIGURE 57 MEMBERS OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE BODIES, AS REPORTED BY HEAD TEACHERS**

The majority of school management bodies were reported to meet 2-3 times per year (most likely once every term), although a growing number reported meeting 12 times a year or more, an increase from Baseline figures. 

As illustrated in the graph below, the majority of the school management groups were reported to meet 2-3 times a year with 57% (n=13) of SMCs, 60% (n=3) of BOGs and 38% (n=11) of PTAs meeting at this frequency. 34% (n=10) of the PTA respondents stated that they meet 4-7 times in a year. On the other hand, few meet 0-1 times a year with 9% (n=2) of SMC, 0% (n=0) of BOG and 3% (n=1) of PTA members stating this as their meeting frequency.
There appears to be an overall increase in the number of school management bodies meeting 12 times a year or more since 2014. 26% of SMC members reported that they met 12+ times a year in 2016, as opposed to 15% in the baseline, whilst the figures for PTA members (2014 – 8%, 2016 – 17%) and BoG members (2014 – 4%, 2016 – 40%) have similarly increased.

This suggests that both the capacity and productivity of school management bodies has increased over the last two years, potentially as a result of GESS training and support, and that school management bodies are meeting more frequently than purely ‘hoop-jumping’ organisations would.

### 6.3 Local government interaction

Across the (former) ten states, the most common reported frequency of visits by Payam supervisors was 2- 3 times a year with 69% (n=33) of school management body members and 30% (n=25) of head teachers reporting this frequency. This is supported by evidence from the County & Payam Survey, which found that Payam Education Officials most commonly visit each school in their jurisdiction three times per year.
The overall frequency of local education authority visits appears to have declined between 2015 and 2016. Again, this evidence is supported by findings from the County & Payam Survey. Clearly, a factor in this could be the reduced value of GRSS funding (if any) now reaching Counties and Payam.

The majority of the respondents said that the group involved in creating the school budget was comprised of head teachers (reported by 32%, n=47 of school
management body respondents), members of the SMC (23%, n=33) and members of the PTA (21%, n=31). Other groups involved in creating the school budget included members of BoG (6%, n=10), PEOs (9%, n=13) and CEOs (6%, n=9).

In most cases the team that is involved in creating the budgets is also the same team that approves it as stated by the respondents.

The most common way of storing money was through bank accounts with 78% (n=40) of the respondents stating this method. Given that GESS accountability guidelines require schools to open a bank account in order to receive a capitation grant, it is not surprising that the majority of schools surveyed reported having a bank account; 78% (n=40) of the SMC/PTA/BoG respondents reporting that their school had a bank account. Given the ongoing insecurity in the Greater Upper Nile region, and the lack of functioning banks in this region, schools there are not required by GESS to have bank accounts, which is likely the reason why approximately one quarter of schools surveyed did not have a bank account.
Bank statements, school budgets and receipt books are the most common records head teachers report keeping.

The majority of head teachers reported keeping some financial records at the school. Researchers then also asked schools to show them these records which yielded slightly lower results.

**6.5 Roles of SMC/PTA/BoG**

Support to development of School Development Plan and Budget reported as the top responsibility of both SMCs and PTAs, suggesting commitment to GESS programme.
The most commonly cited responsibility given by SMC and PTA respondents was the development of the SDP and budget at 91% (n=21) and 79% (n=23) respectively. Monitoring teaching and learning, development of educational policies and curriculum, and reviewing school performance also scored highly. On the other hand, PTA and SMC members less often cited school inspections and teacher recommendations as among their top four responsibilities – logically because these tend to be part of the role of Payam and County Education Officials.

More BoG members highlighted their responsibility for supporting learners and teachers and monitoring learning outcomes, relative to the Baseline the baseline. This took the place in the list above of fundraising, which 72% of BoG members in 2014 cited as a responsibility. The reduction of emphasis on raising money for schools potentially reflects the ongoing financial crisis in South Sudan, but may also be linked to Capitation Grant payment, as school management bodies now rely, with relative confidence, on this money as a key source of school income.
Disparity between reported minuting of school governance meetings, and observable evidence of minutes

From the head teacher survey, 84% (n=70) of the respondents stated that SMC minutes for the last meeting were available. 34% (n=24) had proof to support this. Similarly, 93% (n=78) of head teachers reported that the minutes for the last BOG meeting were available but 36% (n=28) could support this statement with proof of the minutes. 72% (n=21) of PTA members affirmed that they had minutes for their last meeting but 24% (n=7) of the respondents could not confirm availability of minutes, whilst a further 3% (n=1) did not know whether minutes were available.

6.6 Teacher management

92% (n=51) of the respondents stated that they had a teacher code of conduct to guide teachers. This is an increase from the 64.4% that stated they had this document in the 2014 Baseline study.

More than three quarters (78%, n=40) of the SMC survey respondents reported having a teacher absence policy. This proportion has also increased from 49.9% as recorded in 2014.

Relatively high proportion of schools with proof that they keep key GESS documents, such as Pupil Admission Registers (67%) and Daily Attendance Register (66%)
The majority of schools which claimed to keep key documents could also show them to researchers as evidence. This finding is encouraging in demonstrating that GESS materials and systems are in active use.

### 6.7 Teacher salaries and volunteer teachers

The teaching profession remains overwhelmingly male.

Findings indicate that the teaching profession remains overwhelmingly male. Out of the total number of teaching staff (both paid and voluntary) reached as part of the School Survey, 68 of 71 Head Teachers and 111 of 122 teachers surveyed were men.
17% of teachers said that they had been on strike during 2016 due to lack of pay. Teachers report being paid for an average of 4.42 months over the past year, indicating that government salaries are frequently either delayed or not paid at all. 18% (n=21) of teachers surveyed said that they had been on strike in the last year due to lack of payment, and 20% (n=17) of head teachers said that some teachers were on strike on the day of the survey. The average number of days that teachers reported they were on strike for was 7, although the numbers ranged from 1 day to 1 month.
School capitation grants, funded by GESS and GRSS, are a key element of the GESS programme, available to all schools, for the purposes of supplementing operating costs and to improving the learning and teaching environment and boosting quality education.

In order to qualify for capitation grants, eligible schools must fulfil six criteria and provide accountability documents for previous funds received in order to qualify for the next payment:

- Submit a Pupil Admission Register (PARs) to South Sudan Schools’ Attendance and Monitoring System (SSSAMS) / ‘Ana Fii Inni’ (‘I am here’).
- Provide a daily update on the attendance of pupils using the South Sudan Schools’ Attendance Monitoring System (SSSAMS) / ‘Ana Fii Inni’ via SMS.
- Have a School Governing Body in place – usually a Parent-Teacher Association for primary schools, ideally with a School Management Committee drawn from its members, or a Board of Governors for secondary schools.
- Develop a school development plan using a provided template, to lay out how the school will spend their money.
- Develop a school budget, using a provided template.
- Open a school bank account.

Questions on Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers were added into the Midline survey as the first payments to schools had only just begun (in January 2014) when the Baseline survey took place (in June 2014). The Midline surveys therefore asked questions relating to Capitation Grant spending, accountability and impact for both 2014 and 2015. Late payment of 2016 Capitation Grants prevented questions being asked relating to the 2016 school year, which will be covered in the Endline survey.

Ongoing monitoring of Capitation Grant payment and accountability, per school, is captured on SSSAMS and up-to-date data is available online at www.sssams.org.

### 7.1 Spending choices

For 2014 and 2015, between 50% and 75% of the Capitation Grants were to be spent materials that would improve the quality of education in schools, for example, text books, science equipment or teachers’ guides. Between 25% and 50% can be used on physical improvements to schools and school facilities, for example building or repairing classrooms, latrines or fences around a school compound.
Up to 20% could be allocated for spent on general school support, for example incentives for community or volunteer teachers.

**Capitation Grant money tends to be used for immediate needs of school, such as payment of volunteer teachers and maintenance of classrooms, in order to ensure continued functioning**

The ongoing economic crisis in South Sudan has resulted in the delayed payment of teachers’ salaries nationally. Additionally, the high rate of inflation has dramatically reduced the real value of the teachers’ salaries that have been paid. As a result, many salaried teachers have left the profession; the proportion of volunteer teachers working in schools has increased. Head teachers report that the most common use of Capitation Grant money in 2015 was payment of volunteer teachers, presumably in response.

While it was not possible to collect data on 2016 Capitation Grant spending due to late payment, rules on eligible uses were changed in 2016 to allow up to 60% to be spent on teacher incentives. This was designed to respond to the growing need for keeping teachers in school, caused by the falling value of teachers’ wages and the infrequency of wage payment for government teachers.
Classroom maintenance and improvement was consistently regularly cited at 15% (2014 n=19, 2015 n=22). Reports of classroom construction increased over the two years from 5% (n=7) to 8% (n=12) building with local, semi-permanent materials, and from 2% (n=2) to 3% (n=5) building with permanent materials. Investment in classroom infrastructure appears to have noticed by parents, who reported in the household survey that poor quality classrooms were less of a concern than they were during the baseline.

Other commonly reported spending choices included chalkboards (7% n=9 in 2014, and 5%, n=8 in 2015), text books (9% n=11 in 2014 and 13% n=13 in 2015), and exercise books (10% n=13 in 2014, and 5% n=7 in 2015). These are some of the items identified by head teachers as being most needed, suggesting that Capitation Grant money is being used to address the most keenly felt shortages of school materials. The spending choices reported by head teachers confirm that most schools are currently in weak financial health and use the majority of the Capitation Grant money on ‘fire-fighting’ activities such as maintaining classrooms and paying teachers, rather than on longer-dated or quality of education-focused items, such as school gardens and musical instruments. This in turn suggests that Capitation Grants
have played a vital role in helping to keep schools functioning over the last two years.

Secondary schools more likely to report spending money on textbooks and infrastructure items such as water points and latrines, whilst more primary schools report spending money on volunteer teachers and classroom construction and maintenance.

Primary and secondary schools reported different kinds of uses for school capitation grants. More primary schools than secondary schools reported using Capitation Grants for core operational costs including payment of volunteer teachers and classroom construction and maintenance. Head teachers in secondary schools reported spending Capitation Grant funds on, among other things, latrine construction and maintenance as well as water point construction and generator fuel.

13% (n=4) of secondary schools reported buying text books in 2015, as opposed to only 8% (n=9) of primary schools. This foils with the findings outlined in section 4.1, which found that an average of 49% of secondary schools reported having no text books, as opposed to 16% of primary schools.

FIGURE 69 COMPARISON OF 2015 REPORTED USES OF CAPITATION GRANTS BETWEEN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS (NON-EXCLUSIVE)
7.2 Impact on schools

Head teachers in schools which have received one or more Capitation Grant were asked to list what impact(s) the money had had on educational quality. 67% (n=56) of head teachers reported that the money had contributed to a better environment of instruction; 37% (n=31) identified better/more volunteer teachers, increased attendance and improved school management as among positive effects of the grant.

Comparison of building assessments conducted in schools which have received Capitation Grants against those which have not did not see a marked difference in the overall quality of buildings, but those that have received either one or more payment had an average of 8 classrooms against 6 in schools that did not receive in either year and had a slightly higher proportion of permanent or semi-permanent buildings over classrooms with just a roof or open air. The sample is too low to conclude that this is a result of Capitation Grant intervention, or to exclude selection effects.

Schools that have received one or more Capitation Grant payment had a higher number of gender separated toilets (60.9%) compared with 42.9% of schools that have not received capitation grants.
69% of schools that received at least one Capitation Grant are still charging school fees.

Aside from exam fees which schools charge to cover term one examination costs, the most common school fees reported charged are still registration fees. This is consistent with the findings from the household survey. It is not clear whether respondents were necessarily applying the tight definition of ‘registration fees’ GESS has used (as distinct from termly tuition fees). The average cost reported for registration fees was 139SSP. However, 12% (n=10) of all schools visited stated that they have stopped charging school fees altogether.
7.3 Accountability

There is a noticeable improvement in evidence of Capitation Grant use and accountability at schools from 2014 to 2015, including showing observable evidence and proof of purchase

Schools that have received Capitation Grants are required to provide ledgers indicating how they have spent the money, these are signed by head teachers, SMC representatives, and Payam or County officials and then scanned and uploaded to the School Budgeting Reporting Tool (SBRT) on SSSAMS. The ledgers are entered into the data entry tool so that analysis can be done on how much each school has accounted for, and what the percentage of each grant has been spent on each category. Schools can only be eligible for the next tranche if they have accounted for a minimum of 80% of the previous grant. Any incomplete submission is noted and fed back to the school in question. Each school that has applied for a Capitation Grant must be approved by the Education Transfers Monitoring Committee, which is made up of GESS consortium members and MoGEI officials.

The Midline survey was designed to follow up on and add to this process at the school level. Enumerators asked head teachers to show them observable evidence of each item purchased with Capitation Grant money, and then to produce a receipt for proof of purchase.

Prevalence of observable evidence for 2015 Capitation Grant spending was higher, at an average of 68%, than for 2014 (60%) and the majority of spending could be verified with receipts. Clearly, this may be an issue of the respective time elapsed, rather than necessarily a demonstration of improvement. Where receipts were not
available, head teachers reported that they were being kept at home and in some cases by CLOs or Diocese offices for church schools. Scans of receipts are also uploaded by schools onto the SBRT.

FIGURE 74 PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS WITH OBSERVABLE EVIDENCE AND RECEIPTS FOR VARIOUS KINDS OF CAPITATION GRANT SPENDING IN 2014
FIGURE 75: PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS WITH OBSERVABLE EVIDENCE AND RECEIPTS FOR VARIOUS KINDS OF CAPITATION GRANT SPENDING IN 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Spending</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Receipt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms maintained/Classrooms built</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latrine maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water point maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom with lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel for generator bought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water bought</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports ground maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/maths kits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalkboards (stand or...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference books purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise books purchased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community (volunteer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms for needy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel on school business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Cash Transfers

Since 2014, Cash Transfers have been paid once a year to girls enrolled and regularly attending in school years P5-S4. At the time of the baseline, 2014 CTs payments had not yet been made to the majority of eligible girls, and thus there were few questions relating to cash transfers. Questions on Cash Transfer payments were thus added into the Midline survey for head teachers and teachers and a separate Cash Transfer survey was also added which asked student (female) recipients questions relating to Cash Transfer payment and use. Researchers also collected data on attendance of randomly selected girls from the 2014 and 2015 Cash Transfer payment lists on the day of the survey, specifically whether their attendance was recorded correctly in the DARs and also whether the selected girls were physically present on the day of interview. As a quality control measure for this section, the researchers and enumerators did not announce that the school survey was taking place prior to arriving at the school on the day of the survey.

At the time of survey, 2016 Cash Transfer payments had not yet begun, so questions relate to the 2014 and 2015 payment periods. As with questions relating to Capitation Grants for school, questions were not included in the Baseline survey due to timing of the Cash Transfer payments in 2014. An off-cycle pilot with similar questions was conducted in 36 operational schools across 7 states during May 2015, and presented to ETMC. The findings on Cash Transfers from this previous survey were largely consistent with the midline.

Live attendance data, split by gender, and ongoing monitoring of Cash Transfer validation and payments across South Sudan is available online at www.sssams.org.

8.1 Cash Transfer payment

The number of schools reporting receiving Cash Transfer payments, and the number of girls reporting receiving the correct amounts are increasing

The majority of schools surveyed had received Cash Transfers for female learners in either 2014 or 2015, with a marked increase in the number that have received in 2015; this is consistent with what GESS had paid out. 33.7% of schools reported they had received Cash Transfer payments in both years, compared to just 19% which had not received payments in either year.
In schools where girls did not receive Cash Transfers there appears to be a lack of understanding as to why.

When asked why girls did not receive Cash Transfers in either or both payment years, the most common reason given by head teachers (37%, n=18) was that payment never came to the school. A further 35% (n=17) said that they did not know why the girls had not received the money. 16% (n=8) of head teachers reported that they did not know about the Cash Transfer programme at all. A logical response would be to ensure prompt feedback is provided to individual schools, for example by SMS.

**FIGURE 76 NUMBER OF TIMES SCHOOLS RECEIVED CTS, AS REPORTED BY HEAD TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CTs 2014</th>
<th>CTs 2015</th>
<th>Neither year</th>
<th>Both years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 77 REASONS WHY SCHOOLS DID NOT RECEIVE CASH TRANSFERS, AS REPORTED BY HEAD TEACHERS**

- School was not eligible
- School was not validated
- Payment was never received
- Did not know about CT programme
- Other (Specify)
- Don’t know
The proportion of girls reporting receiving the correct amount has also increased from 2014 to 2015.

Alongside the increase in the overall number of girls receiving cash transfers, the proportion of girls who reported receiving the correct amount of money has also increased between 2014 and 2015. Of the girls interviewed who said they had received a Cash Transfer in 2014, 24% (n=5) said they had received the wrong amount, whilst in 2015 the number had shrunk to 9% (n=7).

### 8.2 Attendance and retention of CT recipient girls

The number of 2014 and 2015 CT recipients found attending was high in comparison to national enrolment and attrition rates and in the context of common reasons given for absence by female learners.

Recipients to check on were selected randomly by researchers prior to visiting each school, using 2014 and 2015 cash payment lists, with one girl selected from each class that received a Cash Transfer in 2015 and 2014. An additional girl was selected on the day from S1 or S2 who received a CT in 2014/15 at primary school. As previously mentioned, visits to schools were unannounced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CT Payment List</th>
<th>CT payment year class</th>
<th>Current class to check (2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 2014 the Cash Transfer amount was set at 125SSP per girl. Due to fluctuations in inflation and the relative value of the SSP the amount was readjusted to 320SSP in 2015. This was later further increased to 600SSP during the payment of 2015 Cash Transfers to girls in early 2016, who were not paid the previous year due to insecurity and inaccessibility of schools.*
In addition to interviewing recipients, data collection also recorded the number of Cash Transfer recipients that were present in each school, and examined the school attendance records according to the DARs on the day of surveying.

Just under half of all previous year CT recipients selected for interview were present on the day of the interview. This was the case for CT recipients from both 2014 and 2015.

FIGURE 79 PROPORTION OF SELECTED CT GIRLS ACTUALLY PRESENT ON DAY OF SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Selected</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under half of all CT recipients selected for interview were verified as present on the day of the interview. This was the case for CT recipients from 2015, from whom 44% of selected girls were present, but also those selected from the 2014 payment list, from whom 47% of girls selected were present on the day of the survey. This indicates a high rate of attendance and retention among Cash Transfer recipients when compared to national enrolment and attrition rates. National level data from 2015 indicates that the dropout rate for girls moving...
between P4 and P5 was 11% but between P5 and P6 it was 18%. Overall, between P5 and S4, it is estimated that as many as 25% of girls in South Sudan will have dropped out or repeated at least one year of schooling.

High proportion of schools visited have daily attendance registers (DARs), of these a relatively high number are being used regularly

During interviews with head teachers, enumerators asked to see DARs for 2016. Enumerators then recorded whether the available DARs had been used at least three times in the past week, and whether they had been used on the day of interview. The below graph indicates that a high proportion of schools have DARs – 85% of secondary schools with S2 classes had a DAR for that class, whilst 83% with S3 classes had a corresponding DAR. This demonstrates uptake of this GESS-mandated system.

FIGURE 80 PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS WITH AVAILABLE DARS, DISAGGREGATED BY GRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those schools which had DARs, evidence suggests that a relatively high proportion are used regularly. At least 55% of all schools with DARs were found to have filled them in three times in the past week. The proportion of schools which had used the DAR on the day of the survey was lower overall, but still around the 50% mark. DAR use was slightly less common in primary schools than secondary, which may be due to the large class sizes and practices of having multiple classes per grade in primary school. Although enrolment figures determine the number of DARs each school receives, these figures tend to

---

fluctuate in the first quarter of the year which may result in too few DARs being delivered in relation to the number of learners at the school.

**FIGURE 81** PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS WITH DARs WHICH WERE USED IN THE PREVIOUS WEEK AND ON THE DAY OF THE SURVEY, DISAGGREGATED BY GRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>DAR used today</th>
<th>DAR used in past week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly lower number of CT recipient girls were marked present on DAR than were actually present on the day of survey, indicating that DARs may not be being used correctly.

**FIGURE 82** PROPORTION OF SELECTED GIRLS MARKED PRESENT IN DAR, AGAINST PROPORTION OF SELECTED GIRLS PRESENT ON DAY OF SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CT girls in DAR</th>
<th>CT girls present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the high proportion of schools regularly filling in DARs, when enumerators checked the DARs for specific learners, i.e. those who had received a cash transfer, it was found that attendance of these girls was under-reported. As
the above graph indicates, there was a significant disparity between the number of Cash Transfer girls recorded as present in the DARs and the number of girls physically present. This suggests that, although DARs are being used, they are not always being used correctly. A possible recommendation could therefore be a round of refresher training on DAR usage in schools [the last round of training on DARs was done with State Anchors in 2015].

Marginal difference in educational aspirations between Cash Transfer recipients and non-Cash Transfer recipients

The proportion of girls who stated that they wished to stay in education once leaving school was slightly higher amongst Cash Transfer recipients than it was amongst girls who had never received a cash transfer; 65% (n=97) of girls who had received at least one Cash Transfer as opposed to 62% (n=71) of non-Cash Transfer recipients.

![Bar graph showing percentage of learners who report wishing to continue education when they leave school, disaggregated by gender and receiving cash transfers.](image)

The percentage of girls who said that they would like to get married or start working when they leave school was the same for both CT and non-CT recipients at 2% and 31% respectively.

Generally, boys displayed a marginally higher level of educational aspiration than girls. 70% (n=187) said that they would like to stay in education once they finish school, and only 25% (n=68) reported that they would look for other work.
8.3 Spending choices

Reported Cash Transfer spending choices for both years were similar, with the most common reported uses being shoes (67% n=14 in 2014, 64% n=59 in 2016), followed by exercise books, pens/pencils and soap.

Reported Cash Transfer spending choices were relatively consistent across the (former) states, although shoes and exercise books were not always the most common expenditure. Exceptions were Warrap, where only 29% (n=2) of girls reported buying shoes and 14% (n=1) bought exercise books, and Eastern Equatoria where no girls reported that they had spent the money on exercise books: but the numbers involved (n=7 in Warrap, n=2 in Eastern Equatoria) are low.
The majority of girls in both years of receipt report making their own choices on how to spend their transfers.

87% (n=92) of CT recipients said they made decisions on how to spend the money themselves; 75% (n=36) parents interviewed for the household survey said that the money had benefitted the whole household. This is likely to be because Cash Transfer money reduces the overall burden on household finances as the money is...
used for school fees and other educational items which may otherwise have been paid for by the parents.

Of the small percentage of girls whose families reportedly made the spending decisions, or made decisions together with their families, on how CTs were spent, the most common uses aside from education items, were food or household items. This suggests that even though girls generally retain control of the money they receive, they often chose to contribute at least part of it to general household needs.

9. Conclusions and Recommendations

School and classroom practice

There is an evident shortage of basic school equipment across South Sudan, with items such as reading books and chalk identified by teachers and learners as most needed.

Learners report shortages of basic school equipment, with reading books (56%), chalk (49%) and computers (44%) the most frequently cited items. In a change from the baseline, lab equipment is cited by a majority of S2 students, indicating that learners’ expectations are higher than in 2014 (and potentially that some other shortages have been met, e.g. with Capitation Gants or Cash Transfers resources). There has been a growth in the proportion of lessons observed which took place in a permanent classroom, and fall in proportion held in the open air. Potentially this is linked to Capitation Grant spending on building and maintaining permanent structures over the last three years. Whilst use of Capitation Grant money for building and maintaining classrooms was frequently reported for both years, more Head Teachers reported using Capitation Grants for the building of permanent structure, as compared to more temporary structures, in 2015, than in 2014.

Teacher-student interactions are still dominated by ‘front-of-class’ time, although there is evidence that learners speak out more in class now than they did in 2014.
Logical responses include wider-scale teacher professional development, and more teaching and learning materials.

The average reported number of classes taught per week has increased since the baseline, as well as an increase in the proportion of teachers reporting preparing lesson plans and schemes of work, potentially suggesting growth in teacher productivity and capacity linked to GESS training.

There has been very little change in the forms of punishment reportedly used in schools since the baseline; physical punishments, including beating, kneeling, clearing the school compound and other physical work, remain the most common forms of discipline. Corporal punishment is a barrier to education, that could be addressed, at no cost, by regulation: this should be a priority for development partners and MoGEI.

### Teaching

The average number of teachers reported per school has increased since the baseline, potentially as a result of GESS Capitation Grant funding, of which the majority of Head Teachers reported using a percentage to pay volunteer teachers. There was an increase in the prevalence of this between 2014 and 2015, reflecting delays and decrease in real value of teacher wages in this period (17% of teachers report having been on strike in the past year due to lack of salaries).

Whilst it was not possible, due to timing of payments, to collect information regarding use of the 2016 Capitation Grant, rules on eligible uses were changed in 2016 to allow an increase of up to 60% of money received by schools to be spent on teacher incentives this year, and it is expected that schools will have taken up this option. This should be followed up in the Endline to measure frequency of use and impact, and demonstrate the role of GESS in sustaining the education sector.

Average reported qualification levels of primary and secondary school teachers have dipped since the Baseline with a lower proportion of primary school teachers reported to have teacher training certificates and fewer secondary school teachers with Bachelor’s degrees than in 2015. This is most likely because of the rise in reliance on volunteer teachers, and correlates with anecdotal findings from interviews with guardians in the Household Survey who reported noticing a drop in the number of qualified teachers in their child’s school.

There was correlation found between the areas in which head teachers reported that they feel overworked, and the areas in which they would like further training with development of school budgets and school development plans listed as top in both categories, followed by management of teachers. Whilst this is encouraging as it shows engagement with the GESS Capitation Grant and Cash Transfer processes, refresher training in these areas could help alleviate pressure on head teachers in these areas.
The teaching profession remains overwhelmingly male and therefore female students lack role models. Targeted training and support to encourage women to enter and remain in the teaching profession should be considered in order to address gender imbalance in this area.

**School management**

Some improved school management practices can be seen since the baseline, particularly in the formation and involvement of school management bodies who are reportedly meeting with greater frequency. Support to development of School Development Plan and Budget were reported as the top responsibility of both SMCs and PTAs which suggests a commitment to GESS programme. Among BoG members, fewer respondents reported fundraising as one of their top responsibilities, compared with the 2014 Baseline. This perhaps reflects the more challenging economic context on the one hand, and, on the other, relative confidence in GESS Capitation Grants as a key source of school operational income.

In terms of government involvement, schools report they are typically visited 2-3 times a year by Payam supervisors, however the overall frequency of local education authority visits appears to have declined between 2015 and 2016. This evidence is supported by findings from the County & Payam Survey. This could be an area of additional support and training for County and Payam officials but also brings into focus the issue of remuneration and operational funding for education officials.

**Examinations**

The PLE pass rate of girls was higher than the male pass rate in 2015, both as reported by Head Teachers. In the absence of complete national PLE data, this reported data gives helpful indications. As in the Baseline, more boys than girls are recorded as sitting for the Primary Leaving Examination in 2015 by approximately a factor of 3.

At secondary level, the number of girls sitting for the School Certificate Examination in 2015, as reported by Head Teachers, has increased from the figures recorded in the baseline, although overall pass rate has declined slightly in the same period.

**Attendance**

Personal sickness remains the most common reason for learners missing days of school – both boys and girls. Insecurity is a now a major factor affecting attendance: the proportion of both primary and secondary learners who have missed at least one day of school in the last year because of insecurity has risen dramatically since the Baseline. Of the students that had missed school in the past...
year due to insecurity, the highest proportions were found in Western Equatoria and Western Bahr el Ghazal, reflecting the upsurge in violence in those areas.

These patterns were also reflected among teaching staff where, whilst personal sickness was the most commonly cited reason for missing a day of school, the highest average number of reported days absent was due to insecurity. Potential links to community health initiatives and access to basic care on school sites could be explored, for example, colocation of health services at schools – whether at the basic level of ‘School Mothers’/Matrons, Community Health Workers/Boma Health Initiative, or full-scale colocation of Primary Health Care Units, and join-up of education and health administration at County level, is an obvious priority.

Insecurity is a growing barrier to education, that is not primarily within the control of education actors: local authorities should be encouraged to provide ‘crossing patrols’ (if and only if they can be confident that police and other organised forces involved will do no harm) and more to protect children on the way to school; where schools still don’t have fences, they are an obvious, and cost-effective, measure.

A high proportion of schools visited have daily attendance registers (DARS) for pupils, of these a relatively high number are being used regularly. DAR usage appears more common in secondary schools than primary. However, on checking whether specific Cash Transfer recipients were both physically present on the day of the (unannounced) interview and marked in the DAR, significantly lower number of Cash Transfer recipient girls were marked present than were actually present – an unexpected finding, since one would more likely expect generous reporting -- indicating that DARs may not be being used correctly. This could be a focus of future teacher training [the last round of training on DARs was done with State Anchors in 2015]; GESS has programmed this for early 2017.

Quality education

More than half the teachers and Head Teachers interviewed reported having received GESS training in the 2015 school year, and one third by the third term of 2016 when the survey took place.

Head teachers identified preparing the school development plan and budget as key areas in which they would like further training and also as the areas in which they feel overworked. A significant number of training sessions on budget development and developing a school development plan were rolled out at the start of the GESS programme and although refresher training has taken place since, it has been on a smaller scale.

A second round of refresher training with wider coverage would be a logical response. Future GESS training should logically focus on preparing a school development plan and budget, and reporting and administration – and this has
already been actioned in trainings delivered in Q4 2016. It may also be helpful to explore ways to reduce the burden on head teachers in fulfilling these roles.

There is evidence to suggest that the GESS Mentoring programme has not yet had a tangible impact. Although schools that have taken part in mentoring programme gave positive responses, of the 7 schools that were surveyed which had taken part in the mentoring scheme, not all appeared to be aware of the programme or any of its components (training, girls’ clubs etc.).

The high proportion of schools that reported having a mentor or counsellor on site as a local initiative, suggests potential alternative ways to achieve these goals and refocusing of initiatives could be considered.

**Attitudes and aspirations**

Attitudes towards girls’ education among teaching staff have progressed since the Baseline in 2014, with more teachers and Head Teachers disagreeing with the statement that boys are better suited to higher education than girls. State level disaggregation of teacher and Head Teacher responses indicates that parents in Lakes, Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Upper Nile and Jonglei are perceived to assign less value to sending girls to school, although this is gradually improving.

Among learners, aspirations remain high, with 89% aiming to reach S4 and 66.5% reporting ambitions to attend university. (Former) Lakes State in particular has seen a turnaround in levels of aspiration among learners at primary level, with 93% of pupils in P5 wishing to reach S4, compared to just 54% in 2014.

There is evidence to suggest that girls become more ambitious the longer they stay in school. Whilst boys at primary level are marginally more ambitious than girls, with fewer girls aiming to reach S4, the trend is reversed in Senior 2, indicating that, as in the Baseline, girls become more ambitious the longer they stay in school. In terms of confidence in their abilities, girls are less sure at secondary level that they are as well suited to education as boys. This suggests that as the number of girls enrolled in each progressive school year reduces, girls that do continue become less confident of their position.

A logical response could be to work with upper primary and secondary girls to instil confidence in their academic ability and aid them to achieve their aims of completing school. Potential measures to build confidence could include academic enrichment activities and recognition of achievements: summer schools, essay prizes, even as simple as commendations for good work to take home.

The cost of school fees remains the biggest perceived obstacle to learners reaching their desired grade among both primary and secondary students, although evidence suggests that Cash Transfers are reducing the overall impact of school costs on girls. This is corroborated by findings in the Household Survey where
lack of money was the most common reason cited by guardians for why both boys and girls drop out of school.

**Capitation Grants**

According to Head teachers, GESS School Capitation Grants are having a significant impact in schools for improving the number of teachers and environment of instruction. Capitation Grants have tended to be used to meet immediate needs of schools, such as payment of volunteer teachers and maintenance of classrooms, in order to ensure continued functioning, and are valued for this: this reflects the changed context from that at the time of the design of the project.

Payment of volunteer teachers was the most common reported use in both 2014 and 2015 across all schools, followed by maintenance and construction of physical infrastructure, particularly classrooms. By interviewing Head Teachers and checking receipts and observable evidence, it was found that secondary schools more likely to spend money on textbooks and infrastructure items such as water points and latrines, whilst more primary schools spend money on volunteer teachers and classroom construction and maintenance.

Overall, there is a noticeable increase in evidence of Capitation Grant use and accountability at schools being kept and for 2015 spending, compared with evidence of spending in 2014, including showing observable evidence and proof of purchase.

Further guidance and training on accountability and record-keeping would be helpful for school management structures, including correct storage, to ensure improvements continue and more consistent levels of accountability are achieved and maintained. GESS plans to distribute suitable plastic document folders (which will also deal with the issue of more prominent branding for UK Aid).

**Cash Transfers**

Between 2014 and 2015, there has been an increase in the number of schools receiving Cash Transfers each year. In schools where girls did not receive Cash Transfers there appears to be a lack of understanding among Head Teachers as to why. A greater emphasis needs to be placed on giving clear feedback to individual schools in cases where schools have either applied to the GESS programme for Cash Transfers but been unsuccessful, or where most girls have received cash transfers, but some girls were not paid for any reason.

Interviews with Cash Transfer recipients evidenced the positive, tangible effect that the money received has in terms of both retention of girls in school and in reducing economic barriers to education.

The number of 2014 and 2015 randomly pre-selected Cash Transfer recipients found attending on the day of survey was high in comparison to national
enrolment and attrition rates. This is particularly true in the case of 2014 recipient girls found two years on from their first Cash Transfer impact and is supported by an independent analysis of GESS impact undertaken in 2016 which confirms Capitation Grants and Cash Transfers make schools more likely to remain open, increase their enrolment numbers, and increase attendance rates, despite the prevalence of substantial ongoing levels of violence and conflict.

The majority of girls report making decisions for themselves on Cash Transfer uses and are choosing education supporting items, with exercise books, stationary, shoes and soap being among the most common uses reported. There is also evidence that some girls are also choosing to use the money to purchase household items such as food. This is in line with findings from the Household Survey which suggest Cash Transfers have noticeably reduced pressure on guardian spending on both education-related and non-related items, including food and medicine.

*Crawfurd, L. (2016), 'Cash Grants for Schools and Pupils can Increase Enrolment & Attendance Despite Ongoing Conflict: Findings from South Sudan', Center for Global Development & University of Sussex*