Knowledge, Evidence and Research

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, lessons learned to inform future programmes and other contexts. The KER programme develops an evidence base for the project interventions, linking inputs to outcomes and impacts, and gathers broader information about what works in girls’ education. The Programme gathers data continuously through the South Sudan Schools’ Attendance Monitoring System (SSSAMS), twice yearly through Longitudinal Qualitative Survey (LQS), yearly through the School Sample Survey, and then has set piece Baseline (2014), Midline (2016), and Endline (2018) survey waves.
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Executive Summary

The Girls’ Education South Sudan (GESS) programme is a five and half 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 UK aid. One of MoGEI’s strategic objectives is to eliminate barriers to girls’ education and promote gender equality throughout the education system.

This report summarises the findings from the Endline School Survey. For the sake of comparability, the structure of the comparable survey remains very similar to that of the Baseline and Midline. As at Midline, the School Sample Survey, which asks questions specifically on accountability for, and impact of, Capitation Grants (CG) and Cash Transfers (CT), the decision was made to merge the two surveys in for 2018 (the School Sample Survey occurred as a standalone study in 2017 to ensure consistent coverage between 2014 and 2018). As a result, questions on CG and CT impact and effectiveness, as well us use of daily attendance registers (DARs) are also included in the Endline and are comparable to the Midline.

Structure

This Endline 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 (SMCs), as well as lesson observations and building facility observations. The report presents findings by School and Classroom Practice (Section 4), outlining classroom organisation, teaching methods, teacher qualifications, absenteeism, and commenting on the experiences within class and the broader school environment. Section 5 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 6 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. Section 7 looks at Capitation Grants and Section 8 looks at Cash Transfers, these two sections investigate spending choices and the impact these cash transfers are having on students and 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 in March 2018 and concluded in July 2018. The sampling frame was based on the list of schools previously identified during the Midline school survey conducted in 2016. The list included all schools registered in the South Sudan Schools’ Attendance Monitoring System (SAMS), 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 sample is robust to schools known to be unavailable (including those that are closed or inaccessible) due to insecurity or bad weather, which were replaced at random with another school drawn from the same stratum.

During fieldwork, insecurity and poor weather hampered the ability of enumerators to reach certain rural schools, and they were unable to reach the full sample of 250 schools. 116 primary schools and 39 secondary schools were visited across all ten former States. Of the 155 schools visited in these unannounced inspections, 144 were found to be operational, up from the 88% of schools found to be operational in the Midline sample. Former Western Bahr el Ghazal (WBG) and Upper Nile State (UNS) States were the worst affected.

Two surveyed schools were removed from the dataset as they had received prior information from the County Liaison Officer (CLO).

An additional ten schools were included in the survey as part of the Teacher Professional Development (TPD) study. The full complement of surveys was not completed in these schools, so they have been removed from the sample to be analysed separately.

Overall a total of 97 primary schools and 34 secondary schools were sampled. Proportionally, this is representative of the current ratio of primary schools to secondary schools in South Sudan and is comparable to the Midline research and the 2017 School Sample Survey coverage. It is slightly below the 60:40 split sought in the overall KER strategy to achieve a designed over-representation of secondary schools in GESS research.

The results of the School Sample Survey were presented and discussed at a dissemination event at MoGEI on 31 August 2018.
Key Findings

School and Classroom Practices

- Consistent with the findings presented in the Baseline and Midline reports, chalk remains a pressing concern for Head Teachers. Of the 153 Head Teachers interviewed, 59% reported chalk as their foremost concern; computers were a frequently-reported second concern (51%), and textbooks the third most reported deficiency (32%).
- With respect to furniture, 82% of Head Teachers report chairs as their top concern, 86% report desks as a concern, and 47% report cupboards as a significant missing item. Disaggregation by State shows significant inequalities in the distribution of basic furniture among schools.
- The proportion of classes conducted in permanent buildings has remained somewhat static from the Midline, though the number of classes conducted in a roof-only building has fallen, and the number conducted in the open is minimal.
- The overwhelming majority of schools report using the South Sudanese curriculum (93%, n=142). This shows a trend towards standardisation in the use of the South Sudanese curriculum, compared to Baseline and Midline.
- The majority of classes at upper primary and secondary level are being conducted in English, with 98% and 97% of classes respectively conducted in English.
- Of the 1707 primary school teachers reported by Head Teachers, 76% were reported by the Head Teacher as being able to speak English. Of the 542 secondary school teachers reported by Head Teachers, 92% were reported by the Head Teacher as able to speak English.
- Punishments were widely reported, and vary very little from Baseline and Midline. Chores around the compound were more commonly reported than physical forms of punishment, though beatings remain very common.

Examinations

- Exam pass rates have increased since the Midline, with 90% of boys and 83% of girls passing the Primary Leaving Examination (PLE) as reported by Head Teachers. These figures represent an improvement from the Midline, at which 77% of boys and 79% of girls passed.
- With respect to the South Sudan Certificate of Secondary Education (SSCSE), boys’ performance has declined since the Midline and Baseline (62% pass at Endline, against 69% at Midline and 72% at Baseline), though girls have shown a marked improvement since the Midline (72% at Endline against 31% at Midline and 32% at Baseline).

Attendance

- The proportion of learners reporting no absences has fallen since the Midline.
- The average number of days missed by girls at Endline was 4.8, compared to 3.8 by boys, showing a relatively small differential between the genders.
• The proportion of girls reporting absence due to childcare requirements has fallen from 16% at the Midline to 11% at Endline. The proportion of both girls and boys missing work due to domestic duties remains consistent with the Midline.
• The proportion of both boys and girls missing school due to insecurity has fallen since the Midline.
• Days lost to absence by Head Teachers were found to average 6.38, which is an improvement on the 12.1 days reported as by Head Teachers at Midline.
• Overall, 61% (n=94) of schools reported having a pupil absence policy in place, which is an increase from 54% in the Midline.

**Quality Education**

• Increasing from the Midline, 74% of teachers at Endline reported creating a lesson plan for all their lessons, and 21% for just some of the lessons. The Midline reported that 65% of teachers created a lesson plan for all lessons, which in turn an increase from the 15% that reported the same at Baseline.
• Just 29 teachers (12%) reported having a Bachelor’s degree, with secondary education certificate being by far the most common qualification.
• In the lesson observations, teachers were recorded as talking to both genders equally 82% of the time. This represents an improvement since the Midline, which recorded teachers talking equally to both genders 77% of the time.

**Attitudes and Aspirations**

• Only 32% of teachers reported having a gender policy in place, which reflects a decline from the 43% reporting the same at Midline.
• Between 2014 and 2016, the proportion of teachers and Head Teachers combined reporting that they disagree or strongly disagree that boys are more suited to higher education than girls increased, from 66.9% to 72.5%. In the Endline sample there has again been a small increase to 75% of combined teachers and Head Teachers.
• More boys than girls agree with the statement that girls are less likely to need an education in their future than boys (27% of boys against 22% of girls). While girls disagree with the statement quite consistently (including both disagree and strongly disagree), there is a concerning surge in the number of older (S2) girls who report agreeing that they are less likely to need an education in their future. Furthermore, a worryingly high proportion of S2 girls consistently report agreeing (21%) or strongly agreeing (9%) that girls are less likely to need an education for their future.
• The proportion of teachers and Head Teachers reporting that they agree that parents prioritise sending boys to school over girls has fallen since both Midline and Baseline (56% and 54.4% respectively) to 45%.
• The longer girls remain in school, the more ambitious they become; at P5, 80% of girls aspire to S4 while this increases to 100% of S2 girls aspiring to reach S4. At P5 girls and boys are approximately equal in their aspiration, but they overtake boys in aspiration by the time they reach S2.
• Overall, 85% of both boys and girls reported wishing to reach S4, throughout the sample. This represents a small decrease from the Midline in which 91% of boys and 87% of girls aspired to S4.

• The effect of Cash Transfers is possibly identifiable through the difference in the perceived difficulty in attainment posed by money. Significantly more boys than girls reported foreseeing school fees as an obstacle, and slightly more boys than girls reported ancillary expenses posing a threat to attainment. However, for marriage, pregnancy and ill-health girls saw themselves as more at risk than boys.

**Capitation Grants**

• Classroom maintenance and improvement was reported as the most common use of Capitation Grant money at 48% of schools (n=36) that received a Capitation Grant in 2017. Reports of classroom construction reported 25% building (n=19) with local, semi-permanent materials, and 5% building (n=4) with permanent materials.

• Other commonly reported spending choices included exercise books (33%, n=25), textbooks (27%, n=20), and chalkboards (15%, n=11).

• 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 classroom construction and maintenance. Head Teachers in secondary schools reported spending Capitation Grant funds on, among other things, textbooks, fuel for generators, and payments for volunteer teachers.

• 77% (n=58) of Head Teachers reported that the money had contributed to a better environment of instruction; 39% (n=29) identified better/more volunteer teachers, 71% (n=53) increased attendance, and 61% (n=46) improved school management as among positive effects of the grant.

**Cash Transfers**

• The majority of schools surveyed had received Cash Transfers for female learners in 2017, at 90% of schools (n=122). This is a marked increase in the number that had received at the Midline report; this is consistent with what GESS had paid out.

• The most common reported uses were shoes (77% n=469), followed by uniforms, exercise books, and school bags.

• 94% (n=575) of CT recipients said they made decisions on how to spend the money themselves, which is an increase from 87% at Midline.
Key Recommendations

- Basic needs for schools remain a critical concern. The effective value of GESS Capitation Grants has reduced tenfold since the start of the Programme; CGs funded by GRSS in 2018/19 have been adjusted upwards, but remain well below original target levels. Continuing funding for basic school items, through Capitation Grants at sufficient rates, is crucial to continuing the positive trends in educational quality.

- Sickness remains a persistent cause of absence for Head Teachers, teachers and learners. Consistent with findings and recommendations at the Midline, integrating government or NGO-provided health services to school, and joining-up of education and health administration at County level, may help to reduce absence, and increase overall levels of learning.

- Cost of education is still reported as a major barrier to education; for the first time at Endline more boys reported this than girls, corroborated by qualitative findings from the Household Survey. In light of this, consider expanding the CT programme to include vulnerable and/or economically marginalised children, regardless of gender. A full vulnerability analysis (including of those school-aged children not in school) could be conducted to examine the vulnerability of both boys and girls.

- CTs are tangibly improving girls’ access to education, but the declining effective value of the CT in context of the economic crisis could weaken positive enrolment trends. If Cash Transfers are not adjusted to account for exchange rate depreciation inflation and the worsening economic situation, learners may not be able to purchase essential commodities/prerequisites (uniforms, shoes, exercise books, soap and sanitary pads) which preclude even basic learning. Concern may also be raised that with household budgets squeezed during the ongoing economic collapse, the next cycle may see girls’ autonomy on spending decisions diluted as the basic needs of households become harder to meet.

- Corporal punishment remains a barrier to education, that could be addressed, at no cost, by regulation: this should be a priority for development partners and MoGEI.

- IMPACT incentives have reduced CG spending on teachers’ incentives, but without reliable, consistent, and reasonable salary payments to attract and retain qualified teachers in the profession, these may not be translated into transformative education.

- Girls have consistently reported spending CT money on items for school attendance, such as uniforms and shoes, which, whilst requirements for school attendance, do not in themselves provide educational enrichment. Finding a solution could be a priority for development partners and MoGEI moving forward; for example, the use of low-cost school identification materials such as tabards, which provide a sense of homogenous identity and easy identification without undue financial burden.

---


ii European Union-funded programme that paying incentives to primary school teachers.
• 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.

• The Endline confirms trends identified in the Baseline and Midline that the longer a learner is in school the more likely they are to want to complete their education; policies should therefore seek to provide role models and reduce structural barriers to school drop-out. In addition, consider developing a funding structure that supports adolescents in their transition to further education or a sustainable and entry into the employment market, in order to ensure the benefits of education do not end at Secondary 4.

• Further guidance and training on accountability and record-keeping would be helpful for school management structures, to ensure improvements continue and more consistent levels of accountability are achieved and maintained.

• If County and Payam officials are to supervise schools, they need to be paid a consistent wage, and have operational funding to do so.
1 Background

1.1 The GESS programme in South Sudan

The Girls’ Education South Sudan 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 UK aid. 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, and 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 Mott MacDonald/Cambridge Education (lead), BBC Media Action, Charlie Goldsmith Associates and Winrock International.

GESS 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 the Government of the Republic of South Sudan 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. Knowledge, Evidence and Research - increased knowledge and evidence of what works to promote girls’ education in South Sudan.

1.2 An update on the South Sudanese context since the Baseline and Midline Reports

The security and economic situation in South Sudan has deteriorated significantly since the Baseline. Despite this, enrolment has increased by 800,000 over the last five years;
however, up to 2.4 million South Sudanese children are still not in schools within the country.iii

The context in which GESS operates has deteriorated since 2014, as the dynamics of the conflict that broke out in December 2013 have shifted, and the economy has collapsed. Fighting was initially concentrated in the Greater Upper Nile region, but later spread to areas that had previously been relatively stable, in particular the Equatorias and former Western Bahr el Ghazal (WBG) State. This resulted in mass displacement both within South Sudan and into bordering countries, 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, and the intensification of the conflict elsewhere. In July 2018, the number of South Sudanese seeking refuge in neighbouring countries stood at 2.47 million, with an additional 1.74 million Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs).iv

This deterioration in the security and humanitarian situation has taken place against a backdrop of economic collapse. The fall in oil production has severely eroded the Government of South Sudan’s chief source of revenue; meanwhile inflation has accelerated, with the effective South Sudanese Pound (SSP):USD exchange rate increasing from 4.61:1 in September 2014 to 76:1 in September 2016, and beyond 300:1 in early 2018. This has had a strongly negative impact on education delivery as a whole, eroding the value of teachers’ salaries and affecting the ability of schools to execute their budgets.

While the education sector has continued to operate, its ability to do so effectively has been hampered by the challenging security and economic context. As at August 2018, there were over 4,000 schools open in South Sudan, with 1,705,433 pupils enrolled, taught by around 40,000 full-time teachers, according to data on the SAMS (www.sssams.org - the near real-time management information system developed as part of GESS). However, UNESCO estimates that between 2.2 and 2.4 million children are still out of school in South Sudan, a number that is likely to rise.v

A new peace agreement was signed in August 2018 and oil production is set to start again with the support of Sudan. It remains to be seen how the context of the country will change as the GESS programme comes to an end and GESS2 begins.

iii https://www.unicef.org/southsudan/media_21715.html
iv Figures taken from OCHA’s South Sudan Humanitarian Bulleting, July 15 2018, available at: https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/20180716_OCHA_SouthSudan_Humanitarian_Bulletin%236.pdf
2 Purpose of Survey & Methodology

2.1 GESS Knowledge, Evidence & Research Objectives

The Knowledge, Evidence and Research 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 from P5-P8 and from S1-S4, and which aspects of the Programme contributed towards this?
- Has there been a change in the 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 programme;
- 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 acquire more in-depth information about relationships, activities, and processes linking programme interventions to the outcomes were proposed. These are
school and classroom practices, educational choices by households and girls, and management capacity and structures.

- Complementary to the school survey:
  - In-depth Household Surveys were conducted in March and June 2018, 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 Baseline and Midline results, are presented in a separate report.
  - County and Payam Surveys were also conducted between March and June 2018 with the purpose of gathering information regarding the management structure and capacities of Payam Education Offices (PEO) and County Education Departments (CEDs). All data has been compared with the findings from the 2014 Baseline and 2016 Midline in order to measure the theory of change and are presented in a separate report.
3 Methodology

3.1 Sampling Strategy

For consistency, and to allow like-for-like comparison with the Baseline and Midline findings, the Endline 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 Midline school survey conducted in 2016. The list included all schools registered in SAMS, 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 Endline surveys revisited the same schools used during the Midline, with replacements made from the sample where schools were reported to be non-operational or in areas inaccessible due to the changing security landscape post-July 2016.

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.

Whilst the Baseline focused on seven (former) States, at Midline an additional sample was drawn up for Greater Upper Nile and the research was scaled up to be nationwide with a total sample size of 250 schools. However, the outbreak of conflict in Juba in July 2016 and the subsequent unrest in other parts of the country disrupted both survey logistics and school operations, meaning that the Midline sample size was reduced to 100 schools, of which 93 were operational on the day of survey.

For Endline, as with the 2017 School Sample Survey, continuing insecurity in some areas pushed data collection timelines back, and poor weather conditions in some areas limited the extent to which enumerators could travel to schools outside of urban areas to the full sample of 250 schools. Nevertheless, enumerators reached a total of 155 schools across all ten former States, including 116 primary schools and 39 secondary schools.

Of the 155 schools visited, 144 were found to be operating and functional on the day of survey. This is a positive figure, as despite ongoing challenges, 93% of schools visited unannounced were found to be operational, up from 88% in the School Sample Survey conducted in 2017. The areas of least functionality were the former States of WBG and UNS.

Two schools were found to be aware of the research team’s visit in advance and therefore removed from the final dataset, in line with the survey methodology, which dictates surveys must be unannounced.
A further ten schools were selected as part of the Teacher Professional Development study only, and removed from the overall School Survey sample to be analysed separately under Output 2c of GESS.

Overall, a total of 97 primary schools and 34 secondary schools were sampled. Proportionally, this is representative of the current ratio of primary schools to secondary schools in South Sudan, and is comparable to Midline and the 2017 School Sample Survey coverage. However, it falls below the 60:40 split sought in the overall KER strategy, in order to achieve the designed over-representation of secondary schools in GESS research.

FIGURE 1 NUMBER AND LOCATION OF SCHOOL INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

TABLE 1 LIST OF ALL SCHOOLS SURVEYED AS PART OF THE ENDLINE SCHOOL SURVEY (N=131)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>SAMS</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Former State</th>
<th>Former County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rumanguoth Primary School</td>
<td>RML</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dok Kul Primary School</td>
<td>DKK</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maper East Primary School</td>
<td>MST</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aweil Going Primary School</td>
<td>PEG</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariathdit Primary School</td>
<td>RTH</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph Primary School</td>
<td>STY</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Daystar Secondary School</td>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udhum Secondary School</td>
<td>DHU</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majook Adim Primary School</td>
<td>MDO</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angonglej Primary School</td>
<td>NGC</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riangangon Primary School</td>
<td>RNT</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War-Alel Primary School</td>
<td>WRO</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>NBG</td>
<td>Aweil West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doronj Secondary School</td>
<td>DSS</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Bor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malek 1 Primary School</td>
<td>MLL</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Bor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agorbaar</td>
<td>MMF</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Bor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyinmajok</td>
<td>NNT</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Bor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyrs Primary School</td>
<td>RTY</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Bor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunlight Primary School</td>
<td>SLG</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Bor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awakening Secondary School</td>
<td>WAK</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Bor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aluel Guet Primary School</td>
<td>ALU</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Cueibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbaidit Primary School</td>
<td>DRH</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Cueibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palou Pec Primary School</td>
<td>Mpe</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Cueibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngatinga Primary School</td>
<td>NAI</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Cueibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagor Primary School</td>
<td>PGJ</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Cueibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wel Primary School</td>
<td>WLE</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Cueibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbuoi Location Primary School</td>
<td>WLO</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Cueibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayath Girls Primary School</td>
<td>WYG</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Cueibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cueibet Primary School</td>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Cueibet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuajok National Secondary School</td>
<td>AJN</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Gogrial West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPHA Primary School</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Gogrial West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammy Robin 2 Primary School.</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Gogrial West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akon Secondary School</td>
<td>KNB</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Gogrial West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage Primary School</td>
<td>MNQ</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Gogrial West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngap Anthian Primary School</td>
<td>NAT</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Gogrial West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panliet Primary School</td>
<td>NBY</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Gogrial West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angui Primary School</td>
<td>NGI</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Gogrial West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyiel Kou Primary School</td>
<td>NKA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Gogrial West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlabara West Primary School</td>
<td>AWB</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulluk Model Primary School</td>
<td>BUD</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Friendship Secondary School</td>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba 1 Boys Primary School</td>
<td>JBO</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba Commercial Secondary School</td>
<td>JCM</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba Girls Secondary School</td>
<td>JGR</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juba Technical Secondary School</td>
<td>JSU</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabu Primary School</td>
<td>KAA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockcity Nursery and Primary School</td>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rokon Secondary School</td>
<td>RKO</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejaf West B Primary School</td>
<td>RWB</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supiri Secondary School</td>
<td>SPC</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul Nursery &amp; Primary School</td>
<td>SPU</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlabara East Primary School</td>
<td>TLA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usratuna Primary School</td>
<td>WLU</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Juba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Primary School</td>
<td>GGA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Jur River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Lamb Academy Primary School</td>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Kapoeta East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comboni Nadapal Day Mixed Primary School</td>
<td>CMF</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Kapoeta East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopua Memorial Secondary School</td>
<td>LPE</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Kapoeta East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Daniel Comboni Boys Primary School</td>
<td>STC</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Kapoeta East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotome Primary School</td>
<td>BYS</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Kapoeta South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singaita Primary School</td>
<td>SNB</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Kapoeta South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunj Secondary School</td>
<td>BJB</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Maban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunj Basic School</td>
<td>BUP</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Maban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasmala Basic School</td>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Maban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotobi Secondary School</td>
<td>KTY</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Mundri West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundri II Primary School</td>
<td>MII</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Mundri West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motherland Secondary School</td>
<td>MOH</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Mundri West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundri Adventist Primary School</td>
<td>MUD</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Mundri West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundri Secondary School</td>
<td>MWX</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Mundri West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majook-adim Primary School</td>
<td>MGO</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Raja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comboni Basic School</td>
<td>CMB</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Renk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Shoum Alinj Primary School</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Renk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jok Yousof Ngor Primary School</td>
<td>JYN</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Renk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najkur chol Primary School</td>
<td>NCH</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Renk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazer Lul Primary School</td>
<td>NLU</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Renk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renk Boys Secondary School</td>
<td>RBY</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Renk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renk Girls Secondary School</td>
<td>RER</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Renk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yabioch Secondary School</td>
<td>YOB</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>UNS</td>
<td>Renk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gol Meen Primary School</td>
<td>GLE</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Rumbek Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretto Girls Secondary School</td>
<td>LIR</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Rumbek Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loretto Maker Kuei Primary School</td>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Rumbek Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madol-Akoc Primary School</td>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Rumbek Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapeer LI Primary School</td>
<td>MPL</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Rumbek Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyatkangui Primary School</td>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Rumbek Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyangkot Primary School</td>
<td>QHP</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Rumbek Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumbek National Secondary School</td>
<td>RTN</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>LKS</td>
<td>Rumbek Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Garang Primary School</td>
<td>DRN</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Ruweng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panyang Primary School</td>
<td>HJK</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Ruweng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomlou Primary School</td>
<td>NNM</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Ruweng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parieng Secondary School</td>
<td>PRN</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Ruweng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Micheal Primary School</td>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Ruweng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yida Primary School</td>
<td>YDB</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>UTY</td>
<td>Ruweng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumak Primary School</td>
<td>DME</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Torit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Garang Secondary School</td>
<td>DRZ</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Torit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Teraza Primary School</td>
<td>EUA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Torit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiyala Secondary School</td>
<td>HIY</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Torit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torit Model Primary School</td>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Torit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Holy Rosary Primary School</td>
<td>YPJ</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>EES</td>
<td>Torit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajong Primary School</td>
<td>AGJ</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Twic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhangrial Primary School</td>
<td>DHN</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Twic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muon Primary School</td>
<td>MFT</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Twic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majakaher Primary School</td>
<td>MJO</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Twic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandit Primary School</td>
<td>PMU</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Twic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turalie Sunrise Primary School</td>
<td>Trv</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Twic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titchok Primary School</td>
<td>TTB</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WRP</td>
<td>Twic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wunlir Primary School</td>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Twic East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr John Garang Secondary School</td>
<td>DRY</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Twic East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khir Primary School</td>
<td>KAK</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Twic East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongor Primary School</td>
<td>KON</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Twic East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panyagor Primary School</td>
<td>LBP</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Twic East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ameer Primary School</td>
<td>MEE</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Twic East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayom Primary School</td>
<td>MGW</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Twic East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakuor Primary School</td>
<td>PKI</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>JGL</td>
<td>Twic East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Mukhtar Girls Secondary School</td>
<td>EGR</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Wau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinti Secondary School</td>
<td>GRQ</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Wau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Family Basic School</td>
<td>HLY</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Wau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Paul Secondary School</td>
<td>JHC</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Wau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khorgana Primary School</td>
<td>KHR</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Wau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosti Girls Primary School</td>
<td>KTZ</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Wau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilfam Primary School</td>
<td>NBB</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Wau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taban Primary School</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WBG</td>
<td>Wau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabagu Upper Primary School</td>
<td>NVP</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Yambio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masiya Nursery and Primary School</td>
<td>SYA</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Yambio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yabongo Evening Secondary School</td>
<td>YEV</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Yambio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yambio Primary School</td>
<td>YMC</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>WES</td>
<td>Yambio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ the King Primary School</td>
<td>CTK</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Yei River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul Secondary School</td>
<td>KIV</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Yei River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahad Nursery &amp; Primary School</td>
<td>MHB</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Yei River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah Orphanage Secondary School</td>
<td>NEH</td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Yei River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yei Academy Primary School</td>
<td>YAC</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Yei River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Quantitative Surveys

Enumerators aimed to conduct quantitative surveys with Head Teachers, teachers, members of School Management Committees, and students, including girls who had received CTs, 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:

- Parent Teacher Association (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, including 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 eight Cash Transfer recipients, one from each grade who had received CTs in 2014, 2015 or both years were to be interviewed. 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 CT amount; and
• Whether girls who received CTs are still attending school regularly.

A Building Facilities Observation was 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 of teachers, and the learning activities of pupils.

3.3 Limitations

As at Midline, because the overall sample size was limited by logistical issues such as insecurity and weather, which limited the areas that could be reached by researchers, the KER team made the decision to again include all schools surveyed, despite not having similar numbers of schools per State.

Some States such as (former) Unity State were particularly inaccessible which meant that, as at Midline, there is a smaller sample size, thus reducing the accuracy and representativeness of findings. In order to mitigate against this in analysis and discussion of findings at national level, all State-level results have been compared across the (former) States to verify any conclusions. All findings have therefore been presented as percentages so as not to skew the results.

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 knowledge of and adherence to their duties, as well as pupil and teacher attendance and opinions on the 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 Textbooks and school materials

Consistent with the findings presented in the Baseline and Midline reports, chalk remains a pressing concern for Head Teachers. Of the 153 Head Teachers interviewed, 59% reported chalk as their foremost concern; computers were a frequently-reported second concern (51%), and textbooks the third most reported deficiency (32%).

FIGURE 2 PERCENTAGE OF HEAD TEACHERS WHO IDENTIFY CHALK, COMPUTERS, AND TEXTBOOKS AS MOST NEEDED ITEMS

Disaggregating by State, there are significant variations in the deficiencies reported by Head Teachers. States such as former Northern Bahr el Ghazal (NBG) appear to have met basic needs, with low demand for chalk and textbooks, while identifying a need for computers, States such as former Jonglei (JGL) show high levels of demand for chalk and textbooks, yet low demand for computers, demonstrating the need for basic materials to be delivered consistently.

Turning to furniture, 82% of Head Teachers report chairs as their top concern, 86% report desks as a concern, and 47% report cupboards as a significant missing item. Disaggregation below by former State shows significant inequalities in the distribution of basic furniture among schools.
The Midline report highlighted an upward trend in the number of lessons conducted in a permanent classroom (74%, up from 54% at Baseline). This seems to have levelled out, as 70% of lessons are now conducted in a permanent classroom. This trend is confirmed by the research into the use of CGs – fewer classrooms are now being built as the real terms cash value of the grants has diminished over the course of the programme.

Disaggregation by primary and secondary paints a relatively consistent picture, with the vast majority of classes conducted in permanent or semi-permanent structures.

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

**FIGURE 4 TYPES OF CLASSROOM, COMPARISON BETWEEN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY**
4.2 Curricula and Language

The overwhelming majority of schools report using the South Sudanese curriculum (93%, n=142), with just one school using the Ugandan curriculum and one school using an “other” curriculum (non-responses comprised 6% of responses). This shows a trend towards standardisation in the use of the South Sudanese curriculum, compared to previous surveys: the Midline report showed that 4% of schools were using a blend of the South Sudanese and Kenyan curriculum, and 30% of teachers in the Baseline reported using the Sudanese curriculum; in contrast, both the Sudanese and Kenyan curricula seem to have fallen out of circulation at Endline.

The majority of classes at upper primary and secondary level are being conducted in English, with 98% and 97% of classes respectively conducted in English. This remains consistent with the proportions reporting using English in both 2014 and 2016, with the Midline report raising concerns about the possible over-reporting of the use of English by Head Teachers. Use of mother tongue is significantly more common at lower primary level, with 56% of classes (n=53) being conducted in the mother tongue. Arabic is rarely reported by Head Teachers as the language of instruction across all school types, with just eight lower primary schools and three secondary schools reported using Arabic as language of tuition.

These findings on language use are somewhat corroborated by the survey of teachers, with 95% and 96% of teachers in upper primary and secondary school respectively reporting using English as the main language of instruction. Consistent with the Head Teachers’ survey, 64% of lower primary teachers reported using English as the main language of instruction. Arabic and mother tongue (9% and 27% respectively) were reported as the language of instruction at lower primary, with insignificant numbers of upper primary and secondary teachers reporting non-English use.

Of the 1707 primary school teachers reported by Head Teachers, 76% were reported by the Head Teacher as being able to speak English. Of the 542 secondary school teachers
reported by Head Teachers, 92% were reported by the Head Teacher as able to speak English. Overall, the teaching stock reported as extant by Head Teachers totalled 2249, with 80% (n=1793) reported as speaking English. This is a substantial increase from the Midline, in which just 51% of teachers were reported by their Head Teachers as being able to speak English.

4.3 Lesson Observations

In terms of classroom resources, based on lesson observations, teachers were found to be using a textbook alone as a teaching material for 63% of the lesson, taken as an average of all lessons observed.

The figure below sets out the activity that was observed in the classroom during the lesson observations, at four-minute intervals.
FIGURE 6 TEACHER ACTIVITY PATTERNS THROUGHOUT OBSERVED LESSONS

The teacher has left the classroom/the lesson has ended
Teacher marking
Participating in group discussion; assisting individuals or pairs
Moving around amongst students
Demonstrating or displaying work
Teacher talking to the class
Writing on or reading something from the blackboard
Teacher observing class or observing learner working on blackboard
No teaching activity
At the 16-minute mark, up to 60% of classes were listening to the teacher at the front of the class. In only 3% of cases was the teacher found to be facilitating or engaging in group or pair discussions at the 16-minute mark.

The chart below highlights that on average 40% of the lessons at the 16-minute mark featured children sitting silently, with just 5% of the classes featuring children engaging in discussions. This snapshot at the half-way point in the lesson observation gives insight into the class in full-flow.

---

FIGURE 7 STUDENTS ACTIVITY IN MINUTE 16
Baseline reports indicated that students remained silent 87% of the time; these results, and those of the Midline indicate that this is changing, with more time being given to learners speaking. However, the proportion of the classes in which learners were silent is higher at Endline than at the Midline.

### 4.4 Reported Exam Pass Rates

Exam pass rates have increased since the Midline, with 90% of boys and 83% of girls passing the PLE as reported by Head Teachers. These figures represent an improvement from the Midline, at which 77% of boys and 79% of girls passed. With respect to the South Sudan Secondary Certificate of Education (SSSCE), boys’ performance has declined since the Midline and Baseline (62% pass at Endline, against 69% at Midline and 72% at Baseline), though girls have shown a marked improvement since the Midline (72% at Endline against 31% at Midline and 32% at Baseline).
4.5 Absenteeism

The proportion of learners reporting no absences has fallen since the Midline, though in some States there has been an increase over the Baseline. The pattern is relatively inconsistent, with some former States showing very different rates over the life of the Programme, and there is significant variation between States. The average number of days missed by girls in 2017 was 4.8, compared to 3.8 by boys, showing a relatively small differential between the genders. Considering the structural and normative pressures against women and girls, this relatively small differential is regarded as positive.
As the figures are self-reported, the relationship between these figures and reality may be somewhat tenuous.

Overall, sickness of either the learner or of a family member continues to represent a significant obstacle to attendance. The proportion of girls reporting absence due to childcare requirements has fallen from 16% at the Midline to 11% at Endline. The proportion of both girls and boys missing work due to domestic duties remains consistent with the Midline. The proportion of learners disrupted by bad weather or flooding has reduced since the Midline (at which it was reported by 27% of males and 31% of females).

Overall, the proportion of both boys and girls missing school due to insecurity has fallen since the Midline (at which it was reported by 29% of boys and 26% of girls). When disaggregated by school type, the Endline survey results show that 38% of secondary school boys and 28% of secondary school girls reported missing school due to insecurity. The numbers for primary school-going boys and girls are 17% and 16% respectively: this disparity may reflect the longer distances that are generally required for secondary students to travel to school, and/or age-related risks that may be higher for older students (e.g. the risk of forced conscription for boys, or of gender-based violence for girls).

These numbers are all lower than the figures at Midline (45% of secondary boys and 30% of secondary girls; 28% of primary school boys and 25% of primary school girls), but represent a significant increase from the Baseline (0.9% of secondary school boys and 0% of secondary school girls; 1.9% of primary school boys and 1.6% of primary school girls).
This is consistent with the spread of insecurity across the country since December 2013, and particularly following July 2016.

Looking at absence reasons for both Head Teachers and teachers, illness of themselves or of a relative remains a leading reason for absence, as with learners.

While strike action was only reported by one teacher as reason for absence, 12 (5%) of teachers reported striking in the past year. Head Teachers of 13 schools reported a total of 89 teachers were striking on the day of the survey. Previous reports highlight that teachers may have been unwilling to admit that their reason for absence was strike action due to non-payment of salary, resulting in this discrepancy.
Days lost to absence by Head Teachers were found to average 6.38 in 2017, which is an improvement on the 12.1 days reported as by Head Teachers at Midline. Teachers reported missing an average of 6.03 days, which is almost identical to figures from the Midline.

Overall, 61% (n=94) of schools reported having a pupil absence policy in place, which is an increase from 54% in the Midline.

**FIGURE 14** PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS WITH A PUPIL ABSENCE POLICY, AS REPORTED BY HEAD TEACHERS

---

### 4.6 Discipline and Punishment

Punishments were widely reported and vary very little from Baseline and Midline. Chores around the compound were more commonly reported than physical forms of punishment, though beatings remain very common. The disparity between beatings reported between teachers and learners is perhaps to be expected.
FIGURE 15 COMMON FORMS OF PUNISHMENT AS REPORTED BY HEAD TEACHERS, TEACHERS, AND LEARNERS

FIGURE 16 TYPES OF PUNISHMENT USED IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, AS REPORTED BY HEAD TEACHERS
The very small sample numbers make it difficult to draw conclusions from these figures. However, gender equality in punishment is reported by the near majority of Head Teachers who answered the questions on gender distribution of punishments (not the full sample).

FIGURE 18 MOST LIKELY BODY OR PERSON REPORTED TO IF THERE IS AN INAPPROPRIATE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A TEACHER AND A Student, ACCORDING TO TEACHERS AND HEAD TEACHERS

The number of teachers and Head Teachers indicating that no action should be taken in the event of a teacher/learner relationship is negligible. The proportion of teachers and Head Teachers who would report the relationship to school management is high (65% of teachers and 43% of Head Teachers), although a relatively small percentage would report this to the
police (4% of teachers and 4% of Head Teachers) or government officials (17% of teachers and 18% of Head Teachers).

A very small percentage of teachers or Head Teachers would take no further action. However, the majority would take stricter action against the teacher in question, with a significant minority of teachers reporting that the teacher would be dismissed. A surprising number of Head Teachers reported they would only provide a warning.

4.7 Teacher Workload

The Midline indicated that despite inflation eroding the value of teachers’ wages in government schools (from effective market value of $60 per month to $3 per month), the number of teachers in schools has increased over time (with the slight exception of volunteer female teachers). The Midline School Survey noted that this is possibly a result of the number of schools spending their Capitation Grant on paying teachers’ salaries, following a 2016 change in rules that made it possible for schools to spend up to 60% of their Capitation Grant on teachers’ salaries. Endline figures show that there is a significant increase in teachers across the board, both from the Baseline and the Midline.

| TABLE 2 CHANGE IN AVERAGE NUMBER OF TEACHERS PER SCHOOL BETWEEN 2014 AND 2018 |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|              | Permanent male | Permanent female | Volunteer male | Volunteer female |
| Baseline     | 6.1          | 1.1            | 4.0           | 0.7            |
| Midline      | 7.0          | 2.0            | 6.1           | 0.6            |
| Endline      | 7.6          | 2.5            | 7.3           | 1.2            |
The number of classes per week shows an increase over Baseline and Endline figures, particularly at more senior levels.

**FIGURE 20 AVERAGE NUMBER OF CLASSES TAUGHT PER WEEK, AS REPORTED BY TEACHERS**

Increasing from the Midline, 74% of teachers at Endline reported creating a lesson plan for all their lessons, and 21% for just some of the lessons. The Midline reported that 65% of teachers created a lesson plan for all lessons, which in turn an increase from the 15% that reported the same at Baseline.

**FIGURE 21 PROPORTION OF TEACHERS WHO REPORTED THAT THEY HAD MADE LESSON PLANS FOR ALL LESSONS IN THE PREVIOUS WEEK, COMPARISON BETWEEN BASELINE, MIDLINE, AND ENDLINE**
This varies somewhat by State, with former States such as Western Equatoria State (WES), Warrap (WRP) and NBG showing a slight fall in the number of teachers preparing lesson plans for all lessons.

70% of teachers reported preparing a full scheme of work for the semester, up from 56% at Baseline and 67% at Midline. This may be due to scheme of work preparation being included in the GESS training.

When asked about what types of oversight teachers have received, numbers for most categories have dwindled. However, the number reporting oversight via scheme of work has increased, possibly diluting other methods of oversight.

FIGURE 22 PROPORTION OF TEACHERS WHO REPORTED RECEIVING HELP TO IMPROVE THEIR TEACHING IN 2015, 2016, AND 2018

When asked the areas in which Head Teachers feel overworked, there was a relatively even spread between the top five areas, with SDP preparation being the most commonly-reported area; this is also the area in which Head Teachers most want further training, followed closely by resource management and administration.
4.8 Teacher Qualifications and Training

The education of teachers is presented in this section. Just 29 teachers reported having a Bachelor’s degree, with secondary education certificate being by far the most common qualification.

Head Teachers are somewhat more educated, with slightly more (34) reporting having a Bachelor’s degree. However, the majority still have a secondary school certificate as their highest qualification.
While a little over a third of female teachers hold Bachelor’s degrees, this reflects the very small sample size (23 female teachers in total, of which seven had Bachelor’s degrees). 46 male teachers had at least a Bachelor’s degree, though this represents a smaller proportion (19%) when compared to women (30%), due to the vastly different total sample sizes. As a percentage, female teachers are better educated.

Only a very small number of voluntary teachers hold higher education degrees.

The number of teachers receiving training has fallen over the course of GESS. No Head Teachers reported receiving GESS training in any of the key areas reported upon in the last
report; although 12% did report receiving training, the survey does not detail the areas that this training covered.

4.9 Teacher Professional Development Training

As part of the School Sample Survey, learners were asked if they thought teacher quality had improved since 2014 and if teacher attendance had improved since 2017. In TPD schools, 85% of learners (n=57) stated that teacher quality had improved since 2014, compared to 69% (n=690) of learners in non-TPD schools. Similarly, 88% of learners in TPD schools believed that teacher attendance had improved since 2017 whereas only 82% of learners in non-TPD schools believed the same.
There are tentative indications that learners reported greater improvement in TPD schools where more teachers had been subject to TPD, though this is based off a small subset of the sample and may not be statistically significant.

When asked how they would improve the GESS TPD programme, all teachers surveyed said that they would like to see it expanded. 60% of teachers (n=10) who had received TPD and were surveyed said that the programme would be improved by more training, specifically the number of trainings that are available for teachers. 30% showed some anxiety about the end of GESS 1 by saying that the TPD programme should be continued.

When Head Teachers were asked what further training they would like to see under GESS, “Reporting and Administration” was the category most frequently requested, by 64% of Head Teachers (n=11). This was followed by “Resource Management” at 55% and “Preparing School Development Plan and Budget” at 45%.

FIGURE 29 PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WHO WOULD LIKE FURTHER TRAINING ON DIFFERENT TOPICS

![Figure 29: Percentage of teachers who would like further training on different topics]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource management</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher management</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting and administration</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing SDP and Budget</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of school activities</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus creation</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with the payam/county</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10 Gender Sensitive School Environment

Only 32% of teachers reported having a gender policy in place, which reflects a decline from the 43% reporting the same at Midline. The percentage of teachers stating that they had an abuse-reporting mechanism in place at their school stands at 38%.

The majority of learners, teachers and Head Teachers concur that boys and girls are treated equally by teachers at their school.
In the lesson observations, teachers were recorded as talking to both genders equally 82% of the time. This represents an improvement since the Midline, which recorded teachers talking equally to both genders 77% of the time.

The majority of students (70%) never felt scared to speak out in class. 49 girls did report that they were scared to speak out (10%), while a slightly higher proportion of boys (13%) claimed that they were scared to speak out in class.

78% of girls reported that the teacher always encouraged them, with 73% of boys reporting the same.
In the lesson observations, with the 12-minute mark taken as a random draw, the majority of classrooms were reported to be engaged in whole class activities, with very few reporting single sex working, and no classes were reported to have girls physically separated at the back of the class. This is approximately consistent with findings at Midline.

Girls and boys report feeling safe at approximately equal rates when in the classroom, playground and latrine. There is a big disparity in the proportion of girls and boys feeling safe when on a journey to/from school: Boys feel less safe by 63 percentage points than girls when on a journey (31% of boys report feeling safe, compared to 94% of girls). There may be gender specific threats to boys when on the road, such as the risk of violence and forced recruitment into armed groups.
While the majority of students report feeling either very or quite safe in school latrines, variation is evident by age, State, and to a lesser extent gender. There is a significant uptick in the number of secondary boys reporting feeling quite unsafe in the latrines, and in turn, in over half of States boys reported feeling more unsafe in the latrine than girls. Further investigation would be required to establish the cause of this change.

**FIGURE 34 HOW SAFE LEARNERS FEEL WHEN USING THE LATRINE AT SCHOOL, BY GENDER AND PRIMARY/SECONDARY**

**FIGURE 35 PROPORTION OF LEARNERS WHO FEEL ‘VERY UNSAFE’ OR ‘QUITE UNSAFE’ WHEN USING THE LATRINE AT SCHOOL**
The proportion of schools reporting gender segregated latrines has increased from 43% at the Midline to 66% of primary schools and 77% of secondary schools at Endline. 67% of schools reported gender segregated latrines at the Baseline. Small numbers at Midline make these comparisons non-scientific.

**FIGURE 36 PERCENTAGE OF SCHOOLS REPORTING HAVING GENDER SEGREGATED LATRINES, BY STATE**

As the chart above shows, there are significant variations when disaggregating by former State for gender segregated latrines. While WES schools were all found to have gender segregated latrines, in former UTY they were found to be lacking in all but a few schools.

The link between learners’ reports of feeling unsafe in latrines and the percentage gender segregated latrines by State is not as strong as might be assumed. For example, former UTY reports very few gender segregated latrines relative to other States, but learners do not claim to feel less safe than in many other States; in contrast, the wide prevalence of gender segregated latrines in former WES does not seem to have a great deal of an impact on how safe learners feel when using them.

Further research could be conducted to examine why this relationship is weak, and to understand the uptick in boys reporting insecurity when using latrines. Further work could also be done to implement relevant humanitarian WASH principles, and to examine how menstrual health can be better delivered in resource-poor settings to reduce the female attrition rate.

### 4.11 Mentoring Programme

74% of all Head Teachers surveyed reported that there was a mentor or counsellor for learners at their school. Of these, 14% (n=15) were for girls only, and 83% (n=89) were for both girls and 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.
5 Educational Choices by Students

5.1 The importance of education by gender

Teachers and Head Teachers were asked their opinion on the statement: “Boys are better suited to higher education than girls”. The combined percentage of teachers and Head Teachers reporting that they disagree or strongly disagree with the statement was 66.9% at the Baseline, 72.5% at the Midline and 75% at the Endline. There have been small increases at each survey wave. There has been no discernible difference between Head Teachers and teachers reporting disagreeing with the statement.

When given the same statement, the majority of learners regardless of gender or grade also disagreed that boys are more suited to higher education than girls. Boys in P5 were most likely to report agreeing with the statement, at nearly 20%. The percentage of boys agreeing with the statement reduces in P8 and increases slightly at S2 but not above the level seen at P5.

![Figure 38 Levels of Learner Agreement That Boys are More Suited to Higher Education Than Girls](image)

Teachers were less likely than learners to agree that girls are less suited to higher education (23% of teachers compared to 24% of learners). Consistent with the Baseline and Midline analysis, boys were more likely to agree with the statement than girls: 31% of boys of all ages against 17% of girls. Reversing a trend identified in the Midline that older girls were less confident in their suitability for higher education, the Endline data shows that the percentage of girls agreeing with the statement that girls are less suited than boys to higher education decreases the older the girl. The percentage of boys reporting the same reduces from P5 to P8, and thence remains approximately consistent in S2. The percentage of girls disagreeing
with the statement remains approximately consistent across all grades, with the proportion strongly disagreeing with the statement remains approximately consistent throughout primary school, increasing slightly in S2. This is positive, and efforts should be maintained to ensure girls remain confident in their future.

Teachers and Head Teachers were asked their opinion on the statement: “Girls are less likely than boys to need an education in their future lives”. Head Teachers were more likely than teachers to disagree with the notion that girls are less likely to need an education in their future (79% Head Teachers, 68% of teachers).

In line with the findings at Midline, disaggregation by State yields significant variation. Disagreement with the statement is relatively consistent across States, with the former States of Lakes, Unity, Upper Nile and Western Equatoria showing lower rates of disagreement than the remaining States (who report relatively consistent results). The proportion of teachers and Head Teachers agreeing with the statement rises perceptibly in former Lakes, Unity and Upper Nile States. Due to small sample sizes at Midline, it is difficult to make meaningful comparisons; however, it can be broadly said that States such as Lakes, Unity and Upper Nile that report higher than average rates of agreement at Endline showed similar results at Midline. However, States such as Western Equatoria have shown a remarkable reduction in the percentage of teachers and Head Teachers reporting agreement. The numbers of teachers and Head Teachers agreeing with the statement may be a product of both prevailing cultural norms regarding the role of women, and a realistic reflection on the opportunities available to women in pastoralist-majority States that are beset by material poverty, where dowry payments can be a significant contributor to household wealth.

Turning to learners, more boys than girls agree with the statement that girls are less likely to need an education in their future than boys (27% of boys against 22% of girls). Substantially more girls than boys overall disagreed with the statement (75% of girls against
66% of boys. Disaggregating by gender and grade there are significant variations. While girls consistently disagree with the statement (both disagree and strongly disagree), there is a concerning surge in the number of older (S2) girls who report agreeing that they are less likely to need an education in their future. In fact, as can be seen in the graph below, slightly more S2 boys disagree and strongly disagree than S2 girls. Furthermore, a concerning number of girls consistently report strongly agreeing that girls are less likely to need an education for their future. Future programmes should be tailored to ensure positive role models and post-school aspirations are nurtured. Similar to girls, older boys reported agreeing in greater proportions in secondary school.

5.2 Prioritising Education

The proportion of teachers and Head Teachers reporting that they agree that parents prioritise sending boys to school over girls has fallen since both Midline and Baseline (56% and 54.4% respectively) to 45%.
Disaggregating by State, there are substantial regional variations. Former Lakes State leads the board in Head Teachers and teachers responding in the affirmative, which reflects responses from former Lakes at Midline. Teachers and Head Teachers in former Upper Nile State were most likely at Midline to agree with the statement; however, this has strongly diminished at Endline. Likewise, former Unity at Midline showed very high levels of strong agreement, which has also weakened significantly at Endline. Former Central Equatoria State showed by far the highest level of disagreement, with former Warrap a close second. The regional variation somewhat reflects that shown in Head Teacher and teacher responses on whether boys are more likely than girls to need an education in their future (see Figure 36), in which former Lakes and Unity States were more likely to report agreeing that girls need an education less than boys: Former Lakes shows high levels of agreement that parents prioritise sending boys to school over girls, while former Unity does not. However, while former Lakes still shows a higher level of agreement than other States, this has reduced from 91% at Baseline to 65% at Endline (combining agree and strongly agree), which may reflect a normative change in the community, although the small sample size means that conclusions are difficult to draw. Former Jonglei, another predominantly pastoralist State, also shows relatively high levels of agreement, as was the case at Midline. There is a need for careful consideration to ensure girls can aspire and achieve, notwithstanding the gendered expectations in the community.

The Midline report raised concerns that Greater Equatoria, beset at the time by insecurity and a harsh economic environment, were showing evidence of gender prioritisation among parents. However, this trend appears to have reversed at Endline.

Similar to the Midline report, learners were more optimistic than teachers about parental prioritisation, with only 39% reporting that their parents would prioritise sending boys, compared to 45% of teachers.
The proportion of males who disagree that boys are prioritised is always greater than the proportion of females who believe this, and in turn the proportion of females who agree that boys are prioritised is greater than the number of male learners who believe this. However, for both genders and over all ages, the majority disagree with the statement, with the strongest disagreement coming from male secondary students, at 64%. The number of older females agreeing that parents prioritise boys is slightly higher than those of younger females, though it is a very small difference.

**FIGURE 42 LEVELS OF LEARNER AGREEMENT THAT PARENTS PRIORITISE SENDING BOYS TO SCHOOL OVER GIRLS, BY GENDER AND PRIMARY/SECONDARY**

5.3 Learners’ Aspirations

Learners’ aspirations to reach S4 have shown slight reductions at some grade levels, though these are generally very small, and with differing sample sizes and aspiration as a potentially latent variable, caution should be exercised in interpreting the results. Additionally, while there has been a small reduction in aspiration in some grades, some of this may also be attributable to widespread insecurity and economic collapse.

The longer girls remain in school, the more ambitious they become: at P5, 80% of girls aspire to S4, which increases to 100% of S2 girls aspiring to reach S4. At P5 girls and boys are approximately equal in their aspirations, but girls overtake boys in aspiration by the time they reach S2.

Overall, across the sample, 85% of boys and girls reported wishing to reach S4. This represents a small decrease from the Midline, at which 91% of boys and 87% of girls aspired to reach S4.
At Baseline, former Lakes students were the least ambitious, with the Midline report indicating a significant rise in ambition. These findings are somewhat corroborated in the Endline, with up to 80% of students in former Lakes reporting aspiring to S4. While this is indeed progress, Lakes remains among the least ambitious states. At the bottom of the rankings, former Warrap reports 58% of learners aspiring to S4, with former Western Bahr el Ghazal the next lowest, at 70%.
The graph below, indicating the percentage of learners who think they will reach their desired grade before leaving school, indicates positive results: the fact that the results are so clustered that a reduced scale is required to show evidence of variation is good news. Almost all learners believe that they will achieve their desired grade. Girls’ confidence peaks in P8, with a very slight reduction in S2, though this is statistically negligible. Girls are also more confident than boys, although these differences are very minor. P5 learners are the least confident, with confidence levels appearing to increase the longer the learners remain in school.

**FIGURE 45** PROPORTION OF LEARNERS WHO THINK THEY WILL REACH THE GRADE THEY WANT TO REACH BEFORE LEAVING SCHOOL, BY GRADE AND GENDER

Variation by State is very small, especially as students get older. In only former Northern Bahr el Ghazal and Western Equatoria States did fewer than 100% of S2 students report that they were confident that they would reach S4. The least confident P5 students were to be found in former Unity. This has changed from the Midline, when the least confident learners were to be found in former Northern Bahr el Ghazal and Upper Nile States, including the least confident P5 learners. In contrast, at Endline it was found that 100% of former Upper Nile State students in P5 report confidence that they will achieve their desired grade.
5.4 Perceived Barriers to Education

FIGURE 46 A COMPARISON OF THE REASONS THAT MIGHT PREVENT LEARNERS FROM REACHING THEIR DESIRED GRADE, AS REPORTED IN 2014, 2016 AND 2018

In terms of the factor that may prevent learners from reaching their desired grade, according to the learners themselves, school fees and other education-related expenses remain the biggest perceived obstacles to continued education. Possibly due to the effects of Cash Transfers, the percentage of respondents viewing expenses as a barrier to continuing education reduced at Midline, but has increased again at Endline, albeit not exceeding Baseline levels. Inflation and economic collapse have led to a real-term depreciation in the value of Cash Transfers, as well as increasing the costs of education, which is likely to be leading to this rise in the perception of economic obstacles to school attainment. Marriage and pregnancy remain a small, though somewhat significant, perceived obstacle to school attainment. Sickness also remains a big perceived obstacle, reinforced by the fact that this has been the largest single reason for absence since Baseline.
The table below breaks down the reasons given for why learners might leave school, by gender and age. A difference can be seen between the percentage of girls and the percentage of boys who feel that being unable to afford school fees might cause learners to leave school, with fewer girls seeing this as a potential problem; this may be an effect of GESS Cash Transfers. Slightly more boys than girls report that other educational expenses might cause learners to leave school, but the percentage is much closer, which may be linked to the additional costs of attending school for girls, such as the need for sanitary products. However, more girls than boys perceived marriage, pregnancy and ill-health as possible reasons for leaving school. While pregnancy should not come as a surprise, the difference in health perception may be a cause for concern.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>P5 girls</th>
<th>P5 boys</th>
<th>P8 girls</th>
<th>P8 boys</th>
<th>S2 girls</th>
<th>S2 boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannot afford school fees</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot afford other items needed for school</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickness</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As girls get older, the percentage citing pregnancy as a reason for leaving school increases slightly, though it remains below 15%. Conversely, the percentage of girls citing sickness as a potential cause of leaving school falls as they get older, from 27% at P5 and 28% at P8 to 21% at S2, while the opposite is true for boys, rising from 22% of P5 boys and 19% of P8 boys to 32% of S2 boys. This highlights the importance of a coherent health and education policy to reduce attrition of both boys and girls.

The vast majority of learners report wishing to continue to university after finishing school, though a significant minority report wishing to start working once they have finished school. Learners citing marriage as their preferred post-school choice remain small in number, though not insignificant. Disaggregating by grade and gender does not reveal any particularly significant variations in aspiration in post-school choices.

---

**FIGURE 48 PREFERRED POST-SCHOOL DESTINATION, AS REPORTED BY BOYS AND GIRLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue education (go to university)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue technical education</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get married</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 49 PREFERRED POST-SCHOOL DESTINATION, DISAGGREGATED BY AGE AND GENDER
6  Management Capacity and Structures

6.1 School Development Plan (SDP)

76% (n=70) of the SMC/PTA/Board of Governors (BoG) respondents and 85% (n=117) of Head Teachers confirmed that they had a SDP at the school.

The former States of Upper Nile, Warrap and Eastern Equatoria State had the highest percentage of Head Teachers claiming that they had created a School Development Plan for 2018, although a smaller percentage were actually able to show enumerators proof of the document. Former Western Bahr el Ghazal and Lakes had some of the lowest figures, with only 30% (n=3) and 38% (n=6) of Head Teachers able to produce a copy of the SDP, in Western Bahr el Ghazal and Lakes respectively. This pattern may reflect difficulties schools in former Lakes and Western Bahr el Ghazal have had in accessing school CGs between 2016 and 2018, and/or simply the small sample size in these former States.

![Figure 50: Proportion of Head Teachers who reported having a School Development Plan, against the proportion who could show proof](image)

The majority of the Head Teachers said that the SMC, BoG and/or PTA have some responsibility in establishing the SDP.

6.2 Management and Oversight

Evidence suggests that GESS has had a significant impact on school leadership capacity. Better management practices can be seen over the course of the Programme, such as the
formation of school management bodies as well as coming up with better methods for school improvement, including the use of SDPs.

School management bodies are present in schools across all the of the former States. Data on SAMS indicates that 3500 schools have either an SMC, BoG and/or a PTA, which have been set up to assist in the management of schools alongside the school administration. SMCs were most common in former Eastern Equatoria State with 93% (n=14), and former Warrap, with 94% (n=16) of schools reporting that they had one. PTAs were common in former Eastern Equatoria, Unity and Warrap, found at 100% of schools (n=15, n=6 and n=17 respectively).

Across the country, there was an average of 4.1 (36%) women per SMC, compared to an average of 7.2 (64%) men. BoGs (secondary school management bodies) had an average of 4.1 (31%) female members and 7.2 (69%) men per group, whilst an average of 11.7 (43%) women and 15.2 (57%) men made up the PTAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Governors</strong></td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Management Committee</strong></td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers and parents were the most common members of SMCs, with head pupils and traditional leaders/Boma Chiefs being the third and fourth most common stakeholders respectively. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) were less typically reported as members.

As illustrated in the graph below, the majority of the school management groups were reported to meet 2-3 times a year with 46% (n=51) of SMCs, 50% (n=19) of BoGs and 44% (n=55) of PTAs meeting at this frequency. 25% (n=32) of the PTA respondents stated that they meet 4-7 times in a year. Conversely, few meet 0-1 times a year, with 2% (n=2) of SMCs, 8% (n=3) of BoGs and 5% (n=6) of PTAs 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. 18% of SMC members reported that they met 12 or more times a year in 2018, as opposed to 15% in the Baseline, whilst the figures for PTA members (8% in 2014, 17% in 2018) and BoG members (4% in 2014, 11% in 2018) have similarly increased.

This suggests that both the capacity and the productivity of school management bodies have 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 traditional school bodies would.

### 6.3 Local Government Interaction

Across the former ten States, the most commonly-reported frequency of visits by Payam supervisors was 2-3 times, a year with 39%(n=36) of school management body members and 37% (n=26) of Head Teachers reporting this frequency. This is supported by evidence from the County & Payam Survey, which found that of the schools visited by Payam Education Officials in each year, they were most commonly visited 2-3 times per year.
The overall frequency of local education authority visits appears to have declined since the Midline. Again, this evidence is supported by findings from the County and Payam Survey. Clearly, a factor in this could be the reduced value of GRSS funding (if any) now reaching Counties and Payams.
6.4 Financial Management and Sources of Funding

The majority of the respondents said that the group involved in creating the school budget was comprised of Head Teachers (92%, n=85), members of the SMC (76%, n=70), and members of the PTA (78%, n=72). Other groups involved in creating the school budget included members of BoG (24%, n=22), PEO (7%, n=6) and County Education Officers (CEOs) (3%, n=3).

![Figure 56: Groups Involved in School Budget Development at Their School as Reported by SMC Members (N=92)](image)

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

The most common way of storing money was through bank accounts, with 76% (n=112) of Head Teachers citing this method. Given that GESS accountability guidelines require schools to open a bank account in order to receive CGs, it is not surprising that the majority of schools surveyed reported having a bank account: 74% (n=68) of the SMC/PTA/BoG respondents reported that their school had a bank account. Given the ongoing insecurity and lack of functioning banks in the Greater Upper Nile region, schools there are not required by GESS to have bank accounts, which is likely the reason why one quarter of schools surveyed did not have a bank account.
The majority of Head Teachers reported keeping some financial records at the school. Researchers then asked to see these records, which yielded slightly lower results. Bank statements, school budgets and payment vouchers are the most common records Head Teachers report keeping.

FIGURE 58 FINANCIAL RECORDS KEPT AT SCHOOLS, AS REPORTED BY HEAD TEACHERS

- Cash Ledger: 54% (claimed to have), 31% (document provided as proof)
- Bank Statements: 64% (claimed to have), 44% (document provided as proof)
- School Budget: 59% (claimed to have), 39% (document provided as proof)
- Payment Vouchers: 65% (claimed to have), 41% (document provided as proof)
- Record of Parent Contributions: 50% (claimed to have), 33% (document provided as proof)
- School Finance File: 64% (claimed to have), 49% (document provided as proof)
- School Development Plan: 62% (claimed to have), 39% (document provided as proof)
6.5 Roles of SMC/PTA/BoG

The most commonly-cited responsibility given by SMC and PTA respondents was the development of the School Development Plan (SDP) and budget, at 90% (n=38) and 84% (n=38) respectively – this suggests a commitment to the GESS programme. Monitoring teaching and learning, development of educational policies and curriculum, and reviewing school performance also scored highly. PTA and SMC members cited school inspections and teacher recommendations less often as among their top four responsibilities – this is logical, because these tend to be part of the role of Payam and County Education Officials.

FIGURE 59 TOP FOUR RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SMC AND PTA AS REPORTED BY MEMBERS OF SCHOOL MANAGEMENT BODIES

More management body members highlighted their responsibility for financial management, support to teachers and fundraising. Fundraising decreased as one of the main responsibilities between Baseline and Midline, but rose again at Endline survey, to 77% (n=10). The increasing emphasis on raising money for schools potentially reflects the ongoing financial crisis in South Sudan, which has worsened in the past two years.
There is a disparity between reported minuting of school governance meetings, and observable evidence of minutes. From the Head Teacher survey, 64% (n=71) of the respondents stated that SMC minutes for the last meeting were available. Only 46% (n=51) had proof to support this. Similarly, 45% (n=17) of Head Teachers reported that the minutes for the last BoG meeting were available, but only 34% (n=13) could support this statement with proof of the minutes. 52% (n=66) of PTA members affirmed that they had minutes for their last meeting, but 35% (n=44) of respondents could not confirm availability of minutes, whilst a further 3% (n=4) did not know whether minutes were available.

6.6 Teacher Management

85% (n=78) of the respondents stated that they had a teacher code of conduct to guide teachers. This is a decrease from the 92% reported in the Midline, but an increase from the 64.4% that stated they had this document in the Baseline.

61% (n=45) of the SMC survey respondents reported having a teacher absence policy. This proportion has also decreased from the 78% reported in 2016, but increased from 49.9% as recorded in 2014.
The proportion of schools with proof that they keep key GESS documents has fallen since the Midline, with proof of PARs falling from 67% in 2016 to 47% in 2018 and DARs falling from 66% to 53% over the same period.

The majority of schools that 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**

Findings indicate that the teaching profession remains overwhelmingly male. Out of the total number of teaching staff reached as part of the School Survey (both paid and voluntary), 131 of 138 Head Teachers (95%) and 250 of 273 teachers (92%) surveyed were men.
Teachers report being paid for an average of 3.18 months over 2017 and 0.911 over the first six months of 2018, indicating that government salaries are frequently either delayed or not paid at all. 5% (n=13) of teachers surveyed said that they had been on strike in the last year due to lack of payment, and 9% (n=13) 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 five in 2017 and two in 2018, although the numbers ranged from one day to one month.
7 Capitation Grants

School CGs, funded by GESS and GRSS, are a key element of the GESS programme, available to all schools, for the purposes of supplementing operating costs, improving the learning and teaching environment and boosting quality education.

In order to qualify for CGs, 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 to SAMS/‘Ana Fii Inni’ (‘I am here’).
- Provide a daily update on the attendance of pupils using SAMS via SMS.
- Have a School Governing Body in place – usually a PTA for primary schools, ideally with a SMC drawn from its members, or a BoG for secondary schools.
- Develop a SDP 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 CGs and CTs 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 CG spending, accountability and impact for both 2014 and 2015. Late payment of 2016 CGs prevented questions being asked relating to the 2016 school year. This was therefore covered, along with 2017 CGs, during the Endline survey.

Ongoing monitoring of Capitation Grant payment and accountability, per school, is captured on SAMS.³

7.1 Spending Choices

Prior to 2016, between 50% and 75% of the CGs were required to be spent on materials that would improve the quality of education in schools, for example textbooks, science equipment or teachers’ guides. Between 25% and 50% could 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 to be spent on general school support, for example incentives for community or volunteer teachers.

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

³up-to-date data is available online at www.sssams.org
The ongoing economic crisis in South Sudan has resulted in the delayed payment of teachers’ salaries nationwide. 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, and the proportion of volunteer teachers working in schools has increased. 19% of Head Teachers (n=14) report that their school used Capitation Grant money in 2017 for payment of volunteer teachers.

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 to keep teachers in school, caused by the falling value of teachers’ salaries and the infrequency of salary payment for government teachers.

**FIGURE 63 REPORTED USES OF CAPITATION GRANTS IN 2017**

Classroom maintenance and improvement was reported as the most common use of CG money, at 48% of schools (n=36) that have received a CG in 2017. Reports of classroom construction reported 25% building (n=19) with local, semi-permanent materials, and 5% building (n=4) with permanent materials.

Other commonly-reported spending choices included exercise books (33%, n=25), textbooks (27%, n=20), and chalkboards (15%, n=11). These are some of the items identified by Head Teachers as being most needed, suggesting that CG 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 CG money on “fire-fighting” activities such as maintaining classrooms and paying teachers, rather than on longer-term or quality of education-focused items, such as school gardens and...
musical instruments. This in turn suggests that CGs have played a vital role in helping to keep schools functioning over the last two years.

Primary and secondary schools reported different uses for school CGs. More primary schools than secondary schools reported using CGs for core operational costs including classroom construction and maintenance. Head Teachers in secondary schools reported spending CG funds on, among other things, textbooks, fuel for generators, and payments for volunteer teachers.

50% (n=9) of secondary schools reported buying textbooks in 2017, as opposed to only 20% (n=11) of primary schools.

![FIGURE 64 COMPARISON OF 2017 REPORTED USES OF CAPITATION GRANTS BETWEEN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS THAT HAVE RECEIVED CAPITATION GRANTS](image)

7.2 Impact on Schools

Head Teachers in schools that have received one or more CG were asked to list what impact(s) the money had had on educational quality. 77% (n=58) of Head Teachers reported that the money had contributed to a better environment of instruction, 71% (n=53) reported increased attendance, 61% (n=46) improved school management and 39% (n=29) identified better/more volunteer teachers as among positive effects of the grant.
Comparison of building assessments conducted in schools that have received CGs against those that have not did see a difference in the overall quality of buildings: 48% (n=271) of classrooms in the former were seen as in good condition, compared to 43% (n=138) in the latter. However, only 16% (n=87) of classrooms needed major repairs in schools that had received a CG in 2017 compared to 31% (n=100) in schools that did not. Those that had received a payment in 2017 also had an average of eight classrooms, against seven in schools that did not receive in 2017, and had a slightly higher proportion of permanent or semi-permanent buildings over classrooms with just a roof or in the open air. The sample is too low to conclude that this is a result of CG intervention, or to exclude selection effects.

74% (n=50) of schools that have received a CG payment had gender separated toilets, which is greater than the 58% of schools receiving CGs having gender segregated toilets.
52% of schools that have received at least one CG are still charging school fees.

Aside from exam fees, which schools charge to cover term one examination costs, the most common school fees reported as being charged are still registration fees. This is consistent with the findings from the Household Survey. 39% (n=54) of all schools visited stated that they have stopped charging school fees altogether; however, as CG-recipient schools are expected by MoGEI to stop charging fees, this may have been over-reported due to schools wishing to present themselves as abiding by the rules.
**7.3 Accountability**

Schools that have received CGs 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 on SAMS, as are scans of receipts. 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 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 CG must be approved by the Education Transfers Monitoring Committee (ETMC), which is made up of MoGEI officials and GESS consortium members.

The Endline 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 CG money, and then to produce a receipt for proof of purchase.

76% of Head Teachers were able to show observable evidence for 2017 CG spending, and the majority of spending could also be verified with receipts. Where receipts were not available, Head Teachers reported that they were being kept at home and in some cases by GESS CLOs or Diocese offices for church schools.
FIGURE 69 PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS WITH OBSERVABLE EVIDENCE AND RECEIPTS FOR VARIOUS KINDS OF CAPITATION GRANT SPENDING IN 2017
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 CT payments had not yet been made to the majority of eligible girls, and thus few questions relating to CTs were included in the Baseline. Questions on Cash Transfer payments were thus added into the Midline and Endline surveys for Head Teachers and teachers, and a separate CT 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 2017 Cash Transfer payment lists on the day of the survey, specifically looking at 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.

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

8.1 Cash Transfer Payment

The number of schools reporting receiving CT payments, and the number of girls reporting receiving the correct amounts are increasing.

The majority of schools surveyed had received CTs for female learners in 2017, at 90% of schools (n=122). This is a marked increase in the number that have received since the Midline report, and is consistent with what GESS had paid out. 33.7% of schools reported they had received CT payments in both years, compared to just 19% which had not received payments in either year.

When asked why girls did not receive CTs in either or both payment years, the most common reason given by Head Teachers (50%, n=7) was that the school was not eligible. A further 22% (n=3) said that they did not know why the girls had not received the money. This implies that communication between GESS and schools could be improved, perhaps through the use of means such as SMS.
Alongside the increase in the overall number of girls receiving CTs, the proportion of girls who reported receiving the correct amount\(^v\) of money has also increased between the Midline and Endline. Of the girls interviewed who said they had received a CT in 2015, 9% (n=7) said they had received the wrong amount, whilst in 2017 the number had shrunk to

\(^v\) 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. This was increased again to 2,900SSP in 2017.
8.2 Attendance and Retention of Cash Transfer Recipient Girls

The number of 2017 CT recipients found attending school 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 the 2017 cash payment list, with one girl selected from each class that had received a CT in 2017. An additional girl was selected on the day from S1 or S2 who had received a CT in 2017 at primary school. As previously mentioned, visits to schools were unannounced.

In addition to interviewing recipients, data collection also recorded the number of CT 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 were present on the day of the interview.

Of the 7,407 girls on the CT list for 2017 in surveyed schools, 3,501 were present on the day of the interview, 612 of whom were selected for interview in the Cash Transfer Survey. That is, in the schools surveyed, just under half of girls (47%) who received CTs in 2017 were present on the day of the interview; this is similar to the results in the Midline, which were 44% for 2015 recipients and 47% for 2014 recipients. 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 2017 shows female enrolment
increases between P4 and P5 by 37%, the only rise in enrolment as both male and female learners progress, with enrolment otherwise reducing year on year.\textsuperscript{vii}

A high proportion of the 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 2018. 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 graph below indicates that a high proportion of schools have DARs, the lowest percentage being secondary schools with S4 classes, with 83\%(n=29) having available DARs. This demonstrates uptake of this GESS-mandated system.

\textbf{FIGURE 73 PROPORTION OF SCHOOLS WITH AVAILABLE DARs, DISAGGREGATED BY GRADE}

Of those schools that had DARs, evidence suggests that a relatively high proportion are used regularly. 60\% of all classes (n=276) with DARs were found to have filled them in three times in the past week. The proportion of schools that had used the DAR on the day of the survey was lower overall, but still around the 50\% mark. DAR use was more common in primary schools than in secondary. 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.

\textsuperscript{vii} [www.sssams.org]
Significantly lower numbers of CT recipient girls were marked present on the DAR than were actually present on the day of survey, indicating that DARs may not be being used correctly; however, the gap is smaller than at Midline.
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 CT, it was found that attendance of these girls was under-reported. As the above graph indicates, there was a small disparity between the number of CT 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. There is, however, evidence of improvement since the Midline, with the gap in 2018 being only 1%, compared to 17% in 2015 and 20% in 2014.

A marginal difference in educational aspirations can be found between CT recipients and non-CT recipient girls.

The proportion of girls who stated that they wished to stay in education (either university or technical) once leaving school was slightly higher amongst non-CT recipients than it was amongst girls who had received a CT: 86% (n=326) of girls who had received at least one CT, as opposed to 93% (n=130) of non-CT recipients. Both numbers have increased significantly since 2016, from 65% of girls who had received a CT and 62% of girls who had not.

FIGURE 76 ASPIRATIONS OF LEARNERS AFTER SCHOOL, DISAGGREGATED BY GENDER AND RECEIVING CASH TRANSFERS

The percentage of girls who said that they would like to get married or start working when they leave school was higher for CT recipients than non-CT recipients: 9% (n=34) over 4% (n=5), and 25% (n=95) over 13% (n=18), respectively.

Generally, boys displayed a marginally higher level of educational aspiration than girls. 88% (n=460) said that they would like to stay in education once they finish school, and only 24% (n=126) reported that they would look for other work, less than CT recipients.
8.3 Spending Choices

Reported CT spending choices for both 2016 and 2017 were similar, with the most commonly-reported uses being shoes (77% \(n=469\)), followed by uniforms, exercise books, and school bags. A greater proportion of CT recipients have bought shoes each year since 2014.

FIGURE 77 ITEMS PURCHASED USING CASH TRANSFER MONEY, 2014 TO 2017

Reported CT spending choices were relatively consistent across the (former) States, although shoes and exercise books were not always the most common expenditure in every State. The major exception was former Unity, where only 39% \((n=9)\) and 26% \((n=6)\) had bought shoes and exercise books, respectively; the most common uses of CTs in former Unity were instead soap and uniforms. Other exceptions were only 22% \((n=7)\) buying exercise books in former Western Bahr el Ghazal, and 41% \((n=48)\) in former Central Equatoria State.
94% (n=575) of CT recipients said they made decisions on how to spend the money themselves, which is an increase on the Midline result of 87%. The majority of parents interviewed for the Household Survey said that the money had benefitted the whole household. This is likely to be because CT 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 who 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

Conclusions

School and classroom practice

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

- There has been a small decline in the proportion of lessons observed which took place in a permanent classroom, and fall in the proportion held in the open air. Potentially this is linked to the real value of CGs falling over the last two years due to the economic crisis in the country, meaning that it is less possible to use CG money to construct permanent classrooms.

- 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.

- The average number of days missed by girls in 2017 was 4.8, compared to 3.8 by boys, showing a relatively small differential between the genders.

- 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 enforcement of regulations: this should be a priority for development partners and MoGEI.

Teaching

- The teaching profession remains overwhelmingly male, though slightly less so than at Midline.

- Teachers were paid less in 2017 than 2016. Fewer teachers, however, have been on strike because of lack of pay.

- The majority of teachers interviewed had only a secondary certificate (53%). Head Teachers were generally more highly educated.

  The majority of learners, teachers and Head Teachers concur that boys and girls are treated equally by teachers at their school.

School management

- Improvements have been made in school management practices since the Midline, with the majority of members of school management bodies reporting that the development of SDPs and Budgets were a top responsibility for SMCs and PTAs, with some schools from all former States able to provide proof of the SDP; this perhaps represents a widespread commitment to the GESS programme.
- However, BoG members reported fundraising as a top responsibility, a significant increase compared with the 2016 Midline, perhaps suggesting the impact of the more challenging economic context.

- The number of schools with school management bodies has also increased and the frequency of meetings has improved over the past two years, potentially as a result of GESS training and support.

- In terms of government involvement, schools report they are typically visited 2-3 times a year by PES; however, the number of officials visiting more than this has decreased since 2016, suggesting that the decrease in GRSS funding has affected the capability of County and Payam officials. Additional support and training for officials could therefore be an area of focus in the future.

Attendance

- DARs are regularly being used with over half being used on the day of the survey; use was more common in primary schools than secondary schools.

- DARs may not be being used properly as seen in disparities between the number of CT recipients reported on the DAR and the number actually present, however this disparity is significantly smaller than it was in the Midline, suggesting improvements to usage.

Attitudes and aspirations

- Overall, primary learners show less aspiration to reach S4, across both genders, than secondary learners. However, by secondary schools, learners are more ambitious over both genders. Regardless of year group, the difference in aspiration between boys and girls has almost been eradicated.

- The number of teachers and Head Teachers disagreeing with the idea that boys are more suited to higher education than girls has risen.

Capitation Grants

- The most common use of CG funds was for classroom maintenance and improvement.

- A significant number of schools use CG money for payment of volunteer teachers, though this has declined since 2016.

- The majority of CG funds is being used for operational activities such as maintaining classrooms and latrines, buying exercise books, and paying volunteer teachers; suggests poor financial health of schools.

- According to Head Teachers, the greatest impact of CGs on education quality was on creating a better environment of instruction and increasing attendance.

- Schools with CGs tended to have better quality classrooms, more permanent classrooms, and gender-segregated toilets.

- Over three quarters of CG 2017 spending had observable evidence and over half could be verified with receipts.
Cash Transfers

- The number of girls receiving CTs in 2017 had increased on previous years; main reason for not receiving was because the school was not eligible.
- The proportion of girls reporting receiving the correct amount has increased since the Midline, despite significant changes in the amount received.
- Attendance of CT recipients is higher than the national average; female enrolment between P4 and P5 increased rather than decreasing which is the national trend in other years.
- The most common reported uses of CTs is shoes, uniform, and exercise books, in descending order.
- The vast majority of girls report making their own decisions on how to spend their transfers.
- Girls who have received CTs are more likely to want to enter work after school than those that did not. However they are less likely to want to continue education.

Recommendations

- Basic needs for schools remain a critical concern. The effective value of GESS CGs has reduced tenfold since the start of the Programme; CGs funded by GRSS in 2018/19 have been adjusted upwards, but remain well below original target levels. Continuing funding for basic school items, through CTs at sufficient rates, is crucial to continuing the positive trends in educational quality.
- Sickness remains a persistent cause of absence for Head Teachers, teachers and learners. Consistent with findings and recommendations at the Midline, integrating government or NGO-provided health services to school, and joining-up of education and health administration at County level, may help to reduce absence, and increase overall levels of learning.
- Cost of education is still reported as a major barrier to education; for the first time at Endline more boys reported this than girls, corroborated by qualitative findings from the Household Survey. In light of this, consider expanding the CT programme to include vulnerable and/or economically marginalised children regardless of gender. A full vulnerability analysis (including of those school-aged children not in school) could be conducted to examine the vulnerability of both boys and girls.
- CTs are tangibly improving girls’ access to education, but the declining effective value of the CT in context of the economic crisis could weaken positive enrolment trends. If CTs are not adjusted to account for exchange rate depreciation inflation and the worsening economic situation, learners may not be able to purchase essential commodities/prerequisites (uniforms, shoes, exercise books, soap and sanitary pads) which preclude even basic learning. Concern may also be raised that with household budgets squeezed during the ongoing economic collapse, the next cycle may see girls’
autonomy on spending decisions diluted as the basic needs of households become harder to meet.

- Corporal punishment remains a barrier to education, that could be addressed, at no cost, by regulation: this should be a priority for development partners and MoGEI.
- IMPACT incentives have reduced CG spending on teachers’ incentives, but without reliable, consistent, and reasonable salary payments to attract and retain qualified teachers in the profession, these may not be translated into transformative education.
- Girls have consistently reported spending CT money on items for school attendance, such as uniforms and shoes, which, whilst requirements for school attendance, do not in themselves provide educational enrichment. Finding a solution could be a priority for development partners and MoGEI moving forward; for example, the use of low-cost school identification materials such as tabards, which provide a sense of homogenous identity and easy identification without undue financial burden.
- The practical effectiveness of CGs and CTs is proven: it would now be logical to take advantage of diminishing marginal costs to scale. In particular, ensuring girls are able to receive 2018 CTs in the three months of AY2018 remaining is of vital importance.
- The Endline confirms trends identified in the Baseline and Midline that the longer a learner is in school the more likely they are to want to complete their education; policies should therefore seek to provide role models and reduce structural barriers to school drop-out. In addition, consider developing a funding structure that supports adolescents in their transition to further education or a sustainable and decent entry to the world of work, in order to ensure the benefits of education do not end at S4.
- Further guidance and training on accountability and record-keeping would be helpful for school management structures, to ensure improvements continue and more consistent levels of accountability are achieved and maintained.
- If County and Payam officials are to supervise schools, they need to be paid a viable wage, and have operational funding to do so.