



## Request for Proposals: Process and formative evaluation of select government programmes and policies in Uganda to design robust impact evaluations

3ie Country Policy Window

RFP UCPW01

Issue date: 21 July 2015

Deadline: 23:59 GMT, 24 August 2015

### 1. Introduction

The [International Initiative for Impact Evaluation \(3ie\)](#) requests research organisations and/or consortia to submit proposals for process or formative evaluation of programmes and policies in key thematic areas identified by the Government of Uganda (GoU) through its Evaluation Sub-Committee that works under the National Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Working Group.

The aim of this grant window is to enable the selected research teams to carry out a **process or formative evaluation** of a programme and **propose a rigorous and policy-relevant impact evaluation design based on the findings of that work**. Selected teams will work closely with the relevant ministry and/or implementing agency involved in implementing the programme.

Applications will be accepted **only for the thematic areas** discussed in section 2.

### 2. Background

Over the past decade the GoU has made improvements in public sector performance measurement and financial management, and strengthened scrutiny and oversight of public funds. However, evaluations of public policies and programmes continue to be rare. Indeed there is limited evidence in Uganda on whether government programmes are achieving their stated objectives and what improvements, if any, are needed to improve performance.

In order to address this evidence gap, the government established a National Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy in 2004, which was followed by a national policy on monitoring and evaluation in 2013. This policy provides a clear framework for strengthening coverage, quality and use of evaluations. The Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) has the mandate to coordinate and monitor the Government Evaluation Facility, which conducts evaluations of public policies

#### New Delhi

202–203, Rectangle One  
D-4, Saket District Centre  
New Delhi – 110017, India

3ie@3ieimpact.org  
Tel: +91 11 4989 4444

#### London

c/o LIDC, 36 Gordon Square,  
London WC1H 0PD  
United Kingdom

3ieuk@3ieimpact.org  
Tel: +44 207 958 8351/8350

#### Washington, DC

1625 Massachusetts Ave., NW,  
Suite 450, Washington, DC 20036  
United States of America

3ieus@3ieimpact.org  
Tel: +1 202 629 3939

---

and major public investments. A national evaluation agenda with a rolling thematic focus is outlined and approved by the government every three years. This means that there is a high-level of ownership of evaluations and a large scope for findings from evaluations being discussed for action by policymakers at the highest level.

At the recent half-yearly Government Annual Performance Review Cabinet Retreat, the President identified the following key themes of national importance where rigorous evaluation will be critical for better development programming:

- Youth livelihoods
- Family planning
- Public service delivery and local governance
- Universal primary education

Please see Appendix A for more details on these themes. This grant window's primary aim is to build better and more evidence around the issues of national importance. **Applications from qualified teams are invited on the thematic areas mentioned above.** 3ie aims to fund at least one grant under each theme.

### 3. Overview of 3ie's Country Policy Window

3ie's Country Policy Windows fund and technically support high-quality, mixed-method rigorous impact evaluations relevant for policymakers and programme managers that answer questions about the attributable impact of interventions they implement. The Uganda Country Policy Window (UCPW) is funded by the Government of the United Kingdom through its Department for International Development (DFID). The primary aim of the window is to improve developmental outcomes through evidence-informed decision making in Uganda.

#### 3.1. Scope of work

The UCPW will support a maximum of **four** high-quality process or formative evaluations. 3ie expects that the selected team will work with the implementing agency to identify the programme or policy that the implementing agency wants evaluated, and work during the grant period to undertake a formative or process evaluation (as the case may be) and use the findings to develop a robust impact evaluation proposal.

**Each selected team will therefore be required to produce either a formative evaluation of a planned programme or a process evaluation of an on-going programme or policy. In addition, the team will also be required to prepare and submit a design for the impact evaluation of that programme.** For the benefit of Ugandan policymakers and programme managers, the research teams will also prepare a brief **cabinet paper** lucidly summarising the key findings from the formative or process evaluations.

Selected teams will engage the relevant government agency to identify:

- The intervention or programme to be evaluated;
- The primary process or formative evaluation questions and methods; and
- Possible questions and designs for impact evaluation.

In order to do this effectively, the selected teams will be expected to hold at least two workshops with the implementing agency staff and other relevant stakeholders. The first one will be a **theory of change workshop** within one month of signing the contract. The team will cover these areas:

- Identify the programme or intervention to be evaluated and discuss its theory of change
- Discuss and finalise key gaps, main evaluation questions and timeframe for process or formative evaluation

During the third month, the team will hold an **impact evaluation design workshop** and cover these areas:

- Impact evaluation questions and a feasible design, including identification methods
- Data collection methods
- Stakeholder engagement and evidence uptake plan

3ie funds [theory-based impact evaluations](#) that use counterfactuals via experimental or quasi-experimental methods to examine the causal chain of the programme and answer questions about what works, why, how and at what cost. 3ie also requires cost effectiveness or cost-benefit analyses in the impact evaluations it supports. Quality requirements for 3ie-supported impact evaluations are explained in [3ie's principles of impact evaluation](#).

3ie expects that the preliminary findings from the formative or process evaluation will inform the discussion at the impact evaluation design workshop. These workshops are expected to contribute to a dialogue between implementing agency staff and the research team to ensure the policy relevance of the evaluation. Through this process, 3ie expects the team to build understanding within the implementing agency about process and formative evaluations and ensure their effective participation in identifying questions and developing the impact evaluation design.

3ie expects that during the grant phase, a GoU staff member may be seconded to the study teams. The staff may participate in workshops and field visits, and contribute to the review of process or formative evaluation report and impact evaluation design submitted by the study team.

### 3.2. Process and formative evaluations

The type of evaluation will be decided according to the characteristics of the programme or policy.

If the identified programme or policy is ongoing, the teams will conduct a **process evaluation**. 3ie expects a high-quality process evaluation to:

- Demonstrate and discuss in-depth knowledge of the context and the programme or policy to be evaluated, including its intended outcomes or objectives;
- Articulate the programme theory of change, including the key assumptions
- Assess programme relevance to see if:
  - the programme objectives are relevant to the priorities of the target group;

- the inputs and outputs of the programme are adequate for achieving the intended objectives; and
- the extent to which the programme's objectives are valid in the context in which it is being implemented.
- Establish the effectiveness of the programme by assessing the likelihood of the programme achieving its outputs and final objectives with a discussion on potential enabling or inhibiting factors;
- Explore the cost-efficiency of the programme as compared to other alternatives and benchmark programme performance; and
- Assess the feasibility of undertaking an impact evaluation of a specific policy or programme with a detailed rigorous methodology using the [3ie evaluation proposal form](#).

If the identified programme or policy has not yet been implemented, the teams will conduct a **formative evaluation**. 3ie expects a high-quality formative evaluation to:

- Demonstrate in-depth knowledge of the programme or policy to be evaluated, including its intended outcomes or objectives;
- Articulate the programme theory of change, including the key assumptions;
- Gauge implementation feasibility and efficacy to see if the programme or policy will be able to deliver on its objectives and assess its uptake potential and assess the relevance of the programme; and
- Assess the feasibility of undertaking an impact evaluation of a specific policy or programme with a detailed rigorous methodology using the [3ie evaluation proposal form](#).

The exact methodology will be proposed by the grantees in consultation with the implementing agency at the end of the theory of change workshop. 3ie expects that a robust mix of methods and data will be used for these formative and process evaluations, including the use of administrative and secondary data, primary data collection, key informant interviews, focus group discussions and others.

### 3.3 Impact evaluation design review process

The findings from the process or formative evaluation will feed in to preparing a design for impact evaluation of the selected programme in the format provided by 3ie. The impact evaluation proposal must meet [3ie's definition of impact evaluation](#). The proposal should have sound identification methods with adequate sample size. Impact evaluation proposals should incorporate mixed methods to address questions on how and why the intervention worked or did not work, and to assess unintended consequences.

The proposed impact evaluation design will be reviewed and scored by at least two reviewers in 3ie, two external reviewers, and one implementing agency representative. Review by implementing agency is crucial to ensure that the research questions reflect issues of interest to the implementing agency and address a knowledge gap that they hold as important. **This RFP does not guarantee funding for full impact evaluations.**

### 3.4 Deliverables

The grantees are expected to deliver an **inception report** after six weeks of signing the contract. The report will clearly describe the main questions process or formative evaluation,

articulate the programme theory of change, key indicators of interest, methods of verification for the indicators and the theory of change.

At the end of the grant period, each grantee **will deliver three outputs: (1) a process or formative evaluation report; (2) a cabinet paper; and (3) an impact evaluation design** in the [3ie evaluation proposal form](#), including a proposed budget for the full impact evaluation. The deadline for these deliverables will be 15 February, 2016. Grantees will also be expected to participate in an impact evaluation workshop that will be organised in March 2016 in Kampala or Jinja. The lead PI along with the implementing agency representative is expected to attend the workshop. The findings from the process and formative evaluations, and the respective final impact evaluation designs will be presented at the workshop. The workshop may coincide with the Uganda Evaluation Week or an event under the National M&E programme. The costs of participation in the event must be included in the budget presented by applicants.

## 4. Application process

### 4.1 Eligibility

Eligibility determinants are listed below:

- Only legally registered organisations and consortia of registered organisations, not individuals, may apply.
- The lead grant-holding organisation and the lead principal investigator (PI) may be located anywhere in the world.
- The **research team should include at least one researcher who is a Ugandan national as a co-PI**. The national researcher must be resident in Uganda. Unless an independent consultant, s/he should be working for an organisation or a consultancy firm that is registered in Uganda. The national researcher must be engaged in substantive tasks like study design, data analysis, report writing and stakeholder engagement for uptake of findings into policy and practice.
- The research team may include other researchers who are not employees of the grant holding organisation.
- Each proposal must be submitted by a single organisation that may include others as sub-grantees or sub-contractors (subject to 3ie's [direct](#) and [indirect cost](#) policies).
- For-profit organisations are eligible to apply, but are restricted to the same indirect cost limits as non-profit organisations and may not charge a fee.
- The applicant organisation must be able to sign the [3ie grant agreement](#), which is available on the 3ie website.

### 4.2 Budget

A grant of up to **US\$100,000** will be made to the selected teams. It will cover costs associated with producing a strong process or formative evaluation, and an impact evaluation proposal, including evaluation questions, a feasible identification strategy, stakeholder engagement and research uptake plan, as well as participation of at least one PI and implementing agency representative at the March 2016 workshop.

The budget may include costs related to:

- Relevant literature review, stock taking of relevant administrative documents and available secondary data
- Time spent on data collection and analyses
- Researcher time and travel to work with implementing agency partners and conduct theory of change and impact evaluation design workshops with them
- Field visits to carry out the necessary quantitative and qualitative surveys for the process or formative evaluation

The grant will be paid in four tranches.

Tranche 1	20 per cent	Signing of the contract
Tranche 2	20 per cent	Inception report and theory of change workshop
Tranche 3	20 per cent	Impact evaluation design workshop
Tranche 4	40 per cent	Final report, cabinet paper, impact evaluation design and attendance at Kampala workshop.

### 4.3 Selection criteria

Proposals will be reviewed and scored by a panel consisting of two external reviewers, one 3ie reviewer and a representative from the implementing agency. 3ie will award the research team a grant to conduct the process or formative evaluation under 3ie's standard terms and conditions. Please see the [3ie grant agreement](#) template for more details. 3ie may provide comments and request a resubmission if the proposal does not receive adequate scores. 3ie reserves the right to **not** award any grant in case no applicant meets the requirements.

For teams selected to do a process or formative evaluation, 3ie reserves the right **not** to award any follow-on impact evaluation grant or make it conditional on team bringing on board additional research skill and expertise. The table below provides the evaluation criteria and weights for the assessment of proposals.

Proposals for process or formative evaluations	%
Credentials of PIs <i>Assessed from letter of eligibility, CVs and sample publications</i>	40
Plan for meaningful and substantive involvement of local and regional researchers <i>Assessed from letter of eligibility and Qualification and Eligibility form</i>	20
Organisational capabilities to hold and manage grants <i>Assessed from letter of eligibility, Organisation Information form, Qualifications and Eligibility form including ability to hold and manage similar grants in the past.</i>	10
Sector and country experience of the research team <i>Assessed from letter of eligibility, Qualifications and Eligibility form, sample publications</i>	20
Value for money	5
Associate membership of 3ie <i>Assessed from Organisation Information form</i>	5

<b>Full impact evaluation proposal</b>	<b>%</b>
Qualification of impact evaluation team including previous impact evaluation experience and sector experience	20
Quality of technical proposal, internal and external validity	45
Demonstrated relevance of research question to the need of the implementing agency and potential for uptake of study findings	25
Value for money	10

#### 4.4. Timeline

The following table indicates the timeline for key events.

<b>Activity or deliverable</b>	<b>Dates</b>
RFP is posted	21 July 2015
Deadline for submitting queries related to RFP	28 July 2015
Deadline for posting responses to queries on 3ie website	4 August 2015
Application submission deadline	24 August 2015
Announcement of grant awards	18 September 2015
Financial due diligence undertaken and grant agreements signed; <b>Study period begins</b>	<b>1 October 2015</b>
Virtual meetings between 3ie staff and the grantees	12-16 October 2015
Submission of inception report	16 November 2015
<b>Submission of all deliverables associated with the grant</b>	<b>15 February 2016</b>
Presentation of findings from process or formative evaluation and impact evaluation design at the 3ie impact evaluation workshop in Kampala or Jinja	8-9 March 2016

## 5. Instructions for applicants

Proposals must include the following information:

1. A letter of eligibility, which is a narrative of up to 3000 words covering the following:
  - Preferred thematic area (eligible themes are described in the appendix: youth livelihoods, family planning, public service delivery and local governance and universal primary education);
  - The team's experience in undertaking process and/or formative evaluations
  - Potential process and/or formative questions given the Ugandan context; including a description of possible methods and approach the team may employ
  - Sector and context knowledge in Uganda; and
  - Expertise in planning and conducting rigorous impact evaluations.



2. Copies of up to three process and/or impact evaluation reports relevant for this call, with proposed PIs as named authors.
3. Completed organisation information form available on the 3ie website.
4. Completed eligibility and qualifications form available on the 3ie website.
5. Curriculum vitae (CV, not to exceed three pages each) of all proposed PIs, along with a signed letter from each indicating the share of working time expected to be spent on the study and confirming availability for the proposed time. 3ie expects the same team of PIs to participate in the proposed impact evaluation. Applicants are required to highlight information relevant to previous process, formative and impact evaluations in their CV.
6. If applicable, include CVs (not to exceed three pages each) of additional researchers who will be involved in conducting the evaluation, if approved. Applicants need to provide only information relevant to the grant in their CV.
7. The proposed budget, not to exceed US\$ 100,000, must follow [3ie's direct cost](#) and [indirect cost policies](#).

## 6. Submission guidelines

- Please submit all files in a single email message not to exceed [10MB] to [upw@3ieimpact.org](mailto:upw@3ieimpact.org) **no later than 23:59GMT, 24 August 2015.**
- Components three and four, above, should be submitted in a single Microsoft Word or .rtf file in font size equal to or larger than 11 point.
- The signed letters from the PIs and sample impact evaluation studies relevant to the grant may be submitted as separate pdf files.
- The budget should be presented in [3ie budget format and follow 3ie budget guidelines](#). Budget notes may be submitted as a separate Microsoft® Word or .rtf file in font size equal to or larger than 11.

*Incomplete submissions will not be considered.*

Please direct any questions related to this RFP to [upw@3ieimpact.org](mailto:upw@3ieimpact.org) with **'CPW- Uganda query'** in the subject line by 23:59 GMT on 28 July 2015. By 4 August 2015, a single document with all questions and answers will be made publicly available [here](#).

**This RFP does not constitute a guarantee of an award.**

This grant window funded by the Government of the United Kingdom through its Department for International Development (DFID).





# Appendix A<sup>1</sup>

## I. Youth livelihoods

### Background

The Youth Livelihoods Programme (YLP) is a rolling Government of Uganda (GoU) programme targeting the poor and unemployed youth in all the districts of the country. The programme is implemented by the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD) and funded by the GoU with a possibility of development partners' support in the future. The initial budget estimate for the programme is Uganda Shillings 265 billion<sup>2</sup> for the five years (January 2014 – December 2018).

YLP is a community demand-driven (CDD) programme that is implemented with guidance from the central government and the local governments. The funds are provided to the Youth Interest Groups (YIGs) in form of interest-free **revolving funds** in order to increase outreach and enhance sustainability of the programme.

### Programme development objective

The overall objective of the programme is to empower the youth in Uganda to harness their socio-economic potential and increase **self-employment** opportunities and **income levels**.

### Specific objectives

- To provide youth with marketable vocational skills and tool kits for self-employment and job creation.
- To provide financial support to enable the youth establish income generating activities.
- To provide the youth with entrepreneurship and life skills training as an integral part of their livelihoods.
- To provide youth with relevant knowledge and information for attitudinal change (positive mind-set change).

### Programme components

The YLP has the following three components:

#### (a) Skills development

The skills development component supports the development of relevant livelihoods skills that create opportunities for self-employment among the youth. The component provides hands-on training to the youth in marketable trades and basic start-up tool kits to those who successfully complete the trainings.

---

<sup>1</sup> Information about the programmes has been provided by the Government of Uganda

<sup>2</sup> The Jan-June 2015 average exchange rate for US Dollar (USD) to Ugandan Shilling (UGX) is 3010.

## **(b) Livelihoods support**

The livelihoods support component is intended to finance productive assets for income generating activities initiated by the youth. All the beneficiaries receive basic training in entrepreneurship and life skills and appropriate follow-up support by the relevant subject matter specialists.

## **(c) Institutional support**

The institutional support component is intended to improve the technical, administrative and managerial capacity of the key implementers of the programme, and promote good governance at all levels of programme implementation.

### **YLP beneficiary selection process**

Under YLP support is given to youth<sup>3</sup> aged 18 – 30 years in YIGs of 10 – 15 members. The beneficiary selection process is conducted through community based targeting mechanism facilitated by sub county CDOs. Groups of selected beneficiaries submit project interest forms and are sent a facilitator by the sub county to generate an application form based on their needs. Projects up to UGX 12,500,000 can be approved by the District Technical Planning Committees. However those above UGX 12,500,000 but not exceeding UGX 25,000,000 are sent to MGLSD for approval. Between 2014-18 YLP is expected to fund at least 19,080 projects of which 4,240 are expected to be skills development while 14,840 will be livelihood support. Beneficiaries of YLP funds are expected to pay back the funds in a period of 0 – 3 years as part of the YLP revolving mechanism. Any unpaid funds after one year attract a service fee of 5 per cent per year.

## **II. Family planning**

Family planning services is one of the most cost-effective interventions to prevent maternal, infant, and child deaths globally contributing thereby to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the newly established Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It is estimated that one quarter to one third of all maternal deaths could be prevented only through reduction in the number of unintended pregnancies in a country.

Uganda has one of the highest youth populations in the world, with slightly more than half of its population aged under 15. As noted in the 2008 National Population Policy and Vision 2040, the high child dependency ratio is a major barrier to social transformation and development in Uganda. A large average family size makes it difficult for families and the government to make requisite investments in education and health that are needed to develop high-quality human capital and achieve a higher level of socioeconomic development.

---

<sup>3</sup>Programme targets the following categories of youth: Dropouts from school and training institutions; Youth living in slums, city streets, high risk and impoverished communities; Youth who have not had the opportunity to attend formal education; Single parent youth; Youth with disability; Youth Living with HIV/AIDS; Youth who have completed secondary school or tertiary education (including university).

Uganda has, over the years, enhanced the capacity of institutional and social structures at national and subnational levels to mobilise communities and deliver family planning services. The family planning programme, however, continues to face a number of challenges and constraints that must be addressed to meet the country's family planning goals of a 50 per cent CPR and 10 per cent unmet need by 2020.

The government allocated 8.6 per cent of the 2013-14 approved budget to the health sector. The majority of funding for health comes from donor organisations, especially for drugs and services. Despite the growing need though, the funding continues to be inadequate.

There are other barriers as well. On the demand side, gender inequalities commonly affect women's ability to use contraceptives. Even when men are not opposed to a woman's use of contraceptives, they often consider family planning a woman's issue. There is a well-accepted belief in Uganda that religion prohibits the use of modern family planning methods.

Supply side constraints include inadequately stock of health facilities due to challenges in contraceptive security. This is particularly relevant for long-acting and permanent methods.

Family planning counseling and measures should be accessible for both men and women, including youth. There are numerous supply-side barriers to accessing contraception in Uganda; for example, clients are often unable to access care due to geographical distances and the lack of supplies or equipment at facilities.

The current policy environment is conducive for a strengthened implementation of the family planning programme in Uganda.

However, as mentioned above, there are a lot of challenges that contribute to low usage of methods available for family planning. Evidence is needed to identify robust family planning programmes that reach women, men, youth and communities at large.

### **III. Public service delivery and local governance**

In the mid-1990s the GoU devised a strategy for economic reform, the cornerstone of which was implementation of a decentralised system of governance with improved service delivery. Accountability at the local level, transparent and participatory decision making and monitoring of implementation was vital to the implementation of this strategy.

Poor delivery of public services in Uganda is a major point of discussion in Cabinet meetings mainly because of the implications on socio-economic outcomes such as low household incomes and high maternal and child mortality at 435 per 100,000 births and 76 per 1,000 live births respectively. Though school enrolment increased significantly, quality of education and high rate of school dropout remain of significant concern.

The poor delivery of public services is a result of a number of factors, including

- weak public sector management characterised by unclear policy, legal and regulatory frameworks creating a series of overlapping mandates;
- weak institutional structures and systems; and
- corruption

Overtime efforts have been made to address these challenges. Recent public sector reforms that have taken place in developing countries, Uganda included, are under the influence of the New Public Management. They have been driven by a combination of economic, social, political and technological factors, which have triggered the quest for efficiency and ways to cut the cost of delivering public services much like the private sector.

Uganda is implementing the Public Service Reform Programme (PSRP) which aims at improving governance in the public service. Implemented by the Ministry of Public Service in three phases between 1997 to 2010, the PSRP includes initiatives like the Citizen's Charter, use of information and communication technology in in public service delivery and performance contracting.

In addition, the decentralised system was introduced as a strategy to improve service delivery by bringing services closer to the public who are the ultimate beneficiaries.

Although a number of public service reforms have been successfully implemented, it is important to note that many of the reforms have largely been incremental in nature rather than transformational, and have not been applied comprehensively or consistently. The emphasis has been mainly on structures and systems with minimal attention to motivational and attitudinal issues which are critical in service delivery.

Though the decentralisation policy was an innovative approach towards improving service delivery, its impact on delivery of services remains highly debatable. While some literature shows some positive impacts or positive in some aspects of implementation, others show no clear impact.

Generally, evidence on whether decentralisation has improved service delivery in Uganda is still inconclusive. On the other hand, different models to service delivery based on integrated frameworks exist. There is a need for rigorously evaluating their performance and draw lessons that can improve delivery of public services in Uganda.

#### **IV. Universal primary education**

Universal Primary Education (UPE) is one of GoU's main policy tools for achieving poverty reduction and human development. UPE was introduced in January 1997, following a political commitment by President Museveni that the government would meet the cost of primary education of four children per family. This commitment was soon extended to allow all people that wanted to access primary education. GoU abolished all tuition fees, and Parents and Teachers Association charges for primary education.

The main objectives of UPE are to:

- Provide the facilities and resources to enable every child to enter and remain in school until the primary cycle of education is complete;
- Make education equitable in order to eliminate disparities and inequalities;
- Ensure that education is affordable by the majority of Ugandans;
- Reduce poverty by equipping every individual with basic skills.

Following its introduction, gross enrolment in primary school increased from 3.1 million in 1996 to 7.6 million in 2003, an increase of 145% (4.5 million children), compared to an increase of 39% (0.9 million children) between 1986 and 1996. This is despite the fact that primary education was not made compulsory and not entirely free since parents were still expected to contribute pens, exercise books, clothing, and even bricks and labour for classroom construction.

The UPE programme has required a significant increase in public expenditure devoted to primary education. More importantly, under the country's Education Sector Investment Plan, at least 65 per cent of the education budget must fund primary education. The additional expenditure has been financed largely from debt relief provided under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries initiative, channeled via the country's Poverty Action Fund.

### **Is the policy working?**

School dropout continues to be an area of concern. Although it is difficult to estimate completion rates precisely, of the two million children enrolled in primary school in 1997 at the time UPE was introduced, only close to 500,000 reached grade seven in 2003. Lack of interest (46 per cent), family responsibilities (15 per cent) and sickness (12 per cent) being the most commonly cited reasons for dropout.

### **How is it implemented and managed?**

#### **a) Ministry of Education and Sports**

The Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) has the following responsibility in the implementation of UPE, as specified in the guidelines of 1998:

- Training of teachers, including refresher courses;
- Providing instructional materials in the form of textbooks and teachers' guides;
- Contributing to the construction of basic school facilities (e.g. classrooms, libraries);
- Supervising, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of UPE;
- Providing curriculum, monitoring and assessment standards.

In terms of expenditure, the MoES provides two types of grants for UPE, namely capitation (fees) grants and school facilities grants.

Capitation grants are paid on the basis of the number of students enrolled in a school and the level of education. The monthly grant per child was fixed at about US\$5 per pupil for classes P1–P3, and US\$8 per pupil for classes P4–P7, payable for a fixed period of 9 months per year. The MoES also provides guidelines for the spending of capitation grants in primary schools, which are as follows: 50% on instructional materials; 30% on co-curricular activities (sports, clubs etc.); 15% on school management (school maintenance, payment for utilities such as water and electricity); and 5% on school administration.

## b) UPE implementation at local government level

Under the leadership of the Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs), local authorities are responsible for ensuring that all UPE funds released to them by the MoES reach schools. UPE funds are conditional grants, over which district authorities have little power of reallocation to other uses. The CAOs are responsible for the formulation of the education budget, prompt disbursement of UPE grants to schools, complete accountability of use of funds and adequate briefing of District Councils on the implementation of UPE. Sub-county chiefs represent the CAOs at the sub-county level. They make regular visits to schools, implement local government byelaws on UPE, keep a record of both pupils and teachers in the sub county, submit regular reports on education to the CAOs, ensure safe water and sanitation facilities in schools, and enforce proper use and accountability for UPE grants and public funds.

## c) UPE implementation by school management committees

School management committees are statutory bodies at the school level representing the government. They give overall direction to the operation of the school, ensure that schools have development plans, approve and manage budgets, and ensure transparency, especially in the use of UPE grants. Head-teachers of primary schools report to the District Education Officers, but also work closely with the school management committees in running UPE primary schools.

### **What are the challenges in implementation?**

According to ANPPCAN (2013), there are several underlying social issues responsible for the high school dropout rates in Uganda.

Stigmatisation due to pregnancy is responsible for a large number of dropout rates among the girls.

Child labour is another factor. According to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) approximately 2.7 million children in Uganda are engaged in child labour. The majority of the children are involved in sugar cane cutting (79% in Busede and 57% in Kakira) given the high number of sugar cane growers in this region. Other children are involved in fishing during the whole night, carrying heavy luggage from ferries to markets and stores, digging , working as housemaids, selling foods and drinks at market places or kiosks, making bricks, brewing alcohol, collecting and selling fire woods, washing clothes and keeping cattle.

Corporal punishment and other forms of violence and abuses meted out to students is another deterrent as indicated in a study by ANPPCAN which was carried out in 25 public and private primary schools in Acholi, Lango, West Nile and Central regions in April 2011.

School has also been found to be lacking in infrastructure particularly toilet facilities, which especially affects attendance among girl students during menstruation. In addition, the lack of meals, teacher absenteeism, and insufficient school inspections further contribute to high dropout rates.