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THE SAMOA SCHOOL FEES GRANT SCHEME

INTRODUCTION
The Government of Samoa (GOS) is committed to the Education Goals set out in the Strategy for the Development of Samoa (SDS) and the Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture (MESC) Strategic Policies and Plan 2006-2015 (SPP). Furthermore the SPP is specific in its commitment to quality improvement at all levels of education (Goal 2.4.1) and the achievement of universal primary education by 2015 (Goal 2.4.2).

In the context of the impact of the current economic downturn, and with the knowledge that school quality is of increasing concern to the public, the GOS has decided to promote and support the Samoa School Fees Grant Scheme to both lower the private costs of schooling, particularly for the most vulnerable, and facilitate quality improvement in schools.

GOS has reported a slowing of economic activity and a decline in revenues. As revenues struggle to cover recurrent expenditure in Samoa, government recognize a need to draw on external funding to help sustain and support initiatives already in place to ensure the achievement of its education goals, particularly the achievement of universal primary education in Samoa by 2015. New Zealand and Australia have responded positively and agreed to support the Samoa School Fee Grants Scheme (SSFGS/the Scheme) provided that it is designed to respond to valid needs, to ensure vulnerable populations benefit, and it facilitates and promotes equitable access to quality schooling.

PROGRAM RATIONALE
There are three drivers for the SSFGS. First, all children have access to schooling and that the costs of schooling are not a barrier to enrollment and participation. Second, the quality of primary education must be high enough to ensure that it leads to better and more productive lives. And, third, the GOS can meet its MDG 2 target and honor international obligations, including EFA, compliance with the Convention to the Rights of the Child and the prevention of child labor in compliance with the International Labor Organizations', Child Labor Convention.

The GOS anticipates that the SSFGS will become a key financing mechanism to assist schools meet the MESC Minimum Service Standards (MSS) that are to be revitalized over the coming year. Initially, the GOS intend that the SSFGS be introduced and established outside the education sector program SWAp, the ESP II. However, the GOS intends that, once established, SSFGS will be fully integrated into the sector program. It is expected that this transition can take place as the follow-on activities to ESP II are planned.

A comprehensive background situation analysis was completed as part of the preparation of the program. The work looked at the impact of the global and financial recession on the population, and at the social, cultural and economic situation across Samoa. It also attempted to identify the most vulnerable groups in the country. In sum, the analysis led to the decision that rather than developing a targeted grant scheme that benefited only the nation’s poorest families, it would be more effective if the scheme were to benefit the majority of the primary school population and if it were to support quality improvement throughout the sector. Although the design outlined in this document addresses this wider set of objectives, as the Program develops GOS intend that the SSFGS more substantially

---

1 Afamasaga & Pereira, 'Background Analysis Report', September 2009
benefit the segments of the population that are in hardship and their schools. As more information is gathered on this population more program resources will be targeted at reducing their schooling related costs and improving the quality of their schools.

Important findings from recent analysis

**Vulnerability** In 2008, 5,038 households with a total population of 49,145 people live in ‘poor’ households across the country. Low income earners make up about 27% of the total population. In Samoa, as in many small states across the Pacific, this group has been most adversely affected by the global recession as inflation has dramatically reduced the effect on family welfare of any disposable income that they may have.

In the Samoan context vulnerability is closely aligned with ‘hardship’ - a more readily acceptable concept of poverty. HIES 2005 and HIES 2008 data demonstrate that many people in Samoa live in one or other form of hardship, due mainly to lack of income to meet both basic needs and social and cultural obligations. Many parents reported difficulty to pay school fees. In addition, Samoan society’s traditional means of supporting family and community were found to be stressed in the midst of changing lifestyles and adaptations to a cash and monetized economy. The global recession has amplified these difficulties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% Households (HH) in lowest 3 deciles (L3DHH)</th>
<th>% Population in the L3DHH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Upolu</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apia Urban Area</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of Upolu</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savaii</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 illustrates that there are significant populations of vulnerable households located in all regions with a higher concentration in Northwest Upolu.

Further, HEIS 2008 identified that 20.1% of households representing 26.9% of the population had weekly per capita expenditure below the poverty line. It also estimated that with the current rapid increases in food prices globally, a change of 10% in food prices would take a further 4.4% of the population under the poverty line. The task of determining the location of the families that are most vulnerable has not yet been undertaken as it would require substantial resources and a sophisticated means testing process that could work around difficult social and cultural resistance to such assessments. The GOS through Cabinet did not favour such a process. However, census data does reveal that to one extent or another these families are located in all areas which have access to Government primary schools. In conjunction with the enforcement of the Amended Compulsory Education Act 2009, the GOS through the MESC is committed to research to better identify the vulnerable families. One such research is planned in the short term.

**Out-of School Children** 2006 data reveal that only 584 children in the 5-12 age group were not at school in that year – i.e. 1.5% of the primary age population. From census data, the number of children in the 5-12 age group was 37,690 and from PPRD-MESC data the number of children in school was 37,106.

---

A survey of schools suggests that more effort may be required to keep children in schools as parents face increasing difficulty in meeting schools costs (including fees). As noted above, there is clear evidence that many families are having difficulty paying school fees and, as expected, the problem is more apparent at those schools with higher fees scales. Every school in the survey had a significant percentage of children who have difficulties paying fees — reflected by lateness of payment, non payment, high absenteeism or tardiness in attendance, or an increase in the number of dropouts. The percentages range from 1.1% to 11% for the large schools (populations between 750 and 1300) and from 1.5% to 31% for schools of moderate sizes (250-450).

Substantial evidence show that the payment of fees has been a big barrier to schooling and had resulted in children not attending school, but it is also probable that even with the non payment of fees, some children may still not attend school. The SSFGS program will attempt to identify and quantify the impact of other influences which may still prevent children from attending school. A survey to determine this will be carried out and in the event that the findings point towards a reassessment of the initial funding formula to address the specific needs of those vulnerable children and in the schools with the most urgent needs, this will be done.

School Rolls, Fee Income and Resource Inequities. The highest number of children in government primary schools is found in Savaii (9,657-30% of the total) and Northwest Upolu (9,370, 29%) followed by the Apia Urban Area (6,761, 21%) and the Rest of Upolu (6,751, 21%). In terms of schools fee revenues, however, the Apia Urban Area takes 45.7% of the total compared to 29.3% by Northwest Upolu, 13.4% by Savaii, and 11.4% by the Rest of Upolu. Clearly, schools are very differently resourced in terms of the private contribution per-capita. The SSFGS will attempt to redress this imbalance.

Linking SSFGS to quality improvement

The GOS is confident that if properly designed, managed and implemented the SSFGS will ensure that all Samoan children attend primary school and that there are quantifiable improvements in the quality of primary schooling and in children’s learning outcomes.

GOS recognizes that improving the quality of schooling is dependent on many factors including a steady supply of capable teachers, adequate school buildings and classrooms, appropriate curriculum and learning materials and creating safe learning environments. Currently the ESP II is addressing many of these issues and is strengthening system management. To complement those efforts the SSFGS will provide grants to schools to assist them to directly contribute to how the quality of services they deliver are strengthened and enhanced. Importantly, SSFGS will increasingly make schools, through their school committees and principals, more accountable to the communities they serve. This will be achieved through the revitalization of the MESC Minimum Service Standards program (see below) and the refinement of School Improvement Plans (SIPs) that will in part be financed by the annual SSFGS grant.

SSFGS will work in collaboration with the School Operations Division (SOD) to strengthen the processes and systems put in place for school improvement during the MESC’s Institutional Strengthening Program (completed in 2004). The introduction and establishment of the SDP during the initial years of the SSFGS will ensure that schools are provided ongoing support in school planning (including budgeting and resources use), implementation, monitoring and the assessment of how Plan activities impact on
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3 Ibid, page 21
teaching/learning process. Recognizing that gains in student learning outcomes will be in
great part the result of schools continually being able to meet gradually increasing national
MSS, MESC will undertake an extensive overhaul of those standards and of how they are
introduced to schools and how schools are supported in their efforts to achieve and surpass
them.

The SSFGS management team, the Team of consultants (TOC, see below), will work with
the SOD/SIU to transform the revised MSS\(^\text{5}\) into user-friendly guidelines that can be readily
applied as schools self-assess where they are against the standards and design the school
improvement actions and activities that form their SIPs.

THE SAMOA SCHOOL FEE GRANTS SCHEME

Guiding Principles

The guiding principles for the SSFGS are drawn from the GOS/MESC Strategic Policies and
Plan 2006-2015, and from best practices learned and observed from similar schemes in the
region and globally\(^\text{6}\).

i. Human rights, inclusiveness and social justice. Education is a basic human right and no
child is to be excluded, regardless of gender, creed, religion, socio-economic status,
ethnicity or (dis)ability.

ii. Achievement of Universal Primary Education by 2015. GoS intends that universal
primary education for all primary aged children in Samoa can be achieved by 2015,
thereby meeting Millennium Development Goal 2 (MDG2).

iii. Collective synergies. It is intended that educational communities (government agencies,
schools and communities) work collaboratively to provide the synergy that will result in
the educational outcomes and values necessary to contribute to Samoa’s development.

iv. Maximizing resources at the school level. Schools should ensure that all available funds
are integrated in the context of the Annual School Development Plan to support identified
education priorities (the MSS).

v. Allocating additional resources for schools with the highest needs. SSFGS should allow
for additional resources to be targeted to schools that require extra assistance to meet
the MSS or if they are special needs schools or very small schools in rural areas.

vi. Monitoring expenditure in relation to educational outcomes. The success of SSFGS will
depend on its ability to influence learning outcomes and on MESC’s ability to assess
those outcomes and to link gains to schools’ use of SSFGS resources.

vii. Transparency and efficiency in administration and distribution. The SSFGS funding
mechanism must be transparent and efficient. This means that all schools (principals and
school committees) and the administering authorities (MOF and MESC) must be clear
about the rationale of all funding formulae and mechanisms.

viii. Planning for a sustainable funding structure. Although development partners have
expressed their willingness to support SSFGS in its initial years, MESC and MOF will
develop a mechanism for GOS to absorb part or all of the financial responsibility for the
Program over time, as their ability to do so becomes evident. A study of MESC’s
capacity in this regard will be completed in 2011.

ix. Sustainability. In 2010, GOS will review all existing school grant schemes to assess how
the integration of schemes could influence their effectiveness and sustainability.

---

\(^{5}\) One of the lessons learned from Tonga was that the refinements to the Tonga MSS were done when the
TSGP started its work. It was also learned that the MSS became more meaningful to principals and teachers as
the TSGP team worked through the refinements with them. It is suggested here that the SSFGS does the same.

\(^{6}\) Strudwick, J. “ERF Block grants in LAOS” 2008
Intended Outcomes
The GOS wishes to ensure that financial barriers to primary school attendance are removed; that all Samoan primary schools are able to offer a quality education; that all Samoan children achieve high learning outcomes; and that all Samoan children complete a full cycle of primary schooling. The GOS also wishes to ensure that these goals are met in an efficient and cost effective manner.

Objectives
To provide these outcomes the SSFGS will:

(i) Reduce financial barriers to primary schooling by providing direct government support to schools in lieu of school fees;
(ii) Assist schools to improve their teaching and learning processes by meeting and maintaining MESC’s Minimum Service Standards; and
(iii) Improve school-level resource management by introducing and/or supporting school based management practices such as the principal as a manager, school committees, school development planning and budgeting and school-level accountability for results.

As part of the government’s wider efforts to improve schools and increase student outcomes, the SSFGS will increasingly empower principals and school committees to take charge of their resources through the development and implementation of SIPs that are directed towards the achievement of Minimum Service Standards.

Program Targets
The targets of the SSFGS are to:

Ensure that all children attend and complete primary schooling:

i) During 2010 all SSFGS school committees establish the number of out of school primary aged children in their areas and develop plans to bring them into school in 2011.

ii) 100% gross enrolment in Year 1 by 2012.

iii) At least 85% net enrolment by 2013.

iv) Reduction of dropout rates to zero percent in all primary grades by 2015

Ensure that primary schools progressively improve children’s learning outcomes.

Each school will set its own targets based on the school results for SPELL 1 and 2 in the last four years, once the MSS are clarified and principals become more proficient in planning and budgeting. The following targets maybe used to monitor the success of the SSFGS.

v. The number of at risk children in English literacy in year 6 to decline by 6% every year and by 5% every year in year 4 in the next five years

vi. The number of at risk children in Samoan literacy in year 6 to decline by 3% every year and by 4% every year in year 4 in the next five years

vii. The number of at risk children in numeracy to decline by 5% every year in year 6 and 3% every year in year 4 for the next five years

Assist primary schools to understand the SSFGS and MSS programs.

vi. 100% of all SSFGS primary school principals and school committees are introduced to SSFGS and MSS programs in 2010 and provide

7 ‘At risk’ children in literacy and numeracy are determined largely by the SPELL tests at Years 4 and 6 every year
basic SSFGS awareness, management, planning and reporting training. (These kinds of targets are in the M & E framework)

vii. (100%) SSFGS primary schools are visited by the TOC members at least twice a month to provide ongoing support and advanced SSFGS and MSS training to principals and school committees. In addition, there will also be a formal monitoring visit by the harmonization team every quarter.

viii. 100% of all SSFGS primary schools complete a self-assessment against the MESC MSS by the end of 2010.

ix. 100% of all SSFGS primary schools set annual targets to achieve MSS priority goals, plan associated activities, budget available funds and include these in their School Improvement Plans in 2011 and in each subsequent year.

Ensure that all primary schools are managed using best practices (including financial management) and are using their resources efficiently.

ix. 75% of all SSFGS primary schools successfully use the SSFGS system for accounting and SSFGS financial templates for recording and acquittal in 2011; 100% by 2012.

x. 100% of all SSFGS primary schools submit their completed SSFGS quarterly financial reports in 2010. In 2011 and subsequent years, this financial report will be submitted every six months.

xi. Ensure that schools demonstrate progress towards meeting the MSS identified for any plan period. (eg SAMP or SIP)

SSFGS beneficiaries
SSFGS will benefit all Samoan primary schools with the exception of private primary schools as there is no evidence that they serve disadvantaged populations. Recent school enrolment and fees information revealed a disproportionate relationship between school populations and the resources available for their education. In 2009 private primary schools served just over 4% of primary enrolment but collected more than 50% of all primary school fees.

Public primary schools, mission primary schools and those primary schools serving children with disability or other special needs will benefit directly by receiving grants from the SSFGS. Public schools serve more than 80% of primary school students, and account for some 32% of the fees. Mission schools make up 13% of students and receive 12% of all fees.

SSFGS Grant Formula
In essence, SSFGS grants are intended to substitute for schools fees and to provide schools with adequate resources to help them meet the MESC MSS. In an attempt to fully reflect the goal of an equitable school system set out in the MESC Strategic Policy and Plan 2006-2015, the SSFGS will initially employ a ‘standardized’ approach to ‘replacing’ fees at the school level. It is intended that this approach provide a readily understandable way for government to begin to address resource inequities that exist between schools.

The overall grant amount received by a school will be determined using a formula which is a combination of a base grant component for specific status plus a per capita component of
the grant each of which is determined from time to time by the MoF and MESC. The Program will start off with a per capita allocation of ST100 per student (based on enrollment on March 31) for all government primary schools and mission primary school and ST200 per student for special schools. Government primary schools will also receive a base grant component depending on their size: less than 50 students, ST1,900; 51-150 students, ST1,600; 151-300 students, ST 1,300; and more than 300 students ST1,000. Mission schools will receive a base component of ST2,000 regardless of schools size and special schools will receive a base component of ST3,000 regardless of school size.

Fund Flow Mechanism
SSFGS funds will be provided to schools not to parents. SSFGS funds, in the form of a direct grant to schools, will also be deposited by MOF directly in schools’ bank accounts (cheque accounts).

Funds can only be used by the principal and approved by the school committee and payments by the school for goods or services can only be made by cheque: the main signatory to the cheque account will be the school principal but each cheque must be countersigned by a designated member of the school committee.

Grant Distribution
The school fee grant will be distributed to schools annually in May every year for the next three years. This may be varied depending on findings from the annual review of the Scheme.

The Costs of SSFGS and its Funding
Based on 2009 enrolments it is estimated that the entire SSFGS program will cost an estimated ST 4,575,000 in 2010. Grant costs in 2011 and 2012 are expected to have some modest increases as net school enrolments move closer to the 100% target. Other costs however, should be reduced as associated costs are mostly in the first year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Estimated Costs (ST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>4,150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSFGS consultant Team (TOC)</td>
<td>355,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS Development (year 1 only)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing (year 1 only)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (year 1 only)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Awareness</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,575,000 ST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total 2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,525,000 ST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total 2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,515,000 ST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total 2010 to 2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,615,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is anticipated that donors will finance the entire program from 2010 to 2012. GOS intend that over the period 2013 to 2015, the proportion of SSFGS costs borne by the government will increase annually to be at least 70% of the total program costs by 2014.

Grant Use
In the SSFGS, grants are provided to schools via their principal and school committee who are expected to use the funds to finance activities that eventually influence students’ learning
outcomes. Each school will develop a School Improvement Plan (SIP) over a three year cycle. These in turn are translated into Annual Management Plans (AMPs). The focus of the SSFGS is the AMP and the SSFGS grants funds will finance or assist in the financing of the activities in the Plan. The SIP will increasingly be guided by the MESC MSS (see below) and will outline on an annual basis how the school will go about improving their teaching and learning processes and activities and actions that will ensure that the school provides a learning environment that is conducive for all students. Guidelines in respect to grant use will be detailed in the SSFGS Manual of Operations and to a limited extent are detailed below.

Grants may only be used for “allowable” items:

- Teacher development activities.
- Teacher’s materials: maps, manuals, OHP transparencies, books, photocopying paper, toners, etc.
- Science and Mathematics equipment.
- Student’s materials: texts, readers, library reference materials and student excursions, sports activities.
- Minor Repairs & Maintenance of school property, buildings or equipment; minor repairs to windows, toilets, roofs, furniture, etc.
- School Committee expenses: eg paper, pens, etc for meetings
- School Administration: Schools can spend up to ST 250 for expenses related to administration of the grant, including bank fees.
- Internet charges, and consumables such as printer inks, photocopier inks etc.
- Fixed Assets: Larger items that cost more than ST 500 and are expected to have long life: for example, photocopiers, computers, furniture.
- Transport hire for field trips/excursions, inter-school sports competition
- Consumables ICT consumables such as videos, CDs, DVDs, computer inks, toners for photocopiers.
- Electricity and water bills up to ST 800 a year.
- First Aid Kits

Grants may not be used for:

- Any payment that is not beneficial to the students.
- Staff, Committee or student personal transactions.
- Payment of salaries, salary supplements, loans, meals or daily allowances.
- Repay loans or debts of any kind.
- Food or drink for any school, teacher or School Committee meeting.
- Major renovations or repairs (a new roof, electrical rewiring, a new classroom)
- School fences or water tanks
- Payments to officials and other visitors, gifts (including school prizes) or hospitality.
- Outstanding debts of any description.
- Telephone or call costs.
- Lawn mowing.
- Cleaning.
- Buying on credit terms.

Funds not spent at the end of a school year are carried over into the following year.
The SSFGS Process

MESC collects enrolment numbers at 31 March to calculate the SFGSS grant.

The school reviews its needs.

The school reviews itself against the MSS.

School Development Plan

An inclusive budget is prepared.
This should include all income sources & expenditure including SSFGS School Committee, Ex-Students, donor, etc.

The Budget is approved by the School Committee / Board.
The Budget is signed by Principal & SC/Board.

Education Officers and/or Government Auditors will audit schools during the year.

Grants are deposited in school accounts.
Principals use the funds and record all expenditure using the vouchers and cash book.

Education Officers and/or Government Auditors will audit schools during the year.

Principals will complete School Performance Report (SPR) and submit, together with the carbon copy of their cash book to MESC at the end of November.

Principals will forward information on quarterly spending as requested by MESC.

Principal will complete School Performance Report (SPR) to MESC at the end of November.

Principals give a report to their School Committee/Board at regular meetings.

School Development Plan
SSFGS Management and Administration
The ESP II Education Advisory Committee (EAC), formerly Steering Committee will oversee the SSFGS. The CEO-MESC will report to the EAC on the SSFGS on a quarterly basis. The TOC Leader (see below) will attend EAC meetings when required as done for ESP II Component Heads and other MESC Projects. The Coordinating-Development Partner on the EAC will represent SSFGS donors on the Steering Committee. TOC reports will be distributed to EAC and donors (see Reporting, below).

GoS responsibility for SSFGS will rest with the Implementing Agency, the Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture (MESC). The SSFGS Team Leader will report to CEO-MESC and the Ministry’s Core Executive on a monthly basis.

On a day to day basis, SSFGS operations will be managed by a Team of Consultants (TOC). A team of six senior professional educators will form the TOC and is expected to manage the scheme for an initial period of three years (subject to annual review and individual performance reviews). The TOC will have a Team Leader who will be responsible to and report to the CEO-MESC through the ACEO Schools Operation Division (SOD) on a day to day basis as required.

TOC tasks will include, but not limited to; (i) defining and managing the SSFGS and MSS awareness programs with the SOD; (ii) on-going liaison with schools on the SSFGS (iii) introducing SSFGS and MSS to schools with SOD; (iv) school principal and school committee training and upgrading; (v) initially guiding and then supporting the drafting of school improvement plans; (vi) monitoring the SSFGS; (vii) maintaining an SSFGS database; (viii) reporting; and (ix) SSFGS related capacity building in MESC. In addition to working with schools, the TOC will also be required to work with SOD to use the fund to meet the MSS.

Having an SSFGS consultancy team is to ensure that the Program is introduced and well managed and funds are readily available for cost effective use by Schools. It will also help ensure that a mechanism is in place to facilitate regular review and in-depth monitoring of both the Program and MSS implementation. In respect to SSFGS, it is anticipated that each TOC member, including the Team Leader, will take responsibility for a group of primary schools. At the end of the first three years of the SSFGS, the status of the TOC will be reviewed in terms of the need for continuation and extension.

The TOC will provide direct support to grant recipient schools via their principals and school committees. Principals and the school committee will be required to ensure that their schools meet MSS and that their SSFGS grants (and other school resources) are used effectively and efficiently. They will also be required to ensure the appropriate use of all funds available at the school and to ensure compliance with the guidelines contained in the Manual of Operations.

The school committee will be able to raise additional funds from its community to finance its development plan activities or other community obligations. It will not however be able to impose either “voluntary” or obligatory” fees on parents. MESC will provide additional guidance on school fund raising. Further details of the tasks and expectations of principals and school committees are contained in the Manual of Operations.
While the school committee will have control over the school's resources, including the SSFGS grant and other funds obtained through approved fund raising, parents/families of children attending SSFGS grant recipient school can no longer be required to pay school fees. All such school fees will be replaced with the SSFGS grant described above.

The Ministry of Finance through the ACEO, Aid Coordination and Debt Management will ensure that SSFGS funds are available to schools on schedule. MOF will also provide adequate fiscal oversight to enable the smooth administration of the Scheme. There will be continuous dialogue between MOF and MESC regarding SSFGS. The SSFGS funds will be audited by the Office of the Auditor General.

The Manual of Operations
The Manual of Operations will provide unambiguous information on all SSFGS processes including required financial procedures at all levels and the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders (to ensure full transparency). It will also comprehensively detail what schools may and may not use the SSFGS grant for. The manual will be introduced to schools by the SOD/TOC and will be a key resource in the training of school principals and committees.

Training for School Principals and Committees
To ensure that SSFGS procedures are fully understood, all school committee members and principals of all grant recipient schools will receive substantial training by TOC consultants. Although the training will cover all aspects of SSFGS, emphasis will be placed on financial controls, accounting and transparency. Training will be conducted face-to-face, and will be updated and repeated annually.

MINIMUM SERVICE STANDARDS
Several reviews of schools in Samoa have highlighted the need to improve quality in education. In particular, concern has been expressed over the results of the assessment of literacy and numeracy levels that continue to show high percentages of 'at risk' children. Achievements in the year 8 national examination have also consistently been characterized by low averages in most subjects. The introduction of Minimum Service Standards (MSS) by MESC is a strategy to ensure that schools are provided with both guidance in respect to what is expected of them to help improve these outcomes and to improve schooling in general. The linkage of MSS to the SSFGS, in part, provides the means necessary for schools to finance MSS targeted activities.

Briefly put, the Samoan MSS articulate the conditions believed to be necessary for schools to meet pre-determined levels of learning outcomes. Schools will be expected to evaluate themselves against the initial level of MSS and to determine (with assistance from the SOD/TOC, if necessary) the steps necessary to elevate themselves to a position where they can, over time, meet the MSS on four aspects of schooling:
   - School Environment
   - School Management and Learning
   - Teacher Professional Knowledge, Practice and Values
   - Student Achievement

The Samoa MSS are drawn from the international literature, MESC’s School Development initiatives, project initiatives including the Samoa National Teacher Development Framework, the Samoa School National Assessment Policy Framework, the School Operations Handbook developed during the MESC- ISP and similar documents from across the Pacific (especially Tonga, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands).
Table 4 illustrates the framework of the Samoa Schools MSS. A detailed separate MESC publication will be distributed during the SSFGS program’s first year in time for schools to use it as they plan the use of SSFGS funds in the second year of the Program.

### Table 4
**Proposed Focus of the Samoa Schools Minimum Service Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Management and Learning</th>
<th>Teachers Professional Knowledge, Practice and Values</th>
<th>Student Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Safe, adequate and clean classrooms, office and staffroom facility (by school type).</td>
<td>o School resource management</td>
<td>o Teacher qualifications</td>
<td>o Student achievement targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Safe, adequate, accessible, clean and fully functioning toilets for boys and girls.</td>
<td>o Parents and community involvement in school management, planning, and budgeting through school committees.</td>
<td>o Teacher’s professional knowledge</td>
<td>o Assessing and reporting learning outcome gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Clean and regular water supply that is accessible to students</td>
<td>o Engagement on MSS via school self assessments, school management plans, plan budgeting and funds acquittal.</td>
<td>o Teacher practices</td>
<td>o School and national benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Adequate office equipment and secure storage facilities.</td>
<td>o Student policies: enrollment capacity, staff: student ratios, student health, student nutrition, etc.</td>
<td>o Teacher professional values</td>
<td>o Maintaining student assessment portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Adequate teaching supplies, materials and tools.</td>
<td>o Staff policies: absence, time on task, hours in schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Adequate support facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Functioning maintenance program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Linking MSS to the SSFGS**

SOD and the TOC will introduce MSS implementation over time and will work with schools to develop realistic and achievable MSS targets and MSS assessment procedures. Over the course of the first year of the SSFGS, MSS will be introduced and discussed with schools and communities in preparation for schools to both self-assess against the first round of MSS targets and to determine how best and over what time frame these initial targets can be met. During this period the schools and their communities (represented by their principal and school committee) will work with the TOC to develop initial School Annual Management
Plans that will articulate how schools’ resources (including the SSFGS funds) will be used to progress towards meeting the MSS.

Guidelines to assist the schools to conduct MSS self-assessments and develop initial School Annual Management Plans should be part of the MSS documents that SSFGS would refer to. Suffice to say in the SSFGS Manual of Operations that schools self assess against the MSS in planning AMPs.

MSS link to perceptions and beliefs about quality of education as determined by the stakeholders and these will change as the whole school system makes general progress and continue to set higher and higher standards. It is intended that the initial round of MSS will be articulated as clusters of indicators that will enable schools to see whether they are ‘below’ standard, ‘on’ standard or ‘above’ standard and plan the direction of school improvement accordingly. Over time as more and more schools meet the initial round of MSS, the standards will be raised and so will the MSS. This is all part of continuous school improvement. This is a valuable lesson that was learned from the Tonga School Grant Scheme.

**MONITORING, EVALUATION AND REPORTING**

**Monitoring**

Monitoring and evaluation are essential parts of the SSFGS and are expected to enable critical program decisions to be made based on valid and verified data and information. In addition to monitoring progress against the Program targets detailed earlier in this design, SSFGS will be monitored at three levels: compliance (adhering to guidelines), processes and impact will be monitored at the school level; compliance, management and oversight will be monitored at the ministry level; and overall impact will be assessed at the national level. Annex 2 contains the Framework for Monitoring SSFGS processes and performance.

At the school level the TOC will monitor and report on the extent that:

1. School committees are involved in school planning
2. School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are linked to MESC MSS (effective in Program Year 2)
3. School budgets (in the SIPs) correspond closely to available resources, including the SSSFGS grant and funds that the school is anticipating raising from other sources
4. Expenditures are fully accounted for and SSFGS accounting practices are followed.
5. Compliance with the SSFGS Manual of Operations.
6. Costs of goods and services are reasonable.
7. Schools’ reports follow the required SSFGS formats.
8. Changes in teaching and learning practices and materials occur.
9. Community’s children that are not participating in primary school is known and what is being done to include them in school.
10. School enrollment and participation levels vary/change over time.

School principal and school committee training by the TOC will ensure that appropriate SSFGS processes and objectives are fully understood well in advance of TOC monitoring visits.

MESC and donors will annually review the SSFGS and report to the ESC by assessing Scheme performance in respect to:

1. Timeliness and efficiency in the roll out of funds
2. Compliance with agreed SSFGS processes.
3. Response time and quality of response to issues and complaints that arise
4. TOC performance against agreed work schedules.
5. The quality of TOC reporting against agreed formats and schedules
6. The continuing relevance and appropriateness of the SSFGS Design to its objectives.

At the national level the MESC (PPRD/SOD/CMAD/TOC) will monitor and report on system performance annually to assess:

2. Dropout, retention and transition rates
3. Trends in learning outcomes and student achievement data in respect to national assessment tools

Data collected at the national level will include the Annual School Census and the annual national assessment outcomes at year 4, year 6 and year 8, as well as data from the literacy and numeracy benchmarks that are being developed for all primary year levels

SSFGS TOC will use the MESC baseline data to assess progress annually. As far as possible the data will report the situation at the end of the 2009 school year.

Baseline data will include for each school
- Student performance:
  o Years 4 and 6 SPELL tests and Year 8 examination results
  o Dropout rates
  o Retention rates
  o Enrolments
  o Repeaters at all levels
- Teacher performance:
  o Teacher numbers
  o Teacher Absenteeism
- School resources:
  o Textbooks per child
  o Reading books per child
  o Log of resource materials
  o Status of facilities against a standardized MSS checklist
  o Total non-SSFGS funds available to schools (including community contributions) in each of the last three years

SSFGS data will be collected over the course of 2010 and in each subsequent year from four MESC sources:
- School records
- The Annual School Census
- Manumea and Pelican Databases
- SSFGS Data base
  o SSFGS school monitoring reporting formats
  o SSFGS school resources monitoring reporting formats
  o SSFGS student performance reporting formats

Evaluations
The Program will be evaluated every year to assess the extent to which it is meeting its objectives in a cost-effective and efficient way. The first SSFGS evaluation is scheduled for
the third quarter of 2012. Term of Reference for these evaluations will be drafted by MESC in collaboration with donors.

At the end of the first three years, a comprehensive donor-financed External Review of the SSFGS will be conducted. The External Review will provide recommendations to stakeholders in respect to the extent that the Scheme is progressing towards its objectives and performance goals, its overall impact on the education system, on school-financing, on the introduction and establishment of MSS, and on Scheme expansion and sustainability. The base line data that will be used as indicators to gauge the success of the Scheme will be the MESC 2009 data for enrolment (GER and NER), drop out rates, repetition and transition rates upon which much of the background analysis was based.

**Research**

At the start of the Scheme, it is important to ascertain that all primary aged children in Samoa are attending school. A survey to do this is planned to elicit the following information.

a) determine that all primary school aged children are at school  
b) if not, determine why and find out what other interventions should be carried out to enable these children to attend school.  
c) what interventions and initiatives must be carried out to ensure that all these children are at school and stay at school.

It is also important that the Government carries out a study to rationalize all its grants to schools to ensure sustainability and effectiveness of education in Samoa. The MOF and MESC will address this in the short term.

**Reporting**

Reporting will be kept to an appropriate and sensible minimum. Table 5 summarizes the reporting arrangements within SSFGS.

TOC meetings to discuss SSFGS progress and issues will initially be held monthly. Team members will provide brief written monthly reports based on their work schedule, school visits, training completed, issues arising and actions taken. These briefs will be available to the Core Executive of MESC and will be lodged with Central Records. The Team Leader will report on a monthly basis on all aspects of SSFGS to the Core Executive through the ACEO-SOD.

The Principal of each Grant recipient school will submit a brief SSFGS Financial Report on a quarterly basis in 2010 and on a six monthly basis in subsequent years. The brief financial reports are available to Core executive and will be lodged at central records. The reports will allow schools to make suggestions for improvements in the SSFGS. Schools will also submit their SIPs and AMPs which include their annual budgets to MESC as per the current procedures of the Ministry.

In total, there will be three levels of written reports on the implementation: quarterly reports in the first year and six-monthly reports in subsequent years from each school; TOC consultants’ monthly reports; Team Leader’s monthly report to the MESC CEO and the Core Executive; and the Team Leader’s Quarterly report to Education Advisory Committee and Donors. The MESC CEO will report on the SSFGS to the EAC.

The MESC and donors will review the SSFGS annually and will submit a report on the Scheme to the EAC. The Review Report will include progress on all aspects of the SSFGS as stipulated in page 15 under Monitoring.

---

8 Lessons learned from elsewhere with similar schemes indicate that it takes at least two years before any real system wide impact is observed.
### Table 5
**SSFGS Reporting Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level/Type of Reporting</th>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td>School Improvement Plan</td>
<td>• MSS targets&lt;br&gt;• Annual Management Plan&lt;br&gt;• Income and income sources&lt;br&gt;• Budget</td>
<td>MESC TOC Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quarterly financial and Progress Report</td>
<td>• Progress on SIP&lt;br&gt;• Income and expenditures for SSFGS</td>
<td>MESC Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for 2010. Six monthly in subsequent years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOC</strong></td>
<td>Monthly Consultant Reports</td>
<td>• Reports based on school visits, training completed, status of SDPs, support provided schools, issues arising and actions taken.</td>
<td>MESC TOC Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOC Team Leaders Quarterly Reports</td>
<td>• Comprehensive update on TOC activities that quarter.&lt;br&gt;• Summary of school level progress.</td>
<td>MESC ESC Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MESC</strong></td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>• Program management and administration.&lt;br&gt;• Update on baseline data.&lt;br&gt;• Annual data report on target and process indicators.&lt;br&gt;• Program income.&lt;br&gt;• Funds flows and funding mechanism.&lt;br&gt;• Suitability of the funding formula.&lt;br&gt;• Program governance and oversight.&lt;br&gt;• Progress on MSS.&lt;br&gt;• Highlights from TOC Team Leader Reports.&lt;br&gt;• Highlights from SDPs and Schools’ Reports.&lt;br&gt;• Annual update of the SSFGs monitoring framework.</td>
<td>GoS Stakeholders Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROMOTION AND AWARENESS

Throughout 2010 the MESC will be responsible for developing a comprehensive promotion and awareness media programme on all education sector programmes and projects taking a sector-wide approach inclusive of SSFGS. The Office of the CEO utilizing the Education Communications Officer (ECO) and Assistant ECO is responsible for this work. Within the
first two years of SSFGS, the promotion and awareness program will work with local media outlets to ensure that information about school level SSFGS programs are progressing and about the overall impact of SSFGS on achieving universal primary education in Samoa. MESC intends that the promotion and awareness program be designed in a way that will (i) allow MESC to provide SSFGS information to the public on a regular basis and extensively prior to each school year to encourage and ensure maximum enrollment and minimum dropout, (ii) encourage stakeholders to communicate their views on Scheme progress and effectiveness to MESC, and (iii) advertise the Program's successes.

RISK MITIGATION

While this design attempts to ensure the success of the SSFGS by articulating the Government's approach and commitment to a well thought through and managed program, it is acknowledged that the Scheme is not void of risk. While some risks are more obvious than others, it is fully expected that additional risks and challenges to the Scheme will appear during implementation. At the ministry level risk management will fall to the MESC Core Executive. At the school level, risk management will be the responsibility of the school principals assisted by the TOC. The TOC in collaboration with the SROs will be expected to help principals to plan, budget, procure, record, monitor the use of the grant and assess their impact on the progress towards achieving the MSS.

Key risks
Student Migration. Parents and families tend to perceive that schools in the urban area are superior over schools in the rural area and since fees will no longer be a problem, they might opt to send their children to urban schools. This may result in overcrowding classroom conditions. On the other hand, there may be a reverse trend where students go back to their village schools in order to have the benefit of the additional resources through SSFGS to develop their schools. MESC will continue to monitor any such trends and will enforce its regulations regarding teacher pupil ratios and maximum size of schools.

Possible GoS inability to influence mission schools The inclusion of mission schools and special schools in the Scheme raises two issues: how compliance with SSFGS guidelines and regulations can be enforced as the GoS has no direct authority over these institutions.

The concern is that these institutions may find that the grants are inadequate for their needs and in fact provide less of a financial base than they previously had. Further discussion will be necessary in the first year of the programme with mission and special schools to determine their intent in terms of participating in the program.

Potential declining income in some schools
The MTEF survey has pointed out that there are some schools that will have reduced income as a result of the SSFGS. The potential risk is that these schools may not comply with the processes and requirements of the SSFGS especially with respect to the levying of additional fees. It is important that these government schools are monitored closely by the TOC /MESC so that they also comply with the requirements of the Scheme.

The role of the TOC in problem solving and risk management:
At the school level, TOC assists the school to manage the use of funds through the SSFGS. With regard to the scheme, the TOC liaises directly with the school committee, the principal and the teachers. In their daily work, the TOC will address SSFGS issues and clarify questions in respect to the Manual of Operations.

PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY
While Samoa’s development partners have indicated their willingness to assist in financing SSFGS, the GOS would like to gradually take over responsibility for its funding. As previously noted, substantial donor support is expected over the first three years of the Program (2010 to 2012). While the government will move to gradually provide at least 70% of the total program costs by 2014, GoS understands the possibility that macro-economic conditions in Samoa in the coming years may influence government’s potential to substantially contribute to SSFGS.

Table 6: School Fee Grant funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor funding percentage</th>
<th>Donor costs</th>
<th>GoS costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 (100%)</td>
<td>$4133,600ST</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2 (100%)</td>
<td>$4,133,600ST</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3 (70%)</td>
<td>$2,893,520ST</td>
<td>$1,240,080ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 (50%)</td>
<td>$2,066,800ST</td>
<td>$2,066,800ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5 (30%)</td>
<td>$1,240,080ST</td>
<td>$2,893,520ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,133,600ST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 provides only the costing for the school fee grant. The GOS through MESC is providing related costs for the setting up of the scheme through training of the consultants, initial cluster training of the principals on both islands, public awareness and printing of training materials as follows:

Table 7: GOS –MESC contribution to setting up the scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness (Jan-April)</td>
<td>6,300 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Materials</td>
<td>4,699 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>6,500 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel/Accom/Meals</td>
<td>4,901 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Hire for cluster training</td>
<td>3,334 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting up school cheque accounts</td>
<td>7,000 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment &amp; training TOC</td>
<td>2,150 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>5,000 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshments for training</td>
<td>3,975 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>975 ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$44,834-00 ST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously noted, GOS provides a school grant scheme for private, mission and special schools for primary as well as secondary schools. This scheme currently costs $4,000,000⁹. Mission and Private Schools receive 87.5% of this amount ($3.5m), Special Schools, 5% , ($0.2m); and Pre-Schools 7.5%, ($0.3m). The GOS will explore ways of integrating this and other schemes into the SSFGS to improve efficiency and effectiveness. The GOS is committed to continuing to prioritize education in the SDSs and annual budgets.

---

⁹ MESC-PPRD figures, 2009
THE 2010 SSFGS PROGRAM

MESC will roll out the SSFGS over the course of 2010. At the same time it will also begin a program of activities designed to ensure that the program is properly understood by all stakeholders, well advertised, and most importantly well supported. Furthermore, in mid-2010, MESC will begin the preparation of a series of research and data collection activities that will inform the 2010 review of the Program and subsequently influence its modification and improvement in time for the 2011 school year. The table below details the SSFGS program for 2010.

Table 8
The SSFGS Program for 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsibility/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment of the TOC</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>MESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSFGS awareness and promotion program</td>
<td>January through August</td>
<td>MESC and TOC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of principals and school committees</td>
<td>Cluster training in April: One on one training from May through November</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Grants</td>
<td>April and June</td>
<td>MESC/MoF – two payments in 2010, one payment annually thereafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School monitoring visits</td>
<td>Ongoing after April</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESC Core Executive Meeting</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>MESC/TOC Team Leader reports through the ACEO SOD once a month. MESC Reports in CEO’s Report. TOC Team Leader reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC Meetings</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC meetings</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual SSFGS review and planning meeting</td>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>Reviewer MESC EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research activities</td>
<td>May through November</td>
<td>MESC to develop a plan for these two researches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification of vulnerable groups and barriers to schooling in Samoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rationalization of the Government grants for sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1: School Level Financial Procedures and Accountability

The SSFGS Manual of Operations details the scheme’s requirements in respect to procurement, financial procedures, reporting and accountability. Key requirements are described below.

Procurement
GoS procurement guidelines must be followed. Table 3 details procurement requirements for goods and services up to ST 50,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of goods/service</th>
<th>Number of quotes</th>
<th>Quote to include</th>
<th>Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital eg computer or photocopier ie item costs more than $500</td>
<td>3 written quotes from suppliers</td>
<td>Name and address of supplier, item description, price and how long the quote is valid for</td>
<td>Approval from School Committee and Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books</td>
<td>1 quote</td>
<td>Name and address of supplier, item description, price and method of delivery</td>
<td>Approval from Principal and School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment or any item that costs $100 tala or more but less than $500</td>
<td>3 verbal quotes</td>
<td>Name and address of supplier</td>
<td>Approval from Principal and School Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods in excess of $500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to Tenders Board Approval and Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods costing $500,000 and not less than $200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to Tenders Board Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods costing $200,000 and not less than $100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to Minister of Finance approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods costing up to $100,000 and less than $75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to Minister of Education, Sports and Culture approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods costing up to $75,000 and not less than $50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to CEO Ministry of Finance approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods costing $50,000 tala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject to the CEO, MESC approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial procedures
- The budget is best prepared before the end of the school year preferably by October/November, so that items can be purchased for the new school year.
- SSFGS funds cannot be committed until the school budget (in the SAMP) is approved.
- Grant money left at the end of the year is carried over and must be re-budgeted for the next school year.
- Purchasing will usually be done by the Principal, or a person delegated by the Principal.
- Written quotes are to be kept in the SSFGS file for a minimum of two years. They can be attached to the Payment Voucher.
- The school chooses which supplier to buy from, and should have a good reason if the lowest quote is not used.
- If the school wishes to purchase items not included in the budget, the approval of the School Committee/Board is needed before the purchase is made. Changes to the Budget are to be recorded in the Minutes of the meeting.
- Keep records up-to-date and keep all documents in a safe place.

Bank Account and Cheque Book Cheques can only be signed by authorised persons and each cheque must be signed by two people – the principal and a School Committee/School Board designated person. Schools may have up to four designated persons (one being the Principal. When there are any changes to the signatory, the Principal is responsible for advising the Bank and SSFGS TOC of the changes. In these instances, the Bank has been instructed to request a letter from the school, the presence of the new signatory with Identification, and the minutes of meeting that approved the changes. A copy of the letter provided to the Bank will also be required by the SSFGS office in MESC.

Receipts The school must always obtain receipts for items bought and filed in their SSFGS file for auditing purposes.

Financial Transactions
Schools must follow SSFGS processes and keep clear and accurate records of all spending. Records will show how the funds have been spent. The records help the school to be accountable to its controlling authority and the donors. Records will be kept by the Principal and should be offered for examination by the TOC or the auditors.

The steps for purchasing and keeping financial records are:

1. Decide to Purchase item.
   Obtain Invoice from supplier.

2. Prepare Payment Voucher for purchase.
   Write out cheque with Principal & other co-signer.

3. Purchase the item.
   Obtain receipt.
   Bring invoice & receipt back to school.

4. Complete Payment Voucher.
   Attach invoice & receipt to Voucher.
   File all vouchers in cheque order.

All items purchased should be entered in the school's Asset Register Book.
Cash Book Entries Schools are required to record all transactions either in the SSFGS cash book provided or in a file in a computer. All entries must be ink and corrections made by ruling through the incorrect entry and initialling the new entry. Each entry should include: date, voucher number & cheque number, amount of payment, VAGST (if appropriate), category code cost, and remaining balance in the account.

Computers may be used to record transactions. Some schools will have a computerised financial accounting package; others may use a spreadsheet. Those using a commercial accounting package will be required to provide print-outs of SSFGS financial information. SSFGS will provide schools with an electronic cash book template on demand.

Bank Statements will be collected regularly by the TOC and copies made for the school principals. Principals must make sure to ask their TOC consultant for their monthly bank statement. When the bank statement is collected, schools will be required to compare these with their cashbook transactions and to inform the Toc when these do not correspond.

Asset Register All schools will be asked to keep an Assets Register or Stock Book to record all school items other than small consumable items. Schools will be requested to itemise: the asset, where item was purchased, date purchased, serial number (if applicable) and the cost of the item.

Petty Cash Schools can have petty cash to use for the purchase (no more than ST 20 at any one time) of low cost items that would not normally be paid with a cheque.

Financial Reporting
Schools will be reporting to their communities via their School Committee or Board and to MESC and MoF. The required reports are designed to allow schools to demonstrate that SSFGS funds (and all other funds that contribute to the school budget) have been correctly recorded, that schools have followed correct SSFGS and GoS financial processes, and that funds use has been transparent. The following reports are required:

- Regular monthly reports to the schools’ communities to show how money has been used.
- Quarterly reports to MESC and MoF detailing all transactions for the a three month period.– expenses for the 3 month period.
- Annual reports to MESC and MoF to indicate expenditures for the year and to comment on how the funds available to the school were utilized to meet SIP goals. A carbon copy of the completed Cash Book will be submitted with this report.

Formats for all three types of reports are included in the Operations Manual.

Monitoring
From time to time, the SSFGS TOC will request to see schools’ financial records and documents. At the end of every quarter, there will be formal monitoring to ensure all SSFGS procedures are being followed correctly. If a school has not complied with SSFGS procedures, the TOC consultant will give advice and guidance and request that the school
comply. If non-compliance continues, the TOC will submit a report to the MESC and MESC will request a formal audit by MoF.

**Auditing**
From time to time SSFGS will be subject to government auditing by MoF. Audits results will be made available to the donors. Audits completed required under SSFGS funding agreements with contributing donors will be completed according to agreed schedules for those audits.

**Transparency, Misuse of Funds, and Complaints Procedures**
Every effort will be taken by the GoS to ensure that SSFGS funds are used as intended and that details of the use of SSFGS funds by the government and by schools will made public.

The TOC will provide school principals and committees with annual training in transparency and record keeping and schools will be required to place an outline of the SDP and an updated record of SSFGS grant expenditures a public notice board in the school.

Complaints may be lodged if there is any concern over SSFGS processes at the school level or in respect to any question of misuse of SSFGS funds. Complaints can be lodged at the school to the Principal the School. The principal discusses with the consultant and address the complaint if appropriate. Otherwise the TOC team leader is responsible for bringing all other kinds of complaints to the appropriate authorities at MESC. Complaints that are passed on to MESC will be dealt with according to MESC policies and PSC regulations regarding disciplinary measures. All complaints will be acknowledged. When the complaint is addressed or resolved the person who made the complaint will be informed by TOC of the outcome. If it is found that there has been misuse of funds, disciplinary action will follow. The SSFGS public awareness program will include full explanations of the SSFGS complaints process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring Activity</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Baseline 2009</th>
<th>Year 1 2010</th>
<th>Year 2 2011</th>
<th>Year 3 2012</th>
<th>Data Required/ Source Document</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Monitoring Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/Community level monitoring for Compliance</td>
<td>School Committees are involved in the development of school budgets.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC consultant reports</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are linked to MESC MSS (effective in Scheme Year 2).</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC consultant reports</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School budgets (in the SAMPs) correspond closely to available resources.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC consultant reports</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditures are fully accounted for and SSFGS accounting practices are followed. (see above, Program Targets)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC consultant reports</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with intent of the SSFGS Operations Manual</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC consultant reports</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costs of goods and services are reasonable</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>TOC consultant reports</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schools’ reports follow the required SSFGS formats.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC consultant reports</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community’s’ children that are not participating in primary school.</td>
<td>1005 age group 5-12</td>
<td>Age group 5-12</td>
<td>Age group 5-12</td>
<td>Age group 5-12</td>
<td>TOC consultant reports</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School enrollment and participation levels</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99.9% enrollment all grades</td>
<td>TOC consultant reports</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MESC level Monitoring</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>all grant schools Receive their correct money as</td>
<td>all grant schools Receive their correct money as</td>
<td>all grant schools Receive their correct money as</td>
<td>Consultant Reports</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>MESC appointed consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with agreed SSFGS processes.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>75% of the schools comply scheduled</td>
<td>No annual target other than improved efficiency</td>
<td>Consultant Reports</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>MESC appointed consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response time and quality of response to issues and complaints that arise.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>No annual target other than improved efficiency</td>
<td>No annual target other than improved efficiency</td>
<td>Consultant Reports</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>MESC appointed consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC performance against agreed work schedules.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>No annual target other than improved efficiency</td>
<td>No annual target other than improved efficiency</td>
<td>Consultant Reports</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>MESC appointed consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of TOC reporting against agreed formats and schedules.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>No annual target other than improved efficiency and quality</td>
<td>No annual target other than improved efficiency and quality</td>
<td>Consultant Reports</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>MESC appointed consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National level monitoring</td>
<td>Gross and net enrolments.</td>
<td>GER 103% NER 5-12 years old 97% NER 5-14 years old: 85%</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>100% GER 99.9%NER</td>
<td>MESC statistics</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>TOC/SOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout, retention and transition rates</td>
<td>Drop-out R Y1-Y2: 6% Y2-Y3: -2 Y3-Y4: -1 Y4-Y5: 1 Y5-Y6: 0 Y6-Y7: 1 Y7-Y8: 2 Transition Rates Y1-Y2: 91%</td>
<td>Reduce drop out rate from Y1-Y2 to 3% Improve transition rate Year</td>
<td>Reduce drop out rate from Y1-Y2 to 1 or 2 % Reduce drop out rate Y7-Y8 to 0% Improve</td>
<td>MESC Statistics</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>SOD/PPRD/TOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheme Targets</td>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>Y2-Y3: 101%</td>
<td>Y3-Y4: 100%</td>
<td>Y4-Y5: 99%</td>
<td>Y5-Y6: 99%</td>
<td>Y6-Y7: 99%</td>
<td>Y7-Y8: 97%</td>
<td>7-8 transition rate for Y1-2: 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Establishing SSFGS and MSS</td>
<td>SSFGS introduced to 100% of SSFGS schools by the end of 2010</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>TOC Team Leader’s Report</td>
<td>Prior to end of the year</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSS introduced to 100% of SSFGS schools by the end of 2011</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>TOC Team leader’s Report</td>
<td>Before end of the year</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of SSFGS schools visited by TOC in harmonization team at least twice in 2010 and four times in each of 2011 and 2012.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4 times</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% of TOC schools visited regularly by the TOC (at least twice a month)</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC Team leader’s report</td>
<td>By the end of the year</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Improved resource management</td>
<td>SSFGS schools successfully use the SSFGS system for accounting and SSFGS financial templates for recording and acquittal.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC Team Leaders Report</td>
<td>Prior to end of Program year</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSFGS primary schools submit their completed Annual School Performance Report (ASPR)</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC Team Leaders Report</td>
<td>Prior to end of Program year</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Meeting MSS Targets</td>
<td>100% Primary schools meet initial MESC MSS targets by 2015.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>TOC Team Leaders Report</td>
<td>Prior to end of the year</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Access</td>
<td>100% of all SSFGS primary schools submit their completed</td>
<td>n.a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>TOC Team Leaders Report</td>
<td>Prior to end of the year</td>
<td>TOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>TOC Team Leaders Report</td>
<td>Prior to end of Program year</td>
<td>TOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSFGS annual report in 2010, 2011 and 2012.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% of primary schools meet initial MESC MSS targets by end 2013; 100% by 2015.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of dropout rates to 0 percent by 2015.</td>
<td>Refer baseline data above</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOC</td>
<td>Schools survey – SSFGS annual reports</td>
<td>Every year</td>
<td>MESC, TOC and schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of at risk children in English literacy in year 6 to decline by 6% every year and by 5% every year in year 4 in the next five years</td>
<td>Baseline data for each school in School Profile</td>
<td>Decline of 6% for Y6 5% for year 4</td>
<td>Decline of 6% for Year 5% for year 4</td>
<td>Decline of 6% for Year 6 5% for year 4</td>
<td>SPELL 1 &amp; 2 results</td>
<td>Every Year</td>
<td>MESC CMAD-AEU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of at risk children in Samoan literacy in year 6 to decline by 3% every year and by 4% every year in year 4 in the next five years</td>
<td>Baseline data for each school in School Profile</td>
<td>Decline of 3% for Year 6 4% for y4</td>
<td>Decline of 3% for Y6 4% for year 4</td>
<td>Decline of 3% for y6 4% for y4</td>
<td>SPELL 1 &amp; 2 results</td>
<td>Every Year</td>
<td>MESC CMAD-AEU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of at risk children in numeracy to decline by 5% every year in year 6 and 3% every year in year 4 for the next five years</td>
<td>Baseline data for each school in school profile</td>
<td>Decline of 5% for year 6 3% for year 4</td>
<td>Decline of 5% for year 6 3% for year 4</td>
<td>Decline of 5% for y6 3% for y4</td>
<td>SPELL 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Every Year</td>
<td>MESC CMAD-AEU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Primary students identified as at risk (%) at Year 4 (All schools, Government and Non Government): results from SPELL 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4: Primary students identified as at risk (%) Year 6, Government schools only: results from SPELL 2 Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numeracy</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>