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The critical state and ailing condition of education in many countries in Asia-South Pacific region compels serious and urgent attention from all education stakeholders.

Centuries of neglect, underinvestment in education, corruption, and inefficiency by successive governments in the countries of the region have left a grim toll in poor education performance marked by low school attendance and survival rates, high dropout and illiteracy rates, and substandard education quality.

Moreover, there are glaring disparities in access to education and learning opportunities: hundreds of millions of impoverished and disadvantaged groups which include out-of-school children and youth, child workers, children in conflict areas, women, ethnic minorities, persons with disabilities, dalit caste and other socially discriminated sectors, remain largely unreached and excluded by the education system.

Hence they are denied their fundamental human right to education and hindered from availing of the empowering and transformative tool of quality, life-long learning that could have equipped them to realize their full human potential, uplift their living conditions, and participate meaningfully in governance and in decisions that affect their lives.

At Midway: Failing Grade in EFA

In the year 2000, governments and the international community affirmed their commitment to quality Education for All (EFA) and Millenium Development Goals (MDGs). Midway to target year 2015, government assessments of EFA progress reveal that education gaps and disparities persist, and education conditions may even be worsening as indicated by shortfalls and reversals in EFA achievement.

The landmark year 2007 therefore presents a timely opportunity for civil society networks to engage governments in addressing the unmet EFA goals and MDG education targets, especially for disadvantaged groups.

Real World Strategies

Spurred by the challenge of pushing for accelerated progress towards EFA, the Asian South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education (ASPBAE) and the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) launched the Real World Strategies (RWS) programme to undertake realistic and practical initiatives based on the actual conditions, experiences, and aspirations of people in communities.
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Foreword

It is with great pleasure that I present this report of the research study on “Budget Tracking in Formal School Education in Sri Lanka.”

Sri Lanka is a country that has an age-old tradition of valuing education. In principle, it is the responsibility of the State to provide quality education that is free for all. Such education is based on equity and justice and free of any discrimination. We believe that in achieving the goal of ‘Education for All’ there should be transparency in budgeting for education. Government allocates a substantial portion of its financial resources each year for education, which amounts to nearly 2.5% - 2.8% of the Gross National Income and 8% - 10% of the total budget. It is the duty and responsibility of all of us to improve formal school education by ensuring the fair and equal improvement in all education sub-sectors and the optimum utilisation of this money.

The scenario in education in Sri Lanka is more progressive than in other Asian countries. However, effort should be taken to maintain the full participation in education within the age limits of compulsory education. The quantitative expansion in education should not compromise quality. This research study was conducted to ensure that the attempts made by the State in the development of education result in full benefits for the entire community. Budgeting is a basic function of government. It reflects the government’s developmental priorities. A budget serves as a plan for funding, showing transfer of revenue and ways of mobilising funds over a given fiscal period. Based on available resources and policy objectives, the budget allocates funds to various sectors in education. It serves as the most important tool in ensuring the government’s developmental goals and implementation of programmes.

The Coalition for Educational Development (CED) wishes to express its special thanks to Mr. Nimal Bandara, Secretary of the Ministry of Education, and Mr. S.U. Wijeratne, Additional Planning Secretary, who provided guidance and invaluable support to this study. We profusely thank all provincial secretaries, provincial education directors, zonal education directors, and principals who gave administrative support and facilitated our access to data sources. Many thanks also to the teachers, parents, old pupils, members, and NGOs for providing necessary data and information. Special thanks are due to Dr. Godwin Kodituwakku and Dr. Nihal Wickramasinghe of the National Institute of Education who, with their research expertise, afforded consultancy to the project. The partner organisations of CED also deserve a big Thank You for
collecting grassroots-level information for this venture. Dr. G.B. Gunawardena, Mr. M.A.P. Munasinghe and Ms. Amara Peeris, staff members of CED, took immense efforts in carrying out this study from its very inception, and Mr. Sasanka Pushpakumara provided untiring logistical support in printing the full report. Their efforts are highly valued and appreciated.

CED also expresses its sincere thanks to Mr. Jamie William of Save the Children Sri Lanka for providing financial assistance to this important study, to ASPBAE for providing support in printing this Summary Report, as well as to all those who share our objective of promoting the education of children in Sri Lanka.

It’s my hope that the research findings will help towards ensuring quality education for all in my country.

B. Charles Elamaldeniya
Chairman, Coalition for Educational Development (CED)
Introduction

Budgeting is a basic function of government and reflects its developmental priorities. A budget serves as a plan for funding, showing the sources of revenue and ways of mobilising funds over a given fiscal period. Based on available resources and policy objectives, the budget allocates funds to various sectors in education. In ensuring the government’s developmental goals and implementation of the programs, the budget serves as the most important tool, and Sri Lanka is no exception to this rule.

This research was conducted to identify ways and means of ‘watching’ over the use of resources, as well as measures to ensure rational allocation, equitable distribution, clear targeting, timely transfer, appropriate utilisation, and maximum benefit of budget allocation and utilisation in relation to school education in Sri Lanka.

The education system in Sri Lanka: Legal context

In Sri Lanka, the Parliament, consisting of elected representatives of the people through universal franchise, has the full legislative power and control over public finance. No tax rate nor any levy may be imposed by any local authority or any public authority, except by or under the authority of a law passed by the Parliament.

According to the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution in 1987, some aspects of this power have been devolved to the nine provinces and monetary allocations are made to the provinces through the Finance Commission.

Ministerial responsibility is a convention in governments based on the Westminster System where a cabinet minister bears the ultimate responsibility for the actions of his ministry or department. For the education sector, there are three ministries, namely, the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Ministry of Higher Education and the Ministry of Vocational and Technical Training.
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Provincial Councils are encouraged to establish and develop Pre-schools. School education is the responsibility of both the central government and provincial councils.

**Education system in Sri Lanka: Organisational structure**

With the enactment of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, education governance was devolved to nine provinces, which were given increased powers in the management and supervision of schools. This change created a five-tier administrative structure, viz. (1) Ministry of Education (MoE), (2) Provincial Ministries/Departments of Education, (3) Zonal Education Offices (ZEO), (4) Divisional Education Offices (DEO), and (5) Schools (primary and secondary) (Fig. 1).

The Central MoE has exclusive authority to exercise legislative and executive powers to formulate and implement the national policy on education, prepare plans with respect to school education and manage financial resources.

There are departments and Constitutional bodies attached to the MoE that perform specific roles. The National Institute of Education (NIE) implements curriculum development and professional development of teachers and administrators. The Department of Examinations or National Examinations and Testing Service (NETS) conducts national level examinations.
The Provincial Ministry of Education, headed by the Provincial Secretary and the Provincial Director of Education is in charge of the provincial education administrative system. Financial resources are allocated to each Provincial Department from the Provincial Council through the MoE. Each zone is headed by a Zonal Director of Education who is responsible for administrative work in the schools, as well as for the improvement in the quality of the curriculum, teaching and learning. The Zonal Director has a staff of subject specialists who are responsible for supervision and quality improvement. The division is headed by a Divisional Director whose functions are supervision, data collection and distribution of materials, including textbooks. Service Advisors, who are attached to zones or divisions, engage in quality improvement of the teaching-learning process, prepare teachers for curricular changes and advise teachers on how to improve their teaching.
The school system

The government sector dominates primary and secondary education, accounting for 93% of all schools and 95% of total students. There are approximately 4 million students attending 9,712 national and provincial schools. In addition, there are 652 Pirivenas (Temple Schools), 25 special schools for the disabled, 80 private schools offering the national curriculum (partially supported by government), and nearly 200 private international schools approved and registered under the Board of Investments.

Government schools are classified into four types for management purposes: Type 1AB, with classes up to Grade 13, including advanced level science stream; Type 1C, with classes up to Grade 13 but without A level science stream; Type 2 schools, with classes up to Grade 11; and Type 3 schools, with classes up to Grade 5. These schools provide primary and secondary education for free and are evenly distributed. The average pupil-teacher ratio is 19:1.

Yearly, 300,000 students enrol in Grade 1. In 2005, student who sat for General Certificate of Education (GCE) Ordinary Level (O.L) numbered 307,771, out of which 146,862 or 47.7% qualified for (GCE) Advanced Level (A.L). Of the 204,030 that sat for GCE (A.L), 116,506 qualified for entrance to university. Of those that qualified for university, only 16,000 found places in universities and an additional 16,500 were admitted to other tertiary institutions and National Colleges of Education (Fig.2).

The policy of subsidised education for schools and university education implies big resource requirements. To maintain the basic principles of quality, equality and equity in education for each individual and each province, zone and school, the Education Sector Development Framework and Programme (ESDFP) was introduced in 2006.

The policy environment in education

The Government of Sri Lanka cites its policy of investing in education as a central function, and its objectives as enhancing human development, promoting equity and social mobility and contributing to a high and sustained economic growth. In the context of the far-sighted policies introduced in the 1940s, particularly on free education, free textbooks, materials for uniforms, mid-day meals for the needy, and free transport, Sri Lanka has extended educational opportunities to a large segment of the population (Table 1).

Education expenditure during the two decades, in the 1950s and 1960s, was high, with an average of 5% of GDP and 15% of government expenditure on education.
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Financing of education

Financing of education takes three modes: (1) Government, (2) Foreign funds, and (3) Household expenditure. The central government and the provincial councils provide funds and play a prominent role in financing education. Government expenditure on education has increased over the years from LKR 30.93 billion1 (about USD 374 million) in 2000 to LKR 42.34 billion (USD 512 million) in 2004. However, as a percentage of GDP, it has decreased from 2.5% in 2000 to 2.1% in 2004 (Table 2). By international standards, Sri Lanka spends...
comparatively less on education considering that the average for Asia is 3.5% and 3.9% for developing countries. Though the school system and administrative organisation has expanded, the overall government expenditure on education as a percentage of total expenditure has remained between 7 and 10 percent since 1996. This percentage of the government budget devoted to education is also relatively very low when compared to the 14% average for Asia and the 15% average for developing countries. Reasons identified for the modest level of expenditure include on the one hand the broad range of public services that vie for resources, such as universal free health care, free education, high defense expenditure, and on the other hand low public revenues leading to large budget deficits.

The total government expenditure in 2004 was LKR 42.34 billion and of this, LKR 13 billion and LKR 20 billion were spent respectively on primary and secondary education, and the cost per primary student was LKR 6,500 and LKR 7,500 for a secondary student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government expenditure on education</td>
<td>30930</td>
<td>28286</td>
<td>37209</td>
<td>39116</td>
<td>42340</td>
<td>75454</td>
<td>129963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a % of total government expenditure</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a % of GDP</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The national budget: Formulation, review and approval of the education budget

The budget is prepared in several stages. At the ministerial level, the sequential steps usually followed are:

1. Receiving of capital proposals and recurrent expenditure data from Provincial Education Offices by the Planning Division in the MoE;
2. Preparation of draft budget estimates for the entire Ministry by the Finance Division;
3. Review of proposals by a top-level budget committee and discussions with officials of the Treasury;
4. Inclusion of amendments; and
5. Finalising of the provision to be included in the national budget.

The expenditure budget is divided into two main parts – recurrent and capital. They are again divided into sub-units and include expenditure by programme and by category. There are five major programmes: Primary Education, Secondary Education, Education Development, Special Education, and General Administration. Category-wise, the recurrent expenditures are classified into personal emoluments, travel expenses, supplies, maintenance expenditure and contractual services, transfers, and grants and subsidies. The capital expenditures are categorised into rehabilitation and improvement of capital assets, acquisition of fixed assets, capital transfers, and operational costs of donor-funded projects.

Data related to actual expenditure are presented in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3: Actual capital expenditure as a percentage of estimates on financial statement, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Estimates on financial statement LKRs.* '000</th>
<th>Actual expenditure LKRs. '000</th>
<th>Actual expenditure as a percentage of estimate on financial statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>382,157</td>
<td>224,090</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>352,055</td>
<td>292,154</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>412,055</td>
<td>409,720</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>367,157</td>
<td>288,811</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Western</td>
<td>307,055</td>
<td>279,460</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>317,055</td>
<td>309,960</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uva</td>
<td>342,055</td>
<td>174,783</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaragamuwa</td>
<td>352,055</td>
<td>26,204</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,831,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,241,182</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In 2006, the USD-LKR exchange rate was $1=LKR107.61 at http://www.oanda.com/convert.fxhistory
The reason as to why the recurrent expenditure in all the provinces was bigger than the provincial requests and estimates on financial statements would be the recruitment of teachers in large numbers in the recent past claiming a larger share on teachers’ salaries.

From the year 2000, schools were authorised to procure “quality inputs,” which are defined as all materials, equipment and services used to help improve the quality of learning and teaching. Based on the formula called “Norm-Based Unit Cost Resource Allocation Mechanism” (NBUCRAM), the Finance Commission allocates funds for quality inputs to schools through provincial level authorities. Quality inputs are consumable inputs (e.g. chemicals, chalk etc.), capital inputs (e.g. computers, library books, etc), repair and maintenance of capital goods (e.g. computer maintenance), and external consultation services.

The proportion of education expenditure devoted to recurrent spending has been in the range of 80%, while the capital expenditure has been close to 20%. A large share of capital expenditure in the school system, about 80%, is devoted to construction of buildings. Only a small proportion of funds are invested in inputs, such as furniture, technology, equipment, and tools.

### External sources of funding

The external sources of funding are both multilateral and bilateral donors. Among the multilateral sources are WB, ADB, UNICEF, UNESCO, and UNFPA. JICA, GTZ and DFID are among the major bilateral agencies that have provided external aid. The INGOs contribute as well, though levels of support vary. Table 5 displays the details of the major aid-funded projects implemented during the past two decades in education.

---

**Table 4: Actual recurrent expenditure as a percentage of estimates on financial statement, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Provincial request LKR. '000</th>
<th>Estimates on financial statement LKR. '000</th>
<th>Actual expenditure LKR. '000</th>
<th>Actual expenditure as a percentage of estimate on financial statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>7,267,861</td>
<td>7,424,723</td>
<td>8,723,693</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>4,820,207</td>
<td>5,177,000</td>
<td>5,955,182</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>4,820,755</td>
<td>5,099,774</td>
<td>5,509,354</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>6,060,746</td>
<td>6,347,882</td>
<td>7,031,311</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Western</td>
<td>5,345,093</td>
<td>5,690,981</td>
<td>5,917,974</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>2,556,404</td>
<td>2,551,304</td>
<td>2,886,990</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uva</td>
<td>2,652,900</td>
<td>2,869,797</td>
<td>3,337,449</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaragamuwa</td>
<td>3,504,486</td>
<td>3,959,016</td>
<td>4,147,763</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,028,452</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,120,477</strong></td>
<td><strong>43,509,716</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Major aid-funded education projects until 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Intention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Education Project 2 (GEP 2)</td>
<td>1998-2002</td>
<td>Improve external &amp; internal efficiency of the education system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Education and Teacher Deployment Project (TETD)</td>
<td>1996-2001</td>
<td>Improve quality, equity, cost-effectiveness, and coverage in teacher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Plantation Schools Education Development Project (PSEDP)</td>
<td>1986-1998</td>
<td>Raise the quality of education with special emphasis on improvement of primary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Schools Development Project (PSDP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance Teacher Education Project (DTEP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Education Project (SEP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Management Development Project (EMDP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Education Project (EEP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Secondary Education Development Project (SEDP)</td>
<td>1994-1998</td>
<td>Improve the quality of secondary education (Grades 6-13) and provide more equitable access to quality secondary education particularly in rural areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>Establishment of Sri Pada College of Education</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Improve pre-service and in-service teacher education in the plantation sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Training &amp; Staff Development Project (TSDP)</td>
<td>1998-2002</td>
<td>Improve the quality of teaching &amp; learning in primary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher In-service Project (TIP)</td>
<td>1999-2003</td>
<td>Improve the quality of in-service through the capacity building for learner-centred teaching approaches and upgrade the knowledge and competencies of teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>1991-1996</td>
<td>Improve the quality of education at the primary level to overcome disparities in the quality implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Household investment in education

From estimates based on Department of Census and Statistics, Household Income and Expenditure (1996), the most recent available data, the share of private education expenditure per student by spending category is as follows:

- Tuition fees 45%
- Stationery 28%
- School Fees 8%
- Boarding Fees 4%
- Textbooks 4%
- Donations 4%
- Facility Fees 3%
- Miscellaneous 4%

At present, the private household spending is estimated to be 30-35% of public education spending and it is double the capital budget for education.

The Research Study

Key issues in the budget process

In the present policy context on budgeting, several issues emerge which form the nuclei for advocacy, as well as for further investigation. They are:

- Low level of public investment (2.8% of GDP) and need to enhance the efficiency and equity of public education spending
- Need to explore the budget process and the accompanying processes of policy, planning and implementation
- Lack of budget transparency to get all relevant fiscal information in a timely and systematic manner
- Disproportionate allocation of funding to particular educational levels, e.g. primary and secondary, to the neglect of others
- Limited involvement of stakeholders in the formulation of school level budgets
- The policy of equal fund allocation not giving equal results
- Poor coordination in utilisation of donor funds
- Absence of public watch over the use of resources and expenditure on education
Research objectives

The purpose of the study is to analyse the current state of art in allocation and expenditure of funds in MoE and to advocate measures to maximise its benefits to the different tiers of the education system. The specific objectives of the study are:

- To review the policy background of the budget process in school education
- To analyse the budget and track the process through an analysis framework inquiring into allocation, disbursement and utilisation of funds at MoE, provincial, zonal, divisional, and school levels; and
- To provide feedback to authorities and advocate measures to maximise utilisation of funds for formal school education.

Research methods

The study used the survey research method. Policy research approaches were used in the survey to analyse existing policy and practice using both available documentary data and data derived from the questionnaires, interviews and focus group interviews.

Population and sample

The population of the study is the 9,714 government schools in Sri Lanka.

As sample, 135 schools representing different school categories (1AB = 1; 1C = 1; Type 2 = 2; Type 3 = 1) from 27 educational zones in nine provinces (3 zones from each province) were selected purposively.

Key persons from different levels of education system were selected as the respondents.

Data collection and analysis

Data were collected by documentary analysis and a field survey. The following instruments and strategies were used to collect field data:

- Interview schedule for Zonal Education Officers/Planning officers
- Interview schedule for school principals
- Questionnaire for principals
- Interview schedule for teachers, Old Boys/Girls and School Development Society members
- Zonal-level focus group meetings
- Provincial-level focus group meetings
A pilot survey was conducted to identify basic patterns and ideas. Data collection instruments were developed based on the pilot survey.

The qualitative data of zonal reports were coded and analysed according to content analysis methods to identify patterns and key areas of good practices and issues at school and zonal levels. Problems concerning policy and mechanisms were identified and grassroots level suggestions were solicited. Percentages and simple descriptive statistical techniques were employed to analyse available quantitative data.

Findings, good practices and issues

Sources of funds

Government schools get funds from a variety of sources. Main sources include funds from the central government and provincial governments. Majority of the recurrent budget is financed by the consolidated fund, which is given to provinces as a block grant. Other than for this, schools receive funds for capital and recurrent expenditure through a variety of ways. In addition to government funds, there are schools that also receive funds from various programmes and projects of international and national NGOs, community-based organisations (CBOs) and other donor agencies. Since 2006, these funds are being channeled through the Education Sector Development Framework and Programme (ESDFP). The schools also raise their own funds through Facility Fees (FF), School Development Society (SDS), Old Pupil's Associations (OPAs), and other fund raising activities.

Almost all schools received funds through the Education Quality Inputs (EQI) programme. Schools also received funds through the ESDFP. The receipt of other types of funds varies widely across schools. The receipt of funds from NGOs and CBOs varies widely across
locations. In places where CBOs and NGOs are active, schools have received more funding from these sources.

The funds generated through SDS, OPAs and other fund raising activities of the schools are also affected by school type, location and popularity. Type 1AB and 1C schools have more active OPAs and are able to generate more funds through OPAs, while Type 2 and Type 3 schools located in remote rural areas are less able to generate funds through SDS and OPAs. Some small remote schools serving impoverished communities are unable to even collect facility fees.

The budget

To maintain accounting standards, the budget is divided into two main components, the recurrent budget and the capital budget.

Recurrent budget is mainly financed by the Consolidated Funds (CF). The budget items under the recurrent budget are given in Table 6. Key budget items include, salaries and teacher training. As described earlier, 2.5% of the recurrent budget is being set aside for Education Quality Inputs (EQI) since 2000. Of this, 36% goes to teacher training, 40% to consumable quality inputs and 24% to maintenance of quality inputs.

Table 7 provides examples of actual budgets for 2006 for selected provinces by programme and by category. More than 90% of the total budget of a province goes to recurrent expenditure. Around 95% of recurrent expenditure is spent on personal emoluments. Funds available for all other activities, including human resource development is minimal.

Capital budget is financed through the Finance Commission for the provincial schools. National schools get funds directly from the central MoE. Capital budget comes under two main categories:

PSDG – Provincial Specific Development Grant
ESDG – Education Sector Development Grant (by World Bank)

Capital funds are also financed by other funding sources such as Manthree Prathipadana (provisions by the Members of Parliament representing the area) and funds from NGOs and OPAs. Capital budget is prepared according to rules and regulations given by the Finance Commission (FC).
Following are the parameters followed for preparing the capital budget in 2007 (as reported by the Jaffna Provincial Department of Education):

- 37% - for higher order learning process and higher order capital assets (PSDG + ESDG)
- 15% - Capital Quality Inputs (PSDG only)
- 15% - For maintenance and repair of school and office buildings
- 15% - VAT for ESDG activities
- 40 million – Accelerated Learning Campaign (ESDG) (An additional fund)
- Balance – Building construction

### Table 6: Category-wise division of the recurrent budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recurrent Budget Categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal emoluments</td>
<td>salaries and wages, overtime and holiday pay, other allowances (e.g., cost of living, difficult area, language, others), public servant loan interest</td>
<td>Existing cadre/ paid cadre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling expenses</td>
<td>domestic, foreign</td>
<td>Cadre entitled and the programme for next year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>stationery and office requisites, fuel and lubricants, uniforms (minor employees), mechanical and electrical goods, etc.</td>
<td>Population, institution and number of service items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance expenditure</td>
<td>vehicles, plant machinery and equipment, buildings, others, structures</td>
<td>Number of vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance expenditure</td>
<td>Education - machinery, equipment and buildings small repairs and maintenance curriculum development, teacher training, student-based activities</td>
<td>Building and learning material and student population (NBUCRAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual services</td>
<td>transport, telecommunication, postal charges, electricity and water, rent, rates and local taxes, hire charges and others</td>
<td>Consumption rate and unit rate for contractual services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other recurrent expenditure</td>
<td>losses and write-offs, holiday warrants, others</td>
<td>Transfer, grants and subsidies No. of beneficiaries and approval amount Cadre entitled to claim and the number of claims at present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Information received from various Provincial Departments of Education
Budget estimates at the school level

Schools undertake needs assessments in several ways. The budget for salaries and wages are estimated by taking into account the number of teachers and support staff in schools. As explained earlier, funds for EQI expenditure are allocated to schools according to a formula that takes into account student numbers and the grade coverage of the schools, with adjustments for economies of scale. Since 2006, with the introduction of the ESDFP, the school level budgeting has moved to a new level. According to this plan, school principals are to be trained to identify critical school needs and prepare five-year school level development plans according to guidelines given by the MoE. These guidelines specify physical resource norms for schools and provide guidelines for preparing education development plans based on the four themes as discussed earlier under ESDFP. The main difference under the ESDFP is that schools are given authority to make decisions on their medium term five-year development plan. Based on this,

### Table 7: Actual Expenditure - Selected Provinces (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>North Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amount ('000)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Amount ('000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent</td>
<td>8,652,093</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,765,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>248,456</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>210,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>3,567,031</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>1,288,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>4,744,532</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>2,231,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Access</td>
<td>44,234</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Governance</td>
<td>47,840</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Cultural Affairs</td>
<td>22,768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>166,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administration</td>
<td>19,889</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>8,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>51,755</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>81,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>89,008</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>203,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Access</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Governance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational &amp; Sports</td>
<td>3,627</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Expenditure Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent</td>
<td>8,652,093</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,765,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Emoluments</td>
<td>8,314,728</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>3,559,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling Expenses</td>
<td>7,052</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>10,788</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Expenditure</td>
<td>278,012</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>148,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Investments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Services</td>
<td>27,583</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>12,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Recurrent Expenditure</td>
<td>13,930</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>9,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>166,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation &amp; Improvement of Capital Assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of Fixed Assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Budget Process and Budget Tracking in Formal School Education in Sri Lanka

Schools prepare yearly plans after prioritising school needs. These one-year plans are budgeted and implemented after approval.

Grants given to schools by parliamentarians, NGOS and other social organisations, which are raised through FF, SDS and the OPAs, are also required to be spent according to the abovementioned five-year plan. Utilisation of money received through various sources is governed by rules and regulations as specified in various circulars such as the FF circular and SDS circular.

**Issues on budget estimates at the school level**

Not all schools are able to develop five-year and yearly school development plans. Although almost all schools had a five-year plan, roughly only 85% of the surveyed schools had annual plans. Compared to other schools, Type 3 schools and schools located in places with access difficulties are less likely to have an annual school plan. In 85% of the schools, the principal or the deputy principal, with the help of a few senior teachers, prepared the school development plan. In the remaining 15%, the school management committee prepared the school plan. By type of school, complex 1 AB schools and Type 3 schools are likely to get the assistance of the school management committee to prepare the plan. About a third of the 1AB schools and a quarter of the Type 3 schools had their annual plan prepared by the management committee.

Although schools are required to prepare school development plans using participatory approaches involving all stakeholders, this did not happen in practice. Usually, the principal or the deputy principal, along with a group of senior teachers, prepare the yearly school budget. SDS
and OPAs did not have much involvement in preparing school budgets. Participation of students, parents and the civil society in preparing school budgets was limited.

The lack of capacity at the school level and the lack of accounting and management know-how were constraints in the preparation of development plans and budgets. In many instances teachers, usually Science and Mathematics teachers, are asked to prepare these plans and budgets. We interviewed some of these teachers who said they feel that preparing these plans and budget used up precious time that they could have spent teaching.

**Budget estimation and allocation at the zonal level**

Zones prepare their own development plans according to guidelines provided by the Provincial Ministry of Education. The final zonal level budgets are prepared by the zonal director and the deputy director of planning incorporating zonal level plans and consolidating school level yearly development plans. Most zones received all school level plans before preparing zonal level plans, but with exceptions.

The estimates for salaries and wages are based on the recurrent expenditure circulars for salaries and wages. The EQI funds are allocated to schools according to a formula, as explained earlier. The funds for ESDFP are allocated according to budgets prepared by school based on their approved yearly plans after prioritising school needs. In some provinces, the ESDFP funds for capital expenditures are handled by the Provincial Ministry of Education, and only the ESDFP funds for recurrent expenditure are channeled through the province and zone to schools. The authenticity of needs and statistics provided by schools are verified through school visits before allocating funds. PSDG funds allocations are also decided by the Provincial Ministry of Education after considering the needs of the schools.

Often, the requested funds are larger than the funds available to a zone. A priority list is then prepared, giving special attention to projects meant for quality improvements. There are no clear criteria for prioritising school needs. At the zonal level, accountants prepare budget proposals usually after consultations with the Zonal Director of Education (ZDE) and the Deputy Director of Planning. In addition, heads of schools and divisional level officials also participate in preparing budgets at the zonal level. In many zones, the subject directors are also involved in preparing education development related budgets. In preparing capital budget estimates, inputs from the
construction engineer are also used. Many zones indicated that there are no external influences affecting the preparation of the zonal budget.

**Issues and best practices at the zonal level**

Not knowing the availability of funds was a problem in preparing budgets in some cases. Some zones have been given a rough idea about the availability of funds. Only one Zone in the Eastern Province mentioned that they assess physical resource needs according to Education Management Information Systems (EMIS), which is a mechanism for systematically collecting statistical information for educational planning and monitoring for achieving education for all goals.

Some Provincial Departments of Education found it difficult to coordinate the implementation of school development plans as the Provincial Ministry of Education handled the capital component.

Schools are given no limits for preparing budgets based on the yearly development plans; the zonal level budget is prepared based on these. A Zonal Director indicated that preparing the five-year plan is a useless exercise, resulting in too ambitious plans though there are no funds for it.

**Budget estimation and allocation at the provincial level**

Each year the Finance Commission (FC) calls for budget proposals from each province and provides guidelines to prepare the budget estimates. The provincial council budget divisions in turn call for budget estimates from education offices under their purview. Based on these, a provincial level budget is prepared after consultations with different stakeholders at the provincial level. The budget is finalised at the provincial council (PC) after a budget debate. The finalised budgets are sent to the FC, which checks them to see if they are consistent with the budget-related circulars. After discussions with the central government on the possible amount of funds for the province, the FC decides allocations for each PC in keeping with the policy priorities of the government, such as balancing regional development across provinces. The population of the province, per capita income and need (based on the level of economic development) are considered when allocating funds across provinces. Based on the amount of funds received by the PC, they are able to allocate funds across different sectors, such as health and education.
Budgetary process: Problems in utilisation

EQI was the only source of funds available to all schools. Although many found EQI funds to be useful, some felt that the formula used to allocate EQI funds could be improved. By and large, allocating EQI funds according to the NBUCRAM mechanism is successful. But since this is available even to schools that are already much developed, it may result in unfair distribution of funds to poorly developed schools.

The lack of qualified teachers in the relevant subjects was cited as a reason for the low effectiveness of EQI expenditure. The lack of commitment and technical know-how on the part of principals to ensure effective and efficient use of EQI funds has also been a problem. In addition, not receiving funds at the beginning of the year reduced the efficient and effective use of funds. Spending is done inefficiently, in the hurry to use up the funds towards the end of the year.

Influencing the behavior of various committees assigned to ensure effective use of funds was also found to be a problem. In some schools, the purchasing committee has little authority as the principal handles most purchases.

Corruption on the part of the principals and the inability of the divisional and zonal level officials to take corrective action was also found to be a problem. Sometimes, spending was not done in keeping with the needs of the students. More emphasis was given to high expenditure items, partly due to corrupt behavior of school heads, which was more apparent among those that have been appointed as a result of political influence. Lack of proper storage facilities, too, is a problem for many schools.

Some schools found it difficult to determine the cost of the proposed budget for the development plans. Most schools were unaware of their probable income. As such, they found it difficult to prepare yearly budgets. Sometimes, money meant for the higher order learning processes were misused and not utilised according to approved plans.

Funds raised by schools through facility fees and other activities are spent only in accordance with the guidelines provided by the Ministry of Education. It was pointed out that sometimes it is difficult and time consuming to observe the procedures in the use of funds received by schools, especially large amounts of funds. Schools without administrative assistants and with shortage of teacher find it difficult to observe these procedures.
Budgetary process: Monitoring and evaluation

The budget utilisation by schools is monitored in several ways. Primarily, this is the function of the divisions and the zones. The Provincial Director of Education prepares reports monthly, quarterly and yearly to the Provincial Secretary of Education and the Chief Secretary.

The expenditure of the allocated funds is monitored at working committee meetings at the provincial and zonal levels. Progress is reviewed monthly by the Provincial Department of Education and reviewed quarterly by the Chief Secretary of the Province.

Budgetary process: Issues

Table 8 summarises the various issues relating to the education budgetary process as articulated at the school, zonal and provincial levels.

The following, though not common to all the empirical sites of the study alike, emerged as the major issues related to the budgetary processes:

- Lack of coordination especially in spending capital expenditure
- Inadequacy of funds
- Delays in receiving funds
- Irregular receipt of funds and receipt in installments
- Lack of flexibility in the transfer of funds among different budget heads
- Lack of human resources and capacity for planning and account keeping in schools
- Outdated and intricate rules and regulations
- Lack of zonal level capacity for monitoring and evaluation
- Lack of coordination and inconsistencies in the distribution of responsibilities among different levels of educational administration
- Overlooking circumstantial factors when spending money
- Unfair distribution of resources due to political influences
- Auditing taken up more as a corrective measure rather than as a developmental tool
- Non-regular nature in monitoring and evaluation
- Poor planning capacity of principals and teachers
Recommendations

Improving planning and budget estimation

There is an urgent need to provide funds on time. Untimely provision of funds leads to inefficiencies and ineffective use of funds. It also results in wastage of funds as schools have to abandon already initiated projects. Schools are unable to plan their yearly activities properly when funds are delayed.

Information on the availability of funds helps make planning more effective. Many schools were unaware of the availability of funds. As such, they have had to revise existing plans to fit the reduced budget.

It is also important to build capacity at school, divisional and zonal levels. Although the planning and management functions of education have been decentralised to the schools, the school and zonal level capacity to handle these added administrative functions have not been improved adequately. Awareness about the objectives of various education programmes should be given to all stakeholders at the school level, so they are able to make full use of available resources to develop schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Percentage of schools having expenditure and implementation issues by province, type of school and location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By Province</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabaragamuwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By type of school</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type AB Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By accessibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The documents detailing the rules and regulations of budgeting and implementing projects should be simplified and consolidated so that schools are not required to fill various forms and keep various types of records and accounts regarding different types of funds. A concise document detailing all rules and regulations should be made available to schools. The budgetary process should be made more practical and systematic. Heads of schools should be notified regarding the proper procedures to take with regard to conducting needs surveys, calling for price quotes, appointing committees to implement the programmes, and effectively dealing with problems encountered in purchasing materials and equipment.

**Improving resource availability**

The ways in which schools can earn money should be increased. There should be an effective means of teacher allocations to prevent redundant teacher appointments. The education sector has already forwarded recommendations to achieve these objectives under the ESDFP programme. The proper implementation of these recommendations should be ensured.

Rules and regulation relating to EQI should be relaxed. Textbooks and teacher guides must be given to schools at the beginning of the school year. Provisions should be made to enable schools to obtain additional number of teacher guides and books when necessary.

**Improving equity**

Special considerations should be given to rural schools when allocating funds. For example, priority should be given for providing infrastructure facilities for Type 3 schools. Also, the special circumstances of schools in different locations should be considered when designing rules and regulations. For example, the funds provided through top-bottom basis are difficult for schools to use, when the school is unable to raise funds on its own. Such rules should not be applied to schools serving poor communities. Special attention should be given to school located in difficult areas, which cannot raise funds on their own. The NBUCRAM formula should make special allowances for small rural schools.

Rather than having a uniform set of regulations, there is a need to relax them in view of the individual situation of the school.
Improving community participation

OPAs should be activated, where possible. Old pupils, parents and other well-wishers of the schools should be more involved in preparing school development plans. Awareness building programmes should be conducted in the school community to educate them on new approaches to school development and management. They should be involved in preparing school development plans so that they will be better able to support the school.

Improving efficiency of utilisation

Many of the inefficiencies in resource utilisation by schools relate to inefficiencies in the education system, such as delays in giving funds and other resources to schools, issues relating to teacher shortages, improper transfer of teachers, and appointment of teachers without considering the needs of schools. Action should be taken to correct these anomalies immediately.

Other than for the reasons mentioned above, one main reason for low utilisation of funds is the stringency and the impracticality of the rules and regulations relating to the use of funds and the lack of understanding on the part of school heads of the rules and regulations. It is critical to revise various circulars relating to budgeting and school development to make them simpler, practical and user friendly. All rules and regulations should be combined in one document for easy reference. These documents should be widely available to schools. Record keeping and reporting at school level should also be simplified.

Zonal level human resource and physical capacity should be improved so that zones and divisions could support schools more effectively. The zonal and divisional level officials should be trained to support schools rather than to criticise them. Recruitment to divisional and zonal levels should be done through proper interviews and exams so that capable individuals are recruited to these positions. Zonal officials or consultants should be assigned to assist schools that are in critical need of a technical assistant for proper planning and record keeping so that school officials could receive on-the-job training on these matters. Large schools should be allowed to hire qualified administrative assistants. The school can pay for these individuals.

Zonal and divisional officers should visit schools more frequently. Special attention should be given to visits to schools located in remote areas. All acting principals should be replaced with properly trained
and qualified principals over time. Acting principals should be appointed on a temporary basis with specified duration only until a proper principal is appointed.

Zones should be taught to assess the performance of schools, so that they can identify best practices and replicate these in other schools. Schools who find innovative means of solving problems should be recognised.

There should be strict turnaround times for giving approvals, so that project implementation at school level is not disrupted.

When giving physical resources, one should look at factors other than the number of students. The authority to transfer funds across budgets items should be given to the zone. This will increase the efficiency and productivity of fund utilisation. Flexibility should be given to transfer funds from one item to another so that the unutilised funds from the previous year can be used where funds are needed. Schools with large EQI balances should be assisted to use the EQI funds for useful purposes in the school.

The zone should assign a group of suppliers that can supply quality items after looking into the quality of goods and their costs.

Two- to three-day workshops may be held during December vacation at the planning stage of activities. There should be management and administrative persons to do the paper work, allowing teachers to focus on teaching.

**Reducing waste**

A main reason for the wastage of funds is the inefficiencies on the part of education administration. As pointed out by many zones and schools, the delayed receipt of funds and non-continuity of funds for projects already started, compel schools to abandon them or to hurry through the use of the funds, compromising the fund’s effectiveness. In addition, not having proper storage facilities and an inventory system also contributes to wastage as supplies are destroyed or stolen. Schools should be educated about the necessity of storage space when purchasing large expenditure items. Schools should have a proper place to store school supplies. Supplies should be issued to teachers as and when needed; a proper inventory should be kept.

Within schools, assessments should be undertaken to evaluate the value for money of different education development projects. The perception of the students on these may be obtained as they are the
end-beneficiaries. The projects that have used little resources, but given large benefits should be recognised, and such projects should be replicated where possible.

Teacher training programmes organised by schools and zones should be held but these should be scheduled such that teaching activities will not be disrupted. As much as possible, these should be held only during weekends or during the school holidays. When funds for these activities are given late to schools, they should be allowed to use these funds for the next school year to avoid disruption of regular school activities.

**Improving implementation, monitoring and evaluation process**

Schools are required to produce a variety of reports throughout the year. In addition, the Ministry of Education collects detailed information from schools on the availability of physical and human resources at the school level. However, there is no evidence to show that this information is analysed and used effectively for assisting schools and for reducing disparities across schools. Rather than collecting information as a practice or ensuring adherence to procedure, information collected should be used for improving school performance.

At present, approval for physical resource investments is provided on an ad hoc basis by the provincial level authorities. The information collected from the school census can be used, after verification, to identify schools with critical physical resource needs. These schools may be given priority when allocating limited resources. Stakeholder perceptions should be gathered to decide which physical resource items to be given priority.

As with the school level, zonal level progress in education development should be assessed. Zones using good practices in coping with problems and showing progress should be recognised. Others should adopt the strategies taken by these zones to overcome problems.

Civil society and the school community should be encouraged to be more involved in school development activities. Getting them involved from the initial stages of preparing school development plans is one effective means of obtaining their support throughout the process.

The auditing process should be improved. It should be viewed as a function to support schools rather than to police schools. Auditors
should be given the authority and the training to support schools to improve record keeping and accounting, and to use financial resources more effectively.

The monitoring and evaluation process needs to be more systematic. The zonal level capacity for monitoring and evaluation should be improved. The zones and divisions should be given more powers to take corrective action when anomalies in fund utilisation are observed. The zonal level staff should be given training on proper monitoring and evaluation procedures. Civil society, parents and teachers should be consulted in the monitoring process, and they should be more involved in the school budgetary process. However, caution should be taken when obtaining the involvement of outsiders in school processes, especially in small rural schools, to avoid irregularities and the domination of the processes by a few elite. Only qualified professionals should be recruited. Appointments to various positions should be done on a merit basis. Action should be taken to minimise political interference in recruitments, which undermines the whole monitoring and evaluation process.
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ADB  Asian Development Bank
CBOs  Community-based organisations
CF  Consolidated Fund
DFID  UK Department for International Development
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FF  Facility fees
GTZ  Dutch Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
INGOs  International non-government organisations
JICA  Japan International Cooperation Agency
MoE  Ministry of Education
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OPA  Old Pupil Association
PC  Provincial Council
PSDG  Provincial Specific Development Grant
SDS  School Development Society
UNESCO  United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF  United Nations Children’s Fund
WB  World Bank

Notes
1. LKR is the international code for Sri Lanka Rupees, the national currency of Sri Lanka. In 2000, the exchange rate was LKR. 1=USD 0.01210
2. The SDS comprises the principal and teachers of the school, parents, an official of the zonal education office, selected students and well-wishers of the community; whereas the OPA is constituted by the past pupils of the school.

References

RWS found the need for pursuing a vigorous, evidence-based policy advocacy to build shared understanding and rally civil society organizations (CSOs) around common goals, establish credibility with opinion framers and decision-makers, marshal evidence as part of a systematic strategy to influence policy, and supply missing data on excluded and unreached sectors. Campaign calls and messages needed to be supported by credible evidence, based on the real state of education in communities.

Asia-South Pacific Education Watch Initiative and Publications

These publications are the result of education watch processes initiated and pursued since 2006 by the RWS programme of ASPBAE and GCE, in partnership with national education coalitions from India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Philippines, Indonesia, Cambodia, Solomon Islands, and Papua New Guinea.

Building on the successful Education Watch model implemented by CAMPE in Bangladesh, the Asia-South Pacific Education Watch (EdWatch) was designed and coordinated by the RWS Steering Committee composed of ASPBAE, Education International, and GlobalMarch Against Child Labor, and the RWS Asia Pacific staff.

EdWatch has emerged as an independent, citizen-based monitoring mechanism for assessing the status of education at the regional, national, and local levels, providing well-founded bases for advocacy and education campaign work and strengthening CSO capacities for policy engagement in education. It is designed to track governments’ progress in achieving quality education for all, with focus on addressing the education deficit for disadvantaged sectors.

All Edwatch reports are independent reports and do not necessarily reflect the views of all the members of the Asian South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education (ASPBAE) and the Global Campaign for Education (GCE).

Challenge to Civil Society

The daunting education situation in the region poses a challenge to CSOs to sound a clear wake-up call to governments to shake off their complacency, go beyond rhetoric, summon the political will, and redouble efforts. There is a crying need to assess existing education programmes, allocate more funds and resources for education, and institute targeted measures to address education disadvantage.

Since Dakar 2000, CSO participation in EFA processes has seen the progressive growth in strength and maturity of national education coalitions, and their developing capacity to conduct research and policy analysis and advocacy. Armed with their EdWatch findings, CSOs and education stakeholders can put together more coherent education policy agenda for lobbying, disseminate information to enhance public awareness of education issues, effectively engage governments in education planning and policy-making, and strongly assert and sharpen CSO and stakeholders’ participation in education governance at all levels.
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