

**Analysis of Support to Private Sector Engagement in
Global Partnership for Education Recipient Countries**

Final Report for ActionAid International

Francine Menashy, University of Massachusetts Boston

April 2018

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
Contextualizing Private Engagement from a Human Rights Perspective	5
Methodology of Analysis	6
Education Sector Plan Descriptive Analysis	9
ESPIG Project Document Descriptive Analysis	14
Comparison of ESPs and ESPIGs	17
Analysis of Global and Regional Activities Agreement Documents	19
Reflections on Private Sector Engagement in GPE Recipient Countries	20
Conclusions	23
References	37
 Tables	
Table 1: Countries Included in Analysis	5
Table 2: Education Sector Plan and Project Document Analysis: Forms of Private Sector Engagement	8
Table 3: ESPIG Projects Supporting Fee-Based Private Schools	14
Table 4: Countries with Fee-Based K-12 Private School Support - ESPs and ESPIGs	18
 Annexes	
Annex 1: Country Profiles	24
Haiti Profile	24
Pakistan Profile	26
Uganda Profile	28
Annex 2: Documents Analyzed	30

Executive Summary

This report provides an analysis of support to private sector engagement in Global Partnership for Education (GPE) recipient countries, building off a prior study focusing on GPE decision-making on private schooling. This review includes an analysis of 101 documents relating to the 40 GPE recipient partner countries with active Education Sector Program Implementation Grants (ESPIGs). Country profiles of Haiti, Pakistan, and Uganda are provided in an Appendix, each of which highlights important trends with implications for GPE support to private participation in education.

The report contextualizes private engagement in education from a human rights perspective. Based on a descriptive analysis of Education Sector Plans (ESPs) and ESPIG project documents, it finds that GPE projects include far less private sector engagement in education than do country-designed ESPs. The report also gives a brief account of GRA grants and the single GRA project that engages the private sector.

Summary reflections on private sector engagement in GPE recipient countries note trends and areas for further investigation including issues concerning the ambiguous descriptions of private schools within the documents; the range of rationales provided for support to private schools; tax/fiscal incentives for private engagement; PPPs in early childhood education; private participation in policy-making; the role of the private sector as an education funder; and the widely agreed-upon need for regulation of private schools.

The analysis concludes that while a notable presence and expansion of private participation in GPE recipient countries is clear, this engagement cannot be attributed directly to GPE. In fact, the discrepancy between private school support in ESPs and ESPIGs reflects a GPE prioritization of public education. Yet some significant tensions emerge between GPE's commitment to the right to education and particular forms of private participation as identified in the project documents and ESPs.

The Global Partnership for Education treads a fine line relating to private engagement in education, navigating its dual mandate to both support education as a human right and a public good, while simultaneously promoting country ownership and nationally identified priorities. And so while GPE is in a position to maintain its course in predominantly supporting public education, this current stance may come in tension with the goals of recipient governments and other stakeholders within countries.

Introduction

This report provides an analysis of support to private sector engagement in Global Partnership for Education (GPE) recipient countries, building off a prior study focusing on GPE decision-making on private participation. Based on data collected between 2012 and 2014, the prior study included a review of GPE recipient partner Education Sector Plans (ESPs) coded for support to private schooling (Menashy, 2015). This earlier study was limited to a review of ESPs from 2014 and earlier, whereas the current analysis also includes all new ESPs released since the 2014 study; all active (as of January 2018) GPE Education Sector Program Implementation Grant (ESPIG) project documents; and all available Results Agreements of Global and Regional Activities Programs.

GPE is a multi-stakeholder partnership of donor and recipient country governments, multilateral organizations, civil society, private companies and foundations. Dedicated to increasing access to quality education, the partnership supports low-income countries that lack sufficient funds to provide quality education for all children. Its mandate upholds education as a public good and a human right, and the achievement of inclusive and equitable quality education for all, in accordance with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (GPE, 2018).

The GPE funding process involves the approval of grant applications—which include a country’s Education Sector Plan—by its Board. Grant disbursement at the country level is overseen by a Grant Agent (Supervising Entity), most commonly the World Bank, but also occasionally a bilateral donor, UN agency, or a civil society organization.

GPE provides different types of grants. Education Sector Plan Development Grants assist countries in the development of a solid ESP, or to strengthen an existing one. Program Development Grants support the design of education programs that will enable the implementation of an ESP. Education Sector Program Implementation Grants directly finance educational programs in-country. Finally, Knowledge Grants, or the Global and Regional Activities Program (GRA), promote research, learning, and knowledge sharing on educational issues including learning outcomes, educational finance, and out-of-school children (GPE, 2016). This review focuses on the Education Sector Plans, ESPIG project documents, and GRA Grants relating to the 40 GPE recipient partner countries with active ESPIGs (see Table 1).

The report begins by contextualizing private engagement in education from a human rights perspective and describes the methodology used for the analysis. It then descriptively analyzes the Education Sector Plans, followed by a separate descriptive analysis of ESPIG project documents. A comparison is then provided of the ESP and ESPIG project document findings with a focus on private schooling. The report also gives a brief account of Global and Regional Activities grants and the single GRA project that engages the private sector.

Following the descriptive findings from the review, the report provides summary reflections on private sector engagement in GPE recipient countries and concludes with implications for the organization and its partners. Country profiles of Haiti, Pakistan, and

Uganda are provided in an Appendix, each of which highlights important trends with implications for GPE support to private participation in education.

Table 1: *Countries Included in Analysis*

Afghanistan	Lesotho
Bangladesh	Liberia
Benin	Malawi
Burkina Faso	Mozambique
Burundi	Nepal
Chad	Niger
Cameroon	Nigeria
Central African Republic	OECS ¹
Comoros	Pakistan
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Rwanda
Djibouti	Senegal
Eritrea	Somalia
Ethiopia	South Sudan
Gambia	Sudan
Guinea	Tanzania
Guyana	Togo
Haiti	Uganda
Kenya	Yemen
Kyrgyz	Zambia
Lao PDR	Zimbabwe

Contextualizing Private Engagement from a Human Rights Perspective

Private sector engagement in education has intensified globally in recent years. As this report details, such engagement manifests in a range of ways, from provision of goods and services, to financing, advocacy, and policy-making. This rapid shift towards private participation in a traditionally public service has elicited responses and associated recommendations from a human rights standpoint, in particular concerning the roles of private for-profit providers of schooling.

Rooted in a legal framework, a human rights perspective draws attention to the role of the State as holding the primary duty for fulfilling and protecting the right to education and the government's responsibility for ensuring its educational obligations, even within private schools. These obligations include, for instance, education as promoting equity, access, quality (GIESCR, 2017).

A human rights normative framework responds to concerns that when governments support private providers via common financing mechanisms (subsidies, vouchers, tax incentives), States are "divesting themselves of their primary public function. As a result,

¹ Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States: Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

rather than supplementing government efforts, private providers are supplanting public education and commercializing education in the process” (Singh, 2015, p.9). A human rights framework moreover protects against inequitable access to education due to fee-based private schooling. As enshrined in such conventions as the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education, all private educational institutions must conform to minimum educational standards and should not “secure the exclusion of any group” (Singh, 2015, p.8). The rights-based perspective moreover advocates for increased regulation of private schools in order to ensure minimum standards of quality and non-discriminatory practices.

This analysis is framed under a conception of education as a fundamental human right and a government obligation. At the same time it also acknowledges the vast range of private actors and types of participation in education, with an understanding that not all forms of non-state engagement counter human rights principles in education.

Methodology of Analysis

This report provides an analysis of private sector engagement in education within GPE recipient countries based on a review of three sets of documents (see Annex 2 for a list of documents analyzed):

(1) The Education Sector Plans (ESPs) of all Global Partnership for Education recipient partners with active Education Sector Program Implementation Grants (40 countries). ESPs are country-developed documents detailing the overarching education policies and plans within recipient countries. ESPs were retrieved from the country pages of the GPE website. Several ESPs have been included in both the 2014 and current analysis because they are the most recent released for a recipient country, even in the case that a country’s active grant was approved after 2014. However, the current review seeks to update and expand upon the earlier research through a broader and more detailed coding scheme. For instance, the 2014 analysis primarily coded for private engagement in school provision, whereas this analysis also looks at elements of policy-making, advising, and more varied forms of financing.

(2) Available project documents for all Global Partnership for Education recipient partners with active Education Sector Program Implementation Grants (ESPIGs; 39 countries²). ESPIG project documents are developed by the GPE Grant Agent, and detail the project being supported by the GPE grant, including specific project components. ESPIG project documents differ depending on Grant Agent. For example, where World Bank is Grant Agent, a “Project Appraisal Document” was analyzed, where UNICEF, a “Program Document” was analyzed. All ESPIG project documents were provided directly by GPE Secretariat. ESPIG projects were not included in the 2014 analysis.

² No project document is available for Rwanda

(3) The Results Agreements of Global and Regional Activities Programs, which are targeted programs aiming to engage GPE stakeholders in research and practical application via information sharing, workshops and other dissemination events. Results Agreements are brief (roughly 4 pages) and appear to be authored by a partner organization involved in the program. Agreements of 15 projects were reviewed, all retrieved from the GPE website. GRAs were not included in the 2014 analysis.

A total of 101 documents were reviewed using content analysis methodologies, including a detailed coding to qualitatively document as well as quantify the different ways in which all documents discuss private sector actors and forms of engagement. Overall findings are by country, not by Education Sector Plan or project document, given that some countries have more than one ESP (Nigeria, for example, includes a separate ESP for five states), and some countries have more than one project document (Pakistan, for example, includes a project document for each Balochistan and Sindh). OECS (the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States), although inclusive of Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent, has been considered as one country because of a single ESP and GPE project.

See Table 2 for overall findings of the ESP and ESPIG project document analysis, broken down by form of private engagement and by type of document.

This study is limited by its narrow data source, with findings only derived from documents. And within these documents (as will be explained further), the private sector is often described in very vague terms. Therefore this analysis of country and GPE support to the private sector—and in particular private schooling—often lacks detail and nuance. Moreover, funding distribution to each discrete aspect of a project is often unclear, and so this analysis does not include conclusions relating to direct financing to private schooling. Finally, given the complexity of multi-stakeholder funding and implementation within recipient countries, this analysis would be strengthened by an understanding of the wider aid landscape within each country.

Table 2
Education Sector Plan and Project Document Analysis: Forms of Private Sector Engagement

	Education Sector Plans (n=40 countries)	Project Documents (n=39 countries)
Provision of Goods and Services		
<i>Non-state school provision</i>		
Fee-based private – K-12	23	10
Fee-based private – secondary only	2	0
Fee-based private – upper secondary only	3	0
<i>Fee-based private – Total</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>10</i>
NGO – K-12	15	9
NGO – upper secondary only	1	0
<i>NGO – Total</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>9</i>
Faith-based – K-12	12	4
Faith-based – upper secondary only	1	0
<i>Faith-based – Total</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Fee-based private provision via PPPs</i>		
Subsidies– K-12	10	4
Subsidies – secondary only	2	0
<i>Subsidies – Total</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>4</i>
Targeted stipends – K-12	7	1
Targeted stipends – secondary only	1	0
<i>Targeted stipends – Total</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>1</i>
Scholarships – K-12	1	0
Scholarships – secondary only	2	0
Scholarships – upper secondary only	1	0
<i>Scholarships – Total</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>0</i>
Tax Incentives	9	0
ECE	27	7
<i>Other services</i>		
Data management	2	0
Teacher training	7	4
Accreditation	0	1
<i>Goods</i>		
Textbooks	10	12
Infrastructure	9	12
ICT/technology	7	4
Finance		
Sector funding	22	3
CSR	2	0
Charitable giving	2	0
Bonds	1	0
Expertise		
Policy-making	14	13
Advise/capacity building	10	13
Advise/capacity building – M&E	2	2
Advise/capacity building – curriculum	2	0
<i>Advise/capacity building – Total</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>15</i>

	Education Sector Plans (n=40 countries)	Project Documents (n=39 countries)
Other		
Advocacy	2	1
Regulation of private schools	18	6
General encouragement of private school expansion	16	0
Health/nutrition	2	2

Education Sector Plan Descriptive Analysis

Provision of Goods and Services

Support to private school provision

In roughly two-thirds of the countries analyzed (28 of 40), support of **fee-based private schooling** is detailed in the Education Sector Plans. Such schools are generally described simply as “private schools,” likely run by private entrepreneurs, but others possibly embody a more grey area where fee-charging schools may not be entirely for-profit. However, private schools are often vaguely described with little contextualization. For instance, while some ESPs indicate that the low-cost sector is targeted by the plan (e.g. Haiti, Pakistan), other ESPs discuss private schooling without any discussion of costs to families. As discussed later in this report, this absence of contextualization is characteristic of a prevalent ambiguity within all documents in terms of defining the nature and characteristics of private actors and private schools.

Support to fee-based private schools often comes in the form of a public-private partnership in financing, such as subsidies, targeted stipends or bursaries, scholarships, and/or tax incentives. These mechanisms promote private delivery of schooling as a form of wider education systems supports. Yet several ESPs do not detail the precise ways in which governments support (or intend to support) private schooling. Ten countries describe **subsidies** provided by governments to support private providers. For example, Benin specifies a public subsidy of 15% of the unit cost on average per pupil enrolment in private schools (2013, p.60). Some countries limit such subsidies to secondary schools (Mozambique, Malawi).

Eight countries offer **targeted stipends** to cover private school tuition for disadvantaged students, for instance girls or ethnic minorities. In Kenya, private school tuition will be paid via bursaries for students “from poor household and vulnerable areas” (2014, p.156). Niger’s ESP details targeted financing for girls at the secondary level, which is 40% privately provided (2014, p.12). Bangladesh discusses the continuation of a small-scale targeted stipend policy, similar to a cash transfer program, for the most disadvantaged families. This program has supported sending children to all schools, including non-

government registered (private), community, madrasah, NGO, and government schools (2015, p.27).

Four governments support **scholarships** to private schools, two of which are targeted to secondary schools (Mozambique, Nepal) and one to upper secondary only (Lao PDR).

Nine countries offer or are encouraging the adoption of **tax/fiscal incentives** for the participation of the private sector via investments in education, or the establishment of private schools: Cameroon, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Mozambique, Nigeria (Jigawa), Senegal, Somalia, Tanzania. For instance, the ESP of Kenya states: “Facilitate the private school proprietors to secure loans at low interest rates in order to encourage establishment of new schools and the expansion of the existing ones” (2014, p.140). In Nigeria Jigawa State, “necessary support will be given to the private service providers in the following areas: ... Tax relief for proprietors” (2013, p.83). The Cameroon ESP explains that the “government will use financial incentives to help private providers to support the growth of their offerings” (2013, p.67), while in Mozambique “the expansion of private education through incentive packages will be encouraged” (2012, p.7). Senegal proposes “setting up a guarantee fund for promoters of private schools” and “tax exemption” as “strategies to implement for the development of the non-public offer” (2013, p.42). Somalia includes “providing direct incentives such as tax exemptions to stimulate private sector investment in secondary education” as a “policy priority” (2012, p.50). In general, however, the precise amount of such incentives and exemptions are not included in the ESPs.

Some ESPs include a more general encouragement for private school expansion (see below). None of the ESPs discuss commercial for-profit school chains.

In addition to PPPs supporting K-12 private schools, a majority of the countries (27 of 40) detail existing support to, or encouragement of, public-private partnerships in the area **early childhood education** (ECE). Given that in many countries ECE has been historically under the purview of only the private sector, this form of PPP is oftentimes a shift toward increase *public* participation. For example, in the Comoros “85% of enrollments are in private settlements located mainly in urban areas. To ensure equitable access to pre-primary education for all children, the State has taken the initiative to increase the supply” (2013, p.13). Djibouti’s ESP explains the need “to regulate the uncontrolled development of private preschool provision and to guarantee the quality of service provision” and how “provision of public pre-school education will gradually be developed in the direction of, as a priority, poor urban areas and rural areas to meet the principles of quality and equity” (2010, p.29).

Other services

The private sector is also mentioned as potentially playing a role in the area of **data management** (two countries), for instance: “links with the private sector might include... the provision of knowledge management systems” (OECS ESP, 2012, p.55).

The ESPs also discuss private sector participation or partnerships in **teacher training** (seven countries), for instance the Ministry of Education of Afghanistan will provide

private schools with “services... like teacher training” (2011, p.69). The Burundi ESP suggests the establishment of “PPPs for teacher training” (2012, p.20).

Goods

Private manufacturing and provision of **textbooks** for public schools is discussed in ten countries, often described under the umbrella of a PPP arrangement.

Support to private participation in school **infrastructure** (school construction, renovations, latrines) is encouraged or established in nine countries. This includes both contracting to the private sector to build infrastructure and also eliciting private sector investment into school infrastructure.

Six countries detail the need for further private participation in providing or developing **ICT and technology** for students in public schools. For example, in Bangladesh “The private sector will... be called upon to play a role in Government’s ICT initiative by contributing expertise and equipment that will enable ‘Digital Bangladesh’ to begin in primary schools” (2015, p.49).

Finance

More than half of the countries (22 of 40) encourage increased private funding to the education sector, often in very general terms, with largely aspirational long-term goals of private investments or contributions. For example, the ESP of Burkina Faso states: “The financing of the PSEF [Programme Sectoriel de l’Éducation et de la Formation] will be mainly ensured from the resources of the State budget (85%), the balance being provided by external resources and the private sector” (2012, p.88). The Rwandan government “sees a need for increased public private partnerships as a means to increase available financing for education on any level (from ECD to higher education)” (2013, p.76). In most cases, private funders appear to be businesses and private entrepreneurs seeking to invest in the education sectors. However, in the ESP of Nigeria (Jijawa State), under the heading “Funding Sources” it includes “Private donations, given by individuals towards the upliftment of education in the state” (p.46). The private sector is also considered a resource that can directly fund or invest in specific goods and services as listed elsewhere in this review (teacher training; textbook distribution; infrastructure; technology, etc).

Several ESPs explain that without private sector support, the public sector may be unable to adequately finance education systems. For instance, the ESP for Eritrea laments the limited participation of the private sector in education, stating: “Little cost sharing occurs with the private sector. Eritrea has low levels of non-government provided education at all levels. As a result, the Government has had to shoulder virtually all of the provision of education and training” (2013, p.29), and that “the private sector will be encouraged to invest in the establishment, operation and expansion of schools” (2013, p.59). The OECS ESP explains that adequate resource mobilization for public education will “need significant enhancement through other sources, principally through donor agency funding and public-private partnerships” (2012, p.53). Similarly, in Uganda, “Even with more effective and efficient use of resources, it is not feasible for the Government to fully fund

massive expansion of education. Government has, therefore, developed a strategy of Private Public Partnership to leverage public funds facilitation and private financing” (p.16). This prevalent narrative that governments are dependent on private sector resources in order to support public education systems will be discussed further in the reflections below.

In most discussions of private funders to public education, actors are described very generally as “the private sector,” which could imply any non-state participant (philanthropy, company, charity, etc), although when contextualized it appears that the private sector typically indicates for-profit business actors. Two countries (DRC, Chad) state clearly that the business community ought to invest in education. Only two countries specify that companies’ **corporate social responsibility** (CSR) activities will contribute to education sector financing. For example, in Mozambique: “Over the last few years, partnerships have been established with the private sector within the context of corporate social responsibility agendas. These have resulted in the private sector contributing to the construction of schools, supplying equipment, and providing scholarships and/or other types of support” (2012, p.19).

Expertise

Policy-Making

Several countries encourage private sector participation in policy-making on education due to holding expertise in a range of areas, oftentimes in partnership with government and other actors (NGOs, religious organizations, international donors, etc). For example, in Lesotho “the Government counts on development partnerships with religious organisations, the private sector, NGOs, communities, and development partners” (2005, p.12). The ESP of Niger describes a goal to “set up an inter-ministerial steering committee with the participation of private sector actors and NGOs, which will be responsible for validating the annual programs, ensuring pooling and harmonization of interventions, making remedial decisions on the program evaluations, and to help mobilize funding from domestic and external resources” (2014, p.31). Some ESPs explain that private sector participation is required in particular areas, such as regulation around private schooling. For instance, in its discussion of “Mainstreaming of the Private Sector” the Pakistan Balochistan ESP “recommends filling in the current policy vacuum through development of a framework in consultation with private school stakeholders to allow synergy, reduce gaps between students of the two sectors and adherence to minimum standards” (2013, p.77).

Advising/Capacity-Building

The private sector is seen as contributing to education systems as advisers to Ministries and, most commonly, in **capacity-building**. For example, Afghanistan’s ESP aims for the private sector to “Strengthen the capacity of provincial and district education offices” (2011, p.43). The Comoros look to generally create “spaces for consultation” with the private sector (2013, p.21). The private sector can contribute expertise to **ICT** support; for instance, in support of its “Digital Bangladesh” initiative (also described above), the

government views the private sector as “contributing expertise and equipment” (2015, p.49). Others describe private contributions to the design of school **curriculum**. For instance, the ESP of Lao PDR, in its policy on “Enabling Greater Private and Community Participation” lists “Promote the participation of communities and the business sector in curriculum development” (2011, p.20). In some countries, private sector actors are described as providing expertise to **monitoring and evaluation** of various aspects of the education sector (e.g. OECS, Djibouti).

Regulation

Several countries (18 of 40) discuss the need for **increased regulation of private schooling**, including the design of regulatory frameworks and monitoring of quality of learning within privately-run schools. The need for regulation appears widespread, in particular in those countries which simultaneously include private participation in their ESPs—16 of the 18 countries promoting regulation also include elements of support to private providers. For example, in Benin “regulatory policies must be made... to control the development of this type of education” (2013, p.10). Tanzania proposes regulation through “reviewing the legal and regulatory environments, making proposals for any changes needed based on clear and transparent minimum operational and service standards, facilitating registration of private institutions” (2017, p.83). Kenya includes such regulatory mechanisms as registration, certification, and requiring of data reporting from private providers (2014). This dual support for private schools coupled with recognition of the need to regulate providers indicates an acknowledgement of the poor monitoring of private schools in many countries, potentially impacting quality of learning and access.

Other

Educational **advocacy** on the part of the private sector appears to be limited at the country-level, where few ESPs mention the private sector in reference to advocacy activities. In one of the few cases, Haiti, the government seeks to develop “specific activities” that can spread awareness of the importance of education, such as “meetings, seminars, open days... in the schools with the participation of the private sector and partners” (2013, p.111).

Several countries (16 of 40) express a **general encouragement of private school expansion**, although sometimes without mention of what this form might take or what mechanisms might be adopted to enable such expansion. For example, in Afghanistan “Private sector organizations/companies will be encouraged to participate in education services delivery” (2011, p.57) and in Eritrea “The private sector will be encouraged to invest in the establishment, operation and expansion of schools” (2013, p.59).

Two ESPs (Kenya, Zimbabwe) discuss the possibility of public-private partnerships for wrap-around services in the form of **health and nutrition programs**. It is unclear if this would involve direct service provision or financing.

ESPIG Project Document Descriptive Analysis

Provision of Goods and Services

Support to private school provision

GPE projects support **fee-based private schooling** in 10 of the 39 countries analyzed. In some countries, this support is via public-private partnerships in financing. For example, four projects include private school **subsidies** (Bangladesh, Burundi, Haiti, Pakistan), and **targeted stipends** are supporting in one country (Pakistan). None of the ESPIG project documents describe GPE support to scholarships, tax incentives, or commercial for-profit school chains.

Among these ten ESPIGs are project components with different degrees of support to fee-based schools. For instance, clear and direct public financing of private schools are included in Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Guinea, Haiti, and Pakistan. In Somalia, Togo, and Uganda, projects include indirect support to private schools via, for instance, teacher training services and guides, textbook provision, and curriculum materials. In Burkina Faso and Burundi, while the ESPIG documents mention support to private schools, the exact nature and extent to which the projects include such support is unclear. See Table 3 for brief descriptions of ESPIGs supporting fee-based private schools.

Table 3: *ESPIG Projects Supporting Fee-Based Private Schools*

Country	Description of Support
Afghanistan	Generally described: "Private sector organizations/companies are encouraged to participate in education services delivery within approved rules and regulations" (p.62). Private participation includes contracts awarded by the MoE for services including "running private schools" (p.62). Although the GPE Programme is considered as "own primarily and implemented exclusively" by the Government of Afghanistan, civil society and the private sector are describes as collaborators, when needed (p.93).
Bangladesh	The initial 2011 project supported "financing public-private partnerships to deliver educational services" (2011, p.42). In 2014, Bangladesh received additional financing for the GPE project which includes a goal "to strengthen mechanisms for public and private sectors to work more closely together in education service delivery" (2014, p.1). In addition, it supports the government policy focus of "establishing an integrated school system under a framework that unifies public, nongovernmental organizations (NGO) and private providers" (p.2). The additional financing report on the project moreover includes an "additional intervention" beyond the original project scope to "develop mechanisms to work more closely with the private sector" (p.6; although these mechanisms and precisely what is meant by "private sector" are not clarified).
Burkina Faso	Project supports "establishments of the private sector" including both secular private schools and several religious schools (including madrasas, Catholic and Protestant, and "Franco-Arab" private schools, which for parents "express a clearer rejection of the classical school" (p.31). While the ESPIG document details this range of private schools, it is unclear whether or not all are for-profit.
Burundi	Supports "transfers and subsidies to public and private entities in the sector" (p.34) and supervision of private schools. The nature, extent, and targets of these transfers and subsidies are unclear.
Guinea	Supports "The development of a strategy to boost private sector participation in activities

	relating to accreditation, supervision/monitoring/inspection, performance-based contract, quality assurance, parental involvement and choices, etc., the revision of protocols governing private schools and the development and piloting of tools for improving the management, control and quality of private primary and lower secondary education” (p.51). The project document therefore indicates both support to private schooling, and also the engagement of private entities in activities relating to supervision and monitoring.
Haiti	Supports tuition waivers to “non-public” schools; “The Directorate of Support to Private Education and Partnership (DAEPP) would be responsible for (i) sub-component 1.1 (Enhance the Tuition Waiver Program) and (ii) the Communication Unit of the MENFP (in collaboration of the would be responsible for sub-component 1.3 (Information for Non-Public School Accountability)” (AF, 2014, p.46) See Appendix 1 with country profile
Pakistan	Supports in Sindh: “Strengthening the design and implementation of an accountability-based PPP initiative to cost-effectively deliver quality schooling to unserved rural communities” (p.62) Supports in Balochistan: “recognizes the importance of the private sector given its increasing scale and focuses on forming effective partnerships for increasing access to quality education in the province” (p.68) See Appendix 1 with country profile
Somalia	Government intends to work in cooperation with the Private School Umbrellas, and “GPE-funded programme endorses this approach through its systems development and a focus on institutional capacity building at regional level. These activities support the Ministry’s objective of improving compliance among non-government/private education service providers on adherence to regulatory requirements” (p.34)
Togo	Indirectly supports private schools through training teachers, administrators, curriculum reforms
Uganda	Indirectly supports private schools through providing curriculum, textbooks, and related teacher guides See Appendix 1 with country profile

Source: Grant Agent Project Documents

Note: “AF” indicates an “Additional Financing” of original project

ESPIGs support public-private partnerships in **early childhood education** in seven countries. Project documents indicate that such PPPs are often a challenging shift from a private-dominated sector to one that includes support from the public sector. For example, in the Chad project, because “this sub-sector is dominated by private and community institutions (80%), financial efforts for its development would come first and foremost from these non-state actors” (2013, p.14).

Other services

Four ESPIGs include private involvement in **teacher training** services. For example, the Eritrea project document explains that training will be outsourced to private training institutions. One ESPIG includes the private sector as providing **accreditation** services (Guinea).

Data management is not supported by any of the ESPIGs, and in Somalia, private data management is considered problematic: “Currently, the Ministry uses Pineapple Software, which belongs to and is controlled by individual private consultant based in Australia who does not allow any room for the Ministry to operate, upgrade or modify without his

permission that has resulted in the Ministry incurring excessive recurrent costs in operationalization of this system” (2017, p.29).

Goods

Among the most common forms of private sector engagement in the EPIGs involve provision or financing of goods. **Textbook** production and distribution include PPPs in 12 country projects. In 12 ESPIGs, the private sector is a partner in **infrastructure**, primarily contracts for school construction. Four projects include private sector participation in **ICT and technology** for schools. The Gambia ESPIG includes a separate sub-component of a “Public-Private Partnership (PPP) initiative for ICT integration in learning and teaching, will provide broadband and curriculum-linked dynamic e-content to public schools” (2014, p.16).

Finance

Private procurement of financing for education within the ESPIGs is uncommon. Only three projects include components describing private funding to the education sector. In the Kyrgyz ESPIG, a project risk is described as “Incremental recurrent costs generated by the Project are a risk to its future sustainability” and presents possible risk management as “The Project would support the identification of alternative models, including partnerships with NGOs and the private sector, so as to find a model that is both of high quality and sustainable” (2014, p.53). The Nigeria ESPIG project document explains the need to address “weak procurement capacity in the public sector and to build appropriate partnership with the private sector” (2015, p.68).

None of the projects describe any private sector participation in the forms of corporate social responsibility, charitable giving, or tax incentives.

Expertise

Policy-Making

ESPIGs in 13 countries support private sector participation in policy-making in a range of ways. Private actors serve on strategy committees, LEGs, and groups designed to increase coordination amongst actors. For example, private actors are involved in the Education Development Partner Coordination Group in Kenya, are members of the Joint Annual Review forum in Zambia, and are to participate in the design of a private sector policy framework in Pakistan. Most policy-making activities are as part of partnership arrangements alongside government and other non-state actors.

Six of the ten ESPIGs with elements of support to private schooling also describe private actors as policy-makers (Afghanistan, Burkina-Faso, Burundi, Guinea, Pakistan, Somalia). Although this analysis cannot comment on the extent to which private participation in policy circles might influence support to private schooling, this intersection is worth studying in the future.

Advising/Capacity-Building

Advising/capacity-building is the most prevalent form of private sector engagement in the ESPIGs, where in 15 countries, projects detail direct advising in such areas as teacher training (e.g. Eritrea) and capacity building with Ministries and leadership training (e.g. Senegal). Most include general technical advising through sitting on sub-committees and coordinating with Ministries. Private actors participate in monitoring and evaluation in Burkina Faso and Guinea.

Regulation

Other ways in which ESPIGs support private schooling involves regulation, for example, the “supervision of private schools” in Burundi (2012, p.91), and “the development and piloting of tools for improving the management, control and quality of private primary and lower secondary education” in Guinea (2015, p.51). The GPE project in Somalia endorses “the Ministry’s objective of improving compliance among non-government/private education service providers on adherence to regulatory requirements” through cooperation with “Private Education Umbrellas” (2014, p. 34).

However, support to regulation in the ESPIGs is not as prevalent as within the ESPs, as only six countries discuss regulation of private schooling as a component of project support (Burkina Faso, Burundi, Guinea, Haiti, Pakistan, Somalia).

Other

One country’s ESPIG includes a private sector role in advocacy. In Haiti, an information campaign about education includes: “External firms would be hired to conduct focus groups and provide technical assistance in the development and implementation of the campaign” (2014, p.15)

Two ESPIGs include PPPs to support health and nutrition programs in schools (Chad, Haiti).

Comparison of ESPs and ESPIGs

Overall, upon comparison with ESPs, ESPIG project documents detail far less private sector engagement in education.

In some countries where ESPs heavily focus on increasing private participation, the project documents include minimal discussion of the private sector. Most notably, fee-based private schooling is supported through a range of mechanisms in many of the ESPs, yet in a much smaller number of the ESPIGs. Similarly, private actors are frequently cited in ESPs as much-needed financial contributors to education sectors, whereas in project documents, the private sector is rarely considered in a financier role.

Very few projects engage the private sector in ECE, whereas PPPs at the early childhood level are frequently discussed in the ESPs. The private sector is mentioned relatively often in relation to expertise (policy-making and advising), and provision of goods (textbooks, school construction) in both ESPs and ESPIGs. But overall, the two sets of documents tell quite different stories, particularly with regards to private schooling. See Table 4 for a comparison of support to fee-based K-12 private schooling within ESPs and ESPIGs. The six countries in bold include elements of private school support in both documents.

Table 4: *Countries with Fee-Based K-12 Private School Support - ESPs and ESPIGs*

Education Sector Plans	ESPIG Project Documents
Afghanistan	Afghanistan
Bangladesh	Bangladesh
Benin	Burkina Faso
Cameroon	Burundi
C.A.R.	Guinea
Eritrea	Haiti
Haiti	Pakistan
Kenya	Somalia
Lao PDR	Togo
Lesotho	Uganda
Liberia	
Malawi	
Mozambique	
Nepal	
Niger	
Nigeria	
Pakistan	
Rwanda	
Senegal	
Somalia	
Tanzania	
Uganda	
Zambia	

This contrast is likely due to a combination of factors. The stark contrast between ESPs and ESPIGs in the particular area of fee-based private schooling and associated PPP mechanisms is likely reflective of a GPE prioritization of public education. That Education Sectors Plans widely promote private schooling, yet GPE projects largely do not, indicates that GPE activities, in many cases, directly contrast support to privatization and focus instead on improvement of public education—which is in accordance with the partnership’s mandate.

In four countries, the ESPIG indicates support to private schooling, but its ESP does not. This might indicate that the project is funding something not prioritized in the ESP. However, in three of these cases (Burundi, Burkina Faso, and Togo), the ESPIG support is what could be considered either unclear or indirect. This discrepancy between ESP and ESPIG denotes the importance of increased clarity within documents relating to GPE grants

in order to understand and assess the nature of this support and the degree to which projects are abiding by priorities set out in country-driven ESPs.

Moreover, ESPs and ESPIGs serve different purposes. On the one hand, ESPs are considered “country-driven” documents that detail long-term planning for a country’s education sector. These are therefore very broad and general documents, generally focusing on every facet to a country’s education sector and all school levels, from ECE to higher education. On the other hand, ESPIG project documents are authored by the Grant Agent of the GPE project, and serve to detail the discrete components of the project itself with a bit of overall context. Many project documents have a boilerplate structure and so provide only elements required to understand a particular project. For example, the ESP of the Comoros covers the entire education sector, whereas the ESPIG document only describes a project on school construction. Similarly, the ESP of Liberia is wide-ranging, but the ESPIG has a narrow focus on early childhood education, principal certification, and capacity building.

The contrast might also be rooted in the nature of ESPs as highly aspirational, detailing what countries seek to do, at times describing increased engagement of the private sector as a long-term goal, whereas ESPIGs only describe current operations. In this sense, while countries might aspire to expand private education sectors, GPE project documents indicate that this expansion might be at a nascent stage in some countries.

As well, perhaps GPE projects detailed in the ESPIG documents do not need to focus on private schooling because other aid agencies are supporting the private sector through separate projects. For example, the Nigerian ESPIG focuses on only public education, but notes that a 2013-2018 DfID project includes key components relating to PPPs. Because GPE financing often represents only a component of aid to education within countries, understanding the wider aid landscape for each of its recipient partners can shed light on how and to what degree privatization is occurring.

Finally, all ESPIGs must be approved by the GPE Board. In order to include a major component on private schooling or PPPs, Board members must discuss and agree to this component. As prior research has found, GPE Board members are highly reluctant to discuss private schooling (Menashy, 2017).

Analysis of Global and Regional Activities Agreement Documents

Of the 15 Results Agreements for GRA projects, only one includes a component on the private sector, “Addressing the out-of-school children data and policy gaps,” which is led by the World Bank and also includes partner organizations UNESCO, UNICEF, UIS, and national governments. The project aims to “improve the capacity of countries to identify and plan appropriate policies to reduce the number of out-of-school children and improve learning especially among vulnerable groups” (World Bank, 2014). An expected outcome of the project includes capacity building in order to assess the effectiveness of particular interventions in order to improve access for out-of-school children. The project includes “diagnostic work on the role of private schools in education provision” and research in

order to assess “the contribution of private schools to education systems” (World Bank, 2014). Given the limited scope of the Results Agreement, further investigation into this project would be necessary to better understand in what ways exactly it engages with the private sector.

Reflections on Private Sector Engagement in GPE Recipient Countries

Findings from the analysis highlight several themes relating to GPE private sector engagement that reflect areas of concern and in need of clarification, as well as topics for further investigation. These reflections also include observable trends, given that the current study builds upon a project conducted in 2014, and that the analysis coded for a wider range of private sector participation in the GPE recipient country ESPs, and also examined project documents. Key observations are provided below, selected due to potential relevance for GPE partners and global educational advocates.

Ambiguity Concerning “Private Schools”

Both ESPs and ESPIG project documents frequently mention private schools without much contextualization, for instance the amount of fees typically charged, if such schools are considered low-cost or elite, and whether or not run by for-profit entrepreneurs. As well, no mentions of commercial for-profit chains were found in the analysis. However, it is possible that the fee-based private providers supported in ESPs and in (albeit fewer) GPE projects, are either directly or indirectly part of such chains. In order to understand GPE support to private schooling with accuracy and depth, more contextualization and details on the characteristics of private schools in recipient countries will be necessary. Given the enormous range of private actors and forms of private engagement in education, to use simple descriptions such as “private schools” offers little insight into the manifestations of neither privatization nor how private participation is shifting a country’s educational landscape, and therefore offers only a limited understanding of the implications of this involvement.

Rationales for Support to Private Schools

In ESPs, countries provide a range of rationales for the need to engage and support the private sector in school provision. For example:

- PPPs can help the disadvantaged through targeted stipends and bursaries that send poor children, girls, and ethnic minorities to private schools (e.g. Bangladesh, Nepal, Pakistan)
- Due to security concerns in conflict-affected settings, the private sector is considered a viable alternative provider (e.g. Afghanistan)
- The law dictates that it is a private organizations’ right to establish a school, provided regulations are followed (e.g. Cameroon)
- Support to private providers is cost-effective, can contribute to cost-sharing and make more funding available to the public sector (e.g. Eritrea, Rwanda, Tanzania,

Uganda). Relatedly, private providers help ease the demand on government schools (e.g. Laos)

- Engaging with private providers is unavoidable in countries with very large private sectors (e.g. Haiti)

The above rationales shed light on how countries approach the issue of school privatization through different lenses, and in some cases regional trends emerge. Given the range of rationales provided, education advocates might consider if critiques of support to private schooling are more relevant in some cases or need to be reframed for particular contexts.

Also notable is the absence of rationales based on the quality of private schooling. In fact, several ESPs critique private schools for low quality standards and voice the need for increased regulation of the private sector.

Many countries clearly consider private provision an important alternative to public schooling based on the rationales provided above, despite the relative lack of uptake into GPE projects. In looking at trends over time, ESP support to private schooling remains widespread. For instance, of the 12 ESPs published since 2014, 9 include support to fee-based private schooling.

Tax/Fiscal Incentives for Private Engagement

Fiscal incentives are described as a mechanism to engage the private sector in education in nine country ESPs. Some ESPs describe low interest rates for loans and lower tax rates as potential incentives for private providers to set up schools, while others explain that such mechanisms can elicit more private investments into education sectors. However, no ESPIG documents mention any form of fiscal incentive for private engagement in education, and so it appears GPE projects are not directly supporting such mechanisms.

When analyzed through a human rights lens, incentivizing private participation in educational provision through tax exemptions indicates government divestment from its primary responsibility to provide and ensure equitable access to public education. Therefore, it would be important for future research to explore the extent of tax/fiscal incentives established within countries, what factors drove such policies, and the implications of this for increased private engagement and public finance of education.

PPPs in Early Childhood Education

A notable number of ESPs discuss the need for PPPs to support early childhood education. As stated above, this oftentimes denotes a shift toward increase public financing and/or provision, given that the ECE sector in many countries has historically been dominated by the private sector. However, further investigation is needed to better understand how countries are responding to increased demand for ECE on the part of families, the influence of international organizations and donors on the establishment of ECE facilities, and the ways in which private providers are engaged.

Private Participation in Policy-Making and Advising

An area where both ESPs and ESPIG documents frequently describe private sector engagement is in the area of policy-making, as well as advisors to policy-makers. Private actors, including for instance business representatives, philanthropists, and private school providers, are often mentioned as core members of policy-setting committees and also advisory groups. Given that several countries and projects consider private actors as partners in education policy and planning, it would be important to better understand the roles they occupy, whose interests they represent, if their participation is conditional in some way, and potential conflicts of interest. For instance, in Pakistan, private stakeholders are included in policy discussions on regulation of private schools, raising concerns about the feasibility of the private sector fairly regulating itself. The role of private entities in policy-making spaces has become increasingly visible in GPE projects: of the 13 ESPIGs with components relating to private actor participation in policy-making, 9 are in projects approved since 2014.

Private Sector as Funder

In more than half of the ESPs, the private sector is envisaged as a potential core funder of education systems and programs. As mentioned above, some countries present private financing as a crucial resource to support education sectors. Private funding includes investments from businesses, as well as via a couple of corporate social responsibility programs. ESPIG documents do not often mention broader funding by the private sector, but this is likely because sector funding is rarely a component of discrete GPE projects. Questions remain concerning the amount of private funding elicited by countries, if contributions are incentivized in some way, and if conditions are attached to funds.

Moreover, implicit in many discussions of private financing to education is an assumption that governments lack the capacity to fund education alone. Such rhetoric, however, contrasts what many educational advocates have noted: reforms to public finance policies, most notably via tax justice, could significantly increase financing to education and other public sector services (Archer, 2017).

The Need for Regulation

Of the 18 ESPs voicing a need for increased regulation of the private sector, 16 concurrently support private schooling. Similarly, all of the ESPIGs that support regulation also support fee-based private schooling in some form. This trend reflects a widespread understanding of the need for a strong regulatory environment in countries where private schools are supported.

Conclusions

This analysis has uncovered a notable presence and expansion of private participation in GPE recipient countries, in a variety of forms; however, this engagement cannot be attributed directly to GPE. In fact, the discrepancy between private school support in ESPs and ESPIGs reflects a GPE prioritization of public education. In 30 of the 40 active GPE grants, public sector education is clearly the focus. In the few countries wherein an ESPIG but not an ESP supports private schooling, the project supports private schools primarily via indirect mechanisms—for example, teacher training or provision of textbooks to providers—or the form and extent of support remains unclear. GPE projects that include the most direct and explicit support to private schooling are in only a relatively small number of recipient countries, and directly attributing this to GPE would neglect the numerous factors and stakeholders involved in the GPE project design and implementation process.

Yet some significant tensions emerge between GPE’s commitment to the right to education and particular forms of private participation as identified in the project documents and ESPs. For instance, common PPP financing mechanisms that enable the growth of for-profit private schooling—including subsidies, stipends, tax incentives—indicate State disinvestment in public education. Moreover, the growing participation of private actors in policy circles, while perhaps contributing expertise and knowledge, also spur questions around conflicts of interest. And although private funding of education may on surface be a logical fiscal move, it denotes another case of potential State abdication of its responsibility, in particular because public financing reforms could alternatively contribute to improvement of education systems without needing to turn to private funds.

The Global Partnership for Education treads a fine line relating to private engagement in education. On the one hand, the organization’s mandate upholds education as a “public good, a human right and an enabler of other rights,” and a commitment to Sustainable Development Goal 4 to achieve inclusive and equitable quality education for all. Yet, concurrently, a fundamental tenet to the partnership is “country ownership and nationally identified priorities” (GPE, 2016). Moreover, GPE country-level project implementation is inclusive of many partners, including bilateral donors, members of Local Education Groups, and Grant Agents. And so while GPE is in a position to maintain its course in predominantly supporting public education, this current stance may come in tension with the goals of recipient governments and other stakeholders within countries. The question remains at what point GPE ought to explicitly counter country-driven policies that encourage private sector schooling growth and other forms of engagement.

ANNEX 1: COUNTRY PROFILES

Country Profile: Haiti

Haiti Country Context and Private Education

Haiti is the poorest country in Latin America and the Caribbean, and the 2010 earthquake exacerbated already overwhelming challenges relating to poverty and very poor quality of social services (World Bank, 2017). Haiti has become largely aid-dependent, with nearly 6 billion USD in official aid disbursed to the country since 2010. At the same time, with NGOs and private contractors often acting as intermediate recipients, and a government with very low capacity, the aid architecture in the country is characterized by lack of accountability and corruption (Ramachandran and Walz, 2012).

In this wider context, the challenges facing Haiti's education system are substantial, with poor quality, low access particularly for marginalized groups, and low institutional capacity. Although primary school enrolment rates are roughly 90% for children aged 6-12, attendance drops significantly with only 50% of these students promoted to grade 6 on time. And only 21% of male and 29% of female students attend secondary school. More than 200, 000 school-aged children are not enrolled (World Bank, 2015; 2017; UNICEF, 2018).

One of the most notable traits of Haiti's schooling system is the predominance of private providers. At least 80% of primary level students attend what are often termed in policy documents as "non-public schools," including faith-based, NGO, or—in the majority of cases—for-profit private schools. Given that for-profit private providers dominate the sector, access to education has been largely dependent on ability to pay. According to GPE, tuition for Haitian students averages 80 USD per year, not including costs for materials, transportation, and uniforms (GPE, 2018b). Fees act as a clear barrier to school enrolment and retention. Moreover, private schools in Haiti are largely unregulated. According to the Haiti Education Sector Plan, the private sector is "naturally more difficult to control than the public sector, especially because it is very disparate" (2013, p.22).

And so the Haitian government, with the support of several aid organizations including the World Bank, the Caribbean Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank, has instituted a subsidy program to allow students to attend private institutions with tuition fees waived. This public-private partnership has been touted as a success, with over 430, 000 tuition waivers publicly financed and "allowing disadvantaged children to attend school free of charge" (World Bank, 2017).

Current GPE Project Details

Haiti has been a GPE partner since 2008, with the World Bank as its current Grant Agent and UNESCO its Coordinating Agency. The Global Partnership for Education has also supported the large-scale PPP project in Haiti. Haiti has received two Program Implementation Grants amounting to over 46 million USD in disbursements. Haiti is one of

the few GPE projects with explicit support to for-profit private providers, including via the above-described tuition waiver mechanisms. The project received additional financing in 2014 and included a sub-component to “enhance the Tuition Waiver Program” (World Bank, 2014, p.46). This grant has supported the enrolment of over 100, 000 students into non-public schools (GPE, 2018b). More recently, in April 2017, the ESPIG was extended until June 2018 with 2.7 million USD reallocated to support tuition waivers (GPE, 2018b).

Significance of Haiti Case for GPE

As stated in Haiti’s ESP, given its size and dominance “the participation of the private sector is unavoidable” (2013, p.149) and so must be considered in education policy design and financing. Although the need for regulation is clearly articulated in both the ESP and ESPIG, and the expansive private sector is viewed as problematic from the perspective of the government, the public-private partnership policy in the form of tuition waivers is presented as necessary. Haiti is one of the few countries where support to private schooling is included as both a priority in its ESP and also is a major component of the ESPIG.

Haiti presents a difficult case for GPE given the partnership’s mandate to support public education. If funding were only directed to public schools, this would neglect the education of 80% of the school-aged population. Yet alternatively targeting support to—and thereby strengthening—the public sector could potentially reduce the dominance of private institutions.

Country Profile: Pakistan

Pakistan Country Context and Private Education

The education system in Pakistan faces enormous challenges due to several years of economic and political instability. Since 2010, responsibility for education has been decentralized with provincial governments responsible for school delivery. While the federal government only allocates 2.14% of its GDP on education (the lowest in South Asia), provinces allocate roughly 20% of their budgets to education. A lack of public finance, combined with security and political challenges, has contributed to poor quality of schooling and the second largest out-of-school population in the world (GPE 2018c; ISAPS, 2017).

Pakistan is widely recognized as an exemplar for instituting large-scale public-private partnerships in education. Through PPPs the public sector diverts funding to private schools, in particular to the low-cost sector. Within provinces, publicly-financed “Education Foundations” have been established that direct funds to private providers. Pakistan has initiated a range of PPP mechanisms over the years, including vouchers, subsidies, and targeted stipends for disadvantaged groups, in particular for girls (Malik & Khan, 2015). According to a 2014 report, 180,846 schools in Pakistan are public, and 80,057 are private entities. Roughly 30% of all students attend private schools, serving 10.5 million students. Projects supporting PPP mechanisms in Pakistan have been financed by donors and multilateral agencies, most notably the World Bank and DfID (ILM IDEAS/DfID, 2014; ISAPS, 2017).

Pakistan’s Education Sector Plan (Balochistan) discusses the critical need to revise a regulatory framework given the widespread and growing low-cost private sector, particularly in urban areas. In order to do so, it advocates for the development of a new policy framework with input from private actors, which it describes as “Mainstreaming of the Private Sector” via the “development of a framework in consultation with private school stakeholders to allow synergy, reduce gaps between students of the two sectors and adherence to minimum standards (2013, p.77). Private provision extends to all levels, including university and vocational schooling, and according to the ESP “Very few of the schools... can be categorized as elite institutions. The bulk of the remaining schools cater to families that can only afford low fees” (2013, p.20).

Current GPE Project Details

Pakistan became a GPE partner in 2012, with the provinces of Sindh and Balochistan each receiving Education Sector Program Implementation Grants in 2015, with allocations to Sindh of 66 million USD and Balochistan of 34 million USD. Due to the devolved system, GPE works directly with provincial governments and Local Education Groups. The World Bank is the grant agent and UNICEF is the coordinating agency for both provincial projects (GPE, 2018c).

Project documents frame the public education system in Pakistan as problematic and of poor quality, and thus in need of private participation. For example, in Balochistan, “participation in public sector education remains low, mainly due to the low quality of education and weak accountability mechanisms” (2015, p.14), and “also recognizes the importance of the private sector given its increasing scale and focuses on forming effective partnerships for increasing access to quality education in the province” (2015, p.68). Similarly, in Sindh, “Public service delivery in Sindh is marred by petty corruption, absenteeism and poor allocation of resources... satisfaction with public services in Sindh such as schools (56 percent) is low. The private sector has stepped in to deliver a wide range of education and health services” (2015, p.2).

In order to address the shortcomings of public sector delivery, the Sindh and Balochistan projects support PPP mechanisms. For instance, the Balochistan Education Foundation “a semi-autonomous apex financing body... which partners with communities and private entrepreneurs to increase access to education in the province” supports over 50,000 students in the province (p.21). Similarly, the project in Sindh province supports a “Public-private partnership in education” with an objective of “Strengthening the design and implementation of an accountability-based PPP initiative to cost-effectively deliver quality schooling to unserved rural communities” (2015, p.62).

The GPE Balochistan project “recognizes the importance of the private sector given its increasing scale and focuses on forming effective partnerships for increasing access to quality education in the province” (2015, p.68).

Significance of the Pakistan Case for GPE

The Pakistan case is significant for GPE and its partners given that public-private partnerships are a core key component of the Pakistan education system and the scale of the low-cost sector is exceptionally large and appears to be expanding. In grappling with support to a country with such a large and deeply entrenched system of private schooling, including government funding to the private sector, GPE must weigh its rights-based and equity-driven mandate with Pakistan’s country ownership of its GPE grant. Research has shown that the quality of education provided within low-cost schools in Pakistan is questionable and that the poorest of students do not readily access the PPP program (Malik & Khan, 2015). Moreover, GPE must navigate its role in Pakistan given widespread and relatively long-term donor support to PPPs. Finally, the Government of Pakistan and GPE alike note the urgent need for regulation of the private sector, yet the project indicates that private actors themselves might be engagement in developing regulatory policies, presenting a potential conflict of interest.

Country Profile: Uganda

Uganda Country Context and Private Education

In 1997 Uganda abolished public school fees and instituted a policy of universal primary education, and in 2007 initiated a policy of universal secondary education. While this policy increased enrolments and retention, the education system continues to face several challenges. Large class sizes, strained infrastructure, limited learning materials, lack of qualified teachers, and weak management have all contributed to poor quality of learning (Barrera-Osorio, et al, 2016; GPE, 2018d).

According to the country's Education Sector Plan "it is not possible for the Government to fully fund massive expansion of education. Government has, therefore, developed a strategy of Private Public Partnership" (2010, p.12) in line with a commitment to "adopt a business-like approach to improve delivery of public services" (p.22). Aligned with this perspective, the Ministry of Education and Sports initiated a PPP program at the secondary level, which in turn opened the education system up to a wide range of private providers. The number of schools participating in the PPP program increased 60% over the first four years, with mainly low-cost private schools participating, allowing them to apply to the government for per student funding, textbook provision, and teaching materials (Barrera-Osorio, et al, 2016; Srivastava, 2016). Through PPPs, Uganda cites the potential for improvement to public schools while also easing the burden on public financing.

The private education sector in Uganda has grown substantially in recent years, doubling over the past decade with an estimated 6,000 private primary schools, and 17% of K-12 students enrolled in private institutions. Uganda's private sector moreover includes controversial commercial school chains, most notably Bridge International Academies. Although in 2016 a formal announcement by the Ugandan Minister of Education and Sports stated that the government would be closing Bridge International schools throughout the country (GIESCR, 2016), the company's website currently states that in Uganda "Enrolment is up in our schools, and we are working with the government on the licensing process" (BIA, 2018).

Current GPE Project Details

Uganda joined GPE as a partner in 2011, and its current ESPIG allocates 100 million USD over four years to improve teacher and school effectiveness (GPE, 2018d). The World Bank is its Grant Agent and USAID its Coordinating Agency. Although the government's ESP considers PPPs in education service delivery to be a key component to its sector planning, the GPE project does not directly finance private schools via subsidy, stipend or voucher mechanisms, except at the early childhood level. Instead, support to private schools is indirect, through the distribution of curriculum and related teacher guides and textbooks provided to both private and public schools. Improving teacher effectiveness is therefore targeted to educators in both the public and private sector. The project also supports private schools through monitoring of service provision by non-state actors.

Significance of the Uganda Case for GPE

Uganda presents a case in which a country's policies directly support PPPs in educational service delivery, and yet the GPE project does not. The project does include support to private schools, but through more indirect mechanisms, in particular support to improving teacher effectiveness in all schools. Questions arise based on GPE participation in Ugandan private schools. First, to what extent ought to GPE either question or promote country-driven policies that support financing of private schools? Second, to what degree might indirect support to private schools—via, for instance, textbook distribution, curricula, and teacher training and monitoring—reflect disinvestment from the public system?

ANNEX 2: DOCUMENTS ANALYZED

Education Sector Plans

- Eritrea Ministry of Education. (2013). *Education sector development plan 2013-2017*. Government of Balochistan, Islamic Republic of Pakistan, Education Department, PPIU. (2014). *Balochistan education sector plan 2013 - 2018*.
- Government of Nepal, Ministry of Education. (2016). *School sector development plan 2016-2023 (BS 2073-2080)*. October. Kathmandu.
- Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Ministry of Primary and Mass Education, Directorate of Primary Education. (2015). *Third primary education development program (PEDP-3) revised*. August. Dhaka, Bangladesh: Program Division. Directorate of Primary Education.
- Government of the Republic of Zambia, Ministry of Education, Science, Vocational Training and Early Education. (2011). *Education sector, national implementation framework III, 2011-2015: Implementing the sixth national development plan*. Lusaka.
- Government of Zanzibar, Ministry of Education and Vocational Training. (2017). *Zanzibar education development plan II 2017/18 - 2021/22*.
- Guyana Ministry of Education. (2014). *Guyana education sector plan 2014-2018*. (Volume 1).
- Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Ministry of Education. (2011). *Education interim plan 2011-13*. January. (No. 5).
- Jigawa State, Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2013). *State education sector strategic plan (SESP) 2013-2022*.
- Kaduna State, Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2013). *Reviewed Kaduna state education strategic plan (ESP) 2006-2015*. August.
- Kano State, Federal Republic of Nigeria. Ministry of Education. (2008). *Education strategic plan 2009-2018*. April.
- Katsina State, Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2010). *State education sector strategic plan (SESP): 2011-2020*. September.
- Kingdom of Lesotho, Government of Lesotho, Ministry of Education and Training. (2005). *Education sector strategic plan 2005-2015*. March. Maseru.
- Lao People's Democratic Republic, Ministry of Education and Sports. (2011). *Education sector development plan (ESDP) (2011-2015)*. September. Vientiane.
- Ministry of Education Sokoto. (2010). *State strategic education sector plan (SESP) 2011-2020*. August.
- Republic of Cameroon, Ministry of Economy, Planning and Regional Development, Steering Committee [sic] for the Coordination and Monitoring of the Education Sector Wide Approach' Implementation. (2013). *Document de stratégie du secteur de l'Education et de la (2013-2020)*.
- Republic of Kenya, Ministry of Education Science and Technology. (2014). *National education sector plan, volume one: Basic education programme rationale and approach 2013/2014 - 2017/2018*. March. (Volume One).
- Republic of Liberia Ministry of Education, Office of the Minister of Accelerated Education for Accelerated Development. (2010). *The education sector plan of Liberia*. Monrovia, Liberia.

- Republic of Mozambique, Ministry of Education. (2012). *Education strategic plan 2012-2016, lets learn! building competencies for Mozambique in development*. Maputo.
- Republic of Rwanda, Ministry of Education. (2013). *Education sector strategic plan 2013/14 - 2017/18*. October. Kigali, Rwanda: Ministry of Education.
- Republic of Somaliland Ministry of Education & Higher Education. (2012). *Somaliland's education sector strategic plan 2012-2016*. August.
- Republic of South Sudan, Juba, Ministry of General Education and Instruction. (2012). *General education strategic plan, 2012 - 2017, promoting learning for all*.
- Republic of Sudan, Ministry of General Education. (2012). *Interim basic education strategy*. June.
- Republic of Zimbabwe, Ministry of Primary and Secondary Education. (2016). *Education sector strategic plan 2016-2020*.
- Republika y'Uburundi, Republique du Burundi. (2012). *Plan sectoriel de developpement de l'education et de la formation 2012-2020*. Juillet.
- République Centrafricaine, Ministère de l'Enseignement primaire, secondaire et de l'Alphabétisation, Comité d'actualisation de la SNSE. (2012). *Plan d'action du secteur de l'éducation 2013 - 2015*. December.
- Republique De Djibouti, Ministere de l'Education Nationale et de l'Enseignement Superieur. (2010). *Schema directeur 2010-2019*. Gouvernement de Djibouti Ministère de l'éducation nationale et de l'enseignement supérieur.
- Republique De Guinee, Ministeres En Charge Du Secteur De L'Education. (2014). *Programme sectoriel de L'education 2015-2017*. Août.
- République Démocratique du Congo, Ministère de l'Enseignement Primaire Secondaire et Initiation à la Nouvelle Citoyenneté, Ministère de l'Enseignement Technique et Professionnel, Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et Universitaire, Ministère des Affaires Sociales, Action Humanitaire et Solidarité Nationale. (2015). *Stratégie sectorielle de l'éducation et de la formation 2016-2025*. (Version Finale). December.
- Republique D'Haiti, Ministere De L'Education Nationale Et De La Formation, Professionnelle (MENFP). (2013). *Programme D'interventions prioritaires en education (PIPE) 2013-2016*. Décembre. Port-au-Prince.
- Republique Du Benin, Ministeres en Charge De L'Education. (2013). *Plan decennal de developpement du secteur de L'education actualise phase 3/ 2013-2015*. (Phase 3). Fevrier.
- République du Niger. (2013). *Programme Sectoriel de l'Education et de la formation (2014-2024)*. Juin.
- République du Sénégal, Ministère de la Femme, de l'Enfant et de l'Entrepreneuriat Féminin, Ministère de l'Éducation, Nationale Ministère del'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche, & Ministère de la Formation Professionnelle de l'Apprentissage et de l'Artisana. (2013). *Programme d'Amélioration de la qualité, de l'Equité et de la transparence, Secteur education formation 2013-2025*. Février.
- République du Tchad. (2012). *Stratégie intérimaire pour l'Education et l'alphabetisation 2013-2015*. (Document complet). Juillet.
- Republique Togolaise. (Janvier 2014). *Plan sectoriel de L'education PSE 2014-2025, amelioration de L'accès, de L'equire et de la qualite de L'education au Togo*.
- The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Federal Ministry of Education of Ethiopia. (2015). *Education sector development, Programme V (ESDP V), 2008 - 2012 E.C., 2015/16 -*

2019/20 G.C, *programme action plan*. Addis Ababa.

The Government of Burkina Faso. (2013). *Programme sectoriel de L' education et de la formation (PSEF) 2012-2021*. (Version Finale). Fevrier.

The Government of Uganda, Ministry of Education and Sports. (2010). *The education sector strategic plan (ESSP) 2004-2015*. Global Partnership for Education.

The Kyrgyz Republic. (2012). *Education development strategy of the Kyrgyz Republic for 2012-2020*.

The Malawi Ministry of Education, Science and Technology. (2008). *National education sector plan 2008-2017*. June. Malawi.

The Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States. (2012). *OECS education sector strategy 2012 to 2021*. Morne Fortune: The Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States.

The Republic of Gambia, Ministry of Basic & Secondary Education and Ministry of Higher Education, Research, Science & Technology. (2013). *Draft education sector strategic plan 2014-2022*. August.

The United Republic of Tanzania, ESDP. (2008). *Education sector development programme (2008-17)*. (Revised Edition). August.

Union Des Comores, Ministere De L'Education Nationale, De La Recherche De La Culture Et Des Arts Charge De La Jeunesse Et Des Sports. (2013). *Plan interimaire de L'education 2013-2015*. Janvier.

Yemen Ministry of Education. (2013). *Yemen education sector plan, mid-term results framework 2013-2015*.

Education Sector Program Implementation Grant Project Documents

Department for International Development (DFID) Zambia. (2013). *DFID and GPE funded Zambia education sector budget support programme*.

Government of Burkina Faso. (2017). *Document de programme soumis au Partenariat mondial pour l'Education pour la mise en œuvre du, Plan sectoriel de l'Education et de la formation (PSEF) 2017-2030*. (finale). Ministère de l'Education Nationale et de l'Alphabétisation.

Government of the State of Eritrea (GoSE) Ministry of Education (MoE). (2013). *Program proposal on: Enhancing equitable access to quality basic education for social justice*. Asmara.

Government of Yemen and UNICEF document. (2013). *Proposal to the global partnership for education for a catalytic contribution towards implementation of Yemen's education sector plan 2013-2015*. (Final Programme Document for GPE Grant Application).

La Cooperation Belge Au Développement. (2012). *Don de 52,9 millions USD du partenariat mondial pour l'education, pour la mise en œuvre du plan sectoriel de développement de l'Education et de la formation (PSDEF) du Burundi*. Juillet.

MoE, Local Donor Group (LDG), UNICEF Afghanistan, UNICEF Regional Office for South Asia, UNICEF New York. (2011). *Proposal to the global partnership for educations (GPE) for a catalytic contribution towards implementation of Afghanistan's education interim plan (EIP)*.

Republique Du Tchad, Ministere De L'Enseignement Primaire Et De L'Education Civique. (2016). *Document de projet, projet de revitalisation de L'education de base au Tchad (PREBAT), soumis au fonds du partenariat mondial pour L'education montant du don*

envisage: 47,2 millions USD au profit de la Republique du Tchad.

Somalia Federal Republic of South Central Somalia. (2013). *Programme document (2014-2016) programme implementation grant global partnership for education*. Ministry of Human development and Public Services.

South Sudan Ministry of General Education and Instruction & UNICEF. (2012). *Programme document: "Delivering quality basic education in Challenging Circumstances"*. Global Partnership for Education South.

UNICEF. (2017). *Global partnership for education programme document 2017-2020*. (Final). The Ministry of Education and Higher Education of Puntland State of Somalia.

UNICEF and MENET. (2014). *Education system recovery support project, program document for a global partnership for education grant to the Central African Republic*.

UNICEF on behalf of the Ministry of Education, Sports, Arts and Culture, Zimbabwe. (March 2013). *GPE education support project document*.

Union Des Comores. (2016). *Project GPE aux Comores*.

World Bank. (2016). *Project appraisal document for small recipient executed trust fund grant in the amount of SDR 1,440,000 million (US \$2.00 million equivalent) to the organization of eastern Caribbean states commission for a support to implementation of the regional education strategy*. (No. PP1793).

World Bank. (2014). *International development association project appraisal document on a proposed IDA grant in the amount of SDR 7.8 million to the republic of the Gambia for a results for education achievement and development project (READ)*. (No. 83958-GM).

World Bank. (2016). *Project paper on two proposed additional grants A global partnership for education (GPE) grant in the amount of US \$59.3 million and results in education for all children (REACH) grant in the amount of US \$4.0 million to Nepal for A school sector reform program*. (No. PAD1310).

World Bank. (2015). *Project appraisal document on A global partnership for education fund grant in the amount of US \$88.4 million to the republic of Kenya for a primary education development project*. (No. PAD863).

World Bank. (2014). *International development association project appraisal document on a proposed grant in the amount of US \$100 million to the government of Uganda for the Uganda teacher and school effectiveness project*. (No. 77419-UG).

World Bank. (2013). *International development association project appraisal document on a proposed credit in the amount of SDR 13.4 million (US \$20 million) and a global partnership for education (GPE) grant in the amount of US \$2.8 million to the republic of Senegal for a quality improvement and equity of basic education project*. (No. 75752-SN).

World Bank. (2013). *International development association project appraisal document on A proposed credit in the amount of SDR 85.8 million (US \$ 130.0 million equivalent) to the federal democratic republic of Ethiopia for a general education quality improvement project II*. (No. PAD476).

World Bank. (2015). *International development association project appraisal document on a global partnership for education grant in the amount of US\$ 16.8 million to the Lao people's democratic republic for a second global partnership for education project*. (No. PAD1055).

World Bank. (2014). *Project appraisal document on a proposed global partnership for education fund grant in the amount of US \$84.2 million to the republic of Niger for a support to quality education project*. (No. PAD444).

World Bank. (2015). *International development association project paper on a proposed*

- additional grant in the amount of SDR 36 million (US \$ 50 million equivalent) and global partnership for education (GPE) grant in the amount of US \$ 57.9 million to the republic of Mozambique for an education sector support project. (No. PAD1261).*
- World Bank. (2013). International development association project appraisal document on a proposed grant in the amount of US\$ 100 million to the democratic republic of Congo for a support to basic education project under the global partnership for education fund. (No. 71655-ZR).*
- World Bank. (2011). Project appraisal document on a proposed credit in the amount of SDR 187.5 million (US 300 million equivalent) to the people's republic of Bangladesh for a third primary education development program. (Project Appraisal Document No. 60321-BD).*
- World Bank. (2017). International development association project appraisal document on a proposed grant in the amount of US \$ 44.9 million to the republic of Malawi for a Malawi education sector improvement project (MESIP) (No. PAD1515).*
- World Bank. (2017). International development association project appraisal document on a proposed grant in the amount of US\$ 11.07 million to the republic of Liberia for a Liberia: Getting to best in education project. (No. PCBASIC0094162).*
- World Bank. (2014). Project appraisal document on a proposed grant in the amount of US \$ 12.7 million to the Kyrgyz republic for the Kyrgyz early education project (KEEP) financed by global partnership for education (GPE). (No. 83142-KG).*
- World Bank. (2015). Project appraisal document on a global partnership for education fund grant in the amount of USD \$ 66 million to the Islamic republic of Pakistan for a Sindh global partnership for education project. (No. 839993-PK).*
- World Bank. (2015). Project paper for small recipient executed trust fund (RETF) grant US\$ 1.7 million to the co-operative republic of Guyana for an early childhood education project. (No. 87805-GY).*
- World Bank. (2013). Emergency project paper on a proposed grant in the amount of US \$ 76.5 million to the republic of the Sudan for a basic education recovery project. (No. 75025-SD).*
- World Bank. (2013). Project paper for a proposed global partnership for education grant of US \$3.8 million to the republic of Djibouti for an access to quality education project. (No. 83080-DJ).*
- World Bank. (2015). Project appraisal document on a proposed grant in the amount of USD 34 million to the Islamic republic of Pakistan for a global partnership for education - Balochistan education project (GPE-BEP). (No. PAD910).*
- World Bank. (2011). Project appraisal document on a proposed international development association credit in the amount of SDR 45.2 million (US \$ 71 million equivalent) and a proposed education for all - fast track initiative catalytic fund (EFA-FTI CF) grant in the amount of US \$ 90 million to the republic of Mozambique for the Mozambique education sector support project. (No. 60595-MZ).*
- World Bank. (2014). Project paper on a proposed additional {Loan/Credit} in the amount of US\$ 24.1 million to the republic of Haiti for an education for all project - phase 2 (APL) in support of the education for all program. (from datasheet).*
- World Bank. (2015). International development association project appraisal document on*

a proposed grant from the global partnership for education in the amount of US \$ 27.80 million to the republic of Togo for an education and institutional strengthening project 2 (PERI 2). (No. PAD879).

World Bank. (2016). *International development association project appraisal document on a proposed credit in the amount of SDR 18.1 million (US \$ 25 million equivalent) to the Kingdom of Lesotho for an education quality for equality project. (No. PAD1533).*

World Bank. (2015). *Project appraisal document on a proposed global partnership for education grant in the amount of US \$100 million to the federal republic of Nigeria for a Nigeria partnership for education project. (No. PAD634).*

World Bank. (2015). *International bank for reconstruction and development and international development association, project appraisal document on proposed grants in the amount of US \$ 37.8 million and US \$ 1 million from the global partnership for education fund and the Ebola recovery and reconstruction trust fund to the republic of Guinea for a pooled-fund for basic education (FoCEB). (No. PAD1085).*

World Bank. (2014). *Project appraisal document on A proposed grant from the global partnership for education fund in the amount of US\$ 53.3 million to the republic of Cameroon for an equity and quality for improved learning project. (No. PAD411).*

World Bank. (2014). *International development association project appraisal document on a proposed grant in the amount of US \$ 42.3 million to the republic of Benin for A global partnership for education project. (No. 86094-BJ).*

World Bank. (2014). *Project paper on a proposed additional credit in the amount of SDR 269.8 million (US\$ 400 million equivalent) and project restructuring to the people's republic of Bangladesh for the third primary education development program. (No. 90812-BD).*
Zanzibar Ministry of Education and Vocational Training. (2017). *Zanzibar ESPIG program document 2018-2021.*

Global and Regional Activities Agreement Documents

Alama, A. (2013). *Results agreement with UNESCO international bureau of education (IBE) on quality of Education/Learning outcomes under the global and regional activities (GRA) program. UNESCO International Bureau of Education.*

Atchoarena, D. (2014). *Results agreement with UNESCO on improving teacher support and participation in LEGs under the global and regional activities (GRA) program. Paris, France: UNESCO.*

Cardoso, M. (2013). *Results agreement with the UNESCO institute for statistics (UIS) on learning outcomes under the global and regional activities (GRA) program. Montréal, Québec, Canada: UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS).*

de Grauwe, A. (2013). *Results agreement with UNESCO international institute for educational planning (IIEP) on education financing under the global and regional activities (GRA) program. Paris, France: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP).*

Huebler, F. (2013). *Results agreement with the UNESCO institute for statistics (UIS) on out of school children under the global and regional activities (GRA) program. Montreal, Canada: UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS).*

- Legault, E. (2013). *Results agreement with the UNESCO institute for statistics (UIS) on education financing under the global and regional activities (GRA) program*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS).
- Mannathoko, C., & Saihjee, A. (2014). *Results Agreement with UNICEF on school related gender based violence under the global and regional activities (GRA) program*. New York, NY: UNICEF.
- Marchand, J. (2013). *Results agreement with agence française de développement (AFD) on child Literacy: Learning to read and write in African languages and in French in the context of bilingual primary education under the global and regional activities (GRA) program*. Agence Française de Développement.
- Tehio, V. (2013). *Results agreement with agence française de développement (AFD) on learning outcomes under the global and regional activities (GRA) program*. Agence Française de Développement.
- Tembon, A. (2014). *Results agreement with the world bank on disability, health and education in support of learning for all under the global and regional activities (GRA) program*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Thanh, B., & Machuca-Sierra. (2014). *Results Agreement with the world bank on the pacific early age readiness and learning (PEARL) under the global and regional activities (GRA) program*. World Bank.
- Vivekanandan, R. (2014). *Results agreement with UNESCO on assessment systems and learning outcomes under the global and regional activities (GRA) program*. Bangkok, Thailand: UNESCO Bangkok, Asia Pacific Regional Bureau for Education.
- Waltham, M. (2013). *Results agreement with the UNICEF on access for all out of school children under the global and regional activities (GRA) program*. UNICEF.
- Wodon, Quentin and Lusk-Stover, Oni. (2014). *Results agreement with the world bank on out of school children under the global and regional activities (GRA) program*. World Bank.

References

- Archer, D. (2017) For Education Justice We Need Tax Justice. Retrieved from: <https://medium.com/actionaid/for-education-justice-we-need-tax-justice-34c0b72cf6e3>
- Barrera-Osorio, F., P. de Galbert, & J. Habyarimana. (2016) Impact of Public-Private Partnerships on Private School Performance: Evidence from a Randomized Control Trial in Uganda. Background Paper to the 2018 World Development Report. Washington DC: World Bank.
- BIA (2018) Uganda. Retrieved from: <http://www.bridgeinternationalacademies.com/countries/uganda/>
- GIESCR (2016) Uganda to Close the Largest Chain of Commercial Private Schools. Retrieved from: <http://globalinitiative-escr.org/groundbreaking-news-uganda-to-close-the-largest-chain-of-commercial-private-schools-over-non-respect-of-basic-education-standards/>
- GIESCR (2017) Guide to Human Rights Guiding Principles on State Obligations Regarding Private Schools. Retrieved from: See: <http://globalinitiative-escr.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/GP-Leaflet-2017v4English.pdf>
- GPE (2016) *Strategic Plan 2016-2020*. p.3 Retrieved from: <https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2020-strategic-plan>
- GPE (2018) Funding. Accessed from: <https://www.globalpartnership.org/funding>
- GPE (2018b) Haiti. Retrieved from: <https://www.globalpartnership.org/country/haiti>
- GPE (2018c) Pakistan. Retrieved from: <https://www.globalpartnership.org/country/pakistan>
- GPE (2018d) Uganda. Retrieved from: <https://www.globalpartnership.org/country/uganda>
- ILM IDEAS/DfID (2014) Access to Finance for Low Cost Private Schools in Pakistan. Retrieved from: <http://www.educationinnovations.org/research-and-evidence/access-finance-low-cost-private-schools-pakistan>
- ISAPS (2017) Public Financing of Education in Pakistan. Islamabad: Institute of Social and Policy Studies.
- Malik, R. & M. Khan (2015) Public Private Partnerships in Education: Evidence from Punjab and Sindh. Retrieved from: <http://ideaspak.org/people/item/270-public-private-partnerships-in-education-evidence-from-pakistan/>

Menashy, F. (2015) *Tiptoeing around private schools in the Global Partnership for Education*. National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University

Menashy, F. (2017) The limits of multi-stakeholder governance: The case of the Global Partnership for Education and private schooling. *Comparative Education Review*. 61(2), 240-268.

Ramachandran, V. & J. Walz. (2012). *Haiti: Where Has All the Money Gone?* CGD Policy Paper 004. Washington, D.C.: Center for Global Development. Retrieved from: <http://www.cgdev.org/content/publications/detail/1426185>

Singh, K. (2015). *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education*. Human Rights Council.

Srivastava, P. (2016) Questioning the global scaling up of low-fee private schooling: The nexus between business, philanthropy and PPPs. In A. Verger, C. Lubienski, & G. Steiner-Khamsi (Eds.) *The Global Education Industry—World Yearbook of Education 2016*. New York: Routledge.

UNICEF (2018) Haiti Statistics. Retrieved from: https://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/haiti_statistics.html#117

World Bank (2017) Improving Access to Education for the Poor in Haiti. Retrieved from: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/results/2017/04/11/improving-access-to-education-for-the-poor-in-haiti>

World Bank (2015) Four Things You Need to Know About Haiti. Retrieved from: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2015/03/12/four-things-you-need-to-know-about-education-in-haiti>