SELECTION PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA FOR BENEFICIARY PROVINCES, DISTRICTS AND SCHOOLS

1.   **Selection criteria.** MOET identified and endorsed 13 criteria for selecting the districts to be covered by the project from among the 49 provinces in the Northern Mountains, Central Highlands, and Mekong Delta area. These criteria were shared with representatives of the potential project provinces at the TA Inception Workshop held in Hanoi on 5 July 2013. These 13 criteria are:

(i)   Percentage of poor households;
(ii)   Percentage of ethnic minorities in the districts;
(iii)   Participation in LSEMDRP-I or Lower Secondary Education Development Project (LSEDP) (Phase 1) or LSEDP (Phase 2) or included as beneficiaries of approved programs or investment projects funded by national budget sources or other international organizations;
(iv)   Gross enrollment rate (GER) for LSE;
(v)   NER for LSE;
(vi)   NER for LSE (female);
(vii)   NER for EM;
(viii)   Dropout rate for LSE;
(ix)   Promotion rate for LSE;
(x)   Repetition rate for LSE;
(xi)   Number of communes with no LSE facilities;
(xii)   Number of students who need to stay in semi-boarding or boarding facilities vs. total number of students; and
(xiii)   Class/classroom ratio at LSE.

2.   Due to the unique socioeconomic and geographic conditions of the coastal area, only 11 criteria were adopted, namely:

(i)   Number of typhoons/storms directly affecting the districts within the past 5 years (from 2007–2012);
(ii)   Number of schools affected by typhoons/storms within the past 5 years;
(iii)   Percentage of poor households;
(iv)   GER for LSE;
(v)   NER for LSE;
(vi)   Dropout rate for LSE;
(vii)   Completion rate for LSE;
(viii)   Repetition rate for LSE;
(ix)   Class/classroom ratio at LSE; and
(x)   Number of classrooms to be replaced at LSSs.
(xi)   Typical characteristics (if available).

3.   The identification of provinces and districts in the coastal area involved three steps: (i) identification of provinces; (ii) identification of target districts based on data collected, recommendations of the provinces, and need for infrastructure to replace damaged or temporary facilities; and (iii) selection of LSSs in the target districts.

4.   **Selection procedure.** The procedure for selecting the districts in the Northern Mountainous areas, Central Highland area, and Mekong Delta area followed a four-step process: (i) survey of target provinces; (ii) scoring of target districts; (iii) ranking of districts; and

(iv) random field survey. To collect data and information from the potential target provinces, survey forms were developed based on the selection criteria. The survey forms were then sent to the provinces to collect the needed data and statistics. Subsequently, the data provided by the provinces were analyzed by the PPTA PMU. Thereafter, the PMU assessed the eligibility of the districts through a scoring system by assigning a score to each of the criteria. Subsequently, the points were added to arrive at a total score for the districts. The total scores were then used to rank the districts from the lowest (most disadvantaged) to the highest (least disadvantaged). Based on the ranking, a list of potential districts to be included in the project was prepared.

5.   Based on the scores of the shortlisted districts, the provinces that will be included in the project were identified using the following criteria: (i) focused investment to obtain maximum impact; (ii) efficiency of investment; (iii) implementation capacity; and (iv) other related factors. The last step in the selection process was obtaining approval from the Government and ADB for the chosen districts and provinces.

6.   **Results of the analysis and ranking of districts in three regions.** Altogether there are 336 districts, towns, and cities within the 32 provinces and 1 city in the Northern Mountainous area (14 provinces), Central Highlands including 1 province in the coastal provinces (6 provinces), and the Mekong River Delta region (12 provinces and 1 city). The districts were subjected to evaluation and ranking according to 13 selection criteria based on the following procedure and steps: (i) scoring of each criterion for all districts; (ii) adding of all scores (i.e., points) for all the districts; (iii) ranking of the districts based on the total score from lowest (most disadvantaged) to highest (least disadvantaged); and (iv) identification of districts to be included in the project based on their condition and needs and the availability of loan funds for classroom requirements for each of the districts.

7.   **Scores assigned to the 13 selection criteria.** Out of the 13 criteria, nine were assigned a maximum score of 10 points based on their priority under the project, while four were assigned a maximum score of 5 points as they were rated lower on the priority scale. The maximum score per criterion is 5 or 10, depending on the priority of the criteria, while the minimum score is 1. The criteria on number of schools, which have participated in ODA projects, and number of schools approved for investment in the period, 2013–2015, received a negative score (-5) and were not considered under the project. The total score for the 13 criteria is 120, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Scores Assigned to the Selection Criteria

Criterion	No. of Points Assigned
Percentage of poor households	10
Percentage of EMs in the district	5
a. Participated in LSEMDRP-I or LSEDP Phase 1 or 2	-5
b. Included as beneficiaries of approved programs or investment projects funded by national budget sources or other international organizations	-5
GER for LSE	10
NER for LSE	10
NER for LSE (female)	5
NER for EM	10
Dropout rate for LSE	10
Promotion rate	10
Repetition rate for LSE	10
Number of communes with no LSE facilities	5
Number of students who need to stay in semi-boarding or boarding facilities vs. total number of students	10

Criterion	No. of Points Assigned
Class/classroom ratio at LSE	10
a. Number of classes/total number of permanent classroom facilities	10
b. Number of subject classrooms which are still needed (shortage of special facilities): chemistry and biology laboratories and libraries	10
c. Need for teacher housing facilities based on the ratio of number of teachers with no teacher housing facilities for accommodation/total number of teachers who need teacher housing facilities	5
Total	**120**

EM = ethnic minorities, GER = gross enrollment rate, LSE = lower secondary education, LSEDP = lower secondary education development project, LSEMDRP = lower secondary education for the most disadvantaged regions project, NER = net enrollment rate.

8. **Verification and cleaning of data provided by DOETs.** In order to ensure that the data received from the provinces were accurate, the PMU team reviewed the data set, identified any inconsistency or incongruence of the data, and made the necessary revisions and adjustments to the data, as explained below.

(i) Several data sets were calculated using inconsistent formulas resulting in the difference in calculation, particularly of the ratios. Hence, all ratios were verified and revised, as necessary, prior to scoring.

(ii) Errors in the number of LSSs, which participated in the Second LSEDP and LSEMDRP-I were revised.

(iii) If the number of LSSs was not less than the number of communes, the ratio of communes, which have no facilities for LSSs, was set at 0.

(iv) Any NER figure, which is higher than 100%, was set at 100%. If the NER figure is too small, it was set at 70% for calculation purposes, which is the rate based on MOET Minister's Decision No.26/2001/QD-BGD-ĐT dated 5 July 2001on standard regulations for verifying NER to comply with the requirement for universalization of LSE.

(v) If a district has a percentage of poor households, which is higher than that of the poorest district, the percentage was set at the same value as that of the poorest district in that province in accordance with *Decision No.749/QD-LDTBXH* dated 13 May 2013.

9. **Results of the assessment.** Among the 336 district units of the 33 provinces, 56 district units were not considered. Those included 29 provincial cities, 20 towns, and 5 districts of the central cities, which are already well-developed and have higher level of socioeconomic development. In addition, two districts were not considered because the LSSs in these two districts have been included under an approved plan for investment under other financial sources for the period, 2013–2015. Consequently, a total of 280 districts were scored and ranked as potential beneficiaries under the project.

10. **Scoring and ranking of districts.** Scoring was carried out following two categories:

(i) If the data are high and priority for support is high, then the points will be high. The selection criteria under this category include: 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13b, and 13c (see **Table 1**).

(ii) If the data are high, but priority for support is low, then the points will be low. The selection criteria under this category include: 3, 3b, 4, 5, 6, 9, 13, and 13a (see **Table 1**).

11.   **Results of selection of districts and provinces.** The scoring process resulted in the ranking of districts from highest (most disadvantaged) to lowest (least disadvantaged). It was found that the poorest 100 districts belong to 27 provinces. Out of the 27 provinces, 10 provinces have only one or two districts under their jurisdiction. In order to ensure focused investment of the proposed project for greater impact and to avoid spreading the resources among low-priority provinces and districts, these 10 provinces will not be included under the project. Hence, only 86 disadvantaged districts in the remaining 17 provinces were included in the project, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: List of Target Provinces and Districts

Area/ Province	No. of Districts	District
Northern Mountainous Area (52 districts)		
Hoa Binh	4	Kim Boi, Mai Chau, Lac Son, Cao Phong.
Son La	9	Bac Yen, Moc Chau, Muong La, Phu Yen, Quynh Nhai, Song Ma, Sop Cop, Thuan Chau and Van Ho (newly separated from Moc Chau districts)
Dien Bien	8	Tua Chua, Muong Cha, Dien Bien, Muong Ang, Tuan Giao, Dien Bien Dong, Muong Nhe and Huyen Nam Po (newly established due to separation from Muong Nhe and Muong Cha districts)
Lao Cai	7	Bac Ha, Bao Yen, Bat Xat, Muong Khuong, Sa Pa, Si Ma Cai, Van Ban.
Yen Bai	5	Yen Binh, Van Yen, Van Chan, Mu Cang Chai, TramTau.
Ha Giang	5	Dong Van, Hoang Su Phi, Meo Vac, Quan Ba, Yen Minh.
Cao Bang	5	Phuc Hoa, Thong Nong, Trung Khanh, Bao Lam, Bao Lac.
Thai Nguyen	3	Dinh Hoa, Phu Luong, Vo Nhai.
Phu Tho	3	Yen Lap, Thanh Son, Tan Son.
Lang Son	3	Binh Gia, Cao Loc, Dinh Lap.
Central Highland Area (21 districts)		
Dak Lak	6	Cu Kuin, Lac, Krong Bong, Ea'Hleo, Krong Buk, Krong Pac.
Gia Lai	9	Dak Doa, IaGrai, Mang Yang, KongChro, Duc Co, ChuProng, Ia Pa, Krong Pa, PhuThien.
Ninh Thuan	6	Bac Ai, Ninh Son, Ninh Hai, Ninh Phuoc, Thuan Bac, Thuan Nam.
Mekong Delta Area (15 districts)		
Bac Lieu	4	Vinh Loi, Gia Rai, Dong Hai, Hong Dan.
Kien Giang	5	An Minh, Go Quao, Hon Dat, Kien Hai, Giong Rieng.
Soc Trang	3	My Xuyen, Nga Nam, Tran De.
Tra Vinh	3	Cau Ke, Cau Ngang, Tra Cu.
Central North and Central Coastal Area (47 districts)		
Thanh Hoa	4	Nga Son, Hau Loc, Tinh Gia, Quang Xuong
Nghe An	4	Nghi Loc, Hung Nguyen, Nam Dan, Thanh Chuong
Ha Tinh	5	Ky Anh, Huong Son, Can Loc, Huong Khe, Vu Quang
Quang Binh	4	Quang Trach, Bo Trach, Le Thuy, Quang Ninh
Quang Tri	4	Hai Lang, Vinh Linh, Gio Linh, Trieu Phong.
Thua Thien Hue	5	Phu Vang, PhuLoc, Quang Đien, Phong Đien, Huong Tra
Quang Nam	4	Bac Tra My, Thang Binh, Nong Son, Tien Phuoc.
Quang Ngai	4	Binh Son, Tu Nghia, Duc Pho, Mo Duc.
Binh Dinh	5	Tuy Phuoc, Phu Cat, Phu My, Hoai Nhon, Tay Son.
Phu Yen	4	Song Cau, Tuy An, Dong Hoa, Tay Hoa.
Binh Thuan	4	Ham Thuan Bac, Duc Linh, Bac Binh, Tanh Linh

12.   **Criteria for selecting beneficiary LSSs.** The final step in the selection process after obtaining MOET's approval of the districts and provinces was to identify the beneficiary schools in each district according to the following criteria:

(i)   Shortage of classrooms: number of classes vs. number of available classrooms (semi-permanent and above type) > 1;

(ii)   Shortage of boarding facilities for students: high ratio of students who stay in their home, number of students who need to stay in boarding facilities;

(iii)   Shortage of teacher housing facilities: high ratio of teachers who are staying in boarding facilities vs. number of teachers who need to stay in boarding facilities;

(iv)   LSSs without library;

(v)   LSSs without laboratory or subject room facilities;

(vi)   Typical characteristics (if available): LSSs which did not receive investment support under LSEMDRP-I or LSSs which have not been approved to be included in a plan for new construction or upgrading of facilities by other program/project investments in the period, 2013–2015.