INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET
APPRAISAL STAGE

Report No.: ISDSA8348

Date ISDS Prepared/Updated: 26-Jun-2014

Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed: 28-Jun-2014

I. BASIC INFORMATION

1. Basic Project Data

Country:	Colombia	**Project ID:**	P145353
Project Name:	Improving Upper Secondary and Transition to Tertiary Education Project (P145353)		
Task Team Leader:	Martha Laverde		
Estimated Appraisal Date:	09-May-2014	**Estimated Board Date:**	24-Sep-2014
Managing Unit:	LCSHE	**Lending Instrument:**	Investment Project Financing
Sector(s):	Secondary education (90%), Tertiary education (10%)		
Theme(s):	Improving labor markets (10%), Education for the knowledge economy (90%)		
Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?		No	

Financing (In USD Million)

Total Project Cost:	135.00	Total Bank Financing:	100.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		

Financing Source	Amount
Borrower	35.00
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	100.00
Total	135.00

Environmental Category:	C - Not Required
Is this a Repeater project?	No

2. Project Development Objective(s)

The Project Development Objective is to support the Government in designing and implementing an updated upper secondary education structure in order to increase enrollment and graduation in eligible upper secondary schools, and to increase the number of graduates from these schools that enter tertiary education.

3. Project Description

A. Project Components
The Project would achieve its development objective through implementation of three components.

Component 1. Upper secondary structure design. (Total: an estimated US$ 2.7 million; Bank: US$ 2.7 million). The objectives of this component are to design: (i) programs to improve learning conditions in schools, (ii) programs to improve access and retention in upper secondary and transition to tertiary education, (iii) a school accreditation system and revised student assessment, and to (iv) carry out policy research relevant to upper secondary.

Subcomponent 1.1: Learning conditions. This would finance the design of: (i) revised curricula based on core and socio-emotional competences, and exploratory areas, (ii) a school management strengthening plan, (iii) an in-service teacher training program, (iv) a reformed community social service program for students; (v) student professional counseling and guidance program, and (vi) a framework for ethnic minorities. All these activities would be carried out during the first year of the Project.

Subcomponent 1.2: Programs for retention and transition. It would finance the design of: (i) a Program to increase upper secondary enrollment and retention of upper secondary students from disadvantaged backgrounds. These could include Education Grants on attendance and completion, transportation, and uniforms; (ii) a tertiary education promotion program in upper secondary schools; and (iii) support programs in TEIs providing, inter alia, remedial courses and mentoring during the first two semesters.

Subcomponent 1.3: Accreditation and assessment. This would finance the design of: (i) a national school accreditation system to be piloted in upper secondary schools, (ii) training on evaluation methods for upper secondary upper secondary school staff, and (iii) a revised assessment test for 11th grade students (SABER 11).

Subcomponent 1.4: Policy research. This would finance policy research relevant to upper secondary policy reform, including studies on institutional design and sustainability strategies. This research would feed into the interventions planned under the upper secondary policy reform.

Component 2. Upper secondary structure implementation. (Total: an estimated US$ 118.6 million; Bank: US$ 83.6 million). The objectives of this component are to implement, in the eligible schools of the participating departments: (i) programs to improve learning conditions in schools (ref. sub-component 1.1) and, (ii) programs for retention and transition to improve access and retention in upper secondary and transition to tertiary education, (ref. sub-component 1.2). In addition, the component would include technical assistance strategies to strengthen Departments' institutional and implementation capacity (ref. sub-component 3.1).

The key instrument for the implementation will be the results-based Performance Department Plans (PDPs). The design and implementation of the PDPs would be framed in the context of Upper Secondary Modernization Framework Agreements (Acuerdo para la Modernización de la Educación Media – FAs). FAs will be signed between MEN, each participating department, and the cooperating entity FINDETER. They would cover the period up to the end of the Project, and would include the commitments by each of the three parties regarding the design and implementation of the PDP, including department-specific goals and intermediate indicators with annual targets.

A total of 26 departments would participate in the Project. Targeting of participating departments prioritized those with low access, low retention, and poor student outcomes, based on: (i) low net coverage rates in upper secondary (proxy for access), (ii) low promotion rates in upper secondary (proxy for retention), (iii) low results in the SABER 11 test (proxy for quality), (iv) high secondary enrollment (proxy for number of potential beneficiaries), and (v) high supply of upper secondary schools. In departments with a high proportion of ethnic populations (indigenous and Afro-Colombian peoples), the PDP would be tailored in the framework of an IPP and would also include specific institutional arrangements to embrace local organizations that represent those groups (cabildos, consejos comunitarios), as explained in the social safeguards section. A total of approximately 1,600 public schools would participate in the Project, covering 45% of public schools offering upper secondary education in the participating departments. Eligible schools within the Participating departments would be selected based on: (i) high poverty (Colombian multidimensional poverty index at the municipal level), (ii) low quality (2013 index based on SABER 11 results calculated by ICFES), and (iii) high number of potential beneficiaries (enrollment in upper secondary education and a minimum of institutional capacity).

Component 3. Capacity building, monitoring, and evaluation. (Total: an estimated US$ 13.7 million; Bank: US$13.7 million). The objective of this component is to (i) provide technical assistance to build the capacity of agents involved in the Project; (ii) carry out Project coordination, supervision, and management activities; (iii) design and implement a monitoring and evaluation plan, and (iv) design and implement a communications strategy.

Subcomponent 3.1: Capacity building. This would finance technical assistance to be provided by MEN to departments, TEIs, and schools. The technical assistance program would support the drafting of a study on the status of upper secondary education in participating departments, the design of PDPs, the design and revision of programs for retention and transition, school management strengthening interventions, the communication strategy, and the development of EEPs, among others.

Subcomponent 3.2: Project management, monitoring and impact evaluation: It would finance Project coordination, supervision, and management. This subcomponent would also finance studies, applied research, audits, monitoring and impact evaluation.

Subcomponent 3.3: Communications strategy. It would finance the development and implementation of communication strategies to raise awareness of the need for an upper secondary reform among the actors in the education system.

B. Project Financing
The proposed lending instrument would be Investment Project Financing (IPF).

Project Cost and Financing

Total Project financing requirements are estimated at US$135 million. The Project would be financed as follows: US$100 million through a loan from the Bank, the remaining US$35 million through contributions by the Departments (TEs).

C.   Series of Project Objective and Phases (If Applicable)

D.   Lessons Learned and Reflected in the Project Design (Optional)

The Project design takes into account the lessons that MEN and the local governments learned upon implementing Phases I and II of the Rural Education Project, as well as the Antioquia Upper Secondary Education Project. The experiences of the Education Grants to upper secondary students in the Antioquia Project provide good lessons in terms of the impact of this type of strategy to increase access and retention, but also lessons in terms of administrative arrangements to manage programs like this at a large scale. From the Rural Education Project the main lesson included in this Project is the teacher training strategy developed and implemented during the last two years of the Rural Education Project. This Project also took into account the institutional arrangements and project management structure.

Coordination throughout all layers of government allowed each actor to specialize in what they do best. MEN provided national guidelines and technical assistance, while departments, in coordination with schools and municipalities, designed implementation plans tailored to local needs. Quality control and progress towards goals set in the plans were ensured through the signing and enforcing of agreements between schools, subnational governments, and MEN.

34.   The Project would also revisit the strategy of comprehensive intervention in schools, as seen in the Antioquia Upper Secondary Education Project and the Rural Education Project. The strategy focuses on strengthening school capacity at all levels, improving classroom management and teaching practices through in-service coaching and training, while providing training and technical assistance to school management.

Moreover, performance agreements like those used in the Rural Education Project have been built-in to ensure both the needs of the subnational entities and to the national development priorities, based on agreed results and accountability mechanisms. Bank best practice experiences from other countries in the region and the world would be incorporated.

Finally, the design and implementation of this upper secondary reform would benefit from recent and successful experiences worldwide. During preparation, the experiences of Poland, Finland, Mexico, and other OECD countries were taken as valuable references, and the Bank has played a key role in facilitating knowledge exchange. This Project has paid particular attention to the cases of Poland and Finland, specifically on the delay of technical education tracking, and the focus on providing all upper secondary students with a common set of skills, thus giving everyone the opportunity to reach tertiary education.

4. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)

Indigenous peoples, afro-Colombians and the socioeconomically disadvantaged population are among the main beneficiaries of the Project. The average age for the indigenous and afro-Colombian population is lower than the national average; the distribution is especially skewed towards the bottom of the pyramid, thus making the indigenous and afro-Colombian school and college-aged cohorts larger relative to the rest of the age groups. The school attendance levels for these two groups are lower than the national average: In 2005, whereas nationwide school attendance for 12-17 year olds was 77.8%, the figure was 58.8% and 77.1% for indigenous peoples and afro-Colombians respectively. Attendance is equally low for 18-24 year olds, with only 16.9% of the indigenous population and 23.7% of afro-Colombians currently attending school or HEIs, compared to 27.1% nationwide. The indigenous population has the lowest level of literacy (71.4%), followed by Afro-

Colombians, who show results similar to the national average (88.8%). The poor results for the indigenous population are partly due to inadequate education infrastructure in indigenous areas, generally limited to primary education. There is additionally a latent tension between the Western-style education and the indigenous structures, which is evidenced in different curricula and educational methods, together with the perception among indigenous people that enrolling in upper secondary means abandoning their traditional customs and way of life.

5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists

Carlos Alberto Molina Prieto (LCSSO)

6. Safeguard Policies	Triggered?	Explanation (Optional)
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	No	This policy is not triggered as the nature and scope of the Project activities are not expected to generate adverse environmental impacts.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	This policy is not triggered since no impact is expected on natural habitats.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	This policy is not triggered given that the Project will not finance activities that affect forests.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	This policy is not triggered because the Project will not finance the purchase or use of pesticides.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The policy is not triggered because there are no Project activities that will impact the quality or management of physical cultural resources as defined under the policy.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	The policy is triggered because indigenous peoples (and Afro-Colombians) are present in the Project area and could benefit from targeted activities within the Project. The social assessment identified measures to improve access, retention and outcomes for indigenous peoples and afro-Colombians. Based on the social assessment, an IPMF was prepared, which will focus on further strengthening the Borrower's safeguards capacity where it is necessary and laying out the measures and policies that should be expanded or discontinued. The IPMF was consulted with relevant national indigenous and afro-Colombian organizations and incorporated their feedback and recommendations accordingly and in line with the Project's scope. The IPMF will be disclosed prior to appraisal. EEPs (ethnic education plans) would be developed in parallel to the Department Plans,

		with the objective of adapting the Project activities to the needs and context of each ethnic group. They would also include specific institutional arrangements to embrace local organizations that represent those groups (cabildos, consejos comunitarios). For the purpose of the policy EEPs are considered Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPPs)
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	This policy is not triggered because the Project activities will not require the involuntary taking of land that would result in the impacts covered under OP 4.12.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The policy is not triggered because the Project will not support the construction or rehabilitation of dams nor will it support investments which rely on the operation of existing dams.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The policy is not triggered since the Project will not affect any international waterways as defined under the policy.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The policy is not triggered because the Project will not affect disputed areas as defined under the policy.

II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

A. *Summary of Key Safeguard Issues*

1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:
The Project aims to improve learning conditions, increase upper secondary access and retention, and increase transition to tertiary education, including for ethnic populations. Whereas the probability of negative impacts is considered low, the following issues should be kept in mind during implementation: (i) the creation of false expectations or misinformation among these minorities of the scope and timing of benefits that they will receive from the Project, and in particular from the IPMF, (ii) the activities implemented within the IPMF are considered marginal, and fail to address the systematic barriers to access, retention, and learning conditions of upper secondary education for indigenous peoples.
2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:
From a social safeguards perspective the only potential long term indirect impact related to the Project would be if the increased access and opportunities for indigenous peoples and Afro-Colombians to education were to result in a human resource drain from indigenous territories and a cumulative and gradual loss of cultural identity.
3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.
Not relevant.
4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an

assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.

A Social Assessment (SA) was carried out during the preparation stage of the Project. This SA, focusing on potential beneficiaries, but especially on members of ethnic groups, identified risks and made recommendations and suggestions consistent with the policy of the MEN and the Bank. The SA considered three research phases: (i) characterization of youths currently enrolled in school, (ii) gauging, through analytical work and field interviews (including focus groups), of expectations and perceptions of upper secondary and tertiary education, (iii) feedback from indigenous and Afro-Colombian organizations through meetings and workshops, (iv) design of mitigation measures, based on the potential heterogeneity of Project impact. The results indicate that there is a gap between urban (84.5 %) and rural (54.5%) educational coverage, a situation exacerbated by greater difficulties in finding a job, and thus higher unemployment, in rural areas. Gender equality continues to be a challenge, but progress has been made. Participation in secondary education is higher for women, who also show lower attrition rates. However, women score lower in achievement tests (SABER 11), which is linked to lower wages and higher unemployment later on.

The SA focused on students belonging to ethnic minorities (Indigenous: 3.43 % and Afro-Colombians: 10.62%), finding that the indigenous population has the lowest level of literacy (71.4%), followed by Afro-Colombians, who show results similar to the national average (88.8%). The poor results for the indigenous population are partly due to inadequate education infrastructure in indigenous areas, generally limited to primary education. There is additionally a latent tension between the Western-style education and the indigenous structures, which is evidenced in different curricula and educational methods, together with the perception among indigenous people that enrolling in upper secondary means abandoning their traditional customs and way of life.

Safeguards. An existing MEN report on the demographics and educational coverage of ethnic groups identified ten departments with significant ethnic minority populations. Of these departments, some have indigenous populations, others are mixed, and others have a predominantly Afro-Colombian ethnic population. Thus, the Indigenous Peoples Safeguard (OP 4.10) would be triggered, with a special emphasis on the collective and participatory design of EEPsfor upper secondary education. As a first stage, before Project Appraisal, an Indigenous People Management Framework (IPMF) was formulated and consulted with a representative group of ethnic organizations. The IPMF details the processes and steps to develop the upper secondary EEPs in each Department, which would be considered as the IPPs for the purpose of Bank policy.

The Project Triggers OP/BP 4.10 (Indigenous Peoples) because indigenous peoples (and afro-Colombians) are present in the project area and could benefit from improved targeting of systems for upper education financing. EEPs. The design and implementation of EEPs would follow four steps: (i) dialogue and consultation with indigenous organizations on the concept design of the EEP, pedagogical model, implementation arrangements and community involvement; (ii) design of the EEP, including revised curricula, study guides, and selection of schools, teachers, and administrators; (iii) piloting and implementation of EEPs in eligible schools; (iv) implementation of training plans for indigenous teachers and administrators, this last step being applicable only to communities that already have an EEP and wish to adapt it to the Project. The Project would also include an impact evaluation of EEPs and the drafting of general guidelines to be applied in future EEPs. For coordinating the design and implementation of EEPs, MEN would sign bilateral

agreements with 4 indigenous and 4 Afro-Colombian organizations for the design and implementation of EEPs, all of which must have voluntarily chosen to participate in the Project. Organizations would be selected based on their previous experience in the preparation and execution of EEPs. Lessons learned from the Rural Education Project would provide useful insights.

The Project is classified as category C. It does not include construction or rehabilitation of infrastructure, therefore the OP/BP 4.01 on Environmental Assessment is not triggered

5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.

The IPMF is being consulted with organizations representing ethnic groups at the national level. One workshop has been carried out with Afro-Colombian organizations and one with indigenous organizations. The first phase of the consultation would include the presentation of the Project and a draft IPMF, and the gathering of feedback and recommendations from participants to adapt the Project to ethnic sociocultural contexts. During the second phase, the Project would be presented again in the ten departments with significant ethnic populations, and consulted with regional organizations. The inputs and feedback received during this second consultation will be reflected in the IPMF. During the implementation phase, the EEPs which will be collectively designed and consulted with the ethnic organizations that choose to participate in the Project. The Project would also consider additional plans for minority ethnic groups within Participating departments that choose to participate in the Project.

The MEN has an Ethnic Group Attention Office, in charge of monitoring and assisting DSEs and ethnic groups in the design, implementation and scaling up of Ethnic Education Programs (EEPs) for primary and lower secondary levels. Those EEPs contain the vision, curriculum, expectations and academic pathways for the education of children and youths belonging to ethnic groups, always with the objective of respecting their sociocultural context. To date, the Office has developed and implemented 40 EEPs for primary and lower secondary education, mostly for indigenous peoples; in 20 of these pedagogical structures have been formulated and are being piloted. This Office would assist Project management during preparation and implementation, especially in terms of organizing consultations with indigenous and Afro-Colombian groups. The Office is institutionally strong because it leads the national working group on education, where five national-level ethnic organizations are represented (Confederación Indígena Tayrona - CIT; Organización de los Pueblos Indígenas de la Amazonia Colombiana - OPIAC; Organización Nacional Indígena - ONIC; Autoridades Indígenas de Colombia – AICO; y ASCOBA, Corporación Jorge Artel, Old Town Raizal y FEDECAP, representante de los afrocolombianos, raizales y palenqueros).). The ongoing Rural Education Project has a large experience working with these ethnic organizations and has supported more than 40 indigenous and afro Colombian sub-projects.

B. Disclosure Requirements

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework	
Date of receipt by the Bank	19-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	24-Jun-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Colombia	24-Jun-2014
Comments: http://www.mineducacion.gov.co/1621/w3-article-235111.html	

If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/ Audit/or EMP.

If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:

C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level

OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples			
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [×]	No [　]	NA [　]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Sector Manager review the plan?	Yes [　]	No [　]	NA [　]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Sector Manager?	Yes [　]	No [　]	NA [×]
The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information			
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [×]	No [　]	NA [　]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [×]	No [　]	NA [　]
All Safeguard Policies			
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [×]	No [　]	NA [　]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [×]	No [　]	NA [　]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [×]	No [　]	NA [　]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [×]	No [　]	NA [　]

III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Martha Laverde	
Approved By		
Sector Manager:	Name: Reema Nayar (SM)	Date: 28-Jun-2014