

**INTEGRATED SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET  
APPRAISAL STAGE**

**Report No.: ISDSA9024**

**Date ISDS Prepared/Updated:** 25-Jul-2014

**Date ISDS Approved/Disclosed:** 25-Jul-2014

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**1. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	Mexico	<b>Project ID:</b>	P147185
<b>Project Name:</b>	Mexico School Based Management Project (P147185)		
<b>Task Team Leader:</b>	Rafael E. De Hoyos Navarr		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	27-Jun-2014	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	22-Oct-2014
<b>Managing Unit:</b>	GEDDR	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Sector(s):</b>	Primary education (90%), Public administration- Education (10%)		
<b>Theme(s):</b>	Education for all (40%), Participation and civic engagement (40%), Managing for development results (20%)		
<b>Is this project processed under OP 8.50 (Emergency Recovery) or OP 8.00 (Rapid Response to Crises and Emergencies)?</b>			No
<b>Financing (In USD Million)</b>			
Total Project Cost:	785.00	Total Bank Financing:	300.00
Financing Gap:	0.00		
<b>Financing Source</b>			<b>Amount</b>
Borrower			485.00
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development			300.00
Total			785.00
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	C - Not Required		
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

**2. Project Development Objective(s)**

The Project's development objective is to improve schools' managerial capacity and parental participation to reduce dropout, repetition and failure rates among schools participating in programs to strengthen school based management.

**3. Project Description**

The Mexican Secretariat of Public Education currently implements the constitutional mandate of strengthening school based management through two programs: PEC and PETC. Starting in academic year 2014-15, the amounts of the school grants and the co-responsibilities attached to them, defined in the operating rules or guidelines of PEC and PETC, will be the same under both programs. In addition, the national strategy to strengthen school based management through an improvement of schools' managerial capacity (as defined by the Government's guidelines on school based management) is applicable to schools participating in both programs. The Project would be comprised of the following three components to support the strengthening of school based management through PEC and PETC: i) school grants to eligible schools to support the implementation of school improvement plans that have been agreed with the parents association; ii) technical assistance to improve schools' managerial capacity; and iii) Project monitoring and evaluation.

#### Component 1: Increasing School Autonomy and Parent Participation (US\$285 million)

Support for strengthening school based management through the provision of school grants to eligible schools to implement school improvement plans (Ruta de Mejora) that have been discussed and agreed with parent associations.

a. School grants. The amounts of the school grants are defined by a resource allocation formula taking two criteria into account: exogenous conditions and performance in quality indicators. The resource allocation formula assigns an initial grant amount to all participating schools based on the level of marginalization of the locality (or community) where the school is located and the total number of students. After the first year, participating schools are eligible for additional resources based on the schools' average year-to-year variation in the national standardized test (until 2013 known as ENLACE) and their retention rate.

b. Eligibility criteria. Under PEC, the Federal Education Authority (AEF) allocates to each State a total budget to finance the school grants based on the number of students in the State and the average level of marginalization of schools. The State Education Authorities (AEL) are responsible for issuing a call for applications to enroll in PEC. Schools are selected based on their school improvement plans and their level of marginalization. Priority is now also given to schools that present low levels of educational achievement and high dropout rates. Under PETC, the AEL selects schools based on the State's strategy for the development of basic education, and the availability of financial resources. The target group for PETC consists of basic education schools with only one shift in primary education and tele-secundarias. Priority is given to schools serving vulnerable populations and those with low achievement levels in the national standardized test and high dropout rates.

c. School improvement plan. The school improvement plan a strategic plan whereby the school's technical council (Consejo Técnico Escolar, CTE) identifies the main challenges and defines the goals and the means through which the goals will be reached. The plans are expected to cover improvements to school management, teaching practices, and social participation to improve student learning. The plan is presented to and agreed with the school's social participation council (Consejo Escolar de Participación Social, CTPS) which includes parents. Under PEC, having a school improvement plan approved by the CTPS and AEL is mandatory to be eligible for a school grant. Each year, the CTE and CTPS evaluate the extent to which they have advanced towards reaching their goals and, when necessary, redefine the plan's strategy.

## Component 2: Improving Schools' Managerial Capacity (US\$10 million)

Component 2 would finance the necessary technical assistance to improve schools' managerial capacity or the school's ability to use existing resources in an effective way to provide better education services. Under the education reform, the role of supervisors and school directors are defined by a set of standards determined by the Federal and Local Education Authorities. The school supervisors are responsible for providing schools with the necessary tools, technical assistance, and advice to improve management practices and ultimately the quality of education services. The school directors are responsible for organizing the CTE to identify the schools' challenges, discuss options for improvement, define measurable and reachable goals, monitor the performance of key indicators towards reaching the goals, and promote social participation, among others. The supervisors' and school directors' diagnosis and performance monitoring activities would be based on a newly developed school dashboard providing them with all the necessary information to undertake these activities. The Project would also finance the development and implementation of a training program for school supervisors and directors on the use of the dashboard, the use of a classroom observation method (Stallings), and the improvement of schools' managerial practices in general.

### Subcomponent 2.1: School Dashboards for Supervisors and School Directors

The Federal Education Authorities, in close collaboration with Local Education Authorities, will develop a dashboard with information generated by the national education management information system (SIGED) and other sources of information. The dashboard will include the following sections: (i) minimum standards, (ii) basic inputs, (iii) school performance indicators, (iv) schools' incidents; (v) management practices, (vi) goals, and (vii) sharing best practices.

The AEF defined the "normalidad mínima" or minimum standards that all schools should observe and that will be monitored by the school director's and supervisor's dashboard:

- a. Number of school days, as defined by the official school calendar
- b. All students should have a teacher for all school days
- c. All teachers should start their class on time
- d. All students should attend school during school day and attend classes on time
- e. All learning material should reach all schools
- f. Most of the time in school should be used in instruction
- g. The teachers should be able to keep students engaged in the learning process for most of the instruction time

The dashboard will also include information on schools' basic inputs, such as the number of classrooms, students per classroom, number of teachers, desks available, functioning toilets, water fountains, and availability of learning materials, among others. A section of the dashboard will contain performance indicators such as failure and repetition rates, dropouts or retention, and learning outcomes in Mathematics and Spanish based on the national standardized test. The dashboard will include a registry of school incidences or reports such as infrastructure maintenance or repair needed, administrative issues, and other exogenous conditions like floods and strike violence, among others.

One of the most important elements of the dashboard will be a section recording the school directors' management practices, such as the use of evaluation results as inputs of the school improvement plan, the number of meetings between the director and teachers to discuss pedagogical strategies to

address the school's main challenges and the strategies carried out by the director to engage parents and the community at large in the learning process, to name a few.

#### Subcomponent 2.2: Training to Improve Schools' Managerial Capacity

A training strategy for school directors, supervisors and parents would complement the design and implementation of the school dashboards. Among the activities to be financed would be the design of the training courses to ensure that all directors and supervisors in schools participating in programs to strengthen school based management know how to use the school dashboard. Perhaps more importantly, the training course will be geared to how an instrument like the dashboard can be used to improve school management practices in general. Design of the training's rollout strategy to prioritize among those most in need would also be financed by this component.

To measure and monitor the fulfillment of keeping students engaged in the learning process (part of the "normalidad mínima"), this component would finance the training of school directors and supervisors in the use of the classroom observation method Stallings. The design of the rollout strategy would be part of the activities financed under this subcomponent.

#### Component 3: Monitoring and Evaluation (US\$5 million)

This component would finance (i) the implementation of a new instrument to measure schools' managerial capacity; (ii) technical assistance to the State to improve implementation capacity; and (iii) an impact evaluation measuring the effects of the activities financed by this Project.

#### Subcomponent 3.1: Measuring Schools' Managerial Capacity

Recent evidence using data for Mexico and elsewhere shows the importance of managerial practices on students' performance (Di Liberto, Schivardi and Sulis (2013), Bloom et. al (2014) and de Hoyos, Garcia and Patrinos (2014)). A starting point in the agenda for improving managerial capacity at the school level is to measure it. Therefore, this Project would finance the piloting, redesign (if necessary), implementation, and comparison of three instruments to measure schools' managerial capacity: "The World Management Survey," developed by the London School of Economics, "Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale," developed by a consulting firm and PEC's own directors' questionnaire. The preferred instrument would identify the most important deficits in schools' managerial capacity vis-à-vis a set of standards defined by the Secretariat of Public Education (Secretaría de Educación Pública, SEP). The design of training to school directors financed under Component 2 will be informed by the results of the first measurement of schools' managerial capacities and will focus on strengthening skills that are highly correlated with learning outcomes in the context of school autonomy.

#### Subcomponent 3.2: Technical Assistance to States to Improve Adherence to PEC's Operating Rules

The activities carried out under the umbrella of technical assistance to the States include supervision visits, national and regional meetings, training, workshops, and knowledge exchanges on best practices intended to support States implementing units' understandings of the operating, financial and implementation rules of the Program.

#### Subcomponent 3.3: Impact Evaluation

An impact evaluation, using randomized control trials, would be implemented in self-selected States to estimate and quantify the effect of the intervention supported by the Project. The outcome variables would include intermediate results or indicators, directly linked with the intervention, such as schools' managerial practices (measured by the newly developed instrument) and, long term indicators measuring the quality of education services: efficiency rates, dropouts, repetition, failure, and learning outcomes of the national standardized test. The evaluation design would define two treatment groups, schools part of PEC, schools part of PETC, and a control group. Given time constraints and willingness of States, the evaluation design would define a treatment group receiving only the technical assistance (Component 2), without the additional resources to the school (Component 1) to test if this would be enough to improve managerial capacities, parents' participation and the quality of education services.

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

The Project would have a national coverage, with a focus on marginal and poor rural localities and in selected poor urban areas. Because of this targeting, the Project would include as potential beneficiaries indigenous communities that represent around 10% of the national population and are among the poorest in the country. Hence, Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10 Indigenous Peoples applies to the Project. Accordingly, an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) was prepared. A consultation process of the IPP was conducted and completed before Appraisal, following this safeguard's principles and the national regulations established by the National Indigenous Commission (CDI) in charge of indigenous affairs in Mexico. After consultation, the final IPP was disclosed following Bank's Disclosure Policy.

#### **5. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

<b>6. Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered?</b>	<b>Explanation (Optional)</b>
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	No	None of the Project's activities is likely to cause any adverse environmental impacts. However, minor works financed by the Project would be implemented according to the environmental, health, and safety guidelines included within the PEC operational rules, which are mandatory for all participating agencies.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	No	The Project would not include construction activities.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	The Project would not be situated near forests and would not have any impact on forests.
Pest Management OP 4.09	No	This Project would not include any procurement of pesticides and would not affect pest management in any way.
Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	No	The Project would not include construction activities.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	Yes	The Project would have a national coverage focusing on marginal poor areas in which indigenous communities are usually located.

		Therefore, the Project triggers this safeguard policy. An Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) was prepared. Consultation of the IPP was conducted before Appraisal and the final IPP was disclosed according to Bank's Disclosure Policy.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12	No	The Project does not include any activity that may cause involuntary resettlement.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	The proposed Project would not involve the construction of dams and would not depend upon an existing dam or the construction of a dam.
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	The proposed Project would not affect international waterways.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/BP 7.60	No	The Project would not be situated in any disputed areas.

## II. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

<p><b>1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:</b></p> <p>The Project would have a positive social impact, as it would improve managerial capacity and parental participation in public basic education schools and contribute to reducing dropout and repetition rates, which are highly correlated with the most poor and vulnerable in the country. In addition, both programs supported by the Project (PEC and PETC) give priority to schools located in marginalized and indigenous schools.</p> <p>The Project is not expected to have any adverse environmental impacts. Like the two previous projects, the proposed Project has received an environmental rating of C and OP/BP on 4.01 Environmental Assessment is not triggered. The Project's proposed school grants may support minor works (such as maintenance and repairs of schools' existing facilities) that cannot cause any type of adverse environmental impacts and that will be conducted according to health and safety guidelines included in the Operational Rules of PEC.</p>
<p><b>2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:</b></p> <p>PEC will continue to target all public basic education schools and to prioritize marginalized and indigenous schools; however, given that projects such as PETC have been introduced more recently and with a stronger focus on schools situated in rural, marginalized and indigenous communities, it is likely that the share of PEC indigenous and PEC marginalized schools would stagnate or decrease slightly. Since the Project would focus on supporting the policy of school based management also through PETC, the overall number of indigenous and marginalized schools is expected to increase.</p>
<p><b>3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.</b></p> <p>N/A</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>

In order to ensure that Mexico's indigenous populations benefit equally from Project interventions, an Indigenous People's Plan (IPP) was developed based on the experiences of the previous operations and the targeting mechanisms defined by PEC and PETC. The IPP discusses i) the targeting of investments; ii) actions for improving the effectiveness of interventions in indigenous schools; and iii) the associated budget for IPP implementation. The IPP helps guarantee that concrete actions are taken to ensure that indigenous and marginalized schools benefit from the Project interventions at least at the same rate as the rest of the schools in the country.
<b>5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.</b>
The IPP has been prepared and its consultation was conducted according to a process approved by the Bank following guidelines under OP 4.10 on Indigenous Peoples in order to identify lessons learned for improving the design and implementation. The IPP was disclosed on the Bank's website and on SEB's website prior to Appraisal, as established in the Bank's Disclosure Policy.

### ***B. Disclosure Requirements***

<b>Indigenous Peoples Development Plan/Framework</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	26-Jun-2014
Date of submission to InfoShop	26-Jun-2014
"In country" Disclosure	
Mexico	26-Jun-2014
<i>Comments:</i> Disclosed on SEP website at <a href="http://basica.sep.gob.mx/pi2014.pdf">http://basica.sep.gob.mx/pi2014.pdf</a>	
<b>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.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	

### ***C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level***

<b>OP/BP 4.10 - Indigenous Peoples</b>			
Has a separate Indigenous Peoples Plan/Planning Framework (as appropriate) been prepared in consultation with affected Indigenous Peoples?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If the whole project is designed to benefit IP, has the design been reviewed and approved by the Regional Social Development Unit or Practice Manager?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>			
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
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 [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]	No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]	NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>			

Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]

### III. APPROVALS

Task Team Leader:	Name: Rafael E. De Hoyos Navarr	
<b><i>Approved By</i></b>		
Practice Manager:	Name: Janet K. Entwistle (PMGR)	Date: 25-Jul-2014