**BASELINE REPORT ON THE QUALITY OF PRIMARY EDUCATION
IN SIERRA LEONE:**

**Teacher Absence, School Inputs and School Supervision in District Education
Committee and Government-Assisted Schools in Sierra Leone**

Draft 22 March 2006

Report prepared by Rachel Glennerster, Shehla Imran and Katherine Whiteside

Section 1: Overview

This report summarizes the results of a nationwide survey of primary schools designed to measure the impact on school quality of the decentralization of primary education in Sierra Leone. Using unannounced visits to schools, the survey captures baseline information about key, objective measures of school quality including teacher absence and provision of supplies. Questions also cover teacher activities in the classroom, school facilities, supervisory visits and financing. Because we aim to later examine what changes when the supervision of schools decentralizes, the survey focuses on indicators that the Local Councils may be able to influence by enhancing school oversight and management.

The sample of schools for this survey was chosen with the objective of measuring the impact of decentralization and is not a representative sample of all primary schools in Sierra Leone. In particular, there is an over representation of District Education Committee (DEC) schools compared to the total population of schools in the country. In addition, equal numbers of schools were sampled in each Local Council area, while the actual population of schools varies greatly by district. Nevertheless, within these categories (e.g. DEC schools in Bonthe District or non-DEC schools in Bombali District) the sample of schools was chosen randomly so the survey does give a good picture of the status of schools of different types in different parts of the country.

Section 2: Background

With the Local Government Act, 2004, the Government of Sierra Leone commenced a national decentralization process with the goal of establishing an inclusive, transparent and accountable system of local government. Funded by Institutional Reform and Capacity Building Project (IRCBP), the Decentralization Secretariat (DecSec) was created within the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development to help coordinate this process, providing intensive capacity building to the 19 newly elected Local Councils.

Primary education stands among the first functions scheduled to devolve to the Local Councils. There are three types of primary schools within Sierra Leone—DEC schools, government-assisted schools and private schools. The DEC schools account for around 9% of primary schools nationally, and were previously managed by local government before former President Siaka Stevens centralized the state.[1] According to the statutory instrument, management of DEC primary schools devolves to the Local Councils in 2005. In practice, devolution of DEC schools is behind schedule, and may occur simultaneously with the devolution of government-assisted schools (which account for approximately 80% of primary schools) for the 2006-07 academic year. Specifically, the statutory instrument identifies the following functions to devolve to the Local Councils for DEC schools in 2005: i) recruitment of teachers; ii) payment of staff salaries; iii)

---

[1] Proportion of DEC and government-assisted schools from "Status of Education in Sierra Leone: Report of the Rapid School Survey, December 2001" by Brahm Fleisch.

provision of teaching and learning materials; iv) payment of school fee subsidies; v) provision of furniture; vi) rehabilitation and reconstruction of schools; and viii) staff development (study leave). To establish pre-devolution baseline data on these topics, DecSec fielded a quality of primary education survey in June 2005.

The primary objective of the baseline IRCBP School Survey is to assess the performance of primary schools in the above areas under the current centralized management system. It aims to provide the Local Councils with information on challenges in school supervision to help them improve the management of primary education services. A follow-up survey will investigate any changes the Local Councils may have been able to enact by increasing the quality and intensity of school supervision in these areas. To do so, the sample covers both DEC and government-assisted schools to establish a panel for difference-in-difference analysis of devolution impacts.[2]

Section 3: Methodology

The sample of 296 primary schools was selected from the Account General Department's (AGD's) teacher payroll list for April 2005. A random number for each primary school was assigned and then the list was sorted by Local Council area. The first eight DEC and eight government-assisted schools were selected within each Local Council to be surveyed (however some of the Town Councils contain fewer than 8 DEC schools). Yet in practice, when evaluators arrived to undertake the survey they found that some schools on the list were no longer functioning and others were of a different type (DEC versus government-assisted) than on the AGD's list. For non-functioning schools, where possible, replacement schools were chosen at random; otherwise these were counted as missing observations.

The survey covers a variety of topics, including teacher absenteeism, teacher activity in the classroom, class size, supply of furniture and textbooks, state of infrastructure, public display of information, inspection visits, School Management Committees and Parent Teacher Associations, school finances, and teacher qualifications. Survey teams made two surprise visits to each school to capture estimates of teacher absence and teacher activity. As a quality assurance mechanism, each school was visited by two separate survey teams that collected some of the same information. Supervisors participated in the field testing of the survey, and supervisors and enumerators underwent a week of intensive training before starting data collection.

---

[2] If management of DEC and non-DEC schools devolve simultaneously, a difference-in-difference analytic framework will no longer be relevant.

Table 1: Number of schools surveyed by type and Local Council

Local Council	DEC	Gov't-Assisted	Total
BO DISTRICT	9	8	17
BO TOWN	7	9	16
BOMBALI DISTRICT	7	9	16
BONTHE DISTRICT	8	8	15
BONTHE TOWN	2	7	9
FREETOWN	8	8	16
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	8	8	16
KAMBIA DISTRICT	8	8	16
KENEMA DISTRICT	8	9	17
KENEMA TOWN	8	8	15
KOIDU TOWN	5	8	12
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	7	8	15
KONO DISTRICT	8	7	15
MAKENI TOWN	8	8	16
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	8	8	14
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	6	9	15
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	7	8	15
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	8	8	16
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	8	8	16
NATIONAL	138	154	287

Section 4: First Impressions

4.1 Are the schools open?

Survey teams made unannounced visits to schools and recorded what they saw immediately upon their arrival—in particular whether the school was open and whether teachers were in their classes teaching. Survey teams visited two schools per day, aiming to arrive at the first school at 09:00, and at the second between 12:00 and 13:00 for single shift schools or 14:00 for double-shift schools. The element of surprise was important for capturing as accurate estimates of school and teacher activity as possible. There is no clear evidence that behavior changed in response to the initial visits. In particular, estimates of teacher absence using data from the first visit were actually higher than those using data from the second visit, suggesting that teachers did not respond to the first visit by sharply changing behavior.

Overall, Table 2 below shows that three percent of schools were closed at the time of the visits, averaged over all local councils and over both visits. There is considerable variation between districts however, with seven percent of schools closed in Pujehun while in several districts all the schools were open.

Table 2: Percentage of schools closed, combining both visits

Local Council	Percentage closed	Total no. of school visits
BO DISTRICT	3%	32
BO TOWN	6%	31
BOMBALI DISTRICT	6%	31
BONTHE DISTRICT	3%	31
BONTHE TOWN	6%	18
FREETOWN	0%	31
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	6%	32
KAMBIA DISTRICT	0%	32
KENEMA DISTRICT	3%	31
KENEMA TOWN	3%	30
KOIDU TOWN	0%	25
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	0%	30
KONO DISTRICT	0%	29
MAKENI TOWN	0%	32
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	0%	30
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	3%	30
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	7%	30
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	0%	32
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	3%	32
NATIONAL	3%	569

4.2 What are teachers doing?

Enumerators toured up to eight classrooms in each school. At each classroom, they recorded what the teacher was doing immediately upon their arrival. Table 3 below shows that fewer than half of the operating classrooms actually had a teacher inside teaching. Note that this does not include classes that have been sent home nor absorbed into another class because the teacher is not present that day. It thus understates the actual total of non-functioning classes. In 20 percent of cases, teachers are organizing or doing paper work—i.e. work that does not directly involve teaching. The difference between Local Council areas is very striking: only 21 percent of teachers in Kenema District were actively teaching at the time of visit, compared to 79 percent in Freetown.

Table 3: Teaching activity, all classes weighted equally

Local Council	Teaching	Organizing	Disciplining	Paperwork	Idle	Scheduled break	Teaching second class	Cannot find teacher	Accompanying enumerator
BO DISTRICT	37%	12%	6%	19%	0%	10%	9%	7%	1%
BO TOWN	43%	32%	6%	1%	4%	0%	4%	4%	4%
BOMBALI DISTRICT	61%	6%	0%	5%	0%	2%	13%	10%	3%
BONTHE DISTRICT	35%	2%	2%	7%	8%	2%	10%	29%	3%
BONTHE TOWN	40%	22%	0%	16%	4%	0%	2%	16%	0%
FREETOWN	79%	12%	0%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	0%
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	53%	8%	8%	6%	5%	1%	3%	10%	6%
KAMBIA DISTRICT	62%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	27%	0%
KENEMA DISTRICT	21%	9%	1%	8%	4%	3%	15%	30%	10%
KENEMA TOWN	46%	15%	7%	9%	7%	7%	5%	3%	0%
KOIDU TOWN	42%	6%	1%	28%	0%	0%	13%	9%	0%
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	41%	3%	6%	5%	1%	0%	11%	28%	5%
KONO DISTRICT	30%	8%	1%	15%	1%	11%	17%	16%	0%
MAKENI TOWN	75%	3%	0%	5%	0%	0%	3%	11%	3%
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	23%	20%	0%	20%	1%	1%	19%	15%	0%
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	48%	3%	0%	1%	1%	0%	23%	21%	3%
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	31%	0%	0%	4%	1%	0%	29%	28%	8%
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	27%	38%	1%	12%	0%	1%	17%	4%	0%
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	58%	6%	1%	3%	1%	3%	15%	13%	1%
NATIONAL	45%	11%	2%	9%	2%	2%	12%	15%	2%

4.3 Teacher Absence

At each school, the enumerators compiled a roster of teachers who teach in the school, noting who was present and who absent at the time of visit. They tracked up to a maximum of 8 teachers; if there were more than 8 teachers at the school, they selected the first 8 by alphabetical order for inclusion on the roster. Table 3 shows that of the 3,359 teacher observations covered by the survey, there were 741 cases of teacher absence at the time of visits—i.e. 22 percent of teachers were absent. For head teachers, Table 4 records 111 cases of absence out of the total of 409 observations (27% absent).

By far the most common reason given for the absence was official teaching-related duty such as attending training/meeting or collecting salaries/supplies. This is particularly true for headteachers where 45% of absences are for official teaching related duties. Authorized leave and illness were the next most common reasons. It should be noted that these were the stated reasons and no attempt was made to verify their accuracy.

Table 4: Teacher Absence, combined visits, weighted by teacher

Local Council	Total Teachers	Percent Absent	Official Teaching	Official Non-Teaching Duty	Assigned Elsewhere	Expected to Arrive	Left Early	Out Sick	Authorized Leave	Unauthorized Leave	Other / Don't Know
BO DISTRICT	201	15%	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	16%	65%	3%	10%
BO TOWN	226	10%	0%	4%	0%	17%	0%	22%	26%	4%	26%
BOMBALI DISTRICT	159	21%	6%	3%	0%	3%	0%	27%	52%	3%	6%
BONTHE DISTRICT	155	19%	37%	0%	0%	3%	7%	13%	13%	3%	23%
BONTHE TOWN	124	20%	4%	8%	0%	0%	0%	28%	52%	4%	4%
FREETOWN	239	23%	9%	0%	0%	13%	9%	18%	27%	5%	18%
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	201	30%	21%	2%	0%	3%	8%	20%	21%	7%	18%
KAMBIA DISTRICT	183	22%	20%	3%	0%	18%	8%	18%	20%	15%	8%
KENEMA DISTRICT	149	21%	23%	6%	6%	3%	0%	6%	39%	10%	6%
KENEMA TOWN	197	13%	12%	8%	0%	0%	0%	36%	32%	12%	0%
KOIDU TOWN	167	16%	19%	0%	4%	4%	0%	38%	31%	4%	0%
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	179	20%	17%	3%	3%	0%	8%	25%	25%	6%	14%
KONO DISTRICT	161	24%	11%	3%	0%	18%	8%	26%	24%	3%	8%
MAKENI TOWN	209	22%	4%	2%	0%	9%	0%	15%	52%	7%	11%
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	166	38%	10%	19%	21%	2%	8%	13%	5%	8%	16%
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	147	29%	19%	7%	0%	10%	7%	33%	12%	2%	10%
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	92	20%	6%	0%	0%	17%	0%	22%	28%	6%	22%
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	187	28%	13%	4%	6%	9%	17%	25%	4%	9%	13%
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	211	29%	18%	0%	2%	10%	13%	13%	29%	5%	11%
NATIONAL	3359	22%	14%	4%	3%	7%	6%	21%	27%	6%	12%

Table 5: Headteacher absence, combined visits, weighted by headteacher

Local Council	Total Teachers	Percent Absent	Official Teaching	Official Non-Teaching Duty	Assigned Elsewhere	Expected to Arrive	Left Early	Out Sick	Authorized Leave	Unauthorized Leave	Other / Don't Know
BO DISTRICT	27	15%	25%	25%	0%	0%	0%	25%	0%	0%	25%
BO TOWN	22	23%	0%	0%	0%	60%	0%	20%	0%	0%	20%
BOMBALI DISTRICT	17	29%	40%	20%	0%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%	20%
BONTHE DISTRICT	31	29%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	0%	22%
BONTHE TOWN	12	8%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
FREETOWN	24	29%	14%	0%	0%	43%	29%	0%	0%	0%	14%
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	28	39%	73%	0%	0%	0%	0%	18%	0%	0%	9%
KAMBIA DISTRICT	16	38%	83%	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	0%	0%	0%
KENEMA DISTRICT	25	36%	67%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	11%	11%
KENEMA TOWN	16	19%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%
KOIDU TOWN	22	5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	18	6%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
KONO DISTRICT	28	18%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	40%	0%	0%	20%
MAKENI TOWN	16	6%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	30	63%	32%	26%	5%	0%	0%	11%	5%	16%	5%
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	11	36%	25%	0%	0%	25%	25%	25%	0%	0%	0%
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	14	21%	33%	0%	0%	33%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	24	42%	50%	0%	0%	10%	0%	40%	0%	0%	0%
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	28	25%	14%	0%	0%	0%	29%	14%	43%	0%	0%
NATIONAL	409	27%	45%	8%	1%	8%	5%	15%	6%	4%	8%

Regarding disciplinary action, enumerators interviewed head teachers about actions taken when teachers were repeatedly late or absent. Out of the 96 headteachers who said they had had a problem with a teacher being repeatedly late, 76% said they issued verbal warnings and 18% issued written warnings. Of the 60 headteachers who said they had had a problem with a teacher being repeatedly absent, 31% issued verbal warnings and 24% percent issued written warnings.

Table 6: Reported action taken against teacher repeatedly late

Action	Percent	Total no. of schools
Verbal warning	76%	73
Written letter	18%	17
Transfer request	1%	1
No action	5%	5
Total	100%	96

Table 7: Reported action taken against teacher repeatedly absent

Action	Percent	Total no. of schools
Verbal Warning	31%	31
Written Letter	24%	24
Withheld pay	1%	1
Fired	1%	1
No action	3%	3
Total	100%	60

Section 5: School Inputs

The following tables provide information on school inputs including textbooks, blackboards and furniture compared to the number of students. There are two different ways to compute input to student ratios—based on the number of children present on the day when the enumerator arrives, or based on the number of children enrolled in the school according to the head teacher. Both ways have problems. Taking the number of children in school on a given day does not take into account students who may attend school less frequently because there is no room or supplies for them (it thus underestimates the problem of input scarcity). On the other hand, dividing by the headmaster's estimate of enrollment may make the lack of resources seem worse than it is as principals may overestimate enrollment (overstating the problem). Table 8 presents various ratios based on direct observations of students in attendance and inputs on hand at the time of visit.

Table 8: Students per school supply, district averages*

Local Council	Pupil : Desk	Pupil : Book	Pupil : Bench	Pupil : Chair	Teacher : Desk	Teacher : Chair
BO DISTRICT	4.4	1.9	4.4	4.4	1.7	2.0
BO TOWN	3.9	0.9	3.6	7.3	0.8	0.6
BOMBALI DISTRICT	5.2	1.4	4.6	17.2	1.9	3.6
BONTHE DISTRICT	2.9	0.9	3.0	8.1	1.3	1.3
BONTHE TOWN	2.0	0.6	2.9	3.6	1.2	1.1
FREETOWN	3.2	1.0	4.0	5.5	1.1	1.1
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	2.7	1.0	3.4	10.3	1.5	1.8
KAMBIA DISTRICT	3.5	1.2	4.0	5.3	2.5	2.5
KENEMA DISTRICT	3.1	2.0	3.9	6.5	1.7	1.7
KENEMA TOWN	4.3	4.5	3.8	8.9	1.5	1.4
KOIDU TOWN	3.0	10.2	3.0	0.0	2.0	2.1
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	5.1	3.3	3.6	11.0	3.1	2.5
KONO DISTRICT	2.9	4.3	2.6	29.4	1.8	1.9
MAKENI TOWN	3.1	4.1	3.8	5.2	0.8	0.9
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	2.3	0.5	4.4	1.9	1.2	1.1
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	3.9	1.8	4.2	3.5	1.6	1.8
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	3.7	1.1	3.6	5.2	3.8	3.5
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	4.3	1.2	4.1	10.8	1.8	2.2
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	3.8	1.4	4.5	6.5	1.1	1.2
NATIONAL	3.5	1.5	3.7	6.7	2.8	1.5

* Based on enumerator observation of classrooms, this table resents the number of students sharing a single input - for example, nationally 3.5 students share one desk on average

For textbooks, it is important to note that the figures presented in Tables 8 and 9 relate to single textbooks of any kind, while the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST) supplies textbooks in sets of 3 (English, Maths, Social Studies) for classes 1-2 and sets of 4 (adding in Science) for classes 3-6. Thus the number of children sharing one English textbook (or sharing one complete set of textbooks) will be much higher than the figure presented.

Examining textbooks in greater depth, Table 9 below compares different estimates of how many students share one book. Specifically, Table 9 presents estimates based on: A) head teacher estimates of total children enrolled and total number of textbooks available at the school; B) enumerator observations of total students present in class on day of visit and textbooks available by classroom (as in Table 8); and C) enumerator observations averaged first by school and then by district.

Based on estimates by head teachers, Column A suggests a national average of 1.9 students sharing one textbook. As explained above, this figure overstates the scarcity of textbooks in the school if the head teacher has overestimated total enrollment. Thus it makes sense that this figure is slightly higher than what we saw in Table 8, where enumerator observations lead to an estimate that 1.5 children for every textbook averaged over the whole country (repeated below in Column B).

There are sizeable differences by district. For example, Koidu has only 1 textbook (of any kind) for every 10 children, while Moyamba has 0.5 students per text book (i.e. two textbooks per child). There is also enormous variation in the distribution of textbooks within districts. For example, in Bonthe Town, the ratio for most schools is less than 5 but for some it is as high as 20 students per book. This highly skewed distribution makes the ratios sensitive to different ways of averaging them. Thus for our main table we show total students divided by total textbooks for each class (Table 8 and Column B below), which gives the perspective of an average classroom. If we instead look at an average school, by averaging classroom ratios across each school (Column C), this gives more weight to smaller schools (i.e. those with fewer classrooms) and leads to much different ratios. This difference suggests that schools with fewer classrooms have fewer textbooks per student.

Table 9: Different estimates of student to textbook ratio

Local Council	A. Headmaster estimates	B. Enumerator count; classroom as unit	C. Enumerator count; school as unit
BO DISTRICT	3.1	1.9	7.5
BO TOWN	1.3	0.9	4.4
BOMBALI DISTRICT	1.8	1.4	3.0
BONTHE DISTRICT	1.0	0.9	1.7
BONTHE TOWN	0.3	0.6	0.7
FREETOWN	1.4	1.0	4.6
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	1.0	1.0	2.9
KAMBIA DISTRICT	1.1	1.2	3.4
KENEMA DISTRICT	1.6	2.0	4.5
KENEMA TOWN	5.5	4.5	11.0
KOIDU TOWN	0.7	10.2	16.8
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	2.2	3.3	4.7
KONO DISTRICT	2.2	4.3	9.9
MAKENI TOWN	0.7	4.1	7.2
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	0.5	0.5	1.5
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	3.5	1.8	6.8
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	1.7	1.1	3.9
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	1.3	1.2	3.1
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	1.3	1.4	6.0
NATIONAL	1.9	1.5	5.3

The last table in this section focuses on schools with especially severe input constraints. Out of 281 schools surveyed, we found 18 that had no textbooks at all in the school. Seven out of these 18 were in Makeni. In other words, nearly 40 percent of schools surveyed in Makeni had no textbooks.[3] Two schools had no blackboards. About one third of classrooms visited had no chair nor desk for the teacher.

Table 10: Schools with no blackboards or no textbooks

Local Council	Percent of schools with no blackboard	Percent of schools with no textbooks	No. of schools providing no. of blackboards	No. of schools providing no. of textbooks
BO	0.0%	0.0%	16	16
BO TOWN	0.0%	0.0%	16	15
BOMBALI	0.0%	6.3%	16	16
BONTHE	6.7%	6.7%	15	15
BONTHE TOWN	0.0%	22.2%	9	9
FREETOWN	0.0%	0.0%	15	15
KAILAHUN	0.0%	6.3%	16	16
KAMBIA	0.0%	0.0%	16	15
KENEMA	0.0%	6.3%	16	16
KENEMA TOWN	0.0%	6.7%	15	15
KOIDU TOWN	8.3%	8.3%	12	12
KOINADUGU	0.0%	13.3%	15	15
KONO	0.0%	6.7%	15	15
MAKENI TOWN	0.0%	43.8%	16	16
MOYAMBA	0.0%	0.0%	16	16
PORT LOKO	0.0%	0.0%	15	13
PUJEHUN	0.0%	0.0%	14	14
TONKOLILI	0.0%	0.0%	16	16
WESTERN AREA RURAL	0.0%	0.0%	16	16
NATIONAL	0.70%	6.32%	285	281

---

[3] It should be noted that six of the seven schools in Makeni without textbooks are for CREPS— Comprehensive Rapid Education for Primary Schools—which are different than traditional primary schools. See Section 9.

Section 6: School Facilities

6.1 Multiple Shifts

In the total sample, about one in ten schools hosts two shifts of students. In Bo Town, Freetown, and Kenema Town, having two shifts is quite common, while it is much less common in rural areas.

Table 11: Percentage of schools with two shifts

Local Council	Percentage with two shifts	Total no. of schools
BO DISTRICT	6%	16
BO TOWN	40%	15
BOMBALI DISTRICT	6%	16
BONTHE DISTRICT	6%	16
BONTHE TOWN	0%	9
FREETOWN	40%	15
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	6%	16
KAMBIA DISTRICT	6%	16
KENEMA DISTRICT	0%	15
KENEMA TOWN	47%	15
KOIDU TOWN	0%	12
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	0%	15
KONO DISTRICT	0%	15
MAKENI TOWN	14%	14
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	0%	16
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	13%	15
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	0%	14
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	6%	16
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	6%	16
NATIONAL	11%	282

6.2 Latrines

Seventy percent of schools surveyed have latrines (although fewer than half of those in Kailahun do), while nearly 50 percent have latrines specifically for girls.

Table 12: School latrines

Local Council	Percentage with latrine	Percentage with latrine specifically for girls	Total no. of schools
BO DISTRICT	75%	56%	16
BO TOWN	80%	13%	15
BOMBALI DISTRICT	69%	38%	16
BONTHE DISTRICT	44%	38%	16
BONTHE TOWN	67%	33%	9
FREETOWN	93%	60%	15
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	38%	38%	16
KAMBIA DISTRICT	81%	81%	16
KENEMA DISTRICT	53%	40%	15
KENEMA TOWN	87%	67%	15
KOIDU TOWN	75%	42%	12
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	47%	33%	15
KONO DISTRICT	67%	40%	15
MAKENI TOWN	100%	79%	14
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	63%	50%	16
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	87%	80%	15
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	57%	0%	14
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	75%	60%	16
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	56%	56%	16
NATIONAL	69%	48%	282

Section 6.3 Water Source

Sixteen percent of schools have no source of drinking water and for twenty-one percent, the drinking water source is a stream or river.

Table 13: School water source

Local Council	Piped water	Well / bore hole	Stream / river	None	Total no. of schools
BO DISTRICT	38%	31%	19%	13%	16
BO TOWN	0%	60%	0%	40%	15
BOMBALI DISTRICT	6%	38%	44%	13%	16
BONTHE DISTRICT	0%	25%	6%	69%	16
BONTHE TOWN	0%	56%	0%	44%	9
FREETOWN	87%	0%	13%	0%	15
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	6%	69%	25%	0%	16
KAMBIA DISTRICT	6%	44%	44%	6%	16
KENEMA DISTRICT	20%	60%	20%	0%	15
KENEMA TOWN	40%	33%	7%	20%	15
KOIDU TOWN	8%	83%	8%	0%	12
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	0%	60%	27%	13%	15
KONO DISTRICT	20%	40%	40%	0%	15
MAKENI TOWN	0%	100%	0%	0%	14
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	0%	63%	38%	0%	16
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	13%	53%	33%	0%	15
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	0%	0%	7%	93%	14
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	6%	56%	38%	0%	16
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	75%	13%	13%	0%	16
NATIONAL	18%	46%	21%	16%	282

Section 7: School supervision

Half of the schools in our survey had been visited by a Local Councillor. In four districts, more than three quarters of schools had been visited. At the other end of the spectrum, only one of the schools in Moyamba had been visited by a Local Councillor. Many more schools had been visited by local council members than were visited by their local Member of Parliament (MP). More schools, however, were visited by nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) than by Local Councillors and MPs combined.

Religious figures visited a similar number of schools as Local Councilors. While many of the schools surveyed are run by religious missions, this alone does not explain this result. By construction, half of the sample are DEC schools—i.e. not mission schools—while 57 percent of our schools were visited by a religious leader, and the percentages in some districts are over 80 percent.

Nearly all visits by these public figures included discussions with head teachers, visits to classrooms, checking of records, and a review of supplies.

Table 14: Percentage of schools visited by different public figures

Local Council	MP	Local Councilor	Relgious figure	NGO representative	Total no. of schools
BO DISTRICT	13%	75%	44%	56%	16
BO TOWN	6%	31%	44%	13%	16
BOMBALI DISTRICT	0%	63%	31%	31%	16
BONTHE DISTRICT	13%	63%	31%	38%	16
BONTHE TOWN	44%	38%	11%	33%	8
FREETOWN	13%	53%	53%	67%	15
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	13%	50%	63%	75%	16
KAMBIA DISTRICT	13%	44%	56%	69%	16
KENEMA DISTRICT	13%	60%	53%	60%	15
KENEMA TOWN	7%	79%	57%	71%	14
KOIDU TOWN	8%	82%	67%	92%	11
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	13%	60%	47%	80%	15
KONO DISTRICT	7%	33%	53%	93%	15
MAKENI TOWN	14%	46%	71%	100%	13
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	6%	6%	94%	100%	16
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	13%	40%	60%	73%	15
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	7%	29%	50%	50%	14
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	13%	25%	81%	69%	16
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	0%	75%	88%	63%	16
NATIONAL	11%	50%	56%	65%	279

Section 8: School finances

Schools receive financial and in-kind support from a variety of sources. For the 2004-05 academic year, Table 15 shows that 89% of schools reported receiving some support from the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MEST), 48% from NGOs, 43% from communities, and 33% from parents. While quite closely matched, the percentages of government-assisted schools receiving contributions from MEST, communities and parents are slightly higher than those for DEC schools.

For the one third of schools who reported that they collect contributions directly from parents, 63% of schools reported using at least some of the funds for school infrastructure, 34% for school supplies, 15% for special activities, and 6% for tuition. The average contribution per student, per year for these 91 schools was 5,413 Leones. This ranges from 200 to 60,000 Leones at one school, however 95% of these schools report that parents paid less than 10,000 Leones per student.

Teachers in 25 percent of the sampled schools received in-kind contributions from the community or the local government. Four percent of schools surveyed provide housing for their teachers.

Table 15: Percent of schools that received support from various sources

Local Council	MEST	NGO	Community	Parents
BO DISTRICT	94%	31%	31%	6%
BO TOWN	81%	7%	6%	19%
BOMBALI DISTRICT	100%	50%	31%	56%
BONTHE DISTRICT	94%	13%	19%	6%
BONTHE TOWN	89%	11%	0%	0%
FREETOWN	100%	33%	14%	7%
KAILAHUN DISTRICT	100%	67%	69%	19%
KAMBIA DISTRICT	69%	75%	56%	44%
KENEMA DISTRICT	100%	43%	40%	0%
KENEMA TOWN	100%	14%	21%	14%
KOIDU TOWN	100%	90%	50%	100%
KOINADUGU DISTRICT	93%	50%	87%	20%
KONO DISTRICT	93%	79%	53%	100%
MAKENI TOWN	93%	86%	21%	71%
MOYAMBA DISTRICT	13%	93%	75%	6%
PORT LOKO DISTRICT	80%	54%	67%	40%
PUJEHUN DISTRICT	93%	15%	21%	21%
TONKOLILI DISTRICT	100%	56%	80%	81%
WESTERN AREA RURAL DISTRICT	100%	38%	47%	25%
TOTAL	**89%**	**48%**	**43%**	**33%**

Section 9: Comprehensive Rapid Education for Primary Schools (CREPS)

The sample includes twelve Comprehensive Rapid Education for Primary School (CREPS) programs—four in Port Loko, one in Kenema Town, one in Koinadugu and six in Makeni Town. Targeting older students whose education was disrupted during the war, CREPS programs provide an accelerated primary education in three years. When considering DEC estimates for Makeni throughout the report, it is therefore important to recognize that these represent a very different type of school than in other Local Council areas.

The final table below compares various indicators for CREPS programs compared to non-CREPS schools in the sample. In general, CREPS schools had slightly higher teacher absenteeism, were much less likely to be visited by a Local Councillor and were less well resourced in terms of textbooks. None of the included CREPS schools reported collecting parental contributions.

Table 16: Characteristics of CREPS and non-CREPS schools

Characteristics	CREPS	Non-CREPS	Total
Number of schools	12	276	288
Percent of schools closed, averaged over two visits	0.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Percent of teachers absent	26%	22%	22%
Percent of schools visited by Local Councillor	20%	51%	50%
Student:textbook ratio, enumerator count	10.6	1.5	1.5
Percent of schools that charge fees from parents	0%	53%	50%