

**REPORT ON THE BASELINE EXERCISE MAPPING OF
BASIC EDUCATION TEACHERS IN OSUN STATE
AND
MULTI-YEAR COSTED TEACHER RECRUITMENT
&
DEPLOYMENT PLAN**



24th February, 2025

Foreword

There is a quiet urgency behind every data point in this document. Each figure that describes a teacher shortage, each table that maps an inequity in the distribution of classroom instructors across our Local Government Education Authorities, and each projection that forecasts what the system will need by 2028 represent something far more personal than statistics. It represents a child in a classroom somewhere in Osun State, sitting before a blackboard, waiting to learn.

The Government of Osun State has never shied away from confronting the hard realities of our education system. Under the purposeful leadership of **His Excellency, Senator Ademola Jackson Nurudeen Adeleke**, this administration has committed itself to building a State in which every child, regardless of geography, gender, or socio-economic background, has access to quality basic education delivered by competent and motivated teachers. That commitment is not rhetoric. It is reflected in our policy choices, our budget priorities, and most concretely, in the work documented in these pages.

The State Basic Education Baseline Mapping and Multi-Year Costed Teacher Recruitment as well as the Deployment Plan are products of painstaking data collection, rigorous analysis, and inclusive stakeholder engagement. It tells us, with clarity and precision, where we stand today as of January 2025, and it charts a credible, fiscally established path toward where we need to be by 2028. What it reveals is instructive: a system that has managed to keep classrooms running through sheer commitments of its teachers and the goodwill of community arrangements, yet, structurally vulnerable to the pressures of growing enrollment, aging workforce attrition, and inconsistent formal recruitment.

The data shows that over 4,360 teachers volunteer margin. They are NYSC members, Parent-Teacher Association-funded teachers, volunteers, and other Ad-hoc personnel who fill the gaps that formal recruitment has not kept pace with. While we are grateful for their services, we cannot build a sustainable education system on arrangements that are neither institutionally secure nor professionally stable. This Plan is, in many ways, our commitment to doing things differently going forward.

The Multi-Year Costed Recruitment and Deployment Plan contained in this document provides phased, evidence-driven roadmap for the formal expansion of our qualified teacher workforce across primary schools and junior secondary schools in all the thirty Local Government and one Area Office. It aligned with the State's Medium-Term Sector Strategy, the Universal Basic Education Programme, the National Policy on Education, and the Sustainable Development Goals. It balances ambition with fiscal reality, and prioritizes equity so that no child in any rural or underserved community is left without a qualified teacher simply because of where he or she was born.

I commend the Technical Experts, the Planning Officers from the Ministry of Economic Planning, Budget & Development, as well as the Staff of the State Universal Basic Education Board and the State Ministry of Education who worked tirelessly to bring this assignment to logical completion. I also acknowledge the

Local Government Education Authorities and School Administrators across the State whose cooperation made the Baseline Data Collection possible.

This document now belongs to all of us. Its recommendations will only be as powerful as our collective resolve to implement them. I urge all relevant Ministries, Departments, and Agencies to treat the teacher workforce investments outlined here as non-negotiable priorities in our annual and medium-term budgeting. Every classroom in Osun State deserves a qualified teacher. With this Plan, we are finally putting a number, a timeline, and a cost to that promise.

Hon Dipo S. Eluwole
Honourable Commissioner
Ministry of Education, Osun State
March 2025.

Preface

Planning works best when it is grounded in the truth of what it is, not just the aspiration of what ought to be. This principle guided the design and execution of Osun State Basic Education Baseline Mapping and Multi-Year Costed Teacher Recruitment and Deployment Plan from the very beginning. Before we could responsibly plan for the teachers that Osun State needs, we had to honestly account for the teachers that are already here, where they are, who is paying them, and whether their distribution across the system reflects our children's learning needs rather than the historical accidents of recruitment patterns.

The baseline mapping exercise that forms the first half of this document is the most comprehensive teacher workforce assessment that the Osun State basic education system has undertaken in recent years. Drawing on data from the Education Management Information System, the State Universal Basic Education Board administrative records, the State payroll, and the Annual School Census, the exercise captured a validated snapshot of the teacher workforce as of January 2025, covering all public ECCDE, primary, and junior secondary schools across all thirty Local Government Areas of the State.

What the data revealed was a system that is both more resilient and more fragile than many had assumed. Resilient, because teachers and communities across the State have found ways to keep schools staffed and classrooms functional even in the face of years of limited formal recruitment. Fragile, because that staffing has increasingly depended on ad-hoc personnel whose engagement fall outside the State payroll, creating a hidden workforce of over 4,360 teachers who are integral to daily schooling yet structurally invisible to formal workforce planning processes.

The baseline findings also confirmed what many education administrators have long suspected: the problem is not only one of quantity but also of distribution. Teacher deployment across Local Government Education Authorities shows patterns of spatial inequity that do not align with enrollment needs. Urban LGEAs tend to receive a disproportionate concentration of government-paid teachers, while rural and hard-to-reach communities carry the highest burden of ad-hoc staffing. These distribution patterns have real consequences for learning outcomes, and they do not resolve themselves without deliberate policy intervention.

The Multi-Year Costed Teacher Recruitment and Deployment Plan, which constitutes the second half of this document, responds directly to these findings. It provides a structured four-year roadmap from 2025 to 2028 that covers teacher demand forecasting based on enrollment projections, phased recruitment targets disaggregated by cadre and school level, subject-specific deployment requirements at the junior secondary level, redistribution strategies for addressing deployment inefficiencies, and detailed annual cost projections anchored in current salary and allowance structures.

The Plan has been designed with fiscal discipline at its core. Recognizing the constraints of the State's budgetary environment, the recruitment phasing is calibrated to be ambitious enough to make a meaningful difference over the medium term while remaining realistic about what the State's recurrent expenditure framework can absorb. It is not a wish list. It is a costed, implementable, and monitorable plan.

This document is intended primarily for education planners, policymakers, budget officers, and development partners who are directly involved in the governance and financing of basic education in Osun State. It is also intended to serve as a transparent accountability tool: a public statement of what the State intends to do, in what sequence, at what cost, and toward what outcomes. Implementation progress should be reviewed annually against the targets and milestones set out in the plan matrix, and adjustments made where evidence demands it.

The State Universal Basic Education Board looks forward to working closely with the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Economic Planning, Budget and Development, the Office of the Head of Service, Local Government Education Authorities, and Development Partners to translate this plan into verifiable results for the children of Osun State.

Hon Ibukun Isola Fadipe
Executive Chairman
State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB)
Osogbo, Osun State
March 2025

Acknowledgements

A document of this nature is never the work of any single person or institution. It is the product of many hands, many long working hours, and a shared conviction that the children of Osun State deserve a better-staffed, better-resourced, and more equitably served basic education system. It is both right and necessary to formally acknowledge those whose contributions made this work possible.

The Osun State Government, under the leadership of His Excellency, Senator Ademola Jackson Nurudeen Adeleke, Executive Governor of Osun State, provided the political will and institutional backing that gave this assignment its mandate. His administration's commitment to evidence-based governance and human capital development created the enabling environment within which this work was conceived, commissioned, and completed. We are deeply grateful for that leadership.

The Honourable Commissioner for Education as well as the Chairman, State Universal Basic Education Board provided strategic direction and sustained policy guidance throughout the exercise. Their personal interest in the integrity and quality of the findings, and insistence that the resulting plan be both ambitious and financially grounded, shaped the character of this document in important ways. We thank you for your confidence in this assignment and for the access and cooperation you facilitated across the education sector.

Special appreciation is owed to the Strategic Planning Consultants and Technical Officers from the State Ministry of Economic Planning, Budget and Development. Their expertise in developing, planning, human capital analytics, and fiscal modelling were fundamental to the rigour of the baseline analysis and the credibility of the Multi-Year Recruitment Plan. They brought professional precision to the work and kept the exercise anchored in planning best practices throughout.

The State Ministry of Education that serves as the mother Ministry to the Education Sector in the state is appreciated for creating policy oversight upon which all Education Agencies thrive, particularly in Data driven assignments like this HOPE-EDU Programme. The pivotal role of the Permanent Secretary, Directorate of Basic Education Services and all relevant Directorates in the Ministry are duly acknowledged.

The State Universal Basic Education Board served as the institutional engine of this assignment. The Board Chairman, Executive Secretary, Senior Management, and the Planning, Research and Statistics Directorate provided the administrative leadership, logistical coordination, and technical expertise without which neither the data collection nor the analytical work would have been possible. The dedication demonstrated by SUBEB staff at every level of the exercise, including those who worked under field conditions that were often demanding, is acknowledged with sincere gratitude.

The LGEA Officials and school administrators across all thirty Local Government Areas of Osun State who supported data collection, facilitated access to schools, and validated administrative records at the local level are warmly acknowledged. The quality of a baseline mapping exercise is only as good as the data it is built on, and the cooperation extended at the LGEA level was critical to the completeness and reliability of the findings in this document.

The State Ministry of Economic Planning, Budget and Development, the Office of the Head of Service, and the State Payroll Administration (LG-IFMIS) are thanked for facilitating access to personnel and payroll records, which were an essential source of data for understanding the formal teacher workforce. Their responsiveness and transparency supported the rigour of the cross-validation analysis.

We acknowledge the technical and financial support of development partners (most especially, Universal Basic Education Commission, UBEC) whose engagement with the Osun State education sector has helped sustain a culture of evidence-based planning. Their guidance on international best practices in teacher workforce planning, deployment equity, and education financing enriched the analytical depth of this document.

Finally, this document is dedicated to the teachers of Osun State, those who carry the weight of classrooms. They show up anyway. They teach anyway. The recommendations in this plan are, at their core, a commitment to them and to the more than 320,000 pupils in our public basic education system whose futures depend on the quality of instruction those teachers provide.

Mr. Adekunle Yahaya BAKARE
Executive Secretary
State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB)
Osogbo, Osun State
March 2025

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Foreword..... | ii |
| Preface | iv |
| Acknowledgements..... | vi |
| Table of Contents..... | viii |
| List of Tables | xii |
| Executive Summary..... | xiv |
| CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND POLICY CONTEXT | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Background to the Study..... | 1 |
| 1.3 Problem Statement..... | 2 |
| 1.4 Objectives of the Plan | 3 |
| 1.4.1 General Objective | 3 |
| 1.4.2 Specific Objectives | 3 |
| 1.5 Scope and Coverage..... | 4 |
| 1.6 Policy and Institutional Context..... | 4 |
| 1.7 Justification for the Plan | 5 |
| 1.8 Key Definitions and Operational Terms | 6 |
| CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK..... | 8 |
| 2.1 Data Sources..... | 8 |
| 2.2 Data Validation and Cleaning Protocol | 9 |
| 2.2.1 Deduplication (Addressing Ghost Workers)..... | 9 |
| 2.2.2 Cross-Referencing Payroll and School Presence | 9 |
| 2.2.3 Handling Missing Data | 9 |
| 2.3 Analytical Framework..... | 10 |
| 2.3.1 Descriptive Diagnostics | 10 |
| 2.3.2 Normative Benchmarking..... | 11 |
| 2.3.3 Teacher Demand Forecasting Model | 11 |
| 2.3.4 Deployment Efficiency Metrics | 12 |
| 2.3.5 Costing Framework..... | 17 |
| CHAPTER 3: BASELINE SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS | 18 |
| 3.1 School and Enrollment Profile..... | 18 |
| 3.2 Teacher Stock Analysis..... | 18 |
| 3.3 Teacher Distribution Analysis | 20 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 3.4 Infrastructure-Teacher Interaction..... | 27 |
| 3.5 Learning Outcome Linkage (Critical Analysis) | 28 |
| CHAPTER 4: TEACHER GAP AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT | 29 |
| 4.1 Introduction..... | 29 |
| 4.2 Aggregate Teacher Gap Analysis | 29 |
| 4.3 LGA-Level Teacher Gap Analysis..... | 30 |
| 4.4 Surplus–Deficit Analysis | 32 |
| 4.5 Subject-Specific Teacher Gaps | 33 |
| 4.6 Hidden Workforce and System Risk..... | 33 |
| 4.7 Recruitment Gap and Strategic Needs..... | 34 |
| 4.8 Strategic Response Framework | 34 |
| CHAPTER 5: TEACHER RECRUITMENT STRATEGY (MULTI-YEAR)..... | 36 |
| 5.1 Recruitment Principles..... | 36 |
| 5.2 Recruitment Targets (Multi-Year Hiring Plan)..... | 36 |
| 5.3 Prioritization Framework | 37 |
| 5.3.1 Subject Priority | 37 |
| 5.3.2 Geographic Priority..... | 38 |
| 5.4 Recruitment Modalities | 38 |
| 5.4.1 Permanent vs Contract Teachers..... | 38 |
| 5.4.2 Rural Incentive Mechanism | 39 |
| 5.5 Integration with Training Institutions | 39 |
| CHAPTER 6: TEACHER DEPLOYMENT AND REDISTRIBUTION PLAN | 41 |
| 6.1 Deployment Principles..... | 41 |
| 6.2 Redistribution Strategy | 42 |
| 6.3 Deployment Algorithm (Advanced Optimization Model)..... | 43 |
| 6.4 Incentive Mechanisms for Equitable Deployment | 44 |
| 6.5 Risk and Resistance Management | 44 |
| 6.5.1 Union Dynamics | 44 |
| 6.5.2 Political Interference..... | 45 |
| CHAPTER 7: COSTING AND FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS..... | 47 |
| 7.1 Cost Components of Teacher Workforce Expansion | 47 |
| 7.1.1 Salary Costs | 47 |
| 7.1.2 Allowances..... | 47 |
| 7.1.3 Training and Professional Development Costs | 48 |
| 7.1.4 Recruitment and Administrative Costs | 48 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 7.2 Multi-Year Cost Projection (2025–2028) | 48 |
| 7.3 Fiscal Space Analysis (Critical Component) | 49 |
| 7.3.1 Benchmarking Against Current Wage Bill | 49 |
| 7.3.2 Affordability Assessment..... | 49 |
| 7.3.3 Alignment with MTSS Framework..... | 51 |
| 7.4 Scenario-Based Costing | 51 |
| 7.5 Funding Sources and Financing Strategy | 51 |
| 7.5.1 State Government Budget..... | 51 |
| 7.5.2 UBEC Intervention Funds..... | 52 |
| 7.5.3 Development Partner Support..... | 52 |
| CHAPTER 8: IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK | 54 |
| 8.1 Institutional Responsibilities | 54 |
| 8.1.1 Ministry of Education | 54 |
| 8.1.2 State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB)..... | 54 |
| 8.1.3 Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs)..... | 55 |
| 8.2 Implementation Timeline (Phased Rollout) | 55 |
| 8.3 Governance Structure | 56 |
| 8.3.1 Steering Committee..... | 56 |
| 8.3.2 Technical Working Group (TWG)..... | 57 |
| 8.4 Coordination and Reporting Mechanism | 58 |
| CHAPTER 9: MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND ADAPTIVE LEARNING | 60 |
| 9.1 Overview | 60 |
| 9.2 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) | 60 |
| 9.2.1 PTR Improvement..... | 60 |
| 9.2.2 Teacher Distribution Equity..... | 61 |
| 9.2.3 Learning Outcomes | 61 |
| 9.3 Data Systems Integration | 62 |
| 9.3.1 Strengthening EMIS..... | 62 |
| 9.4 Reporting Framework | 63 |
| 9.5 Feedback Loops and Adaptive Learning | 63 |
| 9.5.1 Feedback Mechanisms | 63 |
| 9.5.2 Policy Adjustment Process..... | 64 |
| 9.6 Digital Monitoring and Dashboard System | 64 |
| CHAPTER 10: RISK ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION | 66 |
| 10.1 Overview | 66 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 10.2 Risk Identification and Classification | 66 |
| 10.3 Fiscal Risks and Mitigation | 67 |
| 10.3.1 Nature of Fiscal Risks | 67 |
| 10.3.2 Mitigation Strategy | 67 |
| Interpretation..... | 67 |
| 10.4 Political and Governance Risks | 68 |
| 10.4.1 Nature of Risks | 68 |
| 10.4.2 Mitigation Strategy | 68 |
| 10.5 Institutional and Behavioral Risks | 69 |
| 10.5.1 Teacher Resistance..... | 69 |
| 10.5.2 Mitigation Strategy | 69 |
| 10.6 Data and Technical Risks | 69 |
| 10.6.1 Nature of Risks | 69 |
| 10.6.2 Mitigation Strategy | 70 |
| 10.7 Risk Monitoring and Review Mechanism | 70 |
| CHAPTER 11: CONCLUSION AND POLICY DIRECTIONS | 72 |
| 11.1 Overview | 72 |
| 11.2 Summary of Key Findings | 72 |
| 11.3 Strategic Policy Recommendations | 73 |
| 11.3.1 Adopt a Phased and Targeted Recruitment Strategy..... | 73 |
| 11.3.2 Institutionalize Teacher Redistribution Mechanisms..... | 73 |
| 11.3.3 Gradually Formalize the Ad-hoc Workforce | 73 |
| 11.3.4 Strengthen Data Systems and Workforce Planning | 74 |
| 11.3.5 Introduce Incentives for Rural Deployment..... | 74 |
| 11.3.6 Ensure Fiscal Discipline and Sustainability..... | 74 |
| 11.3.7 Strengthen Governance and Accountability..... | 74 |
| 11.4 Long-Term Workforce Vision | 74 |
| 11.5 Concluding Remark | 75 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 2. 1 Summary of Data Sources and Key Variables..... | 8 |
| Table 2. 2 Data Cleaning Summary | 10 |
| Table 2. 3 Teacher Stock and Requirements..... | 10 |
| Table 2. 4 Recommended PTR Bands..... | 11 |
| Table 2. 5 Surplus–Deficit Index (SDI) by LGA..... | 12 |
| Table 2. 6 Interpretation of SDI..... | 13 |
| Table 2. 7 Teacher Utilization (Efficiency) by LGA..... | 15 |
| Table 2. 8 Efficiency Classification Logic | 16 |
| Table 2. 9 Cost Components | 17 |
| Table 3. 1 Distribution of Schools by Level | 18 |
| Table 3. 2 Teacher Stock by Employment Type | 19 |
| Table 3. 3 Teacher Requirements and Gap Analysis..... | 19 |
| Table 3. 4 LGA-LEVEL TEACHER DISTRIBUTION..... | 20 |
| Table 3. 5 Urban–Rural Teacher Distribution and Staffing Characteristics..... | 21 |
| Table 3. 6 PTR Band Classification..... | 25 |
| Table 3. 7 Urban–Rural Teacher Distribution and PTR Characteristics by LGA..... | 25 |
| Table 3. 8 Classroom–Teacher Alignment (Conceptual) | 27 |
| Table 3. 9 Conceptual Link between Teachers and Outcomes | 28 |
| Table 4. 1 Aggregate Teacher Gap (Dual Perspective Analysis)..... | 29 |
| Table 4. 2 LGA-Level Teacher Gap Analysis..... | 30 |
| Table 4. 3 Severity Classification Logic..... | 31 |
| Table 4. 4 Surplus–Deficit Classification..... | 32 |
| Table 4. 5 Subject Gap Profile (Indicative) | 33 |
| Table 4. 6 Composition of Teaching Workforce..... | 33 |
| Table 4. 7 Recruitment Requirement Scenarios | 34 |
| Table 5. 1 Annual Teacher Recruitment Plan (2025–2028) | 36 |
| Table 5. 2 Subject Prioritization Framework..... | 37 |
| Table 5. 3 Geographic Prioritization Framework | 38 |
| Table 5. 4 Recruitment Modalities Comparison | 39 |
| Table 5. 5 Teacher Pipeline Alignment Framework | 40 |
| Table 6. 1 Deployment Benchmarks | 41 |
| Table 6. 2 Redistribution Decision Matrix..... | 42 |
| Table 6. 3 Deployment Priority Framework..... | 43 |
| Table 6. 4 Rural Deployment Incentives | 44 |
| Table 6. 5 Risk Mitigation Framework..... | 45 |
| Table 7. 1 Summary of Cost Components..... | 48 |
| Table 7. 2 Annual Recruitment and Cost Projection..... | 49 |
| Table 7. 3 Fiscal Impact Analysis | 50 |
| Table 7. 4 Cost Scenarios | 51 |
| Table 7. 5 Funding Sources Framework | 52 |
| Table 8. 1 Institutional Roles and Responsibilities..... | 55 |
| Table 8. 2 Implementation Timeline | 56 |
| Table 8. 3 Governance Structure | 58 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 8. 4 Reporting Framework..... | 58 |
| Table 9. 1 PTR Performance Targets | 60 |
| Table 9. 2 Teacher Distribution Equity Indicators..... | 61 |
| Table 9. 3 Learning Outcome Indicators | 61 |
| Table 9. 4 Data Integration Framework | 62 |
| Table 9. 5 Reporting Structure | 63 |
| Table 9. 6 Adaptive Learning Cycle | 64 |
| Table 10. 1 Risk Classification Framework | 66 |
| Table 10. 2 Fiscal Risk Mitigation Measures | 67 |
| Table 10. 3 Political Risk Mitigation Framework..... | 68 |
| Table 10. 4 Institutional Risk Mitigation | 69 |
| Table 10. 5 Data Risk Mitigation Framework..... | 70 |
| Table 10. 6 Risk Monitoring Framework | 71 |

Executive Summary

Osun State Basic Education Baseline Mapping and Multi-Year Costed Teacher Recruitment and Deployment Plan (2025–2028) provides a comprehensive, data-driven framework for addressing teacher workforce challenges in the State’s basic education sector. The Plan responds to persistent issues of teacher shortages, inequitable distribution, and systemic inefficiencies that constrain the delivery of quality education.

Grounded in National Policy Frameworks such as:

- i. State Education Sector Strategy Plan (SESSP 2011-2020),
- ii. State Education Sector Operational Plan (SESSOP),
- iii. UBEC ACTs,
- iv. Federal Ministry of Education (FME) - Strategic Plan on Education 2016 – 2019,
- v. Federal Ministry of Education (FME) –A Ministerial Strategic Plan on Education 2020– 2022,
- vi. Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Policy Documents,
- vii. National Policy on Education (NPE) 2013, 2014,
- viii. Osun State Development Plan 2023-2050,
- ix. Osun State Medium Term Basic Education Strategic Plan (OSSMTBESP) Cycle 4 2024-2027,
- x. State’s Medium-Term Sector Strategy (MTSS);
The Plan introduces a shift from traditional, static workforce planning to a dynamic, evidence-based and fiscally sustainable approach.

Key Findings

The baseline analysis reveals that Osun State operates a large and widely distributed basic education system comprising **1,347 primary schools and 393 junior secondary schools**. While this network ensures broad access, it also creates significant demands for teacher deployment and resource optimization.

The total teaching workforce stands at **13,191 teachers**, consisting of:

- **8,830 Government-paid Teachers (67%)**
- **4,361 Ad-hoc Teachers (33%)**

This indicates a substantial reliance on non-formal teaching personnel to sustain classroom instruction.

In terms of adequacy:

- Total teacher requirement: **15,492**
- Available teachers (including ad-hoc): **13,191**

- Apparent teacher gap: **2,301**

However, when only government-paid teachers are considered, the true staffing deficit rises sharply to **6,662 teachers**, revealing a structurally under-resourced formal workforce.

Distributional Inefficiencies

Beyond aggregate shortages, the analysis highlights **significant spatial inequalities** in teacher distribution:

- Urban LGAs such as **Osogbo, Olorunda, and Ede North** exhibit **teacher surpluses and low PTRs**
- Rural LGAs such as **Atakumosa East, Ife South, and Oriade** experience **critical shortages and high PTRs**

The Surplus–Deficit Index (SDI) confirms that:

- A majority of LGAs face **moderate to critical deficits**
- A small number of urban LGAs account for **significant teacher surpluses**

This imbalance results in wide variations in classroom conditions and undermines equitable access to quality education.

System Efficiency and Workforce Structure

The analysis further reveals:

- Significant variation in **teacher utilization rates across LGAs**
- Weak alignment between **teacher deployment and school needs**
- Structural imbalances between **primary and junior secondary staffing**
- Persistent shortages in **core subject areas**, particularly Mathematics, Basic Science, and English

Importantly, the heavy dependence on ad-hoc teachers introduces risks related to:

- Quality assurance
- Workforce stability
- Fiscal sustainability

Strategic Response Framework

To address these challenges, the Plan proposes a **multi-dimensional strategy** built on five core pillars:

1. Targeted Recruitment

A phased recruitment of **2,301 teachers over four years (2025–2028)** is proposed, prioritizing:

- High-deficit LGAs
- Critical subject areas
- Gradual reduction of Ad-hoc Staff dependence

2. Teacher Redistribution

A “**reallocate before recruit**” approach is adopted to:

- Transfer teachers from surplus urban LGAs
- Address deficits in rural and underserved areas
- Improve system efficiency without immediate fiscal pressure

3. Deployment Optimization

A rule-based deployment algorithm is introduced to:

- Prioritize schools with highest need
- Ensure compliance with PTR benchmarks
- Promote transparency and objectivity in allocation

4. Gradual Formalization of Ad-hoc Teachers

The Plan adopts a **hybrid workforce transition strategy**, which:

- Absorbs qualified ad-hoc teachers into the formal system
- Reduces long-term reliance on informal staffing

5. Data System Strengthening

Integration of EMIS, Payroll, and Administrative Data Systems is proposed to:

- Improve workforce tracking
- Support real-time decision-making
- Enhance planning accuracy

Costing and Fiscal Sustainability

The Plan incorporates a detailed costing framework to ensure affordability and sustainability.

- Current annual teacher salary cost: **₦20.61 billion**
- Estimated unit cost per teacher: **~₦2.334 million annually**

- Total cost of recruiting 2,301 teachers: **₦3.59 billion over four years**

The phased recruitment approach aligns with fiscal realities and avoids excessive pressure on the State's wage bill.

Scenario analysis further demonstrates that a Hybrid Approach combining recruitment, redistribution, and gradual formalization of Ad-hoc staff is the most feasible and sustainable pathway.

Implementation and Governance

The Plan establishes a clear institutional framework involving:

- **Ministry of Education** (Policy Oversight)
- **SUBE** (Implementation)
- **LGEAs** (Local Coordination)

A phased implementation timeline, supported by a governance structure comprising a **Steering Committee and Technical Working Group**, will ensure effective coordination and accountability.

Monitoring, Evaluation, and Risk Management

A robust monitoring and evaluation framework is embedded to track:

- PTR improvements
- Teacher distribution equity
- Learning outcomes

Key risks, such as fiscal constraints, political interference, and resistance to redeployment—are identified and mitigated through:

- Phased implementation
- Stakeholder engagement
- Data-driven decision-making

The analysis clearly demonstrates that the teacher workforce challenge in Osun State is not merely a problem of insufficient numbers, but one of inequitable distribution, inefficient deployment, and structural reliance on informal staffing.

Accordingly, the Plan recommends a shift toward:

- Targeted and phased recruitment
- Systematic teacher redistribution
- Incentive-driven rural deployment
- Strengthened data systems and planning tools

Ultimately, the successful implementation of this Plan will:

- Improve equity in access to quality education
- Enhance system efficiency
- Strengthen fiscal sustainability
- Contribute to better learning outcomes across the State, and
- Sustainable financing system

In conclusion, this Plan represents a transition from fragmented workforce management to a **coherent, data-driven, and forward-looking teacher policy framework**, positioning Osun State to achieve sustainable improvements in basic education delivery.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND POLICY CONTEXT

1.1 Introduction

The education sector in Osun State plays a central role in advancing human capital development, promoting social mobility, and supporting long-term economic transformation. As a foundational sub-sector, basic education provides the critical building blocks for literacy, numeracy, and lifelong learning, thereby shaping the productivity and competitiveness of the State's future workforce.

In line with national and global commitments, including the Universal Basic Education (UBE) Programme, the National Policy on Education, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Osun State Government has continued to prioritize access to inclusive, equitable, and quality basic education.

Notwithstanding these efforts, emerging evidence indicates that the effectiveness of the basic education system is increasingly constrained by structural inefficiencies, particularly in the management of the teacher workforce. These inefficiencies manifest in the form of quantitative shortages, inequitable distribution, and suboptimal utilization of teachers across schools and Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs).

This document; *Osun State Basic Education Baseline Mapping and Multi-Year Costed Teacher Recruitment and Deployment Plan* is therefore designed as a technical instrument to address these challenges through a data-driven and fiscally grounded approach to teacher workforce planning.

1.2 Background to the Study

Basic education in Osun State operates within the framework of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) Programme, which guarantees nine years of continuous schooling comprising:

- Early Childhood Care Development and Education (ECCDE)
- Six years of primary education
- Three years of junior secondary education

The institutional framework for delivery includes:

- Ministry of Education (policy formulation and oversight)
- State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB) (implementation)
- Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs) (decentralized administration)

This multi-tier governance structure is supported by federal intervention through the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC), which provides funding and coordination support for basic education delivery.

Over time, the State has developed several planning instruments, including:

- Medium-Term Basic Education Strategic Plan (MTBESP)
- Annual Operational Workplans
- Medium-Term Sector Strategy (MTSS)

These frameworks emphasize key priority areas such as *Access, Quality, System Strengthening, and Sustainable Financing*. However, while these areas articulate sectoral goals, they provide limited operational depth in addressing teacher workforce challenges through quantitative and forward-looking methodologies.

1.3 Problem Statement

The challenges confronting basic education in Osun State extend beyond a simple shortage of teachers, rather, the system is characterized by a complex combination of:

- Quantitative gaps in teacher availability
- Spatial inequities in teacher distribution
- Dependence on non-formal teaching personnel
- Weak workforce planning systems
- Fiscal constraints affecting recruitment and sustainability

Evidence from the baseline mapping reveals that while the aggregated numbers of teacher may appear adequate, this masks a critical structural issue. The system relies heavily on a large pool of ad-hoc teachers; including PTA-funded teachers, NYSC members, volunteers, and other non-payroll staff to sustain classroom instruction.

As of January 2025:

- The State has **9,026 primary teachers and 4,165 junior secondary teachers**, including ad-hoc personnel
- However, government-paid teachers constitute only **6,422 (Primary) and 2,408 (JSS)**
- A total of **4,360 ad-hoc teachers** are engaged across the system

This reveals a significantly larger underlying staffing gap when only formal teachers are considered. While the total teacher gap appears to be **2,301**, the gap increases substantially when restricted to government-paid teachers.

In addition, teacher distribution across LGEAs is highly uneven. Urban areas tend to have relatively higher teacher concentrations, while rural and hard-to-reach areas experience persistent shortages. This imbalance results in wide variations in pupil-teacher ratios (PTR), with some schools being over-staffed and underutilized while others are short-staffed and their utility overstressed.

The system also faces qualitative challenges, including:

- Gaps in subject specialization
- Variations in teacher qualifications
- Limited continuous professional development

Furthermore, existing workforce planning approaches are largely static and reactive, relying on periodic assessments rather than dynamic forecasting models. Weak integration between EMIS, payroll, and administrative data systems further constrains effective planning and decision-making.

Taken together, these issues highlight the absence of a coherent, data-driven, and forward-looking framework for teacher recruitment, deployment, and management.

1.4 Objectives of the Plan

1.4.1 General Objective

The overarching objective of this Plan is to establish a comprehensive, data-driven, and fiscally sustainable framework for teacher workforce planning in Osun State, with a focus on improving equity, efficiency, and learning outcomes in basic education.

1.4.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives are to:

- Conduct a statewide baseline mapping of teacher availability and distribution
- Identify quantitative and qualitative teacher gaps across LGEAs and school levels

- Develop a teacher demand forecasting model based on enrollment projections and policy benchmarks
- Design a multi-year costed teacher recruitment plan aligned with fiscal realities
- Establish an efficient teacher deployment and redistribution strategy
- Strengthen data systems and workforce planning processes
- Improve equity and learning outcomes through optimized teacher allocation

1.5 Scope and Coverage

This Plan focuses on the public basic education sub-sector in Osun State, covering:

- ECCDE
- Primary education
- Junior secondary education

The analysis spans all Local Government Areas and LGEAs, ensuring representation of both urban and rural contexts.

Institutionally, the Plan covers:

- Ministry of Education
- SUBEB
- LGEAs

While the primary emphasis is on public schools, the broader education ecosystem—including community-supported teaching arrangements—is also considered where relevant.

The Plan adopts a **medium-term time horizon (2025–2028)**, aligning with existing sector planning and budgeting frameworks such as the MTSS and MTBESP.

1.6 Policy and Institutional Context

The Plan is anchored within a well-established policy framework at both national and state levels.

At the national level:

- Universal Basic Education Act (2004)
- National Policy on Education

At the state level:

- Osun State Medium-Term Basic Education Strategic Plan (2024–2027)

- Annual Operational Workplans
- Medium-Term Sector Strategy (MTSS)

These frameworks collectively emphasize:

- Access and equity
- Quality and relevance
- System strengthening
- Sustainable funding

However, they provide limited operational detail on how teacher workforce gaps should be systematically addressed over time. This Plan bridges that gap by translating policy priorities into actionable, data-driven workforce planning strategies.

1.7 Justification for the Plan

The need for this Plan is driven by four critical considerations:

1. Evidence-Based Planning

Current planning approaches rely heavily on aggregated estimates, limiting their effectiveness in addressing dynamic changes in enrollment and teacher demand. This Plan introduces a robust analytical framework for evidence-based decision-making.

2. Efficiency Gains

Improved deployment and redistribution of existing teachers can significantly reduce observed shortages without proportionate increases in the wage bill. This is particularly important in a context of limited fiscal space.

3. Fiscal Sustainability

The MTSS emphasizes the importance of aligning sector plans with realistic budgetary frameworks. By incorporating detailed cost projections and phased recruitment strategies, this Plan ensures financial feasibility.

4. Improved Learning Outcomes

Teacher availability, quality, and distribution are among the most critical determinants of student learning. By addressing these factors systematically, the Plan contributes directly to improved educational outcomes.

1.8 Key Definitions and Operational Terms

To ensure clarity and consistency, the following key terms are defined:

Deployment Efficiency: Degree to which teachers are optimally distributed

Qualified Teacher: Teacher meeting minimum professional standards

Pupil–Teacher Ratio (PTR): The number of pupils assigned to a teacher within a school or education system. National benchmarks (UBEC) recommend an average PTR of **35:1 for basic schools**.

Teacher Gap: The difference between the number of teachers required to meet established standards and the number of teachers currently available. A positive gap indicates a shortage, while a negative value indicates surplus.

Teacher Demand: The total number of teachers required in the system based on enrollment levels, policy benchmarks (e.g., PTR), and subject-specific requirements.

Teacher Supply: The total number of teachers available within the system, including both government-paid and ad-hoc teachers.

Government-Paid Teachers: Teachers formally employed and remunerated through the State payroll system (IPPIS or State Payroll), representing the official workforce.

Ad-hoc Teachers (Hidden Workforce): Teachers engaged outside the formal payroll system, including PTA-funded teachers, NYSC members, volunteers, and other community-supported personnel. While they contribute to service delivery, they are not fiscally sustainable or institutionally stable.

Deployment Efficiency: The extent to which teachers are optimally distributed across schools and locations in alignment with enrollment patterns and policy benchmarks.

Surplus–Deficit Index: A measure used to assess teacher distribution imbalance across schools or LGAs. Positive values indicate surplus, while negative values indicate deficits.

Teacher Utilization Rate: The proportion of teachers effectively engaged in classroom instruction relative to total available teachers.

Equity in Teacher Distribution: The degree to which teachers are evenly distributed across geographic locations (urban vs rural) and schools, ensuring fair access to quality instruction.

Inequality Index (Gini Coefficient): A statistical measure used to assess the degree of inequality in teacher distribution across schools or LGAs. Values range from:

- 0 = Perfect equality

- 1 = Maximum inequality

Enrollment Projection: An estimate of future student enrollment based on historical trends or cohort survival rates, used for forecasting teacher demand.

Cohort Survival Rate: The proportion of pupils who progress from one grade level to the next within the education system, used in enrollment projection models.

Teacher Demand Forecasting: A forward-looking analytical process used to estimate future teacher requirements based on projected enrollment, policy standards, and system constraints.

Subject Specialization: The alignment between a teacher's academic qualification and the subject they are assigned to teach, particularly critical at the junior secondary level.

Qualified Teacher: A teacher who meets the minimum academic and professional standards required for teaching, including certification by relevant authorities such as the Teachers Registration Council of Nigeria (TRCN).

Attrition Rate: The rate at which teachers exit the system due to retirement, resignation, transfer, or death.

Recruitment Plan: A structured, multi-year strategy for hiring teachers to address identified gaps, aligned with fiscal capacity and policy priorities.

Unit Cost per Teacher: The total annual cost of employing a teacher, including:

- Salary
- Allowances
- Training and professional development costs

Fiscal Sustainability: The ability of the State to finance teacher recruitment and retention over time without exceeding budgetary constraints.

Education Management Information System (EMIS): A system for collecting, managing, and analyzing education data, including enrollment, staffing, and infrastructure, used for planning and decision-making.

Baseline Mapping: A comprehensive assessment of the current state of the education system, including teacher availability, distribution, and gaps, serving as the foundation for planning and intervention.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Data Sources

This study adopts a multi-source data integration approach to ensure robustness, reliability, and cross-validation of findings. Data were drawn from administrative, statistical, and operational datasets across the education system.

The primary sources include:

- Education Management Information System (EMIS)
- State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB) administrative records
- Payroll data (State Payroll/IPPIS)
- Annual School Census (ASC)
- Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC) datasets
- Baseline teacher mapping and staffing gap dataset

These datasets were harmonized to provide a comprehensive view of teacher availability, distribution, and requirements across the State.

The integration of multiple data sources ensures that the analysis is not dependent on a single dataset, thereby reducing bias and improving reliability. Each dataset plays a complementary role, while EMIS provides enrollment data, payroll validates teacher numbers, and the baseline mapping dataset consolidates staffing gaps.

Table 2.1 Summary of Data Sources and Key Variables

| Data Source | Key Variables | Purpose |
|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| EMIS | Enrollment, school location, infrastructure | Enrollment analysis, PTR computation |
| SUBEB Records | Teacher deployment, school staffing | Teacher distribution analysis |
| Payroll Data | Government-paid teachers, salary structure | Workforce validation, costing |
| School Census | Enrollment, facilities, staffing | Cross-validation |
| UBEC Dataset | Policy benchmarks (PTR, standards) | Normative benchmarking |
| Baseline Mapping Dataset | Teacher stock, requirements, gaps | Core analytical dataset |

The triangulation of these datasets enable:

- Verification of teacher counts
- Accurate estimation of teacher demand
- Identification of inconsistencies across administrative systems

2.2 Data Validation and Cleaning Protocol

Given the multi-source nature of the data, a rigorous validation and cleaning protocol was implemented to ensure data integrity.

2.2.1 Deduplication (Addressing Ghost Workers)

To eliminate duplicate records and potential ghost workers, payroll data were cross-checked against school-level teacher records.

$$\text{Duplicate Rate} = \frac{\text{Duplicate Records Identified}}{\text{Total Records}} \times 100$$

Teachers appearing on payroll but not linked to any school were flagged for further verification.

2.2.2 Cross-Referencing Payroll and School Presence

A key validation step involved matching:

- Teachers listed on payroll
- Teachers physically present in schools

$$\text{Validation Ratio} = \frac{\text{Teachers Matched (Payroll \& School)}}{\text{Total Payroll Teachers}}$$

This ensured that only active and deployable teachers were included in the analysis.

2.2.3 Handling Missing Data

Missing values were addressed using:

- Mean/median imputation (for numeric variables)
- Logical inference (e.g., using LGA averages)
- Exclusion where necessary

$$\text{Missingness Rate} = \frac{\text{Missing Values}}{\text{Total Observations}} \times 100$$

Table 2. 2 Data Cleaning Summary

| Issue | Method Applied | Outcome |
|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Duplicate teachers | Record matching | Eliminated ghost workers |
| Payroll mismatch | Cross-referencing | Improved accuracy |
| Missing data | Imputation | Preserved dataset integrity |

Interpretation

These procedures ensure that the dataset used for analysis reflects the **true operational workforce**, rather than inflated administrative figures.

2.3 Analytical Framework

The analytical framework integrates descriptive, normative, predictive, and efficiency-based approaches.

2.3.1 Descriptive Diagnostics

This component provides a baseline understanding of teacher availability and distribution.

Table 2. 3 Teacher Stock and Requirements

| Category | Primary | JSS | Total |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Government Paid Teachers | 6,422 | 2,408 | 8,830 |
| Ad-hoc Teachers | 2,604 | 1,757 | 4,361 |
| Total Teachers | 9,026 | 4,165 | 13,191 |
| Required Teachers | 10,776 | 4,716 | 15,492 |
| Teacher Gap (Total) | 1,750 | 551 | 2,301 |
| Teacher Gap (Govt Only) | 4,354 | 2,308 | 6,662 |

This table distinguishes between:

- Formal workforce (government-paid)
- Informal workforce (ad-hoc)

This distinction is critical for policy and fiscal planning.

The analysis reveals that:

- The apparent teacher gap (2,301) understates the true deficit
- When only government-paid teachers are considered, the gap rises significantly to 6,662

This indicates heavy reliance on non-formal staffing arrangements.

2.3.2 Normative Benchmarking

Teacher adequacy was assessed against UBEC standards.

Benchmark Used

- Primary PTR: **35:1**

Table 2.4 Recommended PTR Bands

| PTR Range | Interpretation |
|-----------|-------------------|
| < 25 | Overstaffed |
| 25 – 35 | Optimal |
| 36 – 45 | Moderate Pressure |
| > 45 | Severe Shortage |

Interpretation

These bands operationalize national standards into actionable categories for planning and intervention.

2.3.3 Teacher Demand Forecasting Model

Enrollment Projection Model

$$E_t = E_0 (1 + g)^t$$

Where:

- E_t = projected enrollment
- g = growth rate

Teacher Demand Function

$$\text{Teacher Demand} = \frac{\text{Projected Enrollment}}{\text{PTR Standard}}$$

Application Insight

This enables:

- Multi-year recruitment planning
- Alignment with demographic trends

2.3.4 Deployment Efficiency Metrics

Key Metrics

Surplus–Deficit Index

Teacher Gap = Available – Required

$$\text{SDI} = \frac{\text{Available} - \text{Required}}{\text{Required}}$$

Table 2. 5 Surplus–Deficit Index (SDI) by LGA

| S/N | LGEA | Required | Available | SDI |
|-----|-----------------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 | Atakumosa East | 728 | 260 | -0.64 |
| 2 | Atakumosa West | 496 | 252 | -0.49 |
| 3 | Ayedaade | 820 | 404 | -0.51 |
| 4 | Ayedire | 308 | 230 | -0.25 |
| 5 | Boluwaduro | 300 | 134 | -0.55 |
| 6 | Boripe | 432 | 292 | -0.32 |
| 7 | Ede North | 296 | 450 | +0.52 |
| 8 | Ede South | 380 | 319 | -0.16 |
| 9 | Egbedore | 412 | 374 | -0.09 |
| 10 | Ejigbo | 728 | 452 | -0.38 |
| 11 | Ife Area Office | 328 | 412 | +0.26 |
| 12 | Ife Central | 436 | 464 | +0.06 |
| 13 | Ife East | 664 | 423 | -0.36 |

| S/N | LGEA | Required | Available | SDI |
|-----|------------|----------|-----------|--------------|
| 14 | Ife North | 584 | 320 | -0.45 |
| 15 | Ife South | 1008 | 390 | -0.61 |
| 16 | Ifedayo | 244 | 155 | -0.36 |
| 17 | Ifelodun | 408 | 445 | +0.09 |
| 18 | Ila | 288 | 243 | -0.16 |
| 19 | Ilesa East | 392 | 340 | -0.13 |
| 20 | Ilesa West | 276 | 413 | +0.50 |
| 21 | Irepodun | 292 | 318 | +0.09 |
| 22 | Irewole | 708 | 435 | -0.39 |
| 23 | Isokan | 616 | 347 | -0.44 |
| 24 | Iwo | 648 | 593 | -0.08 |
| 25 | Obokun | 600 | 266 | -0.56 |
| 26 | Odo-Otin | 608 | 274 | -0.55 |
| 27 | Ola-Oluwa | 436 | 272 | -0.38 |
| 28 | Olorunda | 480 | 755 | +0.57 |
| 29 | Oriade | 788 | 337 | -0.57 |
| 30 | Orolu | 252 | 230 | -0.09 |
| 31 | Osogbo | 536 | 838 | +0.56 |

The Surplus-Deficit Index (SDI) provides a standardized measure of teacher distribution across LGAs, revealing significant disparities in staffing levels. While a few urban LGAs exhibit substantial surpluses, the majority of LGAs experience moderate to critical deficits. This underscores the need for a coordinated strategy that prioritizes redistribution from surplus areas while targeting recruitment toward critically underserved LGAs.

Table 2. 6 Interpretation of SDI

| SDI Value | Meaning |
|----------------|---------------------------------|
| > +0.10 | Surplus (Redistribution source) |
| -0.10 to +0.10 | Balanced |
| -0.11 to -0.30 | Moderate deficit |

| SDI Value | Meaning |
|----------------|------------------|
| -0.31 to -0.50 | Severe deficit |
| < -0.50 | Critical deficit |

1. Critical LGAs (SDI < -0.50)

- Atakumosa East (-0.64)
- Ife South (-0.61)
- Oriade (-0.57)
- Obokun (-0.56)
- Odo-Otin (-0.55)

These are the **top recruitment priority LGAs**

2. Surplus LGAs (SDI > +0.50)

- Olorunda (+0.57)
- Osogbo (+0.56)
- Ede North (+0.52)
- Ilesa West (+0.50)

☞ These are your **primary redistribution sources**

3. Balanced LGAs

- Ife Central
- Ifelodun
- Irepodun

Require **minimal intervention**

Teacher Utilization Rate

$$\text{Utilization} = \frac{\text{Active Teachers}}{\text{Total Teachers}} \times 100$$

Teacher Utilization (Efficiency) by LGA

Formula Used

$$\text{Teacher Per School} = \frac{\text{Total Teachers}}{\text{Total Schools}}$$

Where:

- **Total Teachers = Govt Pry + Govt JSS + Ad-hoc Pry**
- **Total Schools = Pry Schools + JSS Schools**
- **Table 3.3: Teacher Utilization (Efficiency) by LGA**

Table 2. 7 Teacher Utilization (Efficiency) by LGA

| S/N | LGEA | Total Teachers | Total Schools | Teachers per School | Efficiency Status |
|-----|-----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Atakumosa East | 260 | 84 | 3.1 | Understaffed |
| 2 | Atakumosa West | 252 | 56 | 4.5 | Understaffed |
| 3 | Ayedaade | 404 | 92 | 4.4 | Understaffed |
| 4 | Ayedire | 230 | 35 | 6.6 | Moderate |
| 5 | Boluwaduro | 134 | 33 | 4.1 | Understaffed |
| 6 | Boripe | 292 | 48 | 6.1 | Moderate |
| 7 | Ede North | 450 | 34 | 13.2 | Overstaffed |
| 8 | Ede South | 319 | 43 | 7.4 | Moderate |
| 9 | Egbedore | 374 | 46 | 8.1 | Moderate |
| 10 | Ejigbo | 452 | 81 | 5.6 | Moderate |
| 11 | Ife Area Office | 412 | 36 | 11.4 | Overstaffed |
| 12 | Ife Central | 464 | 50 | 9.3 | Moderate |
| 13 | Ife East | 423 | 76 | 5.6 | Moderate |
| 14 | Ife North | 320 | 67 | 4.8 | Understaffed |
| 15 | Ife South | 390 | 116 | 3.4 | Understaffed |
| 16 | Ifedayo | 155 | 27 | 5.7 | Moderate |
| 17 | Ifelodun | 445 | 45 | 9.9 | Moderate |
| 18 | Ila | 243 | 32 | 7.6 | Moderate |
| 19 | Ilesa East | 340 | 42 | 8.1 | Moderate |
| 20 | Ilesa West | 413 | 30 | 13.8 | Overstaffed |
| 21 | Irepodun | 318 | 31 | 10.3 | Overstaffed |

| S/N | LGEA | Total Teachers | Total Schools | Teachers per School | Efficiency Status |
|-----|-----------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 22 | Irewole | 435 | 81 | 5.4 | Moderate |
| 23 | Isokan | 347 | 71 | 4.9 | Understaffed |
| 24 | Iwo | 593 | 74 | 8.0 | Moderate |
| 25 | Obokun | 266 | 67 | 4.0 | Understaffed |
| 26 | Odo-Otin | 274 | 67 | 4.1 | Understaffed |
| 27 | Ola-Oluwa | 272 | 49 | 5.6 | Moderate |
| 28 | Olorunda | 755 | 52 | 14.5 | Overstaffed |
| 29 | Oriade | 337 | 88 | 3.8 | Understaffed |
| 30 | Orolu | 230 | 28 | 8.2 | Moderate |
| 31 | Osogbo | 838 | 59 | 14.2 | Overstaffed |

The analysis of teacher utilization reveals significant disparities across LGAs, with several urban areas exhibiting high teacher concentration relative to the number of schools, while many rural LGAs remain critically understaffed. This imbalance highlights the need for a structured redistribution strategy to optimize existing teacher resources before additional recruitment is undertaken.

Table 2. 8 Efficiency Classification Logic

| Teachers per School | Interpretation |
|---------------------|----------------|
| < 5 | Understaffed |
| 5 – 10 | Moderate |
| > 10 | Overstaffed |

Key insights from the table;

1. Severe Underutilization in Rural LGAs

- Atakumosa East (3.1)
- Ife South (3.4)
- Oriade (3.8)

Indicates **serious teacher shortages**

2. Overstaffing in Urban LGAs

- Olorunda (14.5)
- Osogbo (14.2)
- Ilesa West (13.8)

Indicates **deployment inefficiency**

Purpose

Shows overstaffing vs understaffing clearly.

2.3.5 Costing Framework

Unit Cost Calculation

Unit Cost = Salary + Allowances + Training

Baseline Cost

- Primary teachers: **₦14.67 billion**
- JSS teachers: **₦5.94 billion**

Recruitment Cost

- 2,301 teachers: **₦3.89 billion over 4 years**

Table 2. 9 Cost Components

| Component | Description |
|------------|--------------------|
| Salary | Based on payroll |
| Allowances | Statutory benefits |
| Training | Capacity building |

CHAPTER 3: BASELINE SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

3.1 School and Enrollment Profile

The structure of the basic education system in Osun State reflects a wide network of institutions distributed across all Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs). The baseline mapping indicates that the State operates a total of 1,347 public primary schools and 393 junior secondary schools, providing access to basic education across both urban and rural communities.

While this network ensures geographic coverage, the distribution of schools does not necessarily correspond with enrollment pressures, thereby creating disparities in class sizes and teacher requirements across locations.

Table 3.1 Distribution of Schools by Level

| Level | Number of Schools |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Primary Schools | 1,347 |
| Junior Secondary Schools | 393 |
| Total | 1,740 |

This table establishes the structural base of the system, indicating the scale at which teacher deployment and resource allocation must operate.

The significantly higher number of primary schools implies:

- Greater demand for teachers at the foundational level
- Increased pressure on recruitment and deployment systems
- The need for differentiated planning across levels

Enrollment Dynamics

Although detailed enrollment figures vary across datasets, the analytical framework assumes enrollment-driven teacher demand. Variations in enrollment across LGAs contribute directly to disparities in PTR and teacher requirements.

3.2 Teacher Stock Analysis

Teacher availability remains a central determinant of system performance. However, the baseline analysis reveals a critical distinction between:

- **Government-paid teachers (formal workforce)**
- **Ad-hoc teachers (informal workforce)**

Table 3. 2 Teacher Stock by Employment Type

| Category | Primary | JSS | Total |
|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Government Paid Teachers | 6,422 | 2,408 | 8,830 |
| Ad-hoc Teachers | 2,604 | 1,757 | 4,361 |
| Total Teachers | 9,026 | 4,165 | 13,191 |

This table disaggregates teacher stock to reveal the true structure of the workforce.

The analysis shows that:

- Approximately **one-third of the teaching workforce is ad-hoc**
- The system depends heavily on non-formal staffing arrangements
- The apparent adequacy of teacher numbers is misleading

This has implications for:

- Quality assurance
- Workforce stability
- Fiscal sustainability

Teacher Requirements and Gap

Table 3. 3 Teacher Requirements and Gap Analysis

| Level | Required Teachers | Available Teachers | Gap |
|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Primary | 10,776 | 9,026 | 1,750 |
| JSS | 4,716 | 4,165 | 551 |
| Total | 15,492 | 13,191 | 2,301 |

Interpretation

While the total gap appears moderate, a deeper analysis reveals:

- The system is only able to meet demand through ad-hoc teachers
- Without these, the gap increases significantly
- This indicates structural under-capacity in the formal workforce

3.3 Teacher Distribution Analysis

Beyond aggregate shortages, the distribution of teachers across LGAs is highly uneven.

Table 3. 4 LGA-LEVEL TEACHER DISTRIBUTION

| S/N | LGEA | Pry Schools | JSS Schools | Pry Teachers | Adhoc Trs (Pry) | JSS Teachers | Adhoc Trs (JSS) |
|-----|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Atakumosa East | 70 | 14 | 123 | 135 | 2 | 9 |
| 2 | Atakumosa West | 44 | 12 | 140 | 85 | 27 | 3 |
| 3 | Ayedaade | 71 | 21 | 199 | 137 | 68 | 65 |
| 4 | Ayedire | 28 | 7 | 130 | 54 | 46 | 3 |
| 5 | Boluwaduro | 24 | 9 | 81 | 46 | 7 | 42 |
| 6 | Boripe | 36 | 12 | 181 | 70 | 41 | 57 |
| 7 | Ede North | 28 | 6 | 301 | 54 | 95 | 40 |
| 8 | Ede South | 34 | 9 | 168 | 66 | 85 | 40 |
| 9 | Egbedore | 35 | 11 | 276 | 68 | 30 | 44 |
| 10 | Ejigbo | 61 | 20 | 272 | 118 | 62 | 119 |
| 11 | Ife Area Office | 26 | 10 | 264 | 50 | 98 | 73 |
| 12 | Ife Central | 41 | 9 | 260 | 79 | 125 | 62 |
| 13 | Ife East | 62 | 14 | 179 | 120 | 124 | 38 |
| 14 | Ife North | 55 | 12 | 165 | 106 | 49 | 38 |
| 15 | Ife South | 96 | 20 | 186 | 186 | 18 | 32 |
| 16 | Ifedayo | 20 | 7 | 94 | 39 | 22 | 7 |
| 17 | Ifelodun | 33 | 12 | 276 | 64 | 105 | 65 |
| 18 | Ila | 24 | 8 | 123 | 46 | 74 | 33 |
| 19 | Ilesa East | 28 | 14 | 144 | 54 | 142 | 36 |
| 20 | Ilesa West | 21 | 9 | 253 | 41 | 119 | 56 |

| S/N | LGEA | Pry Schools | JSS Schools | Pry Teachers | Adhoc Trs (Pry) | JSS Teachers | Adhoc Trs (JSS) |
|-----|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 21 | Irepodun | 20 | 11 | 190 | 39 | 89 | 49 |
| 22 | Irewole | 66 | 15 | 186 | 128 | 121 | 51 |
| 23 | Isokan | 59 | 12 | 169 | 114 | 64 | 22 |
| 24 | Iwo | 60 | 14 | 332 | 116 | 145 | 42 |
| 25 | Obokun | 51 | 16 | 155 | 99 | 12 | 144 |
| 26 | Odo-Otin | 49 | 18 | 156 | 95 | 23 | 49 |
| 27 | Ola-Oluwa | 38 | 11 | 181 | 73 | 18 | 16 |
| 28 | Olorunda | 36 | 16 | 449 | 70 | 236 | 255 |
| 29 | Oriade | 67 | 21 | 181 | 130 | 26 | 51 |
| 30 | Orolu | 21 | 7 | 164 | 41 | 25 | 17 |
| 31 | Osogbo | 43 | 16 | 444 | 83 | 311 | 176 |

The integrated distribution of schools and teachers across LGAs reveals significant structural imbalances in the allocation of human resources within the education system. While some LGAs exhibit relatively high teacher availability in relation to the number of schools, others face severe shortages, particularly at the junior secondary level. The uneven distribution across both primary and junior secondary levels suggests that inefficiencies in teacher deployment are a major contributor to observed staffing gaps. Furthermore, the widespread presence of ad-hoc teachers across LGAs highlights the extent to which the system relies on non-formal staffing arrangements to sustain instructional delivery.

Table 3.5 Urban-Rural Teacher Distribution and Staffing Characteristics

| S/N | LGEA | Category | Total Schools | Total Teachers | Teachers /School | JSS Strength | Workforce Structure |
|-----|----------------|----------|---------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Atakumosa East | Rural | 84 | 269 | 3.2 | Very Weak | Adhoc-heavy |
| 2 | Atakumosa West | Rural | 56 | 255 | 4.6 | Weak | Mixed |
| 3 | Ayedaade | Rural | 92 | 469 | 5.1 | Moderate | Mixed |

| S/N | LGEA | Category | Total Schools | Total Teachers | Teachers /School | JSS Strength | Workforce Structure |
|-----|-----------------|------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 4 | Ayedire | Rural | 35 | 233 | 6.7 | Moderate | Mixed |
| 5 | Boluwaduro | Rural | 33 | 176 | 5.3 | Weak | Adhoc-heavy |
| 6 | Boripe | Semi-Urban | 48 | 349 | 7.3 | Moderate | Balanced |
| 7 | Ede North | Urban | 34 | 490 | 14.4 | Strong | Govt-dominant |
| 8 | Ede South | Semi-Urban | 43 | 359 | 8.3 | Strong | Balanced |
| 9 | Egbedore | Semi-Urban | 46 | 418 | 9.1 | Moderate | Balanced |
| 10 | Ejigbo | Semi-Urban | 81 | 571 | 7.0 | Moderate | Adhoc-heavy |
| 11 | Ife Area Office | Urban | 36 | 485 | 13.5 | Strong | Mixed |
| 12 | Ife Central | Urban | 50 | 526 | 10.5 | Strong | Balanced |
| 13 | Ife East | Semi-Urban | 76 | 461 | 6.1 | Strong | Mixed |
| 14 | Ife North | Rural | 67 | 358 | 5.3 | Weak | Mixed |
| 15 | Ife South | Rural | 116 | 422 | 3.6 | Very Weak | Adhoc-heavy |
| 16 | Ifedayo | Rural | 27 | 162 | 6.0 | Weak | Mixed |
| 17 | Ifelodun | Semi-Urban | 45 | 510 | 11.3 | Strong | Balanced |
| 18 | Ila | Rural | 32 | 276 | 8.6 | Moderate | Mixed |
| 19 | Ilesa East | Semi-Urban | 42 | 376 | 9.0 | Strong | Balanced |
| 20 | Ilesa West | Urban | 30 | 469 | 15.6 | Strong | Govt-dominant |

| S/N | LGEA | Category | Total Schools | Total Teachers | Teachers /School | JSS Strength | Workforce Structure |
|-----|-----------|------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------|
| 21 | Irepodun | Semi-Urban | 31 | 367 | 11.8 | Strong | Balanced |
| 22 | Irewole | Semi-Urban | 81 | 486 | 6.0 | Strong | Mixed |
| 23 | Isokan | Rural | 71 | 369 | 5.2 | Moderate | Mixed |
| 24 | Iwo | Urban | 74 | 635 | 8.6 | Strong | Balanced |
| 25 | Obokun | Rural | 67 | 410 | 6.1 | Very Weak | Adhoc-heavy |
| 26 | Odo-Otin | Rural | 67 | 323 | 4.8 | Weak | Mixed |
| 27 | Ola-Oluwa | Rural | 49 | 288 | 5.9 | Weak | Mixed |
| 28 | Olorunda | Urban | 52 | 1,010 | 19.4 | Very Strong | Mixed |
| 29 | Oriade | Rural | 88 | 388 | 4.4 | Weak | Mixed |
| 30 | Orolu | Rural | 28 | 247 | 8.8 | Moderate | Mixed |
| 31 | Osogbo | Urban | 59 | 1,014 | 17.2 | Very Strong | Mixed |

The analysis of urban–rural teacher distribution and staffing characteristics reveals pronounced structural imbalances in the allocation of teaching resources across the State. Urban LGAs consistently exhibit higher teacher densities, more balanced staffing across primary and junior secondary levels, and PTR conditions that fall within or below recommended standards. In contrast, rural LGAs are characterized by low teacher-to-school ratios, weaker junior secondary staffing, and PTR levels indicative of moderate to severe classroom pressure.

The wide variation in teacher density across LGAs, ranging from critically low levels in rural areas to potential over-concentration in urban centres highlights systemic inefficiencies in teacher deployment. These disparities suggest that the State’s teacher workforce challenge is not solely one of inadequate supply but also of inequitable distribution and suboptimal allocation.

Furthermore, the transitional pattern observed in semi-urban LGAs indicates uneven system performance, where some areas approach optimal staffing conditions while others remain under

pressure. This underscores the need for differentiated policy responses rather than a uniform statewide approach.

Overall, the findings reinforce the necessity for a coordinated strategy that prioritizes the redistribution of teachers from overstuffed urban LGAs to underserved rural areas, alongside targeted recruitment to address residual deficits. Without such interventions, existing inequalities in teacher availability are likely to persist, with implications for equity in access to quality education and learning outcomes across the State.

PTR Analysis

Table 4.X: Urban–Rural Teacher Distribution and PTR Characteristics by LGA

To further understand disparities in teacher allocation, LGAs were classified into urban, semi-urban, and rural categories. Using surplus–deficit analysis as a proxy, PTR bands were derived to assess classroom pressure across locations.

Classification Logic

- **Urban / Peri-Urban:** High teacher concentration (typically surplus)
- **Rural:** Low teacher concentration (typically deficit)
- **Semi-Urban:** Transitional

PTR Band Logic (Proxy-Based)

Since enrollment per LGA is not explicitly provided, PTR bands are **inferred from surplus/deficit pattern:**

Urban–Rural Teacher Distribution and PTR Characteristics by LGA

Formulas Used

- Total Teachers = Pry + JSS + Adhoc(Pry) + Adhoc (JSS)
- Total Schools = Pry Schools + JSS Schools
- **PTR (Proxy) = $\frac{\text{Total Teachers}}{\text{Total Schools}}$**

Table 3. 6 PTR Band Classification

| Teachers/School | PTR Band | Interpretation |
|-----------------|----------|-------------------|
| < 5 | >45 | Critical Shortage |
| 5 – 8 | 36–45 | Moderate Pressure |
| 8 – 12 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| > 12 | <25 | Overstaffed |

Table 3. 7 Urban–Rural Teacher Distribution and PTR Characteristics by LGA

| LGEA | Category | Schools | Teachers | Teachers/School | PTR Band | Interpretation |
|-----------------|------------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------|----------------|
| Atakumosa East | Rural | 84 | 269 | 3.2 | >45 | Critical |
| Atakumosa West | Rural | 56 | 255 | 4.6 | >45 | Critical |
| Ayedaade | Rural | 92 | 469 | 5.1 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Ayedire | Rural | 35 | 233 | 6.7 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Boluwaduro | Rural | 33 | 176 | 5.3 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Boripe | Semi-Urban | 48 | 349 | 7.3 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Ede North | Urban | 34 | 490 | 14.4 | <25 | Overstaffed |
| Ede South | Semi-Urban | 43 | 359 | 8.3 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| Egbedore | Semi-Urban | 46 | 418 | 9.1 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| Ejigbo | Semi-Urban | 81 | 571 | 7.0 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Ife Area Office | Urban | 36 | 485 | 13.5 | <25 | Overstaffed |
| Ife Central | Urban | 50 | 526 | 10.5 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| Ife East | Semi-Urban | 76 | 461 | 6.1 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Ife North | Rural | 67 | 358 | 5.3 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Ife South | Rural | 116 | 422 | 3.6 | >45 | Critical |
| Ifedayo | Rural | 27 | 162 | 6.0 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Ifelodun | Semi-Urban | 45 | 510 | 11.3 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| Ila | Rural | 32 | 276 | 8.6 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| Ilesa East | Semi-Urban | 42 | 376 | 9.0 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| Ilesa West | Urban | 30 | 469 | 15.6 | <25 | Overstaffed |
| Irepodun | Semi-Urban | 31 | 367 | 11.8 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| Irewole | Semi-Urban | 81 | 486 | 6.0 | 36–45 | Pressure |

| LGEA | Category | Schools | Teachers | Teachers/School | PTR Band | Interpretation |
|-----------|----------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------|----------------|
| Isokan | Rural | 71 | 369 | 5.2 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Iwo | Urban | 74 | 635 | 8.6 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| Obokun | Rural | 67 | 410 | 6.1 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Odo-Otin | Rural | 67 | 323 | 4.8 | >45 | Critical |
| Ola-Oluwa | Rural | 49 | 288 | 5.9 | 36–45 | Pressure |
| Olorunda | Urban | 52 | 1010 | 19.4 | <25 | Overstaffed |
| Oriade | Rural | 88 | 388 | 4.4 | >45 | Critical |
| Orolu | Rural | 28 | 247 | 8.8 | 25–35 | Optimal |
| Osogbo | Urban | 59 | 1014 | 17.2 | <25 | Overstaffed |

The analysis of urban–rural teacher distribution and PTR characteristics reveals significant disparities in the allocation of teaching resources across LGAs. While urban areas tend to have adequate or surplus teacher supply, many rural LGAs experience critical shortages, reflected in high PTR levels. The coexistence of overstaffed and understaffed LGAs underscores systemic inefficiencies in teacher deployment. Addressing these imbalances will require a combination of targeted recruitment, strategic redistribution, and incentive mechanisms to improve teacher availability in underserved areas.

The following could be deduced from the table

1. Clear Urban Advantage

Urban LGAs:

- Mostly **Optimal or Overstaffed**
- PTR bands: **<25 or 25–35**

Examples:

- Osogbo
- Olorunda
- Ilesa West

2. Rural Crisis is Evident

Critical LGAs:

- Atakumosa East

- Ife South
- Odo-Otin
- Oriade

PTR >45 → **Severe classroom congestion**

3. System Imbalance

- Some LGAs → **overstaffed**
- Others → **critically understaffed**

This Confirms: Problem is **distribution, not just shortage**

4. Semi-Urban LGAs Are Mixed

- Some optimal
- Some under pressure

Require **targeted balancing**

3.4 Infrastructure-Teacher Interaction

Teacher availability must be assessed alongside infrastructure capacity.

In many cases:

- Schools with adequate teachers lack sufficient classrooms
- Schools with adequate infrastructure lack teachers

This mismatch reduces overall system efficiency.

Table 3. 8 Classroom-Teacher Alignment (Conceptual)

| Scenario | Implication |
|-------------------------------|------------------|
| High teachers, low classrooms | Underutilization |
| Low teachers, high classrooms | Inefficiency |
| Balanced | Optimal |

Interpretation

The interaction between infrastructure and teacher deployment highlights the need for integrated planning rather than isolated interventions.

3.5 Learning Outcome Linkage (Critical Analysis)

A key advancement in this analysis is the linkage between:

- Teacher availability
- System efficiency
- Learning outcomes

Although detailed performance data may be limited, existing evidence suggests:

- Schools with high PTR tend to record lower learning outcomes
- Uneven teacher distribution contributes to disparities in student performance
- Rural schools are disproportionately affected

Table 3.9 Conceptual Link between Teachers and Outcomes

| Condition | Expected Learning Outcome |
|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Adequate teachers | Improved performance |
| High PTR | Reduced performance |
| Uneven distribution | Inequality in outcomes |

Interpretation

This relationship reinforces the need for:

- Equitable teacher deployment
- Adequate staffing levels
- Continuous monitoring

CHAPTER 4: TEACHER GAP AND NEEDS ASSESSMENT

4.1 Introduction

This chapter translates the baseline findings into a structured analysis of teacher gaps across the basic education system in Osun State. Moving beyond descriptive statistics, the chapter identifies the magnitude, distribution, and nature of teacher shortages and surpluses, while providing a basis for targeted recruitment, deployment, and policy interventions.

The analysis draws on integrated datasets, including the baseline teacher mapping, LGEA-level staffing data, and validated administrative records. Particular attention is given to distinguishing between formal (government-paid) teachers and ad-hoc personnel, as this distinction is critical for understanding the true scale of staffing needs.

4.2 Aggregate Teacher Gap Analysis

The overall teacher gap in the State varies significantly depending on whether ad-hoc teachers are included in the analysis.

Table 4.1 Aggregate Teacher Gap (Dual Perspective Analysis)

| Category | Primary | JSS | Total |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Required Teachers | 10,776 | 4,716 | 15,492 |
| Government Paid Teachers | 6,422 | 2,408 | 8,830 |
| Ad-hoc Teachers | 2,604 | 1,757 | 4,361 |
| Total Teachers (All) | 9,026 | 4,165 | 13,191 |
| Gap (Including Ad-hoc) | 1,750 | 551 | 2,301 |
| Gap (Govt Only) | 4,354 | 2,308 | 6,662 |

This table presents two parallel realities:

- The operational system (including ad-hoc teachers)
- The formal system (government-paid teachers only)

The analysis reveals a critical structural issue:

- The system appears to have a manageable gap of 2,301 teachers
- However, when ad-hoc teachers are excluded, the gap increases to 6,662 teachers

This indicates that:

- The system is structurally understaffed

- Ad-hoc teachers are compensating for systemic deficiencies
- The current staffing model is **not sustainable**

4.3 LGA-Level Teacher Gap Analysis

While aggregate figures provide a statewide picture, they conceal significant spatial disparities.

Table 4.2: LGA-Level Teacher Gap Profile

Table 4.2 LGA-Level Teacher Gap Analysis

| S/N | LGEA | Required | Available | Gap | % Gap | Severity Level |
|-----|-----------------|----------|-----------|------|-------|----------------|
| 1 | Atakumosa East | 728 | 260 | -468 | -64% | Critical |
| 2 | Atakumosa West | 496 | 252 | -244 | -49% | Severe |
| 3 | Ayedaade | 820 | 404 | -416 | -51% | Critical |
| 4 | Ayedire | 308 | 230 | -78 | -25% | Moderate |
| 5 | Boluwaduro | 300 | 134 | -166 | -55% | Critical |
| 6 | Boripe | 432 | 292 | -140 | -32% | Severe |
| 7 | Ede North | 296 | 450 | +154 | +52% | Surplus |
| 8 | Ede South | 380 | 319 | -61 | -16% | Moderate |
| 9 | Egbedore | 412 | 374 | -38 | -9% | Mild |
| 10 | Ejigbo | 728 | 452 | -276 | -38% | Severe |
| 11 | Ife Area Office | 328 | 412 | +84 | +26% | Surplus |
| 12 | Ife Central | 436 | 464 | +28 | +6% | Balanced |
| 13 | Ife East | 664 | 423 | -241 | -36% | Severe |
| 14 | Ife North | 584 | 320 | -264 | -45% | Severe |
| 15 | Ife South | 1008 | 390 | -618 | -61% | Critical |
| 16 | Ifedayo | 244 | 155 | -89 | -36% | Severe |
| 17 | Ifelodun | 408 | 445 | +37 | +9% | Balanced |
| 18 | Ila | 288 | 243 | -45 | -16% | Moderate |
| 19 | Ilesa East | 392 | 340 | -52 | -13% | Moderate |
| 20 | Ilesa West | 276 | 413 | +137 | +50% | Surplus |
| 21 | Irepodun | 292 | 318 | +26 | +9% | Balanced |
| 22 | Irewole | 708 | 435 | -273 | -39% | Severe |

| S/N | LGEA | Required | Available | Gap | % Gap | Severity Level |
|-----|-----------|----------|-----------|------|-------|----------------|
| 23 | Isokan | 616 | 347 | -269 | -44% | Severe |
| 24 | Iwo | 648 | 593 | -55 | -8% | Mild |
| 25 | Obokun | 600 | 266 | -334 | -56% | Critical |
| 26 | Odo-Otin | 608 | 274 | -334 | -55% | Critical |
| 27 | Ola-Oluwa | 436 | 272 | -164 | -38% | Severe |
| 28 | Olorunda | 480 | 755 | +275 | +57% | Surplus |
| 29 | Oriade | 788 | 337 | -451 | -57% | Critical |
| 30 | Orolu | 252 | 230 | -22 | -9% | Mild |
| 31 | Osogbo | 536 | 838 | +302 | +56% | Surplus |

The LGA-level teacher gap profile reveals widespread and significant deficits across the State, with a majority of LGAs experiencing severe to critical shortages. At the same time, a small number of urban LGAs exhibit substantial surpluses. This imbalance underscores the urgent need for a coordinated strategy that combines targeted recruitment in high-deficit areas with systematic redistribution from surplus locations.

Table 4.3 Severity Classification Logic

| % Gap | Category |
|--------------|----------|
| $\geq +10\%$ | Surplus |
| -10% to +10% | Balanced |
| -11% to -25% | Moderate |
| -26% to -50% | Severe |
| $< -50\%$ | Critical |

Key Policy Insights

1. Critical LGAs (Highest Priority)

- Ife South (-61%)
- Atakumosa East (-64%)

- Oriade (-57%)
- Obokun / Odo-Otin (-55%)

These LGAs require **immediate recruitment intervention**

2. Surplus LGAs (Redistribution Sources)

- Osogbo (+56%)
- Olorunda (+57%)
- Ede North (+52%)
- Ilesa West (+50%)

These are **primary redistribution zones**

3. System Pattern

- Majority of LGAs fall under **Severe or Critical deficit**
- Very few LGAs are **balanced**

4.4 Surplus–Deficit Analysis

To better understand deployment inefficiencies, a surplus–deficit framework is applied.

Table 4. 4 Surplus–Deficit Classification

| Category | Definition | Policy Implication |
|----------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Surplus | Teachers > Required | Redeployment needed |
| Balanced | Teachers ≈ Required | Maintain |
| Deficit | Teachers < Required | Recruitment priority |

Interpretation

The analysis indicates that:

- Some LGAs have **localized surpluses**, particularly in urban centers
- Others face **systemic deficits**, particularly in rural areas
- This suggests that:
The problem is not only shortage, but also **misallocation**

4.5 Subject-Specific Teacher Gaps

Although aggregate numbers are important, subject specialization gaps are equally critical, particularly at the JSS level.

Evidence from the datasets and planning documents indicates shortages in:

- Mathematics
- Basic Science
- English Language

Table 4.5 Subject Gap Profile (Indicative)

| Subject | Availability | Gap Level |
|---------------|--------------|-----------|
| Mathematics | Low | High |
| Basic Science | Moderate | Moderate |
| English | Moderate | Moderate |

Interpretation

Subject-specific shortages:

- Affect curriculum delivery
- Reduce learning outcomes
- Require targeted recruitment strategies

4.6 Hidden Workforce and System Risk

A defining feature of the system is the large number of ad-hoc teachers.

Table 4.6 Composition of Teaching Workforce

| Category | Number | Share (%) |
|---------------------|---------------|-------------|
| Government Teachers | 8,830 | ~67% |
| Ad-hoc Teachers | 4,360 | ~33% |
| Total | 13,191 | 100% |

Interpretation

The reliance on ad-hoc teachers introduces several risks:

- **Quality risk:** Variations in qualifications

- **Stability risk:** High turnover
- **Fiscal invisibility:** Not captured in payroll
- **Equity issues:** Uneven distribution

4.7 Recruitment Gap and Strategic Needs

Based on the validated gap:

- Total recruitment need: **2,301 teachers (minimum scenario)**
- True structural need: **6,662 teachers (full formalization scenario)**

Table 4. 7 Recruitment Requirement Scenarios

| Scenario | Teachers Needed | Description |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Minimum Gap | 2,301 | Maintain current system |
| Full Formalization | 6,662 | Replace ad-hoc teachers |
| Hybrid Approach | ~3,500–4,000 | Gradual transition |

Interpretation

The hybrid approach is most realistic, balancing:

- Fiscal constraints
- System stability
- Workforce sustainability

4.8 Strategic Response Framework

Based on the analysis, the following strategic directions are proposed:

1. Targeted Recruitment

Focus on:

- Deficit LGAs
- Core subject areas
- Replacement of ad-hoc teachers

2. Teacher Redistribution

- Reallocate surplus teachers from urban to rural areas
- Optimize existing workforce before new hiring

3. Gradual Formalization of Ad-hoc Teachers

- Absorb qualified ad-hoc teachers into the formal system
- Reduce reliance on informal staffing

4. Data System Strengthening

- Integrate EMIS, payroll, and deployment systems
- Enable real-time workforce tracking

5. Incentive-Based Rural Deployment

- Introduce incentives for rural postings
- Address inequity in teacher distribution

General Comment: The teacher workforce challenge in Osun State is not merely a question of insufficient numbers but reflects deeper structural inefficiencies in workforce planning and deployment.

While the apparent teacher gap appears modest, this is largely due to the extensive use of ad-hoc teachers. When examined from a formal workforce perspective, the system faces a significantly larger deficit, indicating the need for sustained recruitment and institutional strengthening.

Equally important is the issue of inequitable distribution, with clear disparities between urban and rural areas. Addressing these challenges requires a combination of recruitment, redistribution, and systemic reforms aimed at improving efficiency, equity, and sustainability.

CHAPTER 5: TEACHER RECRUITMENT STRATEGY (MULTI-YEAR)

5.1 Recruitment Principles

The teacher recruitment strategy for Osun State is anchored on three core principles: **equity, efficiency, and fiscal sustainability**. These principles ensure that recruitment decisions are not only responsive to current gaps but also aligned with long-term system performance and financial capacity.

Equity requires that teacher recruitment prioritizes underserved and disadvantaged areas, particularly rural and hard-to-reach communities where shortages are most acute. Evidence from the baseline analysis shows that teacher distribution is highly uneven, with some LGAs experiencing significant deficits despite overall statewide availability. Recruitment must therefore correct these spatial imbalances.

Efficiency emphasizes the optimal use of existing human resources. Before new recruitment is undertaken, opportunities for redeployment and redistribution of surplus teachers must be fully explored. This ensures that recruitment is targeted and avoids unnecessary expansion of the wage bill.

Fiscal sustainability ensures that recruitment plans are aligned with the State’s budgetary capacity. Given that teacher salaries constitute a significant portion of recurrent expenditure, hiring must be phased and carefully sequenced over time to avoid fiscal stress. The recruitment strategy therefore adopts a multi-year approach, spreading costs while progressively closing the teacher gap.

5.2 Recruitment Targets (Multi-Year Hiring Plan)

Based on the validated teacher gap and fiscal projections, the State adopts a phased recruitment approach over a four-year period (2025–2028). The recruitment targets are derived from the **minimum gap scenario (2,301 teachers)** while allowing for gradual strengthening of the formal workforce.

Table 5.1 Annual Teacher Recruitment Plan (2025–2028)

| Year | Primary Teachers | JSS Teachers | Total Recruitment |
|------|------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 2025 | 450 | 190 | 640 |
| 2026 | 435 | 188 | 623 |
| 2027 | 435 | 186 | 621 |

| Year | Primary Teachers | JSS Teachers | Total Recruitment |
|--------------|------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 2028 | 430 | 186 | 616 |
| Total | 1,750 | 551 | 2,301 |

The recruitment plan reflects a phased and balanced approach, distributing hiring across years to align with fiscal capacity and administrative feasibility.

The table shows that:

- Recruitment is **front-loaded but gradually stabilizes**
- Primary education receives the largest share due to:
 - Higher number of schools
 - Larger enrollment base
- The plan directly addresses the **identified teacher gap (2,301)**

5.3 Prioritization Framework

To avoid indiscriminate hiring, the recruitment strategy adopts a structured prioritization framework based on subject needs and geographic disparities.

5.3.1 Subject Priority

Recruitment will prioritize subject areas with the most critical shortages, particularly at the junior secondary level. Evidence from the baseline analysis indicates persistent gaps in:

- Mathematics
- Basic Science
- English Language

Table 5.2 Subject Prioritization Framework

| Priority Level | Subject Areas | Rationale |
|----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| High | Mathematics, Basic Science | Critical for STEM foundation |
| Medium | English Language | Core learning subject |
| Moderate | Others | Based on school needs |

Interpretation

Prioritizing subject areas ensures:

- Improved curriculum delivery
- Better learning outcomes
- Efficient allocation of specialized teachers

5.3.2 Geographic Priority

Recruitment will also be geographically targeted to address disparities across LGAs.

Table 5.3 Geographic Prioritization Framework

| Category | LGAs | Intervention Strategy |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| High Priority | Rural/underserved LGAs | Direct recruitment focus |
| Medium Priority | Semi-urban LGAs | Partial allocation |
| Low Priority | Urban LGAs | Redistribution before recruitment |

Interpretation

This approach ensures that:

- Recruitment corrects **inequity**, not just shortages
- Rural schools receive adequate staffing
- Urban overstaffing is addressed through redistribution

5.4 Recruitment Modalities

The recruitment strategy adopts a flexible approach that combines different employment modalities to balance quality, flexibility, and fiscal constraints.

5.4.1 Permanent vs Contract Teachers

Two categories of recruitment are proposed:

- **Permanent Teachers**
 - Fully integrated into the payroll
 - Long-term workforce stability
 - Higher fiscal commitment

- **Contract Teachers**
 - Fixed-term engagements
 - Flexible and cost-effective
 - Suitable for immediate gap filling

Table 5.4 Recruitment Modalities Comparison

| Category | Advantages | Limitations |
|-----------|------------------------------|----------------|
| Permanent | Stability, quality assurance | High cost |
| Contract | Flexibility, lower cost | Less stability |

Interpretation

A hybrid model is recommended:

- Permanent recruitment for critical subjects
- Contract recruitment for short-term gaps

5.4.2 Rural Incentive Mechanism

To address reluctance of teachers to accept rural postings, the strategy introduces targeted incentives, including:

- Rural posting allowances
- Housing support
- Accelerated promotion opportunities

Interpretation

These incentives are essential to:

- Improve teacher retention in rural areas
- Reduce urban concentration
- Promote equitable distribution

5.5 Integration with Training Institutions

Sustainable teacher recruitment requires alignment with the teacher supply pipeline.

The State will strengthen collaboration with:

- Colleges of Education
- Universities offering education degrees
- Teacher training institutions

Table 5.5 Teacher Pipeline Alignment Framework

| Component | Strategy |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Training Institutions | Align output with demand |
| Curriculum | Emphasize priority subjects |
| Internship | School-based practical training |
| Recruitment Linkage | Direct absorption of graduates |

Interpretation

This integration ensures:

- Continuous supply of qualified teachers
- Reduced recruitment gaps over time
- Improved teacher quality

General Comment: The recruitment strategy represents a shift from traditional, blanket hiring approaches to a targeted, data-driven model. By integrating equity, efficiency, and fiscal sustainability, the State is able to:

- Address teacher shortages systematically
- Correct geographic and subject imbalances
- Strengthen workforce stability
- Align recruitment with long-term fiscal realities

Importantly, the phased recruitment plan ensures that the State can progressively reduce its reliance on ad-hoc teachers while building a sustainable and professional teaching workforce.

CHAPTER 6: TEACHER DEPLOYMENT AND REDISTRIBUTION PLAN

6.1 Deployment Principles

The effectiveness of teacher workforce management depends not only on recruitment but also on how teachers are distributed across schools and locations. In this regard, the deployment strategy for Osun State is guided by two core principles: equity **and** minimum service standards.

Equity requires that all pupils, regardless of geographic location, have access to adequate and qualified teachers. This implies correcting the current imbalance between urban and rural schools, where teacher concentration is skewed toward urban centers.

Minimum service standards are defined primarily through compliance with the Pupil–Teacher Ratio (**PTR**) benchmark of 35:1 for primary education, as recommended by UBEC. Schools operating significantly above this threshold are considered understaffed, while those below it may be overstaffed.

Deployment decisions must therefore ensure that:

- No school operates under severe teacher shortages
- Excess staffing in some schools is reallocated to deficit areas
- System-wide efficiency is improved without immediate reliance on new recruitment

Table 6.1 Deployment Benchmarks

| Indicator | Standard | Policy Implication |
|---------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| $PTR \leq 35$ | Adequate | Maintain staffing |
| $PTR 36-45$ | Moderate shortage | Targeted adjustment |
| $PTR > 45$ | Severe shortage | Priority deployment |
| $PTR < 25$ | Overstaffed | Candidate for redistribution |

Interpretation

This benchmark framework provides a **decision rule** for deployment, ensuring that teacher allocation is guided by measurable standards rather than administrative discretion.

6.2 Redistribution Strategy

A central finding from the baseline analysis is that teacher shortages coexist with localized surpluses. This indicates that the problem is not purely one of insufficient supply but also of inefficient allocation.

The redistribution strategy therefore adopts a “reallocate before recruit” approach.

Core Redistribution Logic

1. Identify overstaffed schools (PTR < 25)
2. Identify understaffed schools (PTR > 35)
3. Reallocate teachers from surplus to deficit locations
4. Apply recruitment only where redistribution is insufficient

Table 6.2 Redistribution Decision Matrix

| School Category | PTR Level | Action |
|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| Overstaffed | < 25 | Redeploy excess teachers |
| Adequately staffed | 25–35 | Maintain |
| Moderately understaffed | 36–45 | Partial redistribution |
| Severely understaffed | > 45 | Priority deployment |

This matrix translates analytical findings into **operational decisions**.

Applying this framework ensures that:

- Existing resources are optimized
- Recruitment costs are minimized
- Deployment becomes systematic rather than ad hoc

Chart 6.1: Redistribution Flow Framework (Conceptual)

Flow:

Overstaffed Schools → Redistribution Pool → Deficit Schools

Insight:

This demonstrates that internal reallocation can significantly reduce staffing gaps without immediate fiscal pressure.

6.3 Deployment Algorithm (Advanced Optimization Model)

To strengthen decision-making, a rule-based deployment algorithm is introduced. This represents a shift from manual allocation to **data-driven optimization**.

Step-by-Step Deployment Algorithm

Step 1: Compute School-Level PTR

$$PTR_i = \frac{\mathbf{Enrollment}_i}{Teacher_{si}}$$

Step 2: Classify Schools

- Category A: PTR > 45 (Severe deficit)
- Category B: PTR 36–45 (Moderate deficit)
- Category C: PTR 25–35 (Balanced)
- Category D: PTR < 25 (Surplus)

Step 3: Rank Schools by Priority

Priority order:

1. Category A (highest priority)
2. Category B
3. Category C
4. Category D (source of redistribution)

Step 4: Allocate Teachers

Allocation = Required – Available

- First: Redistribute from Category D
- Second: Allocate new recruits (if needed)

Table 6.3 Deployment Priority Framework

| Priority Level | School Category | Action |
|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Severe deficit | Immediate deployment |
| 2 | Moderate deficit | Secondary allocation |
| 3 | Balanced | Maintain |
| 4 | Surplus | Source of redistribution |

Interpretation

This algorithm ensures:

- Objective decision-making
- Transparency in deployment
- Maximum impact of limited resources

6.4 Incentive Mechanisms for Equitable Deployment

One of the major barriers to equitable teacher distribution is the reluctance of teachers to accept postings in rural or underserved areas.

To address this, the Plan introduces targeted incentive mechanisms.

Table 6.4 Rural Deployment Incentives

| Incentive Type | Description | Expected Impact |
|----------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Financial | Rural allowance | Attract teachers |
| Housing | Accommodation support | Improve retention |
| Career | Accelerated promotion | Motivation |
| Professional | Training opportunities | Skill development |

Interpretation

These incentives are critical for:

- Sustaining rural staffing
- Reducing turnover
- Ensuring long-term equity

6.5 Risk and Resistance Management

The implementation of a redistribution strategy is likely to encounter institutional and political challenges. These must be proactively managed.

6.5.1 Union Dynamics

Teacher unions may resist redeployment due to:

- Preferences for urban postings

- Perceived loss of benefits

Mitigation Strategy

- Stakeholder engagement and consultation
- Transparent criteria for deployment
- Phased implementation

6.5.2 Political Interference

Deployment decisions may be influenced by:

- Local political pressures
- Community demands

Mitigation Strategy

- Establish clear, data-driven rules
- Institutionalize deployment guidelines
- Limit discretionary overrides

Table 6.5 Risk Mitigation Framework

| Risk | Likely Impact | Mitigation Strategy |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Union resistance | Delays | Engagement & incentives |
| Political pressure | Misallocation | Rule-based deployment |
| Data limitations | Poor decisions | Strengthen EMIS |

Interpretation

Effective risk management ensures that:

- Deployment reforms are implementable
- Institutional resistance is minimized
- Policy objectives are achieved

General Comments: The teacher deployment challenge in Osun State is fundamentally an issue of optimization rather than mere supply expansion. While recruitment remains necessary, significant efficiency gains can be achieved through improved redistribution of existing teachers.

By introducing a rule-based deployment system, supported by clear benchmarks and incentive mechanisms, the State can:

- Reduce inequities in teacher distribution
- Improve PTR compliance across schools
- Minimize unnecessary recruitment costs
- Strengthen overall system efficiency

This approach represents a shift from administrative allocation to data-driven workforce optimization, positioning the State for more effective and sustainable education service delivery.

CHAPTER 7: COSTING AND FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS

7.1 Cost Components of Teacher Workforce Expansion

The costing framework for teacher recruitment and deployment in Osun State is structured to capture the full economic cost of expanding and sustaining the teaching workforce. Rather than focusing solely on salaries, the framework incorporates all major cost drivers associated with teacher employment.

The key components include salaries, allowances, training costs, and recruitment-related expenditures.

7.1.1 Salary Costs

Salary constitutes the largest component of teacher-related expenditure. Based on validated payroll data:

- Total salary cost for **Primary teachers (6,422)** is approximately **₦14.67 billion annually**
- Total salary cost for **JSS teachers (2,408)** is approximately **₦5.94 billion annually**

This implies a combined annual wage bill of approximately:

$$\text{Total Salary Cost} = \text{₦20.61 billion}$$

Derived Unit Cost per Teacher

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Unit Cost} &= \frac{\text{Total Salary}}{\text{Total Teachers}} \\ &= \frac{\text{₦20.61B}}{8,830} \approx \text{₦2.33 million per teacher/year} \end{aligned}$$

Interpretation

This unit cost forms the basis for:

- Recruitment cost projections
- Multi-year fiscal planning
- Scenario analysis

7.1.2 Allowances

Allowances include statutory and operational benefits such as:

- Housing allowance
- Transport allowance
- Rural posting incentives
- Teachers Peculiar Allowance

These are estimated at **20–27.5% of basic salary**, depending on deployment conditions.

7.1.3 Training and Professional Development Costs

To ensure quality, newly recruited teachers require:

- Induction training
- Continuous professional development (CPD)

Estimated average training cost: Training Cost \approx ₦65,000 – ₦200,000 per teacher

7.1.4 Recruitment and Administrative Costs

Recruitment involves:

- Advertising
- Screening and selection
- Documentation and onboarding

Estimated at: ₦25,000 – ₦30,000 per teacher

Table 7.1 Summary of Cost Components

| Cost Component | Description | Share of Total Cost |
|----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Salaries | Core wage bill | ~50–60% |
| Allowances | Benefits and incentives | ~35–45% |
| Training | Capacity building | ~3–5% |
| Recruitment | Hiring process | <2% |

Interpretation

The dominance of salary costs underscores the importance of:

- Careful recruitment planning
- Fiscal discipline
- Efficient deployment

7.2 Multi-Year Cost Projection (2025–2028)

Based on the recruitment plan of **2,301 teachers**, cost projections are developed over a four-year period.

Table 7.2 Annual Recruitment and Cost Projection

| Year | Teachers Recruited | Annual Cost (₦ Billion) | Cumulative Cost (₦ Billion) |
|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 2025 | 640 | 0.998 | 0.998 |
| 2026 | 623 | 0.972 | 1.970 |
| 2027 | 621 | 0.969 | 2.939 |
| 2028 | 616 | 0.961 | 3.920 |

The projection assumes:

- Unit cost of ~₦1.56 million per teacher /annum as starting salary
- Progressive addition of new teachers

The total cumulative cost reflects:

- Increasing fiscal commitment over time
- Need for budget alignment
- Importance of phased recruitment

7.3 Fiscal Space Analysis (Critical Component)

A key determinant of feasibility is whether the State has sufficient fiscal space to absorb additional teacher costs.

7.3.1 Benchmarking Against Current Wage Bill

- Current wage bill (teachers only): ₦20.61 billion
- Projected additional cost: ₦3.92 billion over 4 years

7.3.2 Affordability Assessment

Assessing the affordability of the proposed teacher recruitment plan is critical to determining its fiscal feasibility and sustainability. While the identified staffing gaps justify the need for

recruitment, the State’s ability to absorb additional personnel costs without destabilizing its fiscal position must be carefully evaluated.

The affordability analysis compares the projected incremental cost of recruitment with the existing teacher wage bill and the broader fiscal framework of the education sector. As established earlier, the current annual salary expenditure for government-paid teachers stands at approximately ₦20.61 billion. The proposed recruitment of 2,301 teachers over a four-year period is estimated to cost ₦3.92 billion in additional wage commitments.

This assessment focuses on three key considerations. First, the proportional increase in the wage bill resulting from the recruitment plan provides an indication of fiscal pressure. Second, the phased nature of the recruitment allows costs to be spread over time, thereby reducing the risk of sudden budget shocks. Third, the potential to leverage supplementary funding sources such as UBEC intervention funds and development partner support further enhances affordability.

Importantly, affordability is not solely a function of available resources but also of expenditure prioritization. Given that teacher availability is a primary driver of learning outcomes, investments in teacher recruitment represent a high-impact use of public funds. The analysis therefore evaluates affordability not only in terms of cost burden but also in relation to expected system-wide benefits. The table below presents a summary of the fiscal impact of the proposed recruitment plan.

Table 7.3 Fiscal Impact Analysis

| Indicator | Value |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Current Teacher Wage Bill | ₦20.61B |
| Additional Recruitment Cost | ₦3.92B |
| % Increase | ~19% |

Interpretation

The projected increase represents:

- A **moderate expansion (≈19%)** of the teacher wage bill
- A manageable fiscal burden if:
 - Spread over multiple years
 - Supported by external funding

7.3.3 Alignment with MTSS Framework

The MTSS emphasizes:

- Linking expenditure to realistic revenue projections
- Avoiding over-commitment

This recruitment plan aligns with MTSS by:

- Phasing costs
- Maintaining budget discipline

7.4 Scenario-Based Costing

To enhance decision-making, three scenarios are considered.

Table 7.4 Cost Scenarios

| Scenario | Teachers Recruited | Total Cost (₦ Billion) | Description |
|--------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Conservative | 2,301 | 3.92 | Minimum gap coverage |
| Moderate | ~4,000 | ~9.3 | Partial formalization |
| Aggressive | 6,662 | ~15.5 | Full system overhaul |

Interpretation

- **Conservative scenario** is fiscally feasible
- **Moderate scenario** balances reform and affordability
- **Aggressive scenario** is transformational but fiscally demanding

7.5 Funding Sources and Financing Strategy

Sustainable financing requires diversification of funding sources.

7.5.1 State Government Budget

Primary funding source through:

- Recurrent expenditure
- Education sector allocation

7.5.2 UBEC Intervention Funds

UBEC provides:

- Matching grants
- Teacher development support

7.5.3 Development Partner Support

Potential sources include:

- UBEC
- WORLD BANK
- UNICEF
- UNESCO
- USAID

Table 7.5 Funding Sources Framework

| Source | Contribution Type | Role |
|--------------|---------------------|---------------|
| State Budget | Salaries | Core funding |
| UBEC | Grants | Supplementary |
| Donors | Technical/financial | Support |

Interpretation

A blended financing approach:

- Reduces fiscal pressure
- Enhances sustainability
- Supports system reform

General Comment: The costing analysis demonstrates that while teacher recruitment requires significant financial commitment, it is both manageable and justifiable within the State’s fiscal framework when implemented in a phased and strategic manner.

The introduction of scenario-based costing provides policymakers with flexibility in decision-making, allowing them to balance ambition with affordability.

Importantly, the analysis highlights that the key constraint is not absolute affordability, but the need for disciplined implementation and alignment with fiscal realities.

By integrating recruitment planning with budgetary frameworks and leveraging multiple funding sources, Osun State can sustainably strengthen its teacher workforce while maintaining fiscal stability.

CHAPTER 8: IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

8.1 Institutional Responsibilities

The successful implementation of this Plan depends on clearly defined roles and responsibilities across key institutions within the education sector. Given the multi-tier governance structure of basic education in Osun State, effective coordination among agencies is essential to ensure accountability, efficiency, and timely delivery of results.

At the core of implementation are the Ministry of Education, the State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB), and the Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs), each playing complementary roles within the system.

8.1.1 Ministry of Education

The Ministry of Education provides overall policy direction and strategic oversight for the implementation of the Plan. Its responsibilities include:

- Formulation of policies guiding teacher recruitment and deployment
- Alignment of the Plan with broader sector strategies (MTSS, MTBESP)
- Budgetary coordination and resource mobilization
- Monitoring sector-wide performance and outcomes
- Liaison with development partners and federal agencies

In this regard, the Ministry ensures that the Plan remains consistent with State priorities and fiscal realities.

8.1.2 State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB)

SUBEB serves as the primary implementing agency for the Plan. It is responsible for translating policy directives into operational actions across schools and LGEAs.

Key responsibilities include:

- Recruitment, deployment, and management of teachers
- Maintenance of teacher records and administrative data
- Implementation of redistribution strategies
- Coordination of teacher training and professional development
- Monitoring school-level staffing and performance

SUBEB also plays a central role in integrating data systems, including EMIS and payroll, to support evidence-based decision-making.

8.1.3 Local Government Education Authorities (LGEAs)

LGEAs provide decentralized implementation and are critical for ensuring that interventions reach schools effectively.

Their responsibilities include:

- School-level teacher deployment and supervision
- Identification of staffing gaps at the local level
- Monitoring teacher attendance and utilization
- Supporting community engagement and accountability
- Providing feedback to SUBEB for planning adjustments

Table 8.1 Institutional Roles and Responsibilities

| Institution | Key Functions | Level of Responsibility |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Ministry of Education | Policy, Oversight, Budgeting | Strategic |
| SUBEB | Recruitment, Deployment, Management | Operational |
| LGEAs | Local Implementation, Monitoring | Tactical |

Interpretation

The delineation of responsibilities ensures:

- Clear accountability
- Reduced duplication of functions
- Effective coordination across levels

8.2 Implementation Timeline (Phased Rollout)

The implementation of the Plan follows a phased approach over the period **2025–2028**, aligned with the recruitment strategy and fiscal projections.

Phasing Logic

The phased rollout is designed to:

- Align recruitment with budget cycles
- Allow gradual system adjustment
- Enable continuous monitoring and learning

Table 8.2 Implementation Timeline

| Phase | Year | Key Activities |
|---------|------|---|
| Phase 1 | 2025 | Initial recruitment, pilot redistribution, system setup |
| Phase 2 | 2026 | Scale-up recruitment, full deployment implementation |
| Phase 3 | 2027 | Consolidation, redistribution optimization |
| Phase 4 | 2028 | Stabilization and evaluation |

Interpretation

This timeline reflects a transition from **initiation** → **expansion** → **optimization** → **stabilization**.

The phased approach ensures that:

- Early lessons inform later stages
- Risks are managed progressively
- Institutional capacity is strengthened over time

8.3 Governance Structure

Effective governance is critical to ensure coordination, accountability, and timely decision-making. The implementation of this Plan will be supported by a structured governance framework comprising a Steering Committee and a Technical Working Group.

8.3.1 Steering Committee

The Steering Committee provides high-level oversight and strategic direction.

Composition

- Honourable Commissioner for Education (Chair)

- Board Chairman, SUBEB (FTM1 & FTM2)
- Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education
- Executive Secretary, SUBEB
- Representatives of Ministry of Finance and Budget
- Representatives of Ministry of Economic Planning ,Budget & Development
- Development partners (as observers)

Responsibilities

- Provide policy guidance
- Approve annual workplans and budgets
- Resolve high-level implementation challenges
- Ensure alignment with State priorities

8.3.2 Technical Working Group (TWG)

The Technical Working Group serves as the operational engine for implementation.

Composition

- MoE Technical Staff
- SUBEB Technical Staff
- EMIS Specialists
- Planning and Budgeting Officers
- LGEA Representatives

Responsibilities

- Day-to-day coordination of implementation
- Data analysis and reporting
- Monitoring recruitment and deployment
- Supporting decision-making with evidence

Table 8.3 Governance Structure

| Structure | Role | Frequency of Engagement |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Steering Committee | Strategic oversight | Biannual |
| Technical Working Group | Operational coordination | Quarterly/Monthly |

Interpretation

The dual governance structure ensures:

- Strategic leadership at the top
- Technical execution at the operational level
- Continuous feedback between policy and implementation

8.4 Coordination and Reporting Mechanism

To ensure coherence across institutions, a structured coordination and reporting system will be established.

This includes:

- Monthly reports from LGEAs to SUBEB
- Quarterly performance reviews by the Technical Working Group
- Biannual reporting to the Steering Committee

Table 8.4 Reporting Framework

| Level | Reporting Frequency | Responsible Entity |
|----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| School | Monthly | Head Teachers |
| LGEA | Monthly | LGEA Officers |
| State (SUBEB) | Quarterly | SUBEB |
| State (Policy) | Biannual | Ministry |

Interpretation

This reporting system ensures:

- Real-time monitoring
- Data-driven adjustments
- Accountability at all levels

General Comment: The implementation framework transforms the Plan from a policy document into an actionable program. By clearly defining institutional roles, establishing a phased implementation timeline, and introducing a structured governance system, the State is positioned to deliver reforms in a coordinated and sustainable manner.

The emphasis on both strategic oversight and technical execution ensures that policy intentions are effectively translated into operational outcomes. Furthermore, the integration of monitoring and reporting mechanisms enables continuous learning and adaptive management, which are essential for successful implementation in a dynamic environment.

CHAPTER 9: MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND ADAPTIVE LEARNING

9.1 Overview

Effective implementation of the teacher recruitment and deployment strategy requires a robust Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptive Learning (MEAL) framework. This framework ensures that progress is systematically tracked, performance is measured against defined targets, and policy adjustments are made based on evidence.

Unlike traditional monitoring approaches that focus solely on compliance, this framework emphasizes **continuous learning and system improvement**. It integrates data from multiple sources to provide real-time insights into teacher availability, distribution, and impact on learning outcomes.

9.2 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

To assess progress and outcomes, a set of carefully defined Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) has been developed. These indicators align with the core objectives of the Plan, focusing on teacher adequacy, equity, and learning outcomes.

9.2.1 PTR Improvement

The Pupil–Teacher Ratio (PTR) is a primary indicator of teacher adequacy and classroom conditions.

$$\text{PTR} = \frac{\text{Enrollment}}{\text{Teachers}}$$

Table 9.1 PTR Performance Targets

| Indicator | Baseline | Target (2028) | Measurement Frequency |
|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Average PTR (Primary) | >35 in many schools | ≤35 | Annual |
| Schools with PTR >45 | High proportion | Reduced by 50% | Annual |

Interpretation

Improvement in PTR indicates:

- Reduced classroom congestion
- Improved teaching effectiveness
- Better learning conditions

9.2.2 Teacher Distribution Equity

This indicator measures how evenly teachers are distributed across LGAs and schools.

Table 9.2 Teacher Distribution Equity Indicators

| Indicator | Baseline | Target |
|---|-------------------|---------|
| Variance in PTR across LGAs | High | Reduced |
| Gini Coefficient (Teacher Distribution) | >0.4 (indicative) | <0.3 |

Interpretation

Reducing inequality ensures:

- Fair access to teachers
- Balanced resource allocation
- Improved system efficiency

9.2.3 Learning Outcomes

Teacher availability must ultimately translate into improved student performance.

Table 9.3 Learning Outcome Indicators

| Indicator | Measurement | Frequency |
|---|--------------------------------|-----------|
| Student performance (literacy/numeracy) | Assessment scores | Annual |
| Completion rates | % of students completing level | Annual |

Interpretation

This links:

Teacher reforms → Classroom conditions → Learning outcomes

9.3 Data Systems Integration

A key limitation identified in the baseline analysis is the fragmentation of education data systems. To address this, the Plan proposes a fully integrated data architecture.

9.3.1 Strengthening EMIS

The Education Management Information System (EMIS) will serve as the central data platform.

Key enhancements include:

- Real-time data capture at school level
- Integration with payroll systems
- Inclusion of teacher deployment data
- Regular data validation processes

Table 9.4 Data Integration Framework

| System | Data Type | Role |
|-------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| EMIS | Enrollment, schools | Core database |
| Payroll | Teacher records | Validation |
| SUBEB Admin | Deployment data | Operational tracking |

Interpretation

Integration ensures:

- Data consistency
- Improved decision-making
- Reduced duplication

9.4 Reporting Framework

A structured reporting system is essential for tracking progress and ensuring accountability.

Table 9. 5 Reporting Structure

| Level | Report Type | Frequency | Responsible Entity |
|----------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| School | Teacher & attendance report | Monthly | Head Teacher |
| LGEA | Consolidated staffing report | Monthly | LGEA |
| SUBEB | Performance report | Quarterly | SUBEB |
| Ministry | Policy review report | Annual | Ministry of Education |

Pre-Table Interpretation

This framework ensures that data flows from the **school level to the policy level**.

Post-Table Insight

Regular reporting enables:

- Early identification of issues
- Evidence-based decision-making
- Continuous performance tracking

9.5 Feedback Loops and Adaptive Learning

A defining feature of this Plan is the incorporation of feedback mechanisms that allow continuous adjustment of policies and strategies.

9.5.1 Feedback Mechanisms

The system will generate feedback through:

- Quarterly performance reviews
- Data dashboards and analytics
- Field reports from LGEAs

9.5.2 Policy Adjustment Process

The adaptive learning cycle follows:

1. Data collection
2. Performance analysis
3. Identification of gaps
4. Policy adjustment
5. Implementation of changes

Table 9.6 Adaptive Learning Cycle

| Stage | Activity | Outcome |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Data Collection | Gather data | Evidence base |
| Analysis | Identify trends | Insights |
| Decision | Adjust policies | Improved strategy |
| Implementation | Apply changes | System improvement |

Interpretation

This cycle ensures that:

- The Plan remains responsive
- Policies evolve with evidence
- Implementation improves over time

9.6 Digital Monitoring and Dashboard System

To enhance real-time monitoring, the Plan proposes the development of a digital dashboard.

Key Features

- School-level PTR tracking
- Teacher deployment visualization
- LGA performance comparison
- Recruitment progress tracking

Interpretation

Digital tools will:

- Improve transparency

- Support rapid decision-making
- Enhance accountability

General Comments: The Monitoring, Evaluation, and Adaptive Learning framework transforms this Plan into a **living system** rather than a static policy document. By integrating performance indicators, strengthening data systems, and institutionalizing feedback loops, the State is equipped to continuously refine its teacher workforce strategy.

This approach ensures that implementation is not only tracked but also improved over time, enabling the education system to respond dynamically to emerging challenges and opportunities.

CHAPTER 10: RISK ANALYSIS AND MITIGATION

10.1 Overview

The successful implementation of the teacher recruitment, deployment, and workforce optimization plan is subject to a range of risks that could affect outcomes, timelines, and sustainability. These risks arise from fiscal, political, institutional, and technical factors inherent in public sector reforms.

This chapter identifies the major risks associated with the Plan, assesses their potential impact, and outlines practical mitigation strategies to ensure resilience and continuity. The objective is to proactively manage uncertainties and embed risk-responsive mechanisms within the implementation framework.

10.2 Risk Identification and Classification

The risks associated with this Plan are grouped into four broad categories:

- Fiscal risks
- Political and governance risks
- Institutional and behavioral risks
- Data and technical risks

Table 10.1 Risk Classification Framework

| Risk Category | Description |
|---------------------|---|
| Fiscal Risks | Budget constraints and revenue shocks |
| Political Risks | Interference in deployment decisions |
| Institutional Risks | Resistance from teachers and administrators |
| Technical Risks | Weak data systems and quality issues |

Interpretation

This classification ensures a structured approach to risk management, enabling targeted mitigation strategies for each category.

10.3 Fiscal Risks and Mitigation

10.3.1 Nature of Fiscal Risks

Fiscal risks arise from the possibility that the State may be unable to sustain the financial commitments associated with teacher recruitment due to:

- Revenue shortfalls
- Competing expenditure priorities
- Wage bill constraints

Given that the Plan introduces an estimated **₦3.92 billion additional cost over four years**, fiscal discipline is essential.

10.3.2 Mitigation Strategy

The Plan incorporates several measures to mitigate fiscal risks:

- Adoption of **phased recruitment** to spread costs over time
- Alignment with **Medium-Term Sector Strategy (MTSS)** projections
- Prioritization of **redistribution before recruitment**
- Exploration of **external funding sources (UBEC, donors)**

Table 10. 2 Fiscal Risk Mitigation Measures

| Risk | Potential Impact | Mitigation Strategy |
|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Revenue shortfall | Incomplete recruitment | Phased hiring |
| Wage bill pressure | Budget stress | Gradual scale-up |
| Funding gaps | Implementation delays | Diversified funding |

Interpretation

These measures ensure that:

- The Plan remains financially viable
- Recruitment is adaptable to fiscal conditions
- Budget shocks are minimized

10.4 Political and Governance Risks

10.4.1 Nature of Risks

Political risks stem from potential interference in:

- Teacher recruitment decisions
- Deployment and redistribution processes
- Allocation of teachers across LGAs

Such interference can undermine the integrity of the Plan and distort equitable distribution.

10.4.2 Mitigation Strategy

To address these risks, the Plan emphasizes:

- Establishment of **clear, rule-based deployment criteria**
- Strengthening of institutional governance structures
- Transparency in recruitment and deployment processes
- Oversight by the **Steering Committee**

Table 10.3 Political Risk Mitigation Framework

| Risk | Impact | Mitigation |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Political interference | Inequitable allocation | Rule-based system |
| Elite capture | Misallocation of teachers | Transparent processes |
| Weak oversight | Poor accountability | Strengthened governance |

Interpretation

Institutionalizing decision rules reduces discretionary influence and ensures that teacher allocation is driven by data rather than external pressures.

10.5 Institutional and Behavioral Risks

10.5.1 Teacher Resistance

A key implementation risk is resistance from teachers, particularly in response to:

- Redeployment to rural areas
- Changes in posting conditions
- Perceived inequities

10.5.2 Mitigation Strategy

The Plan addresses this through:

- **Stakeholder engagement and consultation**
- Introduction of **incentive mechanisms** (rural allowances, housing support)
- Transparent communication of deployment criteria
- Phased implementation to allow adjustment

Table 10.4 Institutional Risk Mitigation

| Risk | Impact | Mitigation |
|--------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Teacher resistance | Delays in deployment | Engagement & incentives |
| Low morale | Reduced productivity | Supportive policies |
| Non-compliance | Ineffective implementation | Monitoring systems |

Interpretation

Addressing behavioral risks is essential for ensuring that policy decisions translate into actual changes on the ground.

10.6 Data and Technical Risks

10.6.1 Nature of Risks

Data-related risks arise from:

- Incomplete or inaccurate records
- Weak integration between EMIS and payroll
- Delays in data reporting

These challenges can compromise decision-making and undermine the effectiveness of the Plan.

10.6.2 Mitigation Strategy

The Plan proposes:

- Regular **data audits and validation exercises**
- Integration of EMIS with payroll and administrative systems
- Capacity building for data management at LGEA and school levels
- Use of digital dashboards for real-time monitoring

Table 10. 5 Data Risk Mitigation Framework

| Risk | Impact | Mitigation |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Poor data quality | Wrong decisions | Data audits |
| System fragmentation | Inconsistency | System integration |
| Reporting delays | Slow response | Digital tools |

Interpretation

Improving data systems ensures that:

- Decisions are evidence-based
- Monitoring is accurate
- Policy adjustments are timely

10.7 Risk Monitoring and Review Mechanism

Risk management is not a one-time activity but a continuous process embedded within the implementation framework.

Key Mechanisms

- Quarterly risk review by the Technical Working Group
- Annual risk assessment by the Steering Committee
- Integration of risk indicators into the monitoring framework

Table 10.6 Risk Monitoring Framework

| Activity | Frequency | Responsible Entity |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| Risk identification | Quarterly | TWG |
| Risk review | Quarterly | SUBEB |
| Strategic oversight | Annual | Steering Committee |

Interpretation

Continuous monitoring ensures that:

- Emerging risks are identified early
- Mitigation strategies are updated
- Implementation remains resilient

General Comments:

The risk analysis demonstrates that while the implementation of this Plan is subject to multiple uncertainties, these risks are **manageable and predictable**. By embedding mitigation strategies within the design of the Plan, such as phased recruitment, rule-based deployment, stakeholder engagement, and data system strengthening, the State is well-positioned to navigate potential challenges.

Importantly, the integration of risk monitoring into the broader implementation and evaluation framework ensures that the Plan remains adaptive and resilient over time. This transforms risk management from a reactive process into a proactive and continuous function of system governance.

CHAPTER 11: CONCLUSION AND POLICY DIRECTIONS

11.1 Overview

This chapter synthesizes the key findings of the teacher workforce analysis and articulates strategic policy directions for strengthening basic education in Osun State. Drawing on evidence from the baseline assessment, analytical framework, and implementation strategy, it provides a coherent pathway for improving teacher availability, distribution, and effectiveness in a fiscally sustainable manner.

The chapter also sets out a long-term vision for the development of a resilient and equitable teacher workforce capable of delivering quality learning outcomes across the State.

11.2 Summary of Key Findings

The analysis undertaken in this Plan reveals several critical insights into the structure and performance of the teacher workforce in Osun State.

First, while the total number of teachers appears relatively adequate when ad-hoc personnel are included, the formal (government-paid) workforce is significantly insufficient. With only **6,422 primary teachers and 2,408 junior secondary teachers on payroll**, the system relies heavily on approximately **4,360 ad-hoc teachers** to sustain classroom instruction. This creates a structural imbalance that undermines workforce stability and fiscal transparency.

Second, the teacher gap varies depending on the analytical lens applied. While the apparent gap is estimated at **2,301 teachers**, the gap increases to **6,662 teachers** when only government-paid teachers are considered. This highlights the extent to which informal staffing arrangements mask the true magnitude of the problem.

Third, teacher distribution across LGAs is highly uneven. Urban LGAs tend to have relatively better staffing levels, while rural and underserved areas experience persistent shortages. This results in wide variations in pupil–teacher ratios, with some schools operating under severe pressure and others potentially overstaffed.

Fourth, the system exhibits inefficiencies in deployment, with evidence of both surplus and deficit conditions occurring simultaneously. This indicates that improving allocation efficiency could significantly reduce staffing gaps without proportionate increases in recruitment.

Fifth, the current workforce planning approach is largely static and reactive, lacking the use of forecasting models, integrated data systems, and optimization techniques. This limits the State's ability to anticipate future needs and respond proactively.

Finally, the fiscal analysis demonstrates that while teacher recruitment entails significant cost implications, a phased and well-structured approach makes it both manageable and sustainable within the State's fiscal framework.

11.3 Strategic Policy Recommendations

Based on these findings, a set of strategic policy directions is proposed to guide the State's efforts in strengthening the teacher workforce.

11.3.1 Adopt a Phased and Targeted Recruitment Strategy

Recruitment should be guided by clearly defined priorities rather than blanket hiring. The proposed multi-year recruitment plan of **2,301 teachers** provides a realistic pathway for addressing immediate gaps while maintaining fiscal discipline.

Priority should be given to:

- Underserved LGAs
- Core subject areas (Mathematics, Science, English)
- Replacement of qualified ad-hoc teachers

11.3.2 Institutionalize Teacher Redistribution Mechanisms

Before expanding the workforce, the State should optimize the deployment of existing teachers.

This requires:

- Adoption of PTR-based deployment rules
- Regular redistribution exercises
- Reduction of overstaffing in urban areas

Institutionalizing redistribution will improve equity and reduce unnecessary recruitment costs.

11.3.3 Gradually Formalize the Ad-hoc Workforce

Given the significant role played by ad-hoc teachers, the State should adopt a structured approach to:

- Identify qualified ad-hoc teachers
- Gradually absorb them into the formal workforce

- Reduce reliance on informal staffing arrangements

This will enhance workforce stability and improve service delivery.

11.3.4 Strengthen Data Systems and Workforce Planning

Effective planning requires reliable and integrated data systems. The State should:

- Strengthen EMIS and integrate it with payroll systems
- Establish real-time teacher tracking mechanisms
- Institutionalize data-driven decision-making

11.3.5 Introduce Incentives for Rural Deployment

To address geographic disparities, targeted incentives should be implemented, including:

- Rural posting allowances
- Housing support
- Career advancement opportunities

These measures will improve teacher retention in underserved areas.

11.3.6 Ensure Fiscal Discipline and Sustainability

All recruitment and deployment decisions must be aligned with fiscal realities. This requires:

- Adherence to phased recruitment
- Integration with MTSS budgeting processes
- Exploration of supplementary funding sources

11.3.7 Strengthen Governance and Accountability

Effective implementation depends on strong institutional coordination. The State should:

- Operationalize the Steering Committee and Technical Working Group
- Ensure transparency in recruitment and deployment
- Strengthen monitoring and evaluation systems

11.4 Long-Term Workforce Vision

The long-term vision for the teacher workforce in Osun State is to establish a sustainable, equitable, and high-performing system that ensures every child has access to quality teaching.

This vision is anchored on three pillars:

1. Adequacy

The State aims to achieve and maintain optimal teacher levels in line with national standards, ensuring that all schools operate within acceptable PTR thresholds.

2. Equity

Teacher distribution will be balanced across all LGAs, eliminating disparities between urban and rural schools and ensuring equal access to quality education.

3. Quality and Professionalism

The teaching workforce will be fully professionalized, with:

- Qualified and certified teachers
- Continuous professional development
- Reduced reliance on ad-hoc personnel

4. Sustainability

The workforce will be supported by a fiscally sustainable model that aligns recruitment with long-term budgetary capacity, ensuring that gains are maintained over time.

5. Data-Driven System

The education system will evolve into a fully data-driven environment, where decisions on recruitment, deployment, and policy adjustments are guided by real-time evidence.

11.5 Concluding Remark

This Plan represents a significant step toward transforming teacher workforce management in Osun State. By moving beyond traditional approaches and adopting a data-driven, fiscally responsible, and equity-focused strategy, the State is well-positioned to address longstanding challenges in teacher availability and distribution.

The successful implementation of this Plan will not only improve the efficiency of the education system but also contribute directly to enhanced learning outcomes and human capital development. Ultimately, investing in teachers is an investment in the future of the State, and sustained commitment to this agenda will yield long-term social and economic benefits.