I realized the problems may not necessarily lie in the quality of policymaking processes or policies themselves, but in the mechanisms in place for implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.
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DeliverEd Core Objectives

DeliverEd is exploring how governments can improve the implementation of desired education policy goals through Delivery Approaches

- Create evidence to enable government leaders to make better decisions on how to implement education reforms that impact learning, and
- Create awareness on the critical need to improve performance to achieve the 2030 goals
Political ownership/signaling (by national or sub-national political leader)

Delivery approach adopted (use of management routines)

Knowledge, attitudes, behaviors of managers and staff change

Policies implemented

Improved school/learning outcomes

What are Delivery Approaches?

- Many governments around the world are responding to the ‘implementation challenge’ by adopting *delivery approaches*.

- Delivery approaches can be understood through answers to these 4 questions:

  - **What is it?**
    
    “An institutionalized unit or structured process within a government bureaucracy…”

  - **What does it aim to do?**
    
    …that aims to rapidly improve bureaucratic functioning and policy delivery…

  - **How does it do it?**
    
    …by combining a set of managerial functions in a novel way…

  - **Why does it do it?**
    
    …to shift attention from inputs and processes to outputs and outcomes.”
Which managerial functions do Delivery Approaches combine and change? At what levels of the educational bureaucracy?

1. Prioritization and target setting
2. Measurement, monitoring and use of data
3. Leveraging political sponsorship
4. Accountability and incentives
5. Problem solving and adaptation
Digital Map and Database of Global Delivery Approaches

- Visualizes the 150+ delivery approaches used across 80 countries
- Allows users to access primary sources identified that share more information on the delivery approach
- Crowdsources additional data from the user on delivery approaches that may not currently exist on the map
Key Research Questions

Are delivery approaches effective in improving policy implementation and service delivery?

And if so, how and why?
Research Studies

**Pakistan: Retrospective analysis**
- Qual: tracing of DA function & impacts on bureaucratic functioning in Punjab
- Quant: impact of key DA process on schooling outcomes in Punjab

**Ghana: Prospective analysis**
- National qual: origin & functionality of Ghana’s National DA
- Subnational qual: cascading of DA to sub-national system
- Quant: large-scale survey of management & performance

**Jordan: Retrospective analysis**
- Qual study of 3 DUs involved in education reform
- How DUs fit within the bureaucratic system & the accountability dynamics

**Sierra Leone: Retrospective analysis [rapid review]**
- National qual: review of national education DA

**Tanzania: Retrospective analysis [in progress]**
- Qual study of the Big Results Now! (BRN) approach in the education sector
- Examines changes in behaviour under BRN! & factors driving persistence of the reforms
- Cross sectoral comparison

**Global Mapping**
- Study of the patterns of DA adoption & design, worldwide
- Systematically coded the different design features & adoption patterns

#DeliverEdu
Overview

• National Education Reform Secretariat (NERS) established in 2019 with support from the UK government

• Initially focused on target-setting, establishing performance contracts, Accounting to Ministers meetings – evolved to more problem-solving and improved coordination across agencies

• Subnational level: Performance contracts cascading started in 2021 down to the regional, district and school levels
1. National-level study

Origin and functionality of Ghana’s National Delivery Approach – the National Education Reform Secretariat (NERS)

2. In-depth district study

- In-depth study of the use of delivery approaches across 2 regions, 5 districts and 10 schools (two rounds).

3. Large-N survey

Large-scale, quantitative study of management practices and performance, nationally representative sample of 174 districts and 1044 schools (plus EOF)
Prioritization and target setting

**National:** Annual performance agreements signed between the Minister of Education & all 17 agencies. Roadmaps developed, roles and responsibilities clarified, national agency heads empowered to achieve agreed KPIs & to collaborate with other agencies.

**Subnational:** GES set annual targets and priorities at the central level
- Quarterly targets set & performance contracts between supervising officials, District Directors & HTs.
- Overlap with existing routines: ADEOPs or WB GALOP program.

Measurement and monitoring

**National:** Performance agreements included outcome & output-level KPIs, quarterly targets operationalized through annual roadmaps. Intro. of target-setting & review of data within their agencies.

**Subnational:** Data collected annually: shift in focus of monitoring activities & data collection.
Leveraging political sponsorship
National: Strong political sponsorship from the Minister of Education; Quarterly ‘ATM’ meetings
Subnational: No sponsorship from the ministerial level or local political authorities. District assembly officials not aware of the delivery approach performance contracts. Difference between local/political authorities who focused on test scores.

Accountability and incentives
National: High stakes accountability, Performance management framework & contracts signed with Minister; quarterly progress reports on KPIs
Subnational: Some performance-based rewards & sanctions in the contract document

Problem solving
National: Shift in the delivery approach, from its initial focus on high stakes accountability to improved coordination & problem-solving routines (data-driven deep dives, TWG). Evolution from ATM to Breakfast with the Minister.
Subnational: GES performance agreements aimed to improve existing routines for problem-solving & coordination e.g. KPIs included targets to ensure routine visits to schools, SMC & School Performance Appraisal Meetings.
Key Findings

National level
• Changes in management routines introduced by NERS positively contributing to the improvement of national agencies’ understanding of their roles, responsibilities, & coordination to achieve set goals
• Sustainability of the DA uncertain

Subnational level
• Challenges in implementing a sub-national due to resources, capacity & limited support
• Variation in practices at sub-national level
• Despite great variation, district office management practices are positively associated with multiple aspects of district & school performance.
• Problem-solving approaches correlated with lower teacher absenteeism & higher time-on task at the classroom level
• Accountability-focused approaches appear to be effective for completion of district tasks (processes).
Retrospective study of Jordan’s experience – three Delivery Units (2010-2019)

1. The Prime Minister’s Delivery Unit (PMDU) at the Prime Minister’s Office with multisectoral focus.
2. The Results and Effectiveness Unit (R&E Unit) established at the Royal Court.
3. The Development Coordination Unit (DCU) at the Ministry of Education.

Research design

- Qualitative Study: 37 semi-structured interviews with representative from various organizations.
- Secondary research & documentation to triangulate the findings from the interviews.
Prioritization and Target-setting
• PMDU worked closely with the Cabinet & the PM to identify national priorities across the critical sectors.
• R&E Unit consulted with different Ministers of Education & mid-level management across the ministries.
• DCU facilitated the development of the ESP in close collaboration with Ministry & donor organizations.

Measurement and Monitoring
• MOE: New structures & monitoring routines for ESP implementation in addition to DCU’s stocktakes
• ESP monitoring routines: Monthly PPCC meetings; TWG meetings – bureaucrats across departments
  - QSC meetings (Minister, Donors, Queen-affiliated foundations, R&E Unit, & other ministry personnel)
• R&E Unit: Weekly meetings with the Minister of Education, Quarterly meetings with the King & Queen.
• PMDU: Bi-weekly meetings with cabinet, in addition to monthly check-ins with line ministries.

Leveraging political sponsorship
• PMDU and R&E unit: High level of ownership from the respective political leaders or institution.
• PMDU: Ministers held accountable for results & used for data requests made to line ministries.
• R&E Unit: Authority needed to access relevant & timely information.
Jordan (contd.)

**Accountability and incentives**
- All three units introduced routine data collection & monitoring practices for policy & program implementation.
- PMDU: Started publishing national priorities & progress towards targets on an online dashboard.
- R&E Unit: Quarterly stock-take meetings with the King & Queen, focusing on key priorities.

**Problem-solving and organizational learning**
- DCU & R&E Unit: More intensive role in problem solving with ministry departments to understand where bottlenecks emerged & how they could be resolved.
- PMDU: Ad hoc meetings with ministers & bureaucrats to discuss implementation issues & solutions.
- R&E Unit: Met monthly with MOE to discuss implementation challenges & sometimes worked with them to problem-solve.
Key Findings

• DUs often confounded accountability: Particularly across complex & politically sensitive policy areas with multiple oversight bodies within & outside of govt.

• Multiple accountabilities sometimes had the positive effect of securing sustained commitment to priorities.

• DUs could solve high-level logistical bottlenecks, but not complex policy implementation issues.

• DCU was effective at engaging in more intensive problem-solving & coordinating targets & inputs across stakeholders.
Sierra Leone

The Sierra Leone Delivery Unit was established in 2020 to support the President’s vision for education transformation & delivery of the Free Quality School Education Program

Research design

- Semi-structured virtual interviews with a small number of government officials, policymakers & partner organizations.
- A total of fifteen people, including the Minister of Basic and Senior Secondary Education.
- Other officials: Staff, key advisors to the Minister, leaders of sub-agencies
- Implementing and supporting partners
- Review & analysis of policy documents & research papers.
Sierra Leone (contd.)

Prioritization and Target-Setting
- Overall priorities determined by the ESP; Minister and Ministry set the goals & objectives.
- No specific timelines & performance benchmarks.

Measurement and Monitoring
- DU supports the Ministry in identifying data sources, improving data collection systems, analysis & use of data.
- Data does not seem to be used to measure & monitor the progress of the key priorities & targets of Ministry.
- No formal structures for monitoring or measurement of the performance of the DU or achievement of priorities of the Ministry.
Sierra Leone (contd.)

**Political Sponsorship**
- High level of political sponsorship from the President (focus on improving human capital) & the Minister – supported politically & financially.
- Used political capital to remove bottlenecks faced to set up the DU & sought funding.

**Accountability and Incentives**
- Unclear whether there are rewards or sanctions linked to meeting delivery goals.
- No high-stake consequences attached to not being able to deliver.

**Problem-Solving**
- The Delivery Unit coordinated efforts and dialogue between the Ministry & development partners, including when barriers or roadblocks for policy implementation arise.
- Lack of coordination & collective problem-solving attitude across the MBSSE departments.
Key Findings

• Political Leadership key to establishing & implementing a successful DA

• Utilization of data is key to inform policy, planning and monitoring

• Establishing a homegrown DU needs time for buy-in from the existing bureaucracy

• Clear prioritization, target-setting and timelines are needed

• Sustainability is a critical component of reforms
Overall Lessons and Takeaways

1. Achieving policy goals requires resources, action, & implementation using the best organizational design (DAs could be catalysts for testing/improving this design)

2. DAs come in all flavors & evolve over time (stepping-stones to gradual, longer-term systems reform)

3. Carefully assessing ground realities & preconditions before choosing DA is important to maximize their learning & catalytic impact

4. Tendency to centralize priorities & attention at the highest political or bureaucratic level rather than ensuring that they create the incentives & support needed to adapt & solve problems at the local level.

5. DAs can be short-lived due to domestic political &/or external donor support, so it is important to ensure that they are catalytic & generate knowledge and experience that has a longer shelf life.
DeliverEd Research-based products

- Feb. 2023: "Cross Case Study" (Flagship Report)
- June 2023: "Tanzania Study"

#LearningGeneration
DeliverEd - Key Partners
Thank You.

#LearningGeneration