Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

G2G Education Toolkit

Version: February 2014

G2G Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

The G2G Education Monitoring and Evaluation Tool provide Education Officers with guidance to track progress and measure outcomes of government-to-government assistance in education projects. With strengthened, sustainable partner-country institutional capacity a key goal of increased G2G assistance, a means to monitor and evaluate that capacity is essential. This Tool provides a methodology, indicators, and a process to track and measure results of the development of partner-country institutional capacity to achieve Goal 1 of the Education Strategy: improved reading in primary schools.

Education Office
Economic Growth, Education and Environment
February, 2014

FOREWORD

Government-to-government Education Toolkit

In line with the compelling policy guidance of USAID Forward, Agency education officers are currently exploring, developing and implementing new government-to-government (G2G) modalities in education projects. An immediate need exists for tools and training materials that will assist Education Teams as they design, implement, and monitor G2G activities to achieve USAID Education Strategy Goals.

Under the leadership of the Bureau for Economic Growth, Education and Environment's (E3) Education Office, the *G2G Education Toolkit* has been developed to provide this support. The Toolkit includes a literature review; an analysis of lessons learned and best practice; an analytic framework and roadmap; operational tools; and case studies. Additionally, sample G2G operational documents from Missions currently undertaking government-to-government activities will be available to guide field staff.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The use of G2G assistance reflects USAID's commitment to the Paris, Accra, and Busan Accords by which donor agencies should maximize the use of partner-country systems. G2G financing for education projects reflects a commitment to support strengthening the capacity of public institutions and organizations at national and local levels to deliver services needed to improve pupil learning achievement.[1] This Education G2G Tool provides guidance to monitor and evaluate USAID Education Projects using government-to-government (G2G) assistance. The Tool is directed to USAID Education Teams who need to factor monitoring and evaluation of G2G assistance into an overall Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP).

USAID has developed a considerable body of guidance and set of tools to monitor and evaluate education projects. For Goal 1 projects,[2] this includes assessments of pupil learning (e.g. EGRA) and methodologies for monitoring and evaluating the factors necessary to support early grade learning: the standards and organization of a reading curriculum; provision of instructional materials; teacher pre-and in-service preparation; classroom conditions and pedagogy; supervision and teacher professional development; community participation; and policy dialogue. These factors are embodied in the Results Frameworks of USAID's education projects and indicators for results are tracked through the Project Monitoring Plan (PMP).

A key goal of Aid Forward's initiative to increase G2G assistance is strengthened, sustainable partner-country institutional capacity for performance. Although this process is implied by the Results Frameworks, the actual improvement of government capacity is typically not a central focus of the Results Frameworks and PMPs; therefore monitoring and evaluating this capacity itself needs to be an essential G2G activity.[3] This G2G Education M&E Tool provides a methodology, indicators, and a process to do just that to support improved reading in primary schools. This guidance aims to assist both the partner country government's education bodies and mission education teams to develop PMPs where G2G-financed activities are components of an overall education project.

---

[1] In this paper, the term 'institution' is used to designate the central established bureaucracies of government: e.g. the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Finance. 'Organization' is used to refer to units within the institutions, e.g. Primary Education Departments, District Education Offices, Curriculum Directorates, schools, or NGOs engaged by governments to provide services.

[2] This G2G M&E Tool focuses on Goal 1, but the framework can also be used for Goal 3 by modifying organizational performance indicators (Table 4).

[3] Of course the management of G2G financed projects, whether outcome and milestone-based, such as the Fixed Amount Reimbursable (FAR) modality, or a Cost Reimbursable modality, also require careful monitoring of results to satisfy milestone requirements or to assure that costs have been used to finance agreed-upon inputs.

G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

> ### Box 1: Definition of Institutional Capacity
>
> Institutional capacity is defined as the quality of leadership, incentives, systems, resources, and personnel that produce results, based on the mission, goals, and objectives of an institution. The term refers to both organizational capacity as reflected by an institution's public mandate, legitimacy, resources, and systems and human capacity reflected by the motivation, status, technical, and managerial skills of leaders and staff. [4]

To contribute to the overall goal of increased partner-country capacity, the approach described here would itself become a key feature of that capacity, i.e. partner-country organizations should increasingly learn to use this approach for self-evaluation and institutional capacity assessments would become part of a national, education sector-wide annual review.

As noted by the USAID HICD Handbook, strengthening institutional capacity is one of the Agency's greatest challenges in the quest to fulfill its development assistance mandate worldwide. Results of previous public sector capacity-enhancement efforts in developing countries have been disappointing and reflect problematic political and institutional issues, not the least of which are the lack of endogenous incentives in public service systems and weak demand for improved performance from civil society. Attempts to implement rigorous, results-based, logical frameworks for institutional capacity development have seldom been effective, in part because of unrealistically short project time-frames, lack of resources, and the need to navigate the complex relationships that characterize public sector systems. This G2G Education M&E Tool draws on the research and analysis of good (and bad) practices from USAID, multilateral, and bilateral agencies in the field of institutional development. As with all institutional reform initiatives, this tool should be viewed as a work in progress, needing to reflect feedback from complex country and institutional contexts. Therefore, its evolution awaits reactions from field testing and evaluation.

The tool has five sections:
1. **Why** monitor and evaluate education projects using G2G?
2. **What** should be monitored and evaluated?
3. **Who** should be involved in the monitoring and evaluation process?
4. **When** should monitoring and evaluation be conducted?
5. **How** are monitoring and evaluation activities implemented for G2G?

---

[4] Adapted from USAID (2009) *HICD Policy Paper* and Fast Track Initiative (2008) *Guidelines for Capacity Development in the Education Sector*.

G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

Section 1: Why monitor and evaluate education projects using G2G assistance?

G2G assistance is increasingly being used as a modality for USAID development aid. In Senegal, for example, virtually the Mission's entire education project budget for Goal 1is now facilitated through G2G.[5] From one perspective, G2G assistance can be evaluated by the tracking of project milestones (for output and sector-based G2G assistance) or the conditions met for cost reimbursements. The degree to which milestones or conditions for reimbursement are met is one measure of G2G effectiveness. And yet, from a broader perspective, these indicators define specific outputs and do not measure the development of partner institutional and individual capacities that contribute to that performance.

G2G assistance is fundamentally intended to catalyze the increase of partner-country institutional capacity. The dollar amount provided through G2G is typically a small fraction of total government recurrent or capital budgets, yet these funds provide targeted support to build capacity and improve the delivery of specific services which, heretofore, were weak or absent. The evaluation of G2G assistance should therefore assess the quality and effectiveness of services provided, while also assessing the degree to which the institutional capacity to deliver those services has been strengthened.

Monitoring and evaluation of growing partner-country capacity is intended to be used and managed primarily by partner country institutions and organizations and secondarily by USAID to report the elements of successful institutional capacity strengthening. The research on good practices to build capacity for M&E indicates that USAID G2G assistance would be most beneficial where:

- Organizations are able and willing to assess their own capacities and performance shortfalls, acknowledge that their capacities are deficient, express a will to 'sign up' to the intervention, and agree to work collaboratively with externally-resourced assistance.
- A clear and thorough definition of the required capacities, is possible and an assessment of existing capacities (and the gap between them and required levels) is done so that it is relatively straightforward to define indicators.
- Incentives are available to improve performance (including demand pressure from clients or citizens) and resources a r e available with which to build capacities further.
- Firm leadership is in place and all the above conditions combine to produce 'ownership.' [6]

In Senegal and Zambia, USAID is working with governments and Ministries of Education to put these conditions into place. In both countries, Mission Education Teams have taken

---

[5] See *Education G2G Case Study: Senegal's Reading Program, PALME* on the E3 Education website.
[6] Adapted from Watson (2006).
G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

considerable time to engage Ministry of Education staffs and departments in field work leading to identification of organizational performance levels necessary to deliver services for improved reading performance. In Senegal, for example, milestones for the implementation of a comprehensive, three year FAR modality specify institutional performance tasks.

In summary, the purpose driving the considerable effort needed to develop and implement a G2G monitoring and evaluation activity is multi-faceted.

- An M&E system should provide timely and compelling evidence to governments and implementing partner-country organizations at local, district, and national levels so that they can monitor increasing capacity and performance. This in itself is a key strategy for institutional capacity strengthening.
- An M&E system should contribute to USAID's reporting requirements by providing evidence for indicators of institutional development without significantly increasing the management burden of partner country institutions.

Section 2: What should be monitored and evaluated?

USAID/E3 Education has developed detailed guidelines and specifications related to the monitoring and evaluation of technical inputs, processes, and outputs for early grade reading.[7] For education projects using G2G assistance, a tool is needed specifically to assess the partner-country institutions' capacity to provide and realize these inputs, processes, and outputs.

Significantly, relatively few examples of monitoring and evaluation for capacity development have been conducted by USAID or other development agencies. Rather, agencies have tended to substitute monitoring of project performance as a proxy for increased institutional capacity and have not attempted to assess capacity development directly.[8] Those cases found to be successful and innovative at both building institutional capacity and assessing that capacity[9] have exhibited these common characteristics:

Approaches are not concerned primarily with quantitative measurement or analysis but with creation of consensus as to what represents qualitative improvements or 'contributions' towards achievement of broad development goals without making any attempt to attribute changes to specific inputs. Additionally, approaches rarely make reference to detailed,

---

[7] See EdData II at https://www.eddataglobal.org/
[8] Ibid, Watson 2006.
[9] Notable cases include Action Aid: *Accountability, Learning and Planning System* (ALPS); ADRA *Most Significant Change* (MSC) technique for complex rural development; and Outcome Mapping (OM), now widely used as a planning and evaluation tool for rural development. Watson (2006) pp. 24-28.
G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

predetermined outcome indicators, but are more likely to reflect emerging themes or trends based on day-to-day practical experience.

'Work stories' generated by a range of actors are often vehicles for 'sense-making' of what is happening and with what effects. These innovative approaches usually involve dissemination of information about 'what happened,' leading to critical reflection and analysis of that experience. They attempt to demystify M&E and allow clients, including the most vulnerable, to have a voice in periodic reflection on achievements and learning to date. They therefore develop capacities for analysis, debate, and consensual decision making among stakeholders and the staff of the organizations concerned.[10]

Box 2: Zambia: Building Ownership for Reform
In 2011 and 2012, the USAID Zambia Education Team organized and joined Ministry of Education officials from central, provincial, and district levels on field visits to over 100 schools in all ten provinces. The objective of the visits was to assess conditions and ask school heads and teachers what was needed for pupils to improve their learning performance. This intensive field work generated a collective set of insights, stories, and understandings about what was needed as a basis for program strategies and objectives.

A useful conceptual framework for identification of institutional capacities to enrich field assessments with theory and research is provided by the Human and Institutional Capacity Development Handbook.[11] The Handbook uses an analytic model of six dimensions of organizational performance.

---

[10] Ibid, Watson (2006) p15.
[11] USAID (2011) HICD Handbook. http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADT442.pdf
G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

Table 1: Institutional Capacities Model[12]

ENVIRONMENTAL	**Information** • Roles and performance expectations are clearly defined; employees are given relevant and frequent feedback about the adequacy of performance. • Clear and relevant guides are used to describe the work process. • The performance management system guides employee performance and development.	**Resources and Tools** • Materials, tools, expert support, and time needed to do the job are present. • Processes and procedures are clearly defined in reference documentation. • Overall physical and psychological work environment contributes to improved performance; work conditions are safe, clean, organized, and conducive to performance.	**Incentives** • Financial and non-financial incentives are present; measurement and reward systems reinforce positive performance. • Jobs are enriched to allow for fulfillment of employee needs. • Overall work environment is positive, where employees believe they have an opportunity to succeed; career development opportunities are present.
INDIVIDUAL	**Knowledge and Skills** • Employees have the necessary knowledge, experience and skills to do the desired behaviors. • Employees with the necessary knowledge, experience and skills are properly placed to use and share what they know. • Employees are cross-trained to understand each other's roles.	**Capacity** • Employees have the individual capacity to learn and do what is needed to perform successfully. • Employees are recruited and selected to match the realities of the work situation. • Employees are free of emotional limitations that would interfere with their performance.	**Motives** • Motives of employees are aligned with the work and the work environment. • Employees desire to perform the required jobs. • Employees are recruited and selected to match the realities of the work situation.

The HICD manual further expands on these capacities with a detailed list of organizational performance questions to guide an analysis of human and institutional capacity. This set of guiding questions is provided in Annex 1. These questions are intended to serve as a resource for consultations to identify key organizational development indicators within the context of each education system, organization, and program.

While considering these generic elements of institutional capacity, specification of measurable outcomes is a necessity for Goal 1 education projects, i.e. increased pupil reading skills by grade and language, as well as identification and definition of specific organizational processes, resources, and capacities to support these outcomes. The monitoring and evaluation of institutional capacity is most effective when, as noted earlier, a clear and thorough definition of the expected capacities is combined with a thorough assessment of the gap between existing

---

[12] Reprinted with permission of the International Society for Performance Improvement. Chevalier, R. (2003). *Updating the Behavioral Engineering Model. Performance Improvement 42(5).* (slightly modified by USAID). (USAID (2011) HICD Handbook, p6

and required capacities. From this perspective, the monitoring and evaluation of G2G assisted reading projects presents a significant opportunity to build stronger institutions.

Much research and evaluation work is needed to develop further knowledge and insight to guide early grade reading provision by national education systems. Current research on good practices to assure improvements in pupil reading achievement indicates that partner-country institutional capacities are needed in the seven following areas:[13]

- Establishment of a language policy (e.g. use of mother-**tongue** and national language) for implementation of early grade reading;
- Development of curriculum (with standards for reading by grade) and **text** development, distribution, and use;
- Reform of classroom **teaching** and learning for effective reading instruction;
- Increased **time** on task for reading instruction and learning;
- Development of appropriate national, school, and classroom level assessments (**testing**);
- Design of research and **evaluations** as the basis for engagement of stakeholders in policy dialogue based on evidence;
- Development of **community mobilization** and social marketing, especially important when the partner country is multilingual and the selection and sequencing of mother-tongue (L1) and national language (L2) literacy can be politically controversial.

In summary, the question about what to monitor has two broad answers. First, implementing organizations, through a consultative process,   need to develop and specify the actual performance tasks relevant to achievement of results (i.e. improved pupil reading skills and comprehension). Second, the organizations must identify and describe the most critical institutional and organizational capacities needed to perform these tasks as the basis for both building their capacity and performing M&E activities. The steps and indicators to support these activities are further elaborated in the following sections.

Section 3: Who should be involved in the monitoring and evaluation process?

The reform of institutional systems to increase capacity can only occur when the political and bureaucratic leadership seeks those reforms as a means to achieve specific results, in this case early grade reading improvements.   Institutional reforms are needed at the national, regional, district, and school levels to develop the curriculum and instructional materials, teacher training, supervision, professional support, assessments, monitoring and evaluation.   As noted in Section 1, implementation of these institutional reforms requires that: 1) those within the

---

[13] USAID (2014) G2G Education Toolkit: Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool
G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

implementing organizations are able and willing to assess their own capacities and performance shortfalls (in relation to the objective of improving pupil reading achievement); 2) incentives are in place to improve performance (including demand pressure from citizens); 3) resources are available to build capacities further; and 4) firm leadership and ownership of the institutional reform process is evident.

These prerequisites for institutional reform, especially the ownership aspect of the reform process, indicate that a key strategy of capacity building efforts is to strengthen the ability of organizations to assess their own capacity to achieve results. An organization will be willing do this to the degree that it operates within a political and bureaucratic context committed to achieving higher academic performance and specific results. Yet it is the political and bureaucratic context and its institutional incentives which are often most problematic. Sustained Institutional capacity development cannot be imposed; but rather requires a process of building strong relationships, not dominated by the application of external standards and judgmental approaches.[14]

A team drawn from partner-country organizations in partnership with USAID should conduct the Institutional Capacity Assessment (ICA) to identify strengths and gaps in existing capacity. This should lead to identification of organizations qualified to receive G2G support. Design of G2G monitoring and evaluation activities will build on the relationships and team structure developed during the ICA process to work on the G2G M&E process. This structure and process should be integrated into the overall assessment of G2G milestones and performance, and to the extent possible, into the government's own education sector monitoring and evaluation systems and process. A strategy for increasing partner-country leadership and management should be built into the design of the G2G monitoring and evaluation plan, while also retaining some level of external review by third party monitoring mechanisms and/or other stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Section 4: When should monitoring and evaluation of G2G activities be conducted?

Prior to planning and initiating a G2G M&E process, government and Ministry of Education leaders need to be committed to the reform process and to the use of G2G assistance for the improvement of primary school reading. Second, as a result of the Institutional Capacity Assessment, which will assess priority capacity development needs, a framework of institutional reform objectives will emerge as the basis for specific monitoring and evaluation activities.

During the implementation of an education project, key indicators for those activities that involve an on-going level of effort and resources should be monitored on a continuous basis

---

[14] Eyben, R. (2011). *The Big Push Forward* http://bigpushforward.net/resources
G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

(for example, as in a program to increase the supervisory and professional development skills of district and sub-district education officers). Successful institutional performance and reforms depend on a steady flow of reliable information on critical indicators to guide management decisions. This process requires focus, committed staff time, and resources.

The M&E process should provide an annual review for each implementing organization using the ICA results as a baseline. The M&E process and indicators will also be derived from organization capacity development objectives.   As a cautionary note, however, the development of this process should not be so time and resource-intensive as to interfere with actual project implementation. To the extent possible, the monitoring process should be embedded in and strengthen existing institutional structures (e.g. an education sector monitoring and evaluation task force) and processes (an annual education sector review). Additionally, successful institutional capacity development projects have demonstrated the importance of including incentives such as grants or awards, given by a transparent annual evaluation, to reinforce effective performance.

In addition to continuous and annual monitoring and evaluation, USAID projects typically demand mid-term and final evaluations. Just as in annual reviews, the indicators and processes for these evaluations should be developed with implementing organizations, be specific to each organization's capacity development goals and objectives, and in this case, linked to enhancement of pupils' early grade reading achievement. For mid-term and final evaluations, progress on institutional capacity development should be carried out as an integral component of an overall education project evaluation. Table 2 presents a checklist of the steps to initiate an institutional capacity monitoring and evaluation plan.

Table 2: Checklist to Initiate an Institutional Capacity M&E Plan

Steps	✔
Obtain commitment of the Government/Ministry of Education to achieve the goals of institutional reform to improve reading performance, using a specific G2G modality	
Identify potential organizations for Institutional Capacity Assessment. Obtain buy-in from the Ministry of Education and organization leadership	
Establish an Institutional Capacity (IC) team/s (within an existing coordinating body if possible), drawing on key staff from implementing organization units, to implement institutional capacity development and M&E.[15]	
Use analytic tools based on good practice (such as those included here) to develop specific priority IC reform objectives and indicators with each team.	
Identify actions, resources, and decisions toward those objectives for G2G assistance.	
Develop the Institutional Capacity M&E plan with indicators and processes for obtaining information, analysis, and review. Include this plan within the PMP	
Organize and provide resources for continuous, annual, mid-project, and final evaluations. If appropriate, support these activities with G2G assistance.	

Section 5: How are monitoring and evaluation activities implemented for G2G?

The Education G2G M&E Tool builds on the Education G2G Institutional Capacity Assessment Tool (ICA). The ICA will provide the baseline and initial analysis for which government partner institutions and organizations, with USAID assistance, will establish institutional capacity development plans.

The institutional capacity monitoring and assessment process first examines the organizational performance of key tasks needed to implement a reading program (Table 4). Many of these performance tasks will be negotiated within the overall education program design and, for G2G assistance, may be milestones within an outcome-based reimbursement modality (e.g. FAR). The second step of this process identifies the key institutional and organizational factors that contribute to or constrain the organization's performance (Table 5).

To facilitate the analysis, a three-point rating scale is used to arrive at a determination for each organizational performance activity designed to improve reading. In arriving at an assessment,

---

[15] Avoid establishment of a new Institutional Capacity team if one already exist. Rather, USAID should seek to build on and focus the work of existing Ministry of Education capacity building/M&E teams so as not to create parallel and overlapping efforts.

G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

the members of the Institutional Capacity Team should consult together and seek to arrive at a consensus on the rating for each performance activity. If consensus is not possible, the majority assessment should be used with a note to indicate alternative assessments and evidence.

Table 3: Rating Scale for Organizational Performance	
Rating	**Description**
Needs Development **1 / ND**	Organization is not fully functional and does not have sufficient resources and capacity to implement policies and program tasks on time and effectively.
Moving Along **2 / MA**	Organization is operationally sound but has some need for reform and strengthened capacity to improve performance.
High Capacity **3 / HC**	Organization functions well and performs program activities on time and effectively.

The organizational performance activities to be assessed are based on current 'good practice' designs for improvement of early grade reading. Each implementing organization should review, amend, delete and/or add specific activities related to improved delivery of early grade reading. Each organization will monitor and self-assess its performance based on a sub-set of capacities (as an example, the curriculum department would be assessed on the capacity to establish early grade reading standards but would not be assessed on the capacity to manage an early grade reading in-service teacher training program). This process therefore does not summarize all the performance ratings but rather assesses each organization only on those activities related to its field of operations.

Table 4 provides a template of indicative performance activities. Using the rating scale (Table 3), the ratings received in each area take into consideration specific capacity factors which constrain performance. They should be noted in the right column. Organizations which receive ratings of 1 (Needing Development) or 2 (Moving Along) should be considered to have the most need for capacity development efforts in the performance areas identified. After a rating has been determined for each organization, the institutional capacity factors identified will then be reviewed using Table 5 to determine the degree of importance of each factor for timely and effective organizational performance.

As an issue to bear in mind, in certain cases Ministries of Education may choose to procure and manage tasks (for example, publishing) through local non-governmental organizations. In these cases, separate assessments of both the government department's capacity to manage the procurement and the non-state organization's capacity to provide quality services should be done. Typically these assessments would be an integral part of the procurement process.

Table 4: Template of Education Organization Performance Indicators

Implementing Organization:				
Illustrative Indictors for Organizational Performance	**ND**	**MA**	**HC**	**Critical Institutional Capacity Factors (from Table 5) Relevant to the Rating**
Establishment of standards for EGR by grade. Development of syllabi, curricula and teachers' guides in appropriate languages.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Specifications for publishers: texts, readers, and materials in L1 (mother tongue) and L2 (national language) based on standards and curriculum.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Procurement, distribution, storage and utilization of materials in classrooms	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Pre-service training on skills for teaching EGR [16]	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
In-service training on literacy instruction skills, including system for local professional support to teachers.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Supervision of teachers and schools on a systematic basis.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Incentives for teachers deployed to early grades in rural areas.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Time on Task: Systems of accountability for attendance and performance in place and enforced at the school level and above.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Time on Task: Supervision and reporting: use of information for personnel management decisions.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Tests: Classroom assessments: Design, analyze and use of data from class assessment (on-going classroom testing and school-based tests at the end of term.).	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	

---

[16] See Abadzi, H. (2013) for a recent review of research on the specific skills teachers need to effectively teach early grade reading.

G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

Implementing Organization:				
Illustrative Indictors for Organizational Performance	**ND**	**MA**	**HC**	**Critical Institutional Capacity Factors (from Table 5) Relevant to the Rating**
Tests: Design and manage national assessment to track progress and effectiveness of EGR program.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Policy Research: Design and conduct targeted national research on literacy implementation failures and successes.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Policy Dialogue: Organization of meetings, seminars, conferences, etc. with stakeholders, CSOs, and media to share findings.	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	
Community mobilization and social marketing: promote understanding and review of school performance, support to school level for EGR activities.[17]	☐ 1	☐ 2	☐ 3	

Table 5 provides a short list of institutional capacity factors for consideration when planning G2G assistance.[18] The template, adapted and designed through a consultative process, provides a means to engage implementing organizations in an ongoing process of monitoring both performance towards program objectives and development of institutional capacity. These ratings of course require the use of judgment. The exercise asks that the Institutional Capacity Team(s) consider each item with a reflective and analytic approach. The tool helps to assess complex institutional issues and can be further elaborated based on the guiding questions in Annex 1 to identify precise organizational reforms needed to improve performance and capacity. The following rating scale is used to determine the degree of importance of each factor:

Rating: Level of importance to current organization performance from Table 4

1	Low
2	Average
3	High
4	Critical

---

[17] This is especially important in multilingual contexts where the selection of L1 and L2 may be controversial.
[18] See Annex 1 for a more detailed listing of institutional capacities as a set of guiding questions from the USAID HICD Handbook.

G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

Table 5: Assessment of Factors Contributing to Organizational Capacity

Factors	Importance (check one)
Policy direction and institutional status, mandated roles and responsibilities, and relationship to education sector leadership	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐
Coordination of departments and organizational units involved in program implementation and performance	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐
Availability of resources and financing from public budgets, donors, and other sources	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐
Adequate physical space, facilities, and equipment (including ICT and communications hardware and software)	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐
Staffing: leadership capacity, training, education, and management experience	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐
Staffing: organization establishment: numbers, training, experience, and performance	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐
Rate of staff turnover	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐
Operational systems (e.g. filing, personnel, financial, EMIS, evaluation and assessment)	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐
Organizational accountability through appropriate management and supervision and demand from the constituents served	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐
Incentives for good performance (which require reliable information about performance and results to be effective)	1☐ 2☐ 3☐ 4☐

As a result of the assessment in Table 4, the rating given for each indicator (e.g. 'needs development,' 'moving along,' or 'high capacity') would produce a determination of which elements are most critical to achievement of a capable, well-functioning literacy delivery system. Identification of critical institutional capacity factors across multiple areas would indicate the targets for an institutional agenda of inter-departmental reforms. From Table 5, those factors which received a rating of 3 or 4 would be considered the most important to building institutional capacity and should become the action points for the organization's capacity development plan.

For annual and mid-term evaluations and for the PMP, each implementing organization may be assessed by summing and averaging the ranking of the individual performance tasks to provide an overall evaluation of organizational performance effectiveness. Further, the tracking of changes on the critical factors contributing to organizational performance will provide a record of reforms and improvements in implementing organizations. When summarized across all implementing organizations, this analysis will provide an overall picture of institutional capacity development. At the mid-term and final evaluations, the Institutional Capacity teams responsible for the ongoing monitoring and annual evaluations should be reinforced by external evaluators.

G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

Conclusion

This G2G Education Monitoring and Evaluation Tool must be seen as a work in progress. Although it draws on research and experience of good practice in institutional capacity building, including USAID's Human and Institutional Capacity Development Handbook and the Agency policy on evaluation, this is the first attempt to provide a process to monitor and evaluate G2G assistance to build institutional capacity, in this case for Goal 1 of the Education Strategy. Feedback on the usefulness of this tool from Missions attempting to design and implement M&E plans for G2G assistance would be extremely useful to the E3 Office of Education in on-going efforts to effectively operationalize government-to-government assistance in education programming.

Resources

EuropeAid (2005). *Institutional Assessment and Capacity Development: Why, what and how?* Luxembourg, Luxembourg: European Commission.

Eyben, R. (2011). 'Relationships Matter: the best kept secret of international aid.' From the website of *The Big Push Forward*, http://bigpushforward.net/resources

Fast Track Initiative (2008). *Guidelines for capacity development in the education sector within the Education for All Fast-Track Initiative Framework.* Retrieved from: http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/library/CDguidelines.pdf

Kimata, Y. (2008). *Capacity assessment for enhancing development effectiveness: Application to JICA program management.* Tokyo: Japan International Cooperation Agency.

Rondinelli, D., Middleton, J. and Verspoor, A. (1990). *Planning Education Reforms in Development Countries: The Contingency Approach.* London: Duke Press Policy Studies.

USAID (2009). *Human and institutional capacity development (HICD) Policy Paper: A Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 201.* Washington, DC: USAID.

USAID (2011a). *Education data for decision making: What works to improve reading.* Washington, DC: USAID.

USAID (2011b). *Education strategy: Opportunity through learning.* Washington, DC: USAID.

USAID (2011c). *Human and institutional capacity development handbook. A USAID model for sustainable performance improvement.* Washington, DC: USAID.

USAID (2011d). *USAID Evaluation Policy.* Washington, D.C. USAID.

USAID (2012a). *ADS Chapter 203: Assessing and Learning.* Washington, D.C. USAID.

USAID (2012b). *ADS Chapter 220: Use of reliable partner government systems for direct management and implementation of assistance.*

Wilson, D., and Beaton, L. (2003). *Promoting institutional and organizational development: A sourcebook of tools and techniques.* London: Department for International Development.

Watson, David (2006). *Monitoring and evaluation of capacity and capacity development.* Discussion Paper 58B. European Center for Development Policy Management (ECDPM).

Performance Factor	Guiding Questions
Information: *Job expectations*	- Does the organization have a mission that is known by all? - How well do employees understand organizational goals? Are strategies developed and communicated to achieve those goals? Do strategies actually lead to fulfillment of the goals? Is there alignment between performance, goals, and strategies to achieve the goals? - How are goals set for work? How are employees involved in the goal-setting process? - Do employees know what is expected of them? If we asked people what is expected of them, would they be able to tell us? - How clearly are roles defined? - Do employees have clearly written job descriptions that describe what is expected of them? What work needs to get done? Who does it? Is it clear who is supposed to do what? - Can employees tell doing it right from doing it wrong? - How are decisions made? Who makes them? How well does the decision-making process appear to work? How much input do people closest to the work have in making decisions? How decentralized is the decision making? Who can make decisions about spending money? How does this affect outputs?
Information: *Performance Feedback*	- How do employees know how their actual performance compares to the performance desired of them? Does anyone give employees feedback on their performance? In writing? Verbally? - If you asked one of the workers how they are doing compared to what the organization wants, would they know? How would they know? - Is the feedback understandable to employees? - Is the feedback tied to something over which they have control? (i.e., their own performance?) How is the accomplishment of goals measured and acknowledged?
Resources: *Environment and Tools*	- Do employees have all the items they need in order to do their job? Are there better tools available? - Is the environment helping or hindering getting the desired performance? - Is there a specific link between the performance and any particular tools or resources that come to mind? Either observe or ask questions to find out about: - Electricity/light source, heat source - Water source - General space/private space - Furniture, storage, equipment, supplies - Vehicles - Maintenance systems
Resources: *Organizational Support*	- Are organizational systems conducive to good performance? - Does adherence to policies and procedures allow for good performance? Or do policies and procedures create inefficiencies? - Do all parts of the organization work toward the same goals? - How is the organization structured? How does the structure help people get work done? How does it get in their way? - How is quality determined and measured? - Who makes decisions about budget items? Do employees have adequate input into budget decisions that will help them get their work done? - Are there any organizational processes that hinder effective work (e.g., a complicated clearance process that delays key supplies, tools or decisions needlessly)? - What kinds of meetings are there? Who attends? How do the meeting results contribute to work agendas? What do employees need from a supervisor? Are they getting it? - How are problems solved? (Ask for examples.)
Incentives	- If people do a good job, what happens? Anything? Does their work life get better or worse somehow? - If people do not do the work the way it should be done, what happens? - How do people get recognition for their work? - How/when are incentives/rewards given? - What opportunities exist for career development or promotions?

G2G in Education: Monitoring and Evaluation Tool

	o What are the procedures/criteria applied to make decisions about rewards?
	o What are the different existing mechanisms to recognize good staff performance?
Skills and Knowledge	• Do employees know how to do their job?
	• What kind of prior training have employees had that relates to how well they do their job? Was that training effective?
	• Were employees able to apply what they learned in the training program? Why or why not? What could future training do to fill in skill and knowledge gaps?
	• What is the in-service training policy? Does it actually work as described? How well does it work in keeping employees up-to-date with the skills and knowledge they need to do their job?