Intervention to improve management and local accountability in public primary schools

Measure for progress
Introduction

- A research and action program to demonstrate the impact of using a scorecard in management of public schools as a strategy to improve pupil performance
  - Community-defined -- Stakeholders at the school determine exactly what they want to “measure for progress”
  - Shared -- Contents of scorecard are pre-determined
- Spearheaded by an international partnership
  - Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC),
  - Centre of Studies of African Economies (CSAE),
  - World Vision,
  - SNV Netherlands Development Organization
What is a score card?

- A strategic management tool that helps measure, monitor, and communicate plans, activities and goals throughout the school in a way that is understood by everyone involved.

- Parents, teachers, SMC members, and Head teacher simply call it “measure for progress”
...but PLE and EMIS exist

... the focus is on inputs, partly outputs and outcomes, but we also want to **measure & improve** the *process* of production
What the score card does...

1. Provides Voice to all stakeholders, especially at school - teachers, parents, SMC members, pupils, headteacher
2. Allows flexibility: the things which are measured are changeable over time and across schools, and under our community-defined approach, we want to allow flexibility to adapt even the information we gather to local circumstances
3. Enables increased communication between the stakeholders – parents, teachers, head-teacher, School Management Committee and communities
4. Enables local dissemination: although EMIS (especially decentralized) is a laudable effort, it doesn't provide information to and empower the community
5. Enhances action: schools and DEO are better able to plan, monitor and communicate e.g. identify schools in most need of supportive supervision
The scorecard process [1]

1. All stakeholders - parent, teacher, SMC & pupil - agree on what to monitor at the start of each period, e.g. a term;
   - Done through a school platform in which parents, teacher, SMC elect 3 representatives,
   - A committee of 3 teachers, 3 SMC, 3 parents, headteacher, 2 teachers representing pupils agree on issues to monitor,
   - Pupils views are solicited from them separated for boys and girls by the 2 teacher representatives.

2. Each stakeholder – parent, teacher, SMC & pupil complete individual scorecards during the term – 12 scorecards.
3. Each group of stakeholders - parent, teacher, SMC & pupil - meet to discuss the contents of the scorecard and develop a **group** scorecard → 5 group scorecards

4. The entire committee meets to discuss the contents of the group scorecard and develop a **school** scorecard → 1 scorecard

5. The school scorecard is communicated and discussed with the parents and teachers at a general meeting at the start of the next term → actions are prioritized for the next round.

6. The school scorecard with additional comments, if any, from the parents and teachers general meeting to the District Education Office.

7. The District Education Office analyzes the performance of schools → identifies those in need for support supervision, and those from which he/she can learn good practices
Version of scorecards

- **Shared** scorecard and a **Community** defined scorecard
- What is the difference?
Community defined

- Stakeholders at the school determine exactly what they want to “measure for progress”
- Example ...
Community defined: advantages & disadvantages

- **Advantages**
  - Allows school communities to define what they consider important,
  - Challenges differ from one school community to another school community
  - Is very flexible, can change from term to term to reflect changing preferences

- **Disadvantages**
  - Cannot be compared across schools – only thematic areas such as finances, pupils can
Shared

- Contents of scorecard are pre-determined
- Example ...

**School finances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Y / N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you find the money received by the school listed publicly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much UPE money received since end of last term?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does school have an approved budget?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much money has been spent THIS TERM for purpose of...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are receipts available for all expenditure?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How satisfactory is progress in the management of school's finances?

How satisfactory is the spending of school funds according to plan?
Shared: advantages & disadvantages

- Advantages
  - Allows comparison across schools

- Disadvantages
  - Communities have little input in defining what to monitor,
  - Not flexible