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Introduction

• The paper reflects “non-educationalist” perspectives.
• The central question we ask is: what are the lessons of aid effectiveness that can guide us in the area of education?
• We present a general framework, and case studies mainly from education (though could equally be from other sectors).
• The aim is to provoke discussion, rather than provide a recipe for success
Aid for education: an overview

- Education has long been an aid priority (around 10%), though recently left behind by health.
- Education overall is a development success story
  - Massive increases in literacy (from $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{4}{5}$ between 1950 and 2000) and enrollments (from 47% to 87.5% between 1950 and 2002 in net primary enrolment) [Kenny, *Getting Better*]. Gender inequalities on the decline.
- Aid has probably played a useful role in this regard
  - Easterly: “Foreign aid likely contributed to some notable successes on a global scale, such as dramatic improvement in health and education indicators in poor countries.” (p. 176, *White Man’s Burden*)
- Though note ongoing concerns about education quality and access for marginalized groups.
Determinants of aid effectiveness

• Recipient quality the most important determinant.
  – Development 101

• Donor quality can also be an issue
  – It’s not easy to be a donor

• The patterns of donor-recipient interaction can itself be a problem.
  – Paris Declaration
Strategies to improve donor effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve the quality of host governments</th>
<th>Improve the quality of donor agencies</th>
<th>Reduce transaction costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Link aid more closely to performance (create competition for aid)</td>
<td>A. Strengthen the poverty reduction objectives of donor agencies</td>
<td>A. Harmonize donor activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Improve the institutions of aid recipient countries</td>
<td>B. Make donor agencies more accountable</td>
<td>B. Align with governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Reduce the knowledge burden of donor agencies</td>
<td>C. Work more with non-government and private sector partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Make donor agencies less discretionary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons about the strategies

• Aid reform is not easy.
• There is no dominant strategy. We need to work on all fronts.
• But there are trade-offs:
  – Using aid for institutional reform reduces accountability.
  – So does alignment and harmonization.
Case study approach

• Not intended to be representative or systematic.
• Have chosen cases which are opportunities for learning.
• Reflects belief that the case-study approach is the best to approach understanding of whether and what aid works.
• The case studies are mainly from the education sector; some from health, but really they could come from any sector.
• Most are actual case-studies; a couple are proposals.
• 9 case-studies: can only scratch the surface in this presentation.
Linking the case studies to the strategies
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<td>A. Strengthen the poverty reduction objectives of donor agencies</td>
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</tr>
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<td>B. Improve the institutions of aid recipient countries</td>
<td>B. Make donor agencies more accountable</td>
<td>B. Align with governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Reduce the knowledge burden of donor agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. Work more with non-government and private sector partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Make donor agencies less discretionary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Demonstration impacts (CARE Cambodia Highland Children Education Project)

- Bilingual primary education provided for Tampuen and Kreung ethnic minority groups in six remote villages in Cambodia’s northeastern province of Ratanakiri.
- Funded by AusAID and others.
- 3 year project 2002-2004 $US 600K
- Provides ethnic minority children with the first two years of primary education in their own languages and Khmer, the national language.
- Target villages had no education before, so project involved developing new (community) schools, as well as curriculum and teacher training.
- Positive evaluation: “the HCEP has proven that young, marginalized people from isolated ethnic minority groups, in fact, can learn to read and write their own mother tongue and the national language surprisingly fast given suitable conditions for learning.” (p. 40).
- Post-pilot scale-up: Ministry has since promulgated policy framework for bilingual education, and has expanded it to five north eastern provinces in Cambodia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of bilingual schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ethnic minority teachers trained by CARE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ethnic minority children receiving bilingual education</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>2889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ethnic minority languages used in formal education programs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ethnic minority children from HCEP schools attending secondary school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ethnic minority children from HCEP schools who graduated from grade 9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ethnic minority children from HCEP schools attending teacher training college</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CARE Australia
Social accountability (Uganda and India)

- The idea here is to work on the demand rather the supply side to improve “recipient quality.”
- In Uganda, community monitoring led to improved quality of health delivery. In 25 randomly selected rural communities, local NGOs organized meetings of residents with health service providers based on score cards. Quality of services improved leading to 33% decline in child mortality.
- In India, a leading education NGO mobilized communities about leaning in schools in 195 randomly selected villages in UP. Volunteers provided report cards on the schools. NGOs shared information about how to improve quality (e.g. through Village Education Committees).
- Why the difference? A comparison suggests country, sectoral and project differences.
  - Like other forms of aid, no guarantee of success
Technical assistance:
(PNG Curriculum Reform Implementation Project)

• 2000-2006, $43 million AusAID project
• Resulted in a new “outcomes-based” curriculum.
• In 2011, press reports that PNG Government “has declared the nation's outcome-based education system a failure and announced an education taskforce to find a new curriculum for school students.”
• No AusAID evaluation published, but PNG’s National Research Institute carried out its own evaluation in 2010.
• What went wrong?
  – “The study revealed that the students learning was ineffective under the OBE curriculum model…. This was due mainly to a widespread lack of teachers’ guides and syllabi, student text books, student resource books, lack of access to the internet, and lack of library resources.” (p. xii)
  – An example of wrong fit?
Results-based aid
(Cash on delivery)

• Instead of trying to “improve” the recipient, we can improve aid effectiveness by choosing “better” recipients.
• This is the idea behind results-based aid in general, and “Cash on Delivery” in particular.
• In technical terms, it is a form of outcomes-based budget support.
  – E.g. $200 per child who enrolls (or passes a standard test) above some agreed benchmarks
• Status: Now being piloted by DFID
• Advantages:
  – Hands-off (no SWAPs, no TA).
  – Focus on results.
• Disadvantages:
  – How to define the counter-factual.
  – Political difficulties of budget support.
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Results frameworks (India DPEP/SSA)

• Results framework nowhere applied more strongly than in education.
  – E.g. DFID claims its aid to India will enrol “1.5 million children, of which 0.73 million girls” by 2012.

• Education seems well-suited to the application of a results framework, but it is actually much less straightforward than it seems
  – Fungibility
  – Inability to specify the counterfactual (i.e. to say what is driving the change: is it an increase in funding, or something else?)

• India is one of the few cases where this dispute has come into the open
  – Enrollments have gone up, but whether the donor-funded DPEP (now SSA) is the reason is very unclear (Jalan & Glinskaya/Pritchett).
Project M&E
(Kenyan deworming and PNG text books)

• Results framework approaches are not substitute for project level M&E.
• Randomized evaluations are not used enough (esp by NGOs).
  – Kenyan deworming study showed that deworming kids a cost-effective education intervention
    • One quarter of Kenyan student absenteeism is attributed to abdominal pains which likely due to intestinal helminth infections.
    • A randomized (at the school-level) trial showed that deworming increased school participation by at least 7 percentage points, a one-quarter reduction in school absenteeism.
    • The cost per additional year of school participation is US$3.27.

• We also need better project monitoring.
  – Randomized evaluations only suited to a small category of pilot interventions.
  – Project monitoring should be bottom-up as well as top-down.
  – PNG text book example (of what is needed):
    • Australia provides 500,000 textbooks to 3,400 PNG schools.
    • But do they reach their destination?
    • Could engage a survey firm to check.
    • Matt Morris has proposed using crowdsourcing.
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Harmonization I
(SWAp\$s)

- SWAp\$s have long been viewed as the answer to donor proliferation and fragmentation.
- Especially popular in health and education.
- But have they delivered?
- Andrew McNee has recently done a survey on health and finds “at best, mixed” performance
  - SWAp architecture has had few flow-on benefits (such as reduction in transaction costs).
  - Too much emphasis on process, not enough on results
  - He argues for a more pragmatic approach following SWAp principles, but using various “hybrid” sector approaches.
- A recent CfBT Education Trust survey on education SWAp\$s is somewhat more positive
  - Contribution to institutional development in some cases
  - Helped finance the “dramatic increases in the provision of and enrolment in fee-free primary education in low-income countries”
  - but nevertheless concedes that
    - “SWAp\$s are ineffective without strong ownership and leadership by the partner government”
    - Not enough focus on results
  - and argues for a “looser definition” of SWAp\$s going forward.
Harmonization II
(Global Partnership for Education)

• In general, aid field very complex:
  – “233 multilateral development agencies; 51 bilateral donor countries (most with multiple official agencies); several hundred international NGOs; and tens of thousands of national NGOs,” (Homi Kharas)

• Education quite unlike health in terms of fragmentation.
  – More than 100 international organizations in health.
  – More general move to earmarking (more than 50% multilateral funds)

• Now we are starting to see education “fight back” with the Global Partnership for Education (previously Fast Track Initiative), of which Australia is a huge supporter.
  – The primary rationale of GPE is coordination, with GPE envisaged to take a leading role.

• But do we need a Global Partnership for Education?
  – The 234th multilateral development agency?
  – What about IDA? In 2010 alone, spent $2.1 billion on education
  – Do we need a global partnership for roads?
Contributions of over $100 million in at least one replenishment shown separately.
Alignment
(Indonesia Basic Education Project)

• Began in 2005 with $388 million project
  – $200 m. for school construction in poor, remote districts
  – Funds for construction went through GoI; community monitoring of construction
• Published ICR overall positive
  – Project “effective and efficiently implemented”
  – Value for money high; leakage low; gender gains
• Australia Indonesia Education Partnership
  – $500 million over five years beginning 2011
  – AusAID’s biggest project (by far)
  – Additional funds mainly from EU (almost doubling AusAID’s contribution). Note EU funds are performance-based budget support).
  – Shift from “construct” to “construct or expand.”
  – Overall an example of building on success
• Main criticisms are around
  – Fungibility
  – Maintenance
  – Construction quality
  – Need for more technical assistance (though in new project $182 m for school and district level staff management, and $25 million for education policy research)
• Take-away positives
  – Alignment worked
  – Excellent documentation
Conclusions

1. Education is already an aid success story.
2. There is room for improvement, but there are no guarantees of (greater) success. There are certainly no magic bullets, though various have been put forward (SWAPs, Results Frameworks, TA, social accountability, m/l leadership).
3. Partnerships obviously are critical, and can take many different forms.
4. Of the various strategies discussed for improving effectiveness, under the three broad headings, the one that looks most promising is greater accountability.
   – It is the one which has been least tried, and the one most directly under donor control/influence.
   – The donor community (government and NGOs) can do better in being accountable for all forms of aid, from TA to pilots to SWAPs.
   – Project level M&E much more important than results frameworks.
   – Benefits go beyond accountability to learning.
   – Can usefully be done in partnership with academics (NRI example).
   – This approach will mean being open about failures, willing to live with different points of view and controversies, but also celebrating and publicizing successes.