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FOREWORD

The Governance Approach to Civil Service Reform developed by the Capacity Building and Implementation Division of the Technical Department (AFTCB) is the cornerstone of the Region's efforts to design lending and non-lending operations to strengthen public institutions in Sub-Saharan Africa. Two publications have been issued under this Regional Program: Technical Paper No. 225, "A Governance Approach to Civil Service Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa" and Discussion Paper No. 252, "Projectizing the Governance Approach to Civil Service Reform: An Institutional Environment Assessment for Preparing a Sector Adjustment Loan in The Gambia."

The present Discussion Paper, "Assessing Sector Institutions," flows from the work of the Regional Program, and is another step forward in the dissemination of methodologies to operationalize the governance approach to civil service reform. More important, it builds on the concept of environmental surveys to carry out institutional assessments of sector institutions. The extensive appendices also constitute valuable materials to be used in the Region's training efforts in relation to the emerging integrated sector approach.

Like the earlier Discussion Paper on projectizing the governance approach in The Gambia, this paper takes the concept to its practical application by detailing the steps in the assessment process and methodically records the experience of launching such an assessment in the Education Sector in Zambia. While this paper focuses on the work done in the core Ministry of Education, it also lays out the method to be used in assessing the cluster of institutions that support the sector. The cluster assessment that follows is being done in conjunction with the preparation of an Integrated Education Sector Operation, which further enhances its practical utility.

The Africa Technical Department is pleased to be able to add yet another practical instrument to the "tool kit" of task managers, especially those in Sector Operations Divisions involved in the preparation of Sector Integrated Programs. I recommend this Discussion Paper to all those in and outside of the Region who are involved in the preparation of lending and non-lending operations in this critical area of institutional development and capacity building in the sectors.

Kevin M. Cleaver
Director
Technical Department
Africa Region
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ABSTRACT

This study presents the methodological customization of Institutional Environment Assessments (IEAs) introduced in Discussion Paper No. 252 into Sector Institutional Assessments (SIAs) and discusses the first experience with its operationalization. It describes the SIA, how it is actually being conducted in the education sector of Zambia, and discusses what lessons are being learned. The Zambia pilot application of the SIA is divided into two distinct phases. **Phase I** consists of the assessment of the core sector agency: the Ministry of Education, which was combined with a Management Audit of the Ministry as required by the Public Service Reform Program, hence the designation MASA (Management Audit and Institutional Assessment) for the exercise of Phase I. **Phase II**, not yet completed at this writing, brings the remaining sector ministries into a full SIA, building on the results of the MASA. Furthermore, the study pays particular attention to the recently launched preparation of the **Zambia Integrated Sector Education Program** and draws on the discussions of the AFR Thematic Team on Broad Sector Approach to Lending. It also includes the design of the full SIA for the Education sector in Zambia and goes as far as progress with its implementation allows it to be documented and reported at the time of its publication.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IEAs and Tiered Analysis

The diagnostic procedure of Institutional Environment Assessments (IEAs) is based on a tiered analysis of different levels or segments of public administration. For this analysis, data is gathered at the political-structural, administrative-systems, and technical-sectoral levels. Each level is examined in terms of the interaction between institutional and governance dimensions, and a distinct set of variables is proposed for data gathering. As posited by the tiered analysis approach, higher levels have a determining effect over lower ones. For example, the system-wide administrative features of a given civil service are by and large determined by the nature of the political structures and institutions. Similarly, the capabilities for service delivery at the technical level of a given sector are to a large extent determined by the quality of system-wide administrative functions. The proposed tiered analysis therefore requires that data on one level be related to that of another in the quest for cause-and-effect dynamics.

Approaches to Institutional Assessments

Approaches to diagnosis and assessments of individual agencies for capacity building or institutional development purposes can generally be grouped into two categories: functional and strategic. The newly emerging environmental assessment, such as the IEA, constitutes a third category focusing instead on public administration systems, involving clusters of agencies, policy systems and their environment.

Generic IEAs can be conducted in a top-down or a bottom-up manner. In both cases, data is collected and processed on all three levels, as the intent is a comprehensive diagnosis of the broad environment and how it affects the public administration system. Top-down IEAs are reserved for comprehensive civil service reforms in environments needing basic institutional and environmental mapping. Bottom-up IEAs, in contrast, are intended to focus on either core economic functions where policy flows across agencies, or on service sectors where interfacing with clients by sector agencies assumes critical importance.

When an assessment is conducted with the intent of achieving a broad mapping of the environmental determinants of the functioning of the public administration system or of a core function that is tied both to system-wide administrative functions and the organization of the state, then data gathering and analysis must involve all levels. However, when the intent is to seek an understanding of the immediate causes of poor service delivery, and to design capacity building measures that will impact sector agencies, assessments must stress the technical-sectoral level and emphasize the links with system-wide administrative functions. This special customization of IEAs leads to the configuration of Sector Institutional Assessments (SIAs).
SIAs pay particular attention to the institutional dynamics among sector agencies. A thorough SIA for a given sector that includes several agencies will need to start with assessments of individual agencies to draw out profiles of the legal and policy framework of each agency as well as its organizational and managerial profile. These tasks will require the use of both the strategic and the functional approaches to assessments mentioned earlier. Once these assessments are related to environmental factors such as client views and expectations as well as the renditions of the sector by stakeholders, conclusions can be drawn about overall organizational and managerial performance.

**What an SIA is**

A sector institutional assessment (SIA) is a diagnostic and consensus-building procedure used to design and plan institutional reforms/development or capacity-building measures as required by a sector-specific development/investment program. It may also serve as a diagnostic tool in a given sector in the context of a government-wide institutional or civil service reform program.

The end product of an SIA is a consensually derived Action Plan containing measures and identifying those responsible to carry them out. SIAs are appropriate when there is a high level of commitment to genuine change on the part of the leadership of sector agencies, making them willing to accept a thorough scrutiny of their agencies’ client effectiveness. It should also permit mid-level managers and involved staff to openly discuss institutional problems in a way that predisposes them to assume responsibility for institutional change. This situation usually obtains when substantial sector investments/institutional improvements are being planned or when a government-wide reform is being launched.

**The Zambia Education Sector**

The education sector was by 1992 in a state of crisis—a crisis of *quality* indicated by shortages of education materials, crumbling physical infrastructure, and low morale among education personnel; a crisis of *access* because the resilience of the sector to expand without new investments reached its limits around 1985; and a crisis of *financing* as result of protracted resource starvation. Underlying the crisis was the continued dependence of the education system on the Government as the main source of education finance during a period of prolonged economic decline and fast population growth. Consequently, there had developed an inherent tension between the need to expand education provision on the one hand and the need to reduce expenditures on the other.
Customizing the SIA for Zambia's education sector demanded ensuring MASA's suitability as a diagnostic tool for sector-specific needs of service delivery; and flexibility for satisfying the requirements of the PSRP. The MASA process was therefore designed to secure four interrelated activities:

- the Desk Review, done with documentation available to the World Bank to draw a profile of the education sector in Zambia and to develop the Sector Environment Survey (SES) instrument;
- the Field Review, done in Zambia by Ministry of Education working groups to generate information for the MASA Strategic Planning Workshop;
- the Management Audit of the Ministry of Education, done by one of the working groups; and meeting the requirements of MDD/CO as well as the MASA process; and
- the Management and Strategic Planning Workshop.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE MASA EXPERIENCE

The MASA experience provided useful lessons regarding processes of institutional change of a core sector ministry in the context of a comprehensive reform program. First, it involved learning about the relationship between the central reform management unit and the sector ministries; and second, it was an opportunity to compare and contrast ideas and initiatives as developed by a central reform management unit vis-a-vis the reforming sector agencies. Furthermore, as was seen by the redirection of the Workshop after Day Two, it is crucial that the assumptions made about sector policy and agency objectives be established at the outset, when Working Groups prepare profiles for the Workshop. The SIA methodology ensures that this provision is applied.

Built on a participatory and group-based methodology, the MASA process improved interaction between MDD/CO and the Ministry of Education on two fronts: On the one hand, it provided a medium of dialogue between the central reform management unit and the sector ministry on sequencing the reform agenda and bringing out sector symptomatic problems as seen by the Ministry of Finance staff. On the other hand, it provided a process through which participatory diagnosis improved and enriched the agenda around which Component I of the Public Sector Reform Program (PSRP) was built. The MASA process also provided the necessary bridge from Component I to Components II and III, challenging participants to proceed beyond restructuring and reorganization of the Ministry of Education to implementing an action
plan, with capacity-building activities consistent with the PSRP. The significance of MASA’s impact is evident in the way that MDD/CO was able to learn from the process and to suggest modifications for applying the MASA methodology in another education sector ministry (Ministry of Science, Technology, and Vocational Training) as part of the expanded Sector Institutional Assessment discussed in Chapter V.

Another important lesson was that the MASA process enabled the Ministry of Education management to see: a whole range of factors that would impede reform; a range of measures that were necessary to remove the impediments; and the requisites for success and sustainability of the Ministry of Education’s reform, capacity-building, and performance improvement activities. For example, the realization that the new Policy Document did not have operational objectives that would provide the strategic and quantifiable means of achieving its (policy) goals came as a hard lesson that changed the course of the MSP Workshop. It was helpful for the Ministry of Education that such an important weakness was discovered early in the process of reform, and the Permanent Secretary announced at the end of the MSP Workshop that the Policy Document would have to be reviewed.

The MASA Strategic Planning (MSP) Workshop provided lessons on the adaptation of the IEA approach to a service delivery sector both in terms of the process and its outcome. Although it changed along the way, the program of the Workshop was designed more or less along the lines of the IEA Workshop. This led to mistakenly assuming that there was a mission and policy framework to which syndicate groups could relate in Task 1. In reality, however, given the PSRP restructuring requirements, the need emerged to revisit the mission and objectives of the sector in general and the agency in particular. The lesson here is that there is need to assign a working group during Field Review to focus on mission, policy goals, objectives, and functions of the sector agency. This is important because there may be cases in Sub-Saharan Africa where sector agencies do not have a clear mission and policy framework, or where these are not disseminated when they do exist. Besides satisfying the requirements of the PSRP and enriching the reform of the Ministry of Education, the MASA process prepared the ground for initial preparatory activities for a World Bank-funded Sector Investment Program (SIP) that the Government envisaged for the education sector.

**THE MASA AND THE INTEGRATED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP)**

As the Ministry of Education was concluding the submissions based on the MASA exercise, the World Bank intensified discussions with the Government of Zambia to launch the preparation of an Integrated Education Program (IEP), which was likely to have an impact on certain areas of the Ministry of Education, especially as regards policy and investments in the education sector. This event affected the finalization of Ministry of Education submissions in the sense that they had to incorporate requirements of the Integrated Education Program (IEP), especially those
regarding relationships with other ministries also involved in the provision of education. As the IEP is based on intensive sector donor coordination, donor-funded projects and their management by the Ministry of Education, the other ministries were also likely to change. These include: Ministry of Science, Technology, and Vocational Training; Ministry of Youth, Sports, and Cultural Development; and Ministry of Community Development and Social Services.

Early in 1995, preparation of the Integrated Education Program (IEP) was launched in earnest. The program is envisaged to adopt a sector lending approach and accordingly will:

- cover the entire education sector;
- be designed by the education sector ministries;
- be consolidated through an interactive high-level dialogue between the ministries and a series of refining workshop;
- involve and be supported by interested donors from the outset of preparation;
- put the local stakeholder in charge in order to secure commitment and ownership; and
- have common implementation arrangements among donors and minimal dependence on long-term foreign technical assistance.

Given the need for local ownership and coordinated program design by sector agencies, a participatory upstream diagnostic procedure focusing both on individual agencies and on the cluster of sector agencies became critical in the launching of the IEP. Following up on the Ministry of Education MASA therefore became the logical link to undertake this up-stream work.

**CUSTOMIZING THE SIA**

On the basis of the foregoing orientation, AFTCB designed a customized SIA for the IEP in Zambia. In order to ensure involvement of MDD/CO and secure its coordinating role over the four ministries involved, customization required that the SIA build on the MASA of Ministry of Education and generate information useful for the Management Audits of the remaining sector ministries.

The first formal contact with the Government of Zambia to undertake IEP/SIA discussions in a structured format and to carry out the stakeholder analysis was through an inter-ministerial meeting organized in close collaboration among the education sector ministries and the Cabinet Office.

While the IEP/SIA Inter-Ministerial Meeting and follow-up activities focused primarily on matters of sector policy and the identification of targets for investment, arrangements were made to address purely institutional issues in the preparation of the
SIA. At this writing, the Field Review Group of the Ministry of Science, Technology & Vocational Training started work, and the Focal Group/Technical Committee has held several meetings to organize the work of its sub-committees. At this juncture preparations are under way to plan the SIA Workshop and to fine-tune its design. A subsequent paper is planned to report on the experience of fully implementing the proposed SIA design.
I.
INTRODUCTION

Discussion Paper No. 252 projectizes the Africa Region’s Governance Approach to Civil Service Reform and introduces Institutional Environment Assessments (IEAs) as the operational expression of the approach’s conceptual framework. IEAs are presented as a diagnostic procedure to assess the broad impact of the environment on the functioning of public administration systems. They are, therefore, useful for the preparation of operations that support comprehensive administrative reform programs or for projects that entail significant institutional changes to core functions of government.

While IEAs are flexible enough to be customized to different circumstances of the host environment, the emergence of Sector Investment Programs (SIPs) in the Africa Region has called for a special effort to adapt IEAs to the institutional assessment needs of service delivery sectors. This special adaptation of IEAs has given way to Sector Institutional Assessments (SIAs), which review the institutional performance of sector agencies against the background of sector policy and service delivery requirements. While IEAs assess the environment of the entire public administration systems, SIAs combine assessments of individual sector agencies with that of the sector as a whole and their environment, leading to action plans for agency-specific capacity building measures in tandem with sector and system-wide administrative reform measures.

This study presents the methodological customization of IEAs into SIAs and discusses the first experience with its operationalization. It describes the SIA, how it is actually being conducted in the education sector of Zambia, and discusses what lessons are being learned. The Zambia pilot application of the SIA is divided into two distinct phases. Phase I consists of the assessment of the core sector agency: the Ministry of Education, which was combined with a Management Audit of the Ministry as required by the Public Service Reform Program, hence the designation MASA (Management Audit and Institutional Assessment) for the exercise of Phase I. Phase II, not yet completed at this writing, brings the remaining sector ministries into a full SIA, building on the results of the MASA. Furthermore, the study pays particular attention to the recently launched preparation of the Zambia Integrated Sector Education Program and draws on the discussions of the AFR Thematic Team on Broad Sector Approach to Lending. It also includes the design of

---


2 SIPs are Sector Investment Programs which are: sector-wide in scope; locally owned; based on all-donor subscription; with common implementation arrangements and with minimal dependence on long-term foreign technical assistance.

the full SIA for the Education sector in Zambia and goes as far as progress with its implementation allows it to be documented and reported at the time of its publication. The voluminous appendices are included in the paper for those readers interested in conducting SIAs and whose tasks would be facilitated by adapting the instruments contained in the appendices.

Finally, it should be pointed out that, while the SIA methodology described in Chapter III of this study builds on the MASA experience (phase I) and feedback received on the IEA methodology, it is particularly sensitive to the requirements of SIPs. Although the MASA focused primarily on the Ministry of Education, policy and institutional issues for the sector as a whole were also discussed, bringing out the need for a sector, rather than an agency-specific assessment methodology. The SIA methodology, therefore, goes beyond that of the MASA, as it provides a process to assess both individual sector agencies and their interaction to implement sector policies and goals.

---

4 The education sector was chosen in agreement with the Government, as it corresponded to a set of ministries targeted for examination under the diagnostic phase of the Government's Public Sector Reform Program (PSRP).
II.
INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT ASSESSMENTS AND 
SECTOR INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENTS

IEAs and Tiered Analysis

The diagnostic procedure of Institutional Environment Assessments (IEAs) is based on a tiered analysis of different levels or segments of public administration. For this analysis, data is gathered at the political-structural, administrative-systems, and technical-sectoral levels. Each level is examined in terms of the interaction between institutional and governance dimensions, and a distinct set of variables is proposed for data gathering. As posited by the tiered analysis approach, higher levels have a determining effect over lower ones. For example, the system-wide administrative features of a given civil service are by and large determined by the nature of the political structures and institutions. Similarly, the capabilities for service delivery at the technical level of a given sector are to a large extent determined by the quality of system-wide administrative functions. The proposed tiered analysis therefore requires that data on one level be related to that of another in the quest for cause-and-effect dynamics.\(^5\)

The political-structural level of inquiry focuses on state institutions, e.g., the legislature or the judiciary. The nature of the environment at this level has a direct impact on the institutions of the state and at the same time deeply affects the functions and performance of the civil service. Box 1 shows the variables examined under each of the institutional and governance dimensions at this level.

The administrative systems level focuses on the environment of public bureaucracies affecting the system-wide "cross-ministry" support systems that integrate public administration coherently and with common standards. The nature of these environmental factors also deeply affects the performance level of civil servants. The potency of these factors will have a significant bearing on the nature of bureaucratic systems, especially on the attitudes and behaviors of bureaucrats in the management of system-wide functions such as personnel, finance, and the provision of services or management of core economic functions. Box 2 shows the variables examined under each of the governance and institutional dimensions at this level.

---

\(^5\) Institutional analysis derived from institutional economics theory also proposes a multilevel analytical process. The three levels proposed are: operational, governance, and constitutional. "Diagnostics begin with outcomes and work backward through the framework. Outcomes follow from some pattern of interaction, which follows from a set of institutional arrangements within a particular physical setting. The diagnostic focus is on the incentives supplied by an existing set of institutional arrangements, given the physical-technical context. Perverse incentives are understood to derive from a mismatch between the rules and physical facts of a situation. Design begins with the relationship between the physical world and institutions and works forward through the framework. The aim is to create incentives that support patterns of interaction that generate preferred outcomes." L. Schroeder. 1994. *A Guide to Sustaining Rural Infrastructure Investments.* Decentralization: Finance & Management Project Report. Burlington, Vt.: Associates in Rural Development.
Box 1. Political-Structural Level

At the political-structural level, the following variables are targeted for inquiry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL DIMENSION</th>
<th>GOVERNANCE DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the State</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>norms/values</td>
<td>ascribed role of the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizational structures</td>
<td>accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles</td>
<td>access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules</td>
<td>participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparency</td>
<td>representation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 2. Administrative-Systems Level

At the administrative systems level, the following variables are targeted for inquiry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL DIMENSION</th>
<th>GOVERNANCE DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Personnel System</td>
<td>Rule of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment</td>
<td>universal rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compensation</td>
<td>equal application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career</td>
<td>enforcement and redress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training &amp; development</td>
<td>rule-making &amp; amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work conditions</td>
<td>balance of power/authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civil service statutes</td>
<td>code of ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial System</td>
<td>Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budgets</td>
<td>leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accounting/audit</td>
<td>efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procurement</td>
<td>effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general services</td>
<td>professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal regulatory framework</td>
<td>service quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOCUS ON THE TECHNICAL/SECTORAL LEVEL

The analysis at the technical-sectoral level focuses on the environment of sector agencies responsible for service delivery or the performance of core economic functions. At this level, sectoral-technical aspects tend to dominate the nature of the organization, the policy environment,
and the professional orientation of staff to a greater degree than at other levels, with implications for the behavioral profiles of the civil servants concerned. Prevailing values and expectations of client groups associated with a particular sector play a significant role in its performance. Accordingly, variables at this level relate to the role of the state in a particular sector or more generally in promoting growth with equity. Data on these variables are therefore studied from the perspective of the political economy of service delivery to ascertain which social groups benefit from services and which do not. The impact of these variables is felt not only on macroeconomic and sectoral policy-making, but also on organizations and organizational networks directly responsible for the delivery of specific policies, projects, or services—both macro, e.g., fiscal and monetary; and sectoral, e.g., agriculture, education or health. Box 3 shows the variables examined under each of the institutional and governance dimensions at this level.

**Box 3. Technical-Sectoral Level**

At the technical-sectoral level, the following variables are targeted for inquiry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL DIMENSION</th>
<th>GOVERNANCE DIMENSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sectors</strong></td>
<td><strong>Role of the State</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic development strategies</td>
<td>macroeconomic policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sector agency norms</td>
<td>regulatory framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sector agency structures</td>
<td>sector policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical skills and capacity</td>
<td>burden of costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management skills and capacity</td>
<td>beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic management systems</td>
<td>resource mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs/projects</td>
<td>resource allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approaches to Institutional Assessments**

Approaches to diagnosis and assessments of individual agencies for capacity building or institutional development purposes can generally be grouped into two categories: functional and strategic. The newly emerging environmental assessment, such as the IEA, constitutes a third category focusing instead on public administration systems, involving clusters of agencies, policy systems and their environment. Generic IEAs can be conducted in a top-down or a bottom-up

---

6 Excluded from this typology are the institutional economics approach and the behavioral approach to assessments. The latter focuses on value, attitudinal, and behavioral profiles of organization members and so far has had very limited penetration in the operational work of the World Bank. The emergence of the new institutional economics in World Bank work and the operationalization of AFTCB's applied Research Program on African Management in the 90s are, however, likely to change this trend.

7 See Discussion Paper No. 252 for a full description of Institutional Environment Assessments.
manner. In both cases, data is collected and processed on all three levels, as the intent is a comprehensive diagnosis of the broad environment and how it affects the public administration system. Top-down IEAs are reserved for comprehensive civil service reforms in environments needing basic institutional and environmental mapping. Bottom-up IEAs, in contrast, are intended to focus on either core economic functions where policy flows across agencies, or on service sectors where interfacing with clients by sector agencies assumes critical importance.

The functional approach to assessing individual institutions examines their capacity to perform core organizational functions such as: policy making and implementation, human resource and operations management, communications, coordination, monitoring, and evaluation. Strategic approaches focus on the guidance systems of institutions such as mission, legal framework, structures, roles, goals, objectives, plans, resource allocation, values/norms, and the distribution of power and authority. Both of these approaches favor the input side of institutions and place little emphasis on their outputs or outcomes in response to environmental client demands. When the environment is considered in such approaches, it is on the basis of how insiders see it and on the assumptions they make about it. The environmental approach, however, emphasizes the demand side of institutions— inherent in the governance or client environment as seen by outsiders—by focusing first on the needs among the public that justify the institution’s existence and the burden of costs among beneficiaries. Requirements laid down by clients or the detection of impediments due to governance failures become the basic determining factors for institutional outputs and outcomes, which are then linked to the input factors included in the functional and strategic approaches to institutional assessments.

The functional approach to assessments of individual agencies is essentially top-down and is guided by an input orientation based on a "trickle-down" assumption. The strategic management approach, while recognizing the importance of the organizational environment and stakeholders, only addresses them after mission and goal clarifications, thus in a subordinate capacity. The assumption behind strengthening managerial capacity through improved management practices and organizational structures is that higher productivity in the public service will follow and so will the quality of outputs. The input orientation leads to assessments centered around organizational and managerial inputs rather than client-centered outputs and outcomes. The validity of the "trickle-down" assumption increasingly is being questioned in the context of reforms in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)—mostly on the grounds of lack of evidence to corroborate it. Furthermore, given the urgent need in SSA for improved outputs and effective outcomes, especially in the service-producing areas of public administration, "trickle down" reforms are no longer an option.

---


10 This attribute of the environmental approach is consistent with the Institutional Economics assessment of institutions, which also focuses on outcomes (at the operational level) and works backwards through patterns of interaction, rules, and the physical nature of the environment. See L. Schroeder, op. cit.
Effective core-function management remains a necessity, but efforts to "improve bureaucracy" are being displaced by efforts to "install clientocracy" to assure that clients have their say and the bureaucracy is made accountable for responding to their needs.

Accepting the current service delivery challenge requires balancing the current emphasis on diagnostic/reform paradigms favoring improvements of bureaucratic management along the lines of functional capacity and strategic planning, with more attention to outputs and outcomes in line with needs of relevant client groups. This paradigm shift starts with institutional assessment procedures that build on assessing the quality of service at the point of delivery followed by a chain of upward analytical links in search of the functional or strategic causes of low service performance. In the new paradigm, changes and reforms flow upward in the sense of adjusting organization and management practices to requirements set at the point of service delivery. This means that strategic and functional standards will have to be modulated by output/service standards as the criteria to guide reforms.

The new assessment/reform paradigm, centered on dimensions of the environment—governance, clients, demands/expectations—places a greater premium on a thorough understanding of the immediate causes of poor service performance in specific contexts. These causes may be inherent in the governance environment or may be a more complex "disconnect" with civil society. This disconnect, in particular, necessitates attention, as it is linked to a lack of perceived legitimacy and performance on the part of governance and sector institutions. This lack of culturally rooted legitimacy and accountability encourages civil society, in turn, to lower expectations and demand less of their governance and sector institutions. To factor in these necessary elements, the proposed assessment/reform paradigm explicitly includes a mapping of both formal and indigenous institutions.

Environmental and tiered analysis allows causal links to be made between service delivery units and environmental causes (horizontally) on the one hand, and on the other with higher levels in the public administration system, such as the administrative or political-structural ones (vertically). The knowledge gained through this process complements the well-known causes of poor performance in the management of core public administration functions and strategic planning, which include inadequate organization structures, procedures, communication, coordination, information systems, and staff incentives, among others.

The paradigm shift discussed above favors institutional assessment of service sectors, hence, the relevance of institutional assessment for sector-focused CSR programs or the design of sector-wide development programs. As described in Discussion Paper No. 252, an IEA, as a generic methodology, can focus on one or all three of the proposed levels of the institutional environment (structural, administrative or technical-sectoral). When an assessment is conducted with the intent of achieving a broad mapping of the environmental determinants of the functioning of the public administration system or of a core function that is tied both to system-wide administrative functions and the organization of the state, then data gathering and analysis must involve all levels. However, when the intent is to seek an understanding of the immediate causes of poor service delivery, and to design capacity building measures that will impact sector agencies, assessments must stress the technical-sectoral level and emphasize the links with system-wide
administrative functions. This special customization of IEAs leads to the configuration of **Sector Institutional Assessments** (SIAs).

SIAs pay particular attention to the institutional dynamics among sector agencies. A thorough SIA for a given sector that includes several agencies will need to start with assessments of individual agencies to draw out profiles of the legal and policy framework of each agency as well as its organizational and managerial profile. These tasks will require the use of both the *strategic* and the *functional* approaches to assessments mentioned earlier. Once these assessments are related to environmental factors such as client views and expectations as well as the renditions of the sector by stakeholders, conclusions can be drawn about overall organizational and managerial performance.

Specific SIAs focusing on sector agencies or ministries may also be required in cases where comprehensive CSR programs set standard diagnostic and reform procedures for all reforming ministries or sectors, as in the case of Zambia's Public Service Reform Program (PSRP). In these cases, reform proceeds simultaneously in a top-down and bottom-up sense. The top-down thrust includes the programmatic framework for government-wide reform with wide applicability, setting general reform goals, strategies for sequencing of reform interventions, timetables, resources, diagnostic procedures, and progress reporting. These comprehensive reform programs usually entail centralized reform decision-making to formalize the adoption of reformed structures and procedures. The SIA methodology offers a diagnostic process for individual agencies that reconciles sector policy requirements and capacity building initiatives with system-wide CSR policy and programs.

An SIA conducted as part of a comprehensive CSR program provides valuable sector demand inputs to enable relevant reforms of system-wide core functions such as central personnel management, procurement, regulatory framework, budgeting and financial management, etc. An SIA is also an appropriate diagnostic method to ascertain the degree to which sector agencies can become autonomous of centrally managed system-wide functions. It can therefore play a useful role in the design of decentralization strategies.
III.
SECTOR INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENTS

WHAT AN SIA IS AND WHAT IT PRODUCES

A sector institutional assessment (SIA) is a diagnostic and consensus-building procedure used to
design and plan institutional reforms/development or capacity-building measures as required by a
sector-specific development/investment program. It may also serve as a diagnostic tool in a given
sector in the context of a government-wide institutional or civil service reform program. As the SIA
draws on the methodology of the IEAs, it has similar characteristics, as described in Box 4.

Box 4. Features of an SIA

- It relies on a group-based process of participatory diagnosis building on beneficiary and stakeholder
  inputs collected through environmental surveys fed back to a sample community of stakeholders
  and beneficiaries.*

- While it is government-driven and donor-assisted, it is particularly appropriate to run concurrently
  with project/program preparation for donor funding or for a donor-assisted diagnosis as part of a
  Sector Environment Survey (SES).

- It uses information provided by beneficiaries and stakeholders in a way that builds consensus not
  just around sector problems and a common vision, but around corrective measures and
  responsibility for undertaking them.

- It flows in a bottom-up sense, having symptomatic problems at point of delivery as the starting
  point for a group-based tiered analysis using performance data addressing: (a) sector
  functional/strategic capacity, (b) management capacity, and (c) overall institutional capacity.

- It provides diagnostic elements required for a sector-specific project/program formulation, or the
  elements needed from a sector to formulate a government-wide administrative reform program.

* In order to achieve the necessary consensus on specified issues, this process of participatory diagnosis necessarily
  relies on a more intensive level of participation, that must be incorporated into the planning exercise.
Action Plan

The end product of an SIA is a consensually derived Action Plan containing measures and identifying those responsible to carry them out with regard to the topics listed in Box 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box 5. Change Measures of SIA Action Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Reforms that require fundamental institutional/legal development changes beyond the reach of the sector, but that affect it, usually covered by comprehensive administrative reform programs building on these sector inputs; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Capacity-building initiatives that can be undertaken within the purview of sector agencies and that have an immediate impact on improving performance at the Macro-Organizational level (functional/strategic performance) and Overall Management performance level (the sector-specific systems management performance; program and project management).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combination of (a) and (b) provides a composite of planned and agreed actions that contributes to improving the overall institutional performance of the sector.

WHEN AN SIA IS APPROPRIATE AND HOW IT IS CONDUCTED

SIAs are appropriate when there is a high level of commitment to genuine change on the part of the leadership of sector agencies, making them willing to accept a thorough scrutiny of their agencies' client effectiveness. It should also permit mid-level managers and involved staff to openly discuss institutional problems in a way that predisposes them to assume responsibility for institutional change. This situation usually obtains when substantial sector investments/institutional improvements are being planned or when a government-wide reform is being launched.

The following steps are required for a generic SIA of a sector with no more than two agencies. These steps should be sequenced and adapted to fit particular circumstances or preferences of the collaborating agencies of the recipient government. Figure 1 provides a graphic lay-out of the steps described below.

Government Agreement and Stakeholder Analysis

Discussions are required with a key interlocutor (agency/leadership) of the sector or overview unit in a coordinating ministry in order to reach agreement on the points contained in Box 6.

---

11 In sectors with 3 or more agencies, as in the case of the Zambia Education Sector, the SIA requires individual-agency assessments complemented by an abridged sector-assessment procedure. Accordingly, the education SIA in Zambia started with the Institutional Assessment of the Ministry of Education, designated as MASA for Management Audit and Institutional Assessment.
FIGURE 1: THE GENERIC SIA
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Detailed planning of the concluding Workshop and support to the activities of the working groups undertaking Field Reviews take place concurrently. However, it may be useful to raise basic issues concerning the sponsorship of the concluding Workshop as early as possible during initial discussions. Special attention must be given to the issue of "sitting allowances" for participants at the Workshop, as well as compensation for after-hours work undertaken by members of the working groups.

**Box 6. Items Covered In First Discussion With Government**

- Set the institutional boundaries of the sector and identify key stakeholders (such as government agencies, NGOs, donors and contractors/suppliers).
- Ascertain the status of sector policy (established or in transition).
- Agree on the principles of the SIA and on the terms and conditions to carry it out (focal/coordinating government officers, sponsorship, funding, timing, follow-up etc.).
- Reach agreement on conduct of (a) Field Reviews, (b) Sector Environment Surveys,* (c) mapping of formal and indigenous institutions, and (d) the concluding Workshop.
- Agree on donor participation, resources, and facilitation for the SIA.
- Conduct an Orientation Seminar on the concept and method of the SIA for participants in the Field Reviews.

* Unlike client/beneficiary surveys, which canvas users of a given public service, the surveys conducted under stakeholder analysis collect inputs from civil servants providing the service or involved in support functions that enable services to be provided and from representatives of stakeholders of the sector agencies, along with a small sample of beneficiaries. The results of those surveys are then fed back to participants at the SIA Workshop, which usually includes those responding to the survey.

**Desk Reviews**

Desk Reviews are undertaken by the sponsoring donor organizations to collect relevant information to be fed into the process. Desk Reviews include specific analytical contributions from expert points of view on substantive technical matters such as those included in Box 7.

Desk Reviews are particularly appropriate to provide inputs into the assessment; they can facilitate a review of sector structures, strategies, systems, and staffing, as well as functional capabilities. Sector donors may have especially pertinent information regarding sector policy, resulting from their assistance to the sector. Project implementation units are also likely to have current information both on the sector as a whole and on individual sector agencies. While some of this information is useful and possibly of higher analytical value than that generated locally, it should not be allowed to displace or belittle the information provided by the Working Groups during SIA preparatory activities.
Preparatory Working Groups may consult the Desk Review sources as needed, but the facilitators assisting these groups should ensure that these sources do not set the tone for fact-finding and brainstorming that ought to take place, so that Working Groups make their own diagnosis.

**Box 7. Topics for Desk Review**

- A sector profile, pulling together relevant information on sector structure, policy framework, PERs/Financial Management, investment and resource allocation patterns, usually available at donor headquarters.

- An Institutional Mapping of relevant formal and indigenous institutions and definition of hypotheses to explore current levels of disconnect/linkage between formal and indigenous institutions. (See Appendix I for guidelines on development of Institutional Mapping).

- Guiding hypotheses and instruments for a Sector Environment Survey (SES), including service user/beneficiary/stakeholder surveys. (Done in coordination with information from both the Desk Review's Institutional Mapping and from on-going Systematic Client Consultation (SCC) framework).

**Field Reviews**

Designated working groups (WGs) representing sector stakeholders and beneficiaries collect data and brainstorm on agreed topics relevant to the diagnostic exercise, generating information required for syndicate group tasks at the concluding Workshop. Membership of the working groups should be negotiated with sector leadership to assure that (a) both senior and mid-level managers are included; (b) all sector agencies are represented; and (c) access is facilitated to the best possible sources for the information required by each working group. Findings of recent or on-going donor or government studies on the sector should be made available to working groups. Field Reviews should include between 4 and 6 preparatory working groups selected from among stakeholders and beneficiaries who will take responsibility for reform or capacity-building action. The tasks of Field Review working groups are described in Box 8.

The quality of preparatory work during Field Reviews will ultimately determine the quality of information for the Workshop; it is therefore likely to determine the quality of the Workshop outcome as well. Aside from unimpeded freedom to contribute their views on the institutional diagnosis, participants in Field Review working groups should also bring to the task a certain awareness of diagnostic processes. They are expected to brainstorm on the basis of information that they have collected from different sources and are discouraged from recycling products from external consultants.
Box 8. Field Review Tasks

- One or more groups (WG1 and WG2) are charged with identifying, brainstorming on, and developing a profile on Sector Symptomatic Problems at the Point of Service Delivery, from the joint perspective of beneficiaries and internal and external (to agencies) stakeholders. Working Groups 1 and 2 validate and define in detail the institutional mapping inventory of formal and indigenous institutions, initiated first at the Desk Review stage. Working Groups 1 and 2 define suggestions/examples of culturally based mechanisms to improve sector productivity, accountability, and legitimacy, for presentation to the SIA Workshop.

- With inputs from the Desk Review on functional and strategic traits of the sector—(a) mission, vision, legal framework; and (b) policy, objectives, substantive functions, structure, and resource allocation—WG3 members are tasked with outlining the Macro-Organizational Profile of the sector.

- With the facilitation of a management expert, WG4 develops a Systems Management Profile of the sector, including a description of: (a) the management of sector-specific support systems (personnel, accounting, auditing, budgeting, procurement/logistics); (b) the interface between system-wide and sector-specific support systems; and (c) sector investment program and project management.

- A Sectoral Focal Group will assemble representatives from each of the sector agencies and key outside stakeholders to provide inter-agency coordination and assess broad sector development needs.

Each Field Review working group receives specific instructions to ensure that, at the end of their task periods (approximately 12 work sessions over a period of 4-6 weeks), they will have prepared summaries for each task to be presented and posted for plenary discussion at the Workshop. Field Reviews also serve the purpose of bringing together stakeholders and beneficiaries likely to participate in the SIA Workshop. Field Reviews should therefore provide both a common understanding of the SIA process and basic diagnostic and problem analysis skills to facilitate the accomplishment of Workshop tasks. An element of training provided by resource persons is therefore required as part of the Field Reviews.

Sector Environment Surveys (SES/SCC)

Sector Environment Surveys are conducted concurrently with Field Reviews. They are structured according to a set of hypotheses and variables agreed beforehand. Sector Environmental Surveys canvass values, perceptions, and attitudes of sector agencies' civil servants, stakeholders, and a sample of beneficiaries (including all participants at the SIA Workshop). Hypotheses informing the Sector Environmental Survey instruments are derived from the variables contained in the conceptual framework for institutional and governance tiered-analysis as described especially in Box 3 on Technical-Sectoral Level (page 11). If indigenous institutions are included in the survey, appropriate hypotheses are also developed by the Desk Review.

---

12 This activity should be done in close coordination with any on-going systematic client consultation (SCC) exercise in the country.
These hypotheses generally refer to:

- Expectations/access by beneficiaries and stakeholders;
- Overall status of sector service delivery and the performance of operational management systems including those which mobilize and allocate resources;
- Performance of the sector regulatory framework and fairness of burden of costs;
- Access, participation, transparency, equity and inter-agency coordination;
- Leadership effectiveness, stability and trust; and
- Prospects and commitment to change.

Unlike typical client/beneficiary surveys, Sector Environmental Surveys provide a combination of views of the sector by both insiders and outsiders, involving both beneficiaries and stakeholders. Information gathered in this manner provides a balanced tension of opposing views: both the providers and the recipients of sector services. The Surveys are structured so as to generate inputs relevant to syndicate group tasks of the concluding Workshop. The surveys are conducted with the intent of feeding results to the Workshop at the appropriate point of syndicate group tasks. Figure 2 below lays out the elements of the SIA agreed to with the host government. It includes the initial stakeholder analysis as well as Desk and Field Reviews in preparation for the SIA Workshop.

The SIA Workshop

The SIA Workshop builds on the outcomes of the Desk and Field Reviews. Its primary purpose is to synthesize, prioritize, and analyze the information developed and to go as far as possible in building consensus around the major change actions to be undertaken in the sector, for its improvement or in preparation for a major sector investment program. The SIA Workshop carries the diagnostic process from the information gathering stage through tiered analysis for diagnosis and reassessment of sector strategy to a consensual change strategy and an agreed action plan for reform and capacity building.

Through this participatory workshop process, strategic actions for change emerge in a way that ensures not only validation of the sector diagnosis, but also ownership and high probability of effective implementation. Furthermore, the preparatory groups that have worked together will, during the workshop, consolidate themselves into syndicate groups that will undertake the institutional change tasks, thereby becoming energized and focused on the required sector changes.

A standard SIA Workshop is an intensive residential one-week event, bringing together approximately 50 participants, including all the members of the preparatory working groups. Also participating are representatives of the core government agencies providing support functions to the sector (Ministry of Finance, Central Personnel and Procurement agencies, and the Central Civil Service Reform agency). Workshop planning is undertaken by a Steering Committee, chaired by a senior official of the leading sector agency, and may include representatives from the leading sector donor agencies sponsoring the SIA.
FIGURE 2. GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT AND STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS
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The recommended roles for Workshop resource persons are described in Appendix II. To ensure control of the Workshop by the local participants, plenary sessions should be chaired by senior civil servants or by stakeholder representatives, and the lead facilitator should be selected by the Steering Committee. While each Workshop should be customized to local circumstances, they should all minimize time spent in plenary sessions and favor syndicate group work.

As a rule, the goal of the SIA Workshop is to conclude with an Action Plan capturing the results of the change strategies emerging from the tiered and SWOT analyses. Workshop activities are determined by syndicate group tasks, the results of which are vetted in plenary. The Steering Committee ensures that the whole process is kept on track and on schedule. The Workshop starts with presentations on results from:

- Desk Review;
- Field Review;
- Sector Environment Survey.

In the event that the profile of sector symptomatic problems identified by Working Groups 1 and 2 (Figure 2) is unmanageably large, the first task of the SIA Workshop is to synthesize and prioritize the profile items, which will then be vetted by the plenary.

Syndicate groups (SGs) are mixed groups selected at the Workshop with the purpose of undertaking tasks for which members will need to bring some analytical skills, the appropriate agency knowledge and information gleaned from their participation in the working groups. Normally, the Workshop will have five syndicate groups of no more than ten members each. Membership in the syndicate groups is on a self-selection basis at the Workshop. It is intended that the SG configuration be different from that of the working groups, allowing for mixed institutional representation in each SG. The Workshop Steering Committee may, however, re-assign SG membership in case balance is not achieved on a self-selection basis. The SGs will perform the following indicative tasks:  

**SG Task 1:** Relate the information provided by WG1 and WG2 on Symptomatic Problems of the sector to the following elements of the Macro-Organizational profile generated by WG3: sector mission/policy and legal framework—determining if the sector has the right mission(s)/policies and legal framework, and identifying the actual/formal mission/policies and legal framework for the sector. The product of this task takes the form of profile 1 on the actual sector mission and legal framework.

**SG Task 2:** Relate information of WG1 and WG2 to the following elements of the Macro-Organizational Profile generated by WG3: organizational structures, objectives, functions, and resource allocation—determining if the sector has the right strategic

---

13 Further process design of each Workshop is required to customize these tasks as well as those undertaken in plenary. In addition to the information generated by working groups during Field Reviews, syndicate groups may also rely on information generated by the Desk Review and the Sector Environment Survey.

14 The analytical sequence of WG/SG and Workshop plenary tasks is: descriptive profiles (WGs) → actual performance (SGs) → capacity assessment (plenary).
guidance and organizational/resource strategy. The product of this task takes the form of profile 2 on actual sector organization and resource performance.

By combining the results of SG Task 1 and SG Task 2, the Workshop plenary will reach consensus on the sector's Macro-Organizational Capacity; which is Requisite I for sector institutional effectiveness. Assessing macro-organizational performance is done by relating the highest order of institutional organization (macro causes) to very concrete elements of output/outcome performance as evidenced in symptomatic problems (micro consequences). The leap between the two may be perceived as too large, especially in the absence of many intervening factors not yet addressed. SG Tasks 3 and 5 turn to these factors, which have to do with strategic orientation and managerial performance.¹⁵

SG Task 3: Having reached a conclusion on the level of macro-organizational performance for the sector, the Workshop is ready and usually eager to revisit its mission and strategic orientations, which constitutes Requisite II. Task 3 engages the five groups in redefining the sector’s mission and strategy on the basis of the analysis undertaken so far. The formulation of strategy/mission is highly prescriptive and based on the elements discussed under tasks 1 and 2. Filling Requisite II on strategic orientation provides an answer to the question regarding the right macro-organization for the sector in terms of both guidance systems and organizational/resource strategy.¹⁶

SG Task 4: On the basis of the elements (a) and (b) of the Systems Management Profile developed by WG4, discuss and analyze the interface between sector-specific support systems/procedures and government-wide management systems—determining the actual level of systems management performance of the sector.¹⁷

SG Task 5: On the basis of information provided by WG1, WG2 and element (c) of the Systems Management Profile developed by WG4, analyze and discuss the capacity of the sector to manage investment programs and projects—determining the actual level of investment program/project management performance of the sector.

By combining outcomes of Tasks 4 and 5, the Workshop plenary will reach consensus on the sector's overall Management Capacity, which is Requisite III for institutional sector effectiveness.

¹⁵ SG Tasks 1 and 2 are likely to cause some perplexity and tension among syndicate groups, as it is understandably difficult to link symptomatic problems to policies, legal framework and to mission, organizational structure and resources. It is through this tension, however, that SGs will come to understand the essence of the institutional implications of sector performance, setting them on the right course to the identification of change action required.

¹⁶ Alternatively, the sector mission/strategy might be revisited after the workshop assesses the performance level of overall sector management (after tasks 4,5). This option is less desirable, because ideally the sector’s management requirements should be determined by its prescribed strategic orientation.

¹⁷ Systems management performance is determined, for example, by how system-wide budgetary norms are translated and adapted to sector-specific budgetary norms. The same would also apply to such functions as personnel management, procurement, etc.
SG Task 6: This task consists of relating the conclusions supporting Requisites I and III to those of Requisite II to arrive at a consensus on the sector's Overall Institutional Capacity. If Macro-Organizational Capacity and Overall Management Capacity are not consistent with the new mission, then a detailed strategic analysis is required to identify specific measures with regard to the profile elements.

SG Task 7 consists of conducting a SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) of the profile outcomes of SG Tasks 1, 2, 4, and 5. This SWOT analysis will then prepare the Workshop to identify specific measures for sector Institutional Development and Reform (ID/R) and/or Capacity Building (CB) which provide the basis for an action plan for change.18

Figure 3 lays out the sequenced tasks and products undertaken at the SIA Workshop.

The ID/R and CB measures will be identified by examining each element of the five profiles emerging from SG Tasks 1 - 5, and determining whether or not it constitutes a strength (S), weakness (W), opportunity (O), or threat (T); and by then determining which specific ID/R or CB measure is appropriate to bring about the required change to rectify one or more of the diagnostic profile factors. For example, if a given factor represents a clear strength of the sector, the recommended action would be to protect and preserve that factor. Likewise, if the factor is a weakness, it would need to be strengthened, and if it is an impediment, it would need to be removed. The resulting matrix provides the basis for the action plan. Figure 4 provides a matrix approach to the SWOT analysis.

Because SIA Workshops are unlikely to conclude with a consolidated and coherent action plan, the ID/R and CB measures identified by the syndicate groups are referred to the Steering Committee, which at the end of the Workshop transforms itself into a Sector Institutional Reform and Development Committee (Sector Focal Group). This Committee then links up with donor representatives in the process of preparation or appraisal of sector-wide investment programs (SIPs). The Committee's first task is to revise or draft an action plan based on the outcome of the Workshop. The Workshop may also include an evaluation of the process conducted in accordance with the Structured Learning approach.19 This evaluation provides continuity to the monitoring undertaken of the first IEA experience in The Gambia and should generate information to help assess the value of such procedures. A full report of the Structured Learning evaluation done in the context of the MASA in Zambia is presented as Appendix X.

---

18 SG Task 7 is quite laborious, as it involves reviewing the profiles prepared in tasks 1, 2, 4 and 5. On the basis of the capacity of each workshop to work efficiently—and the fatigue level of members—a separate workshop may be required to carry out this exercise. The second workshop may be combined with the detailing of the Action Plan that follows.

19 "Structured Learning" is a technique similar to action research that is being applied in the World Bank under the supervision of the Central Vice Presidency for Environmentally Sustainable Development to monitor innovative operations by formulating and testing certain hypotheses about the relationships between certain new features in project preparation and quality of design and the sustainability of implementation. For a full explanation of the methodology, see Arturo Israel. 1993. "Program of Structured Learning". Unpublished Note. Transport, Water and Urban Development Department. Washington, D.C., World Bank.
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FIGURE 3. THE SIA WORKSHOP

**PRESENTATIONS OF PROFILES SUMMARIZED INTO MANAGEABLE CLUSTERS**

* Formation of Syndicate Groups for TIERED ANALYSIS

**DAY ONE**

**Task 1:** SYMPTOMATIC PROBLEMS → FORMAL MISSION/ POLICY & LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Q: Does the sector have the right mission/policies and legal framework?

**Profile 1**
Actual Sector Mission/Policies and Legal Framework

**Task 2:** SYMPTOMATIC PROBLEMS → ACTUAL ORG. STRUCT. & FUNCT.

Q: Does the sector have the right org. structures, objectives, functions, appropriate resources?

**Profile 2**
Actual Sector Org. Functions & Resource Performance

**DAY TWO**

**REQUISITE I**
Macro-Organizational Capacity

**Profile 3**
Actual Sector Org. Systems Mgmt Performance

**Task 3:** MID-POINT CORRECTION: REASSESSING SECTOR STRATEGY

Q: How should the Sector be Macro-Organized (new Mission, Policies, Structure)?

**REQUISITE II**
Strategic Orientation

**Profile 4**
Actual Sector Program Project Mgmt Performance

**Task 4:** SECTOR-SPECIFIC GOVT. WIDE SUPPORT SYSTEMS → SYSTEMS INTERFACE

Q: What is the level of Sector Management Systems Performance?

**REQUISITE III**
Overall Management Capacity

**Profile 5**
Actual Sector Stakes' Mgmt Rendition

**Task 5:** PROGRAM MGMT CAPACITY → STAKEHOLDERS' RENDITION

Q: What is the level of Program/Project Management Performance of the sector?

**Profile 6**
Actual Sector Systems Mgmt Performance

**Task 6:** REQUISITES I & III → REQUISITE II

Q: Does the sector have the right Institutional Capacity given the new Strategic Orientation?

**Task 7:** CONDUCTING THE SWOT ANALYSIS (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats)

Action Plan for sector Reform/CB Measures and ID Requisites (for SIP)

If the answer is "NO" then undertake Task 7

**REQUISITE IV**
SECTOR INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY APPROPRIATE FOR REVISED STRATEGIC ORIENTATION

process evaluation (SL)
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FIGURE 4. SWOT ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Profile Factors</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>WEAKNESSES</th>
<th>OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>THREATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission/Policy and Legal Framework</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. 4. 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/Functions &amp; Resources</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. 4. 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Management Systems</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. 4. 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program and Project Management</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. 4. 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Institutional Performance</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. 4. 5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ID = Institutional Development measures (e.g., rule and role clarification)
R = Reform measures (e.g., change to legal framework)
CB = Capacity Building measures (e.g., skills development)
IV.
ZAMBIA: CONDUCTING A SECTOR INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT (SIA) IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR

THE ZAMBIA CONTEXT

Since the historic elections of November 1991, Zambia has been undergoing major policy reforms. On the one hand, the reform process has been driven by a shift in political outlook, given the ruling party’s underlying policy of liberalization. On the other hand, however, the seeds of the reform process have been germinating from the late 1980s, due to the crisis precipitated by economic decline. As far back as 1986, a World Bank study on wages had recommended that the government institute measures to arrest the erosion of salaries. In 1991 the Public Sector Management Review (PSMR) was undertaken to assist the Government of Zambia with formulating a medium-term strategy for rationalizing its planning, budgeting, and non-parastatal public employment systems. The PSMR was aimed at improving the Government’s capacity to perform its appropriate functions and rationalizing public expenditure to meet fiscal stabilization.

These efforts culminated in the Government-sponsored Public Sector Reform Program (PSRP) Workshop in Livingstone, Zambia, in February 1992. Emerging from the Livingstone Workshop were nine project ideas, which formed the intended substance of the PSRP, as well as a commitment from Government to continue the development of the projects into a feasible program. This was followed by the Ndola Workshop in July 1992, in which the nine project ideas were consolidated into the current PSRP with five main project areas, namely: (1) restructuring the public service; (2) public service management performance improvement; (3) improvement of planning, programming, budgeting, and expenditure control; (4) improvement of human resources management systems in the public service; and (5) decentralization and strengthening of the local government system.

The World Bank also had been involved in assisting the Government’s reform efforts through Structural Adjustment Lending. In 1991, the Economic Recovery Credit (ERC) emphasized macro-economic stabilization and market liberalization. The June 1992 and June 1993, Industrial Reform Credits (PIRC1 and PIRC2) aimed at strengthening the stabilization effort and hence shifted the emphasis to privatization and parastatal reform. All three credits contained minor elements for strengthening social services and safety-net programs. Throughout 1992, the World Bank and other donors urged the Government to give more attention to improving the delivery of social services. Finally, by early 1993, the Government realized the critical determinance of social service delivery for political sustainability of the adjustment program. Hence, the Government asked the World Bank to assist in longer-term institutional development and capacity building as well as explore another adjustment operation that would possibly identify and remove structural constraints to the delivery of social services.
The Economic and Sector Adjustment Credit (ESAC)

One of the three objectives of the ESAC was to support basic policy changes to remove obstacles to the delivery of vital social services. These were seen to be essential not only for beginning the longer-term process of increasing investment in human capital, but also for assuring the sustainability of the overall structural adjustment program. During the preparation of the ESAC, policy constraints to the improvement of social service delivery on which progress could be made in the short-run were identified. These included: decentralization of budgetary and implementation authority to lower levels of Government; devolution of some activities to existing community groups; budget restructuring for education, health, water supply, and existing safety-net activities; the revision of implementation policies in selected social sectors; and the selective implementation of the civil service reform program.

As part of the conditionality built into the ESAC, the Government was expected to: maintain expenditures in the social sectors (including education) at the levels set out in the budget; revise education sector policies (including vocational and technical education); and adopt as well as begin to implement an incentives program to attract and retain highly skilled professionals. The incentives program was also expected to link pay to performance and, where appropriate, to revise the job classification system to reconcile it with the public service reform program.

The Public Service Reform Program (PSRP)

The PSRP is a “home-grown” blueprint and timetable for guiding and managing the execution of reforms in the public service. It was approved by the Government of Zambia in March 1993 and launched by the President in November 1993. The PSRP is a comprehensive approach that is intended to develop a public service that is lean, cost-efficient, highly motivated and productive, and whose authority and responsibility have been properly decentralized. To improve the quality, delivery, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness of public services to the people of Zambia, the PSRP has three objectives:

1. To improve government capacity to analyze and implement national policies and to perform its appropriate functions;
2. To effectively manage public expenditure to meet fiscal stabilization objectives; and
3. To make the public service more efficient and responsive to the needs of the country’s population.

The intensive implementation of the PSRP was expected to last for three years; yet, there was flexibility for on-going and new reform efforts to continue to address performance issues and attempt to reflect the changing needs in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of service delivery. In terms of implementation strategy, the PSRP has three components:

1. Restructuring of the public service;
2. Management and human resources improvement; and
3. Decentralization and strengthening of local government.
Coordination and implementation of the PSRP is the responsibility of the Management Development Division of Cabinet Office (MDD/CO), whose Permanent Secretary chairs the PSRP Technical Committee of twelve permanent secretaries. In each Ministry and Province, MDD/CO works with and is supported by PSRP Implementation Committees made up of selected officers assigned responsibility for coordinating PSRP implementation at ministry and provincial levels. Financially and technically, MDD/CO and the Technical Committee are supported by the UN Development Programme/Government of Zambia Management Development/Public Service Management Project based in the Cabinet Office. It was against this background and in the context of discussions for the preparation of a PSM lending operation that the World Bank was asked by MDD/CO to assist in implementing Component I of the PSRP in the Ministry of Education under the Regional Program for CSR managed by AFTCB.

The Zambia Education Sector

The education sector\(^{20}\) was by 1992 in a state of crisis—a crisis of quality indicated by shortages of education materials, crumbling physical infrastructure, and low morale among education personnel; a crisis of access because the resilience of the sector to expand without new investments reached its limits around 1985; and a crisis of financing as a result of protracted resource starvation. Underlying the crisis was the continued dependence of the education system on the Government as the main source of education finance during a period of prolonged economic decline and fast population growth.

Consequently, there had developed an inherent tension between the need to expand education provision on the one hand and the need to reduce expenditures on the other. This tension in turn, led to a steep decline in government spending on education, exemplified by:

- **a decline in real income of teachers**, illustrated by the loss of the purchasing power of the starting salary of a primary school teacher by 40 percent between 1971 and 1985; and which by the end of 1989, had fallen to a quarter of its 1985 value;

- **the crowding out of virtually all non-salary expenditures**, illustrated by the absorption by primary education teachers' salaries of about 97 percent of the primary-education recurrent budget; and

- **extreme shortages of physical facilities**, to the point where many schools have to teach in triple and quadruple shifts.

The implementation of the PSRP therefore coincided with the need to revitalize the education system by, among other things, making fundamental shifts in: (a) **education goals and strategies**, in order to reconcile fundamental needs with fiscal reality; (b) **education management**, in order to improve education delivery services and increase efficiency in the utilization of

\(^{20}\) Four ministries have education components in their portfolios: the Ministry of Education (MOE); the Ministry of Science, Technology and Vocational Training (MST&VT); the Ministry of Youth, Sports and Cultural Development (MYSCD); the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (CDSS). The MASA process focused on Ministry of Education, which handles formal and tertiary education.
resources; and (c) education financing, in order to increase the level of resources to the sector and to target resources to priority areas.

Shepherding all of the measures needed to make the fundamental shift in education delivery required a process. In discussions with the World Bank mission in March 1994, the MDD/CO formally requested the Bank to assist the Government in the institutional aspects of restructuring the education sector. It became apparent in the discussions that given the Ministry of Education sheer size and importance as a service-sector ministry, a traditional management audit would not be sufficient to define the correct agenda for revitalizing education delivery. Thus MDD/CO agreed to the Bank’s proposal to use a participatory methodology that would go beyond the traditional management audit and introduce an element of self-assessment. This is the background that gave rise to the application of the Sector Institutional Assessment (SIA) in the education sector.21

**Phase I of the SIA: The Management Audit and Assessment of the Ministry of Education**

**The MASA Design**

Customizing the SIA for Zambia’s education sector demanded ensuring MASA’s suitability as a diagnostic tool for sector-specific needs of service delivery; and flexibility for satisfying the requirements of the PSRP. The MASA process was therefore designed to secure four interrelated activities:

- the Desk Review, done with documentation available to the World Bank to draw a profile of the education sector in Zambia and to develop the Sector Environment Survey (SES) instrument;

- the Field Review, done in Zambia by Ministry of Education working groups to generate information for the MASA Strategic Planning Workshop;

- the Management Audit of the Ministry of Education, done by one of the working groups; and meeting the requirements of MDD/CO as well as the MASA process; and

- the Management and Strategic Planning Workshop.

The MASA process was also intended to provide the link between Components I and II (Restructuring and Performance Management) of the PSRP—the purpose of post-Workshop activities.22

---

21 There was an operational benefit to the PSRP since World Bank involvement meant providing resources for the Ministry of Education to implement Component I of the PSRP in the Ministry. The World Bank approached the European Union (EU) for this purpose, and secured a grant.

22 Discussed in Chapter V of this paper.
The initial MASA design emerged after consultations between the World Bank (AFTCB), MDD/CO, and the Ministry of Education. It was agreed during the consultations that external consultants would be needed to facilitate the process. The World Bank was therefore asked to help identify suitable consultants for the task. Accordingly, consultants were short-listed for the Government; and European Center for Development Policy Management (ECDPM) was selected, given its experience in public administration and familiarity with the IEA methodology. The World Bank prepared the initial methodology with the consultants—shaping the MASA into the final form that was adopted for the Zambia education sector. Matrix I and II, which are provided as Appendix II, outline the MASA process—namely, the activities during the preparatory phase and the planned structure of the MSP Workshop. It should be noted that the SIA methodology presented in Chapter III of this paper was not yet fully developed when the MASA was designed.

The MASA preparatory phase began with an advance mission, comprised of two analysts from ECDPM, to present the initial MASA design as agreed with the World Bank (AFTCB). They had fruitful discussions with MDD/CO and the Ministry of Education on the proposed scope, stages, and expected outputs of the MASA process; and its contribution to the PSRP. The mission also discussed and agreed on the schedule of activities, the allocation of responsibilities, logistics, and resources needed for the MASA process. Finally, the mission assisted the Ministry of Education management with identifying staff for membership in the MASA working groups and, once these were selected, conducted a brief familiarization seminar that introduced the concept, its aim and methodology, and how it might relate to the broader PSRP.

The terms of reference for the advance mission required the ECDPM consultants to assess the status of Ministry of Education’s Management Audit, which initially was thought to be funded by UK/ODA. The objective was to determine the extent to which its output would meet the management audit requirements of the MASA process. The advance mission learned that UK/ODA was in fact funding only certain studies that could marginally contribute to the management audit and that therefore the audit had not yet started. Consequently, the advance mission proposed to incorporate the management audit into the tasks of the working groups. Thus a fourth group was designated Working Group 1 and was tasked with carrying out the management audit.

As part of donor coordination, the advance mission discussed the MASA proposal with relevant donor organizations participating in the reform program as well as those involved in the education sector. The consultations stimulated interest among donors; as a result, representatives of six donor agencies ultimately attended the MSP Workshop.

---

23 AFTCB stands for Capacity Building and Implementation Division in Africa Technical Department of the World Bank.

24 Donor representatives from UNICEF, UK/ODA, UNESCO, and SIDA made presentations at the MSP Workshop, and although their inputs were expected only during Day One, several decided to participate in the entire Workshop.
The Preparation Phase

_Desk Review and Policy Studies._ The terms of reference for the Desk Review (DR) demanded an extensive review of all available information about the management of the education sector in Zambia. Accordingly, information was collected about education service delivery in general, the experience of the World Bank in Sub-Saharan Africa and other regions, and the state of the education sector in Zambia. The objective was to obtain an ideal model of effective management of education delivery that could serve as a conceptual referral "best practice" when deriving the profile of education delivery in Zambia. The primary source of information was internal World Bank reports and other available generic publications on the sector. The DR also consulted Bank staff who had been involved in the education sector in Zambia.

Internal World Bank consultations provided some valuable inputs, including clarification of the relationship between an on-going Bank-funded Education Rehabilitation Project and the MASA process. The clarification was crucial because the on-going project was financing the Education Policy Studies Program aimed at providing inputs for the Zambian leadership to develop the proposed Integrated Education Sector Program.²⁵ By linking it to the policy studies, the MASA process would be enriched while at the same time providing a support element to the proposed integrated program. Initially, it was anticipated that the link with some of the policy studies would provide MASA with a valuable source of policy material which could be incorporated into the MASA Field Review. However, the objective was not realized because, by the time the policy studies commenced, the Field Review was already far ahead.²⁶

The Desk Review developed the following products for the MASA process:

- a profile of the education sector, which pivoted on the theme of deterioration and inability to revitalize education delivery; and focused on the three levels of diagnosis, namely, the symptoms at point of delivery, problems in sector-wide support systems and structural and environmental impediments;

- an outline for the Sector Environment Survey based on six hypotheses on sector-wide support systems (effective financial management, organizational and managerial capacity, fair access to education, quality and morale of teaching staff, effective administrative support, and effective coordination of activities) and four hypotheses on structural and environmental elements (transparency, participation, institutional coordination and socio-cultural attitudes); and

---

²⁵ The program would impact on all the ministries involved in education delivery in Zambia: Ministry of Education; Ministry of Higher Education, Technology, and Vocational Training; Ministry of Community Development and Social Services; and Ministry of Youth Sports and Cultural Development.

²⁶ Despite missing the policy studies' inputs, the MASA outputs should have significant impact on future policy in education delivery.
the SES survey instrument with fifty statements/questions, designed to confirm events and facts, gauge perceptions, values, practices, and stimulate thought and reflection on the situation in the education sector.

**Ministry of Education Restructuring and Decentralization Task Force.** As the MASA process took shape, the Ministry of Education's own change activity was already being implemented by a Restructuring and Decentralization (R&D) Task Force. Emulating the reform strategy adopted by the Ministry of Health, the standing Senior Management Committee of Ministry of Education had decided to launch District Education Management Boards on a pilot basis. The activities of the R&D Task Force raised two major concerns: (1) its members had no prior training or induction to orient them into what was being embarked upon; and (2) the Ministry of Education was on the brink of "going its way" with reform, disregarding management audits as required by the PSRP. Ostensibly, the Ministry of Education might have proceeded without working hand-in-hand with the MDD/CO through the Components outlined in the PSRP. Although the Ministry of Education was anxious to begin to reform the education sector, the MDD/CO evidently wanted to see that changes would be carried out within the PSRP framework.

The MASA process therefore offered a timely opportunity for dialogue between MDD/CO and the Ministry of Education and at the same time provided an umbrella under which all reform efforts in the education sector could be pulled together. Consequently, the members of the R&D Task Force were assimilated into the MASA working groups; three of them were appointed to lead their respective groups. By assimilating the R&D Task Force into the MASA working groups, the Ministry of Education avoided launching reforms in a piecemeal fashion. Relative to the restructuring task, the working group leaders were better prepared to begin assessing the sector's institutional milieu, albeit their interaction with the MASA consultants was minimal. Moreover, the working group tasks were clearer, and additional assistance was provided by a World Bank consultant who conducted the Sector Environment Survey in addition to assisting with the overall MASA process. Nevertheless, the foregoing illustrates the limited nature of the training and experience that the Ministry of Education change managers obtained at the onset of reform.

**Field Review: The Four Working Groups.** The preparatory phase is crucial to the success of an SIA, and it proved so in the case of the MASA process. The Field Review was primarily intended to challenge members of the working groups to reexamine the state of the Ministry of Education's outputs. Hence, working group tasks were designed to stimulate a critical reflection of the interface between education delivery and the sector's institutional environment. As their reports indicate, systematic group tasks facilitated dialogue and consensus regarding problem areas—a requisite step toward shared perceptions and values about solutions and change action. Another key objective was to generate adequate background information regarding the reality of serving the

---

27 The centerpiece of the Ministry of Health’s restructuring was the creation of autonomous District Health Management Boards; and the devolution of legal authority empowering the Boards to supervise all management functions of the hospitals under them. Consequently, medical professionals were removed from Ministry of Health headquarters and deployed to provinces and districts.

28 Other efforts—e.g., SHAPE (Self-Help Action Plan for Education), aimed at improving the quality of primary education and enhancing the relevance of education through self-help initiatives of pupils; PTAs; etc.—were being managed without proper coordination by Ministry of Education structures.
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Ministry of Education's clients. The ECDPM consultant mission had impressed on the working groups that it was the quality of preparatory work that determined the efficacy of the Workshop and the character of the ultimate Action Plan for sector reform.

Each of the four groups concentrated on an area of institutional relevance to education delivery, namely:

- The management audit;
- Symptomatic problems at points of delivery;
- System-wide problems; and
- The impact of the structural environment on education delivery.29

Group leaders appointed for the working groups had the responsibility of convening group sessions, supervising and monitoring tasks assigned to each of the working group members, and coordinating the production of the final group report. The working groups met for approximately eight weeks—once a week in the initial weeks; and as discussions gained momentum, more weekly sessions were scheduled. In fact, as the MSP Workshop came closer, the groups decided to work daily and after normal business hours in order to beat the deadline for circulating profiles to other groups as well as Ministry of Education staff selected to participate in the Workshop. Appendix IV describes the method used by working groups and the accomplishments of each one. Appendix V contains the survey package, which includes the Education Sector Profile, the outline of the survey and the survey instrument.

THE MASA STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP

Day One

Information Presentation

The MASA Strategic Planning (MSP) Workshop was the climax of the Institutional Assessment of the Ministry of Education. The Workshop was a four-day structured event attended by 52 participants from the Ministry of Education, MDD/CO, the Ministry of Health, and representatives of the donor community. ECDPM consultants facilitated the Workshop, and donor representatives acted as resource persons to the syndicate groups. In short, all who were present participated rather than just observed. The Field Review tasks and Workshop program are provided in Appendix III, and the flow of planned activities is presented in Figure 5. Day One of the MSP Workshop was programmed for the presentation of group reports, briefly summarized below.

---

29 The working groups were asked to employ a wide range of information-collection techniques in order to obtain inputs for their brainstorming and compilation of group reports/profiles for the MSP Workshop.
The Management Audit: PSRP Guidelines (WG1)

The guidelines for the conduct of the management audit are provided by the PSRP. The PSRP terms of reference describe the purpose of the management audit so as "to gain a detailed understanding about the Ministry" as it exists at the time of the audit, including its current staffing levels, capital assets, liabilities, functions, plans, and operations. For the purpose of the PSRP, the management audit report would be used as an important background and baseline information during the MASA Strategic Planning Workshop and later, during the restructuring process that follows. Specifically it entails:

- Examining the current personnel inventory of the Ministry, at what levels, and current organizational structure;
- Identifying how much office/building space the Ministry occupies, and where it is located;
- Identifying the Ministry's current capital assets and their approximate value and condition (including all project equipment and office machinery donated by donor agencies);
- Disclosing the Ministry's 1993 annual budget and expenditures to date;
- Identifying current management and/or operational structures and procedures;
- Examining the Ministry's current objective(s), expected outputs, activities, and work plans;
- Identifying current job descriptions and required qualifications for positions in the Ministry or Province; and
- Any other information deemed by the consultants and Ministry's management to be important in the reorganization process.

The terms of reference clearly show that the management audit focuses on managerial and technical-functional operations. It is the realization that the management audit missed the critical institutional elements associated with service delivery that caused the MASA to be adopted for the diagnosis of the Ministry of Education. Hence, the management audit report was not only prepared by one of the working groups, but was presented in a profile fashion at the MSP Workshop in order to highlight the issues arising out of it. **Appendix VI** describes the issues raised in the MSP Workshop in connection with the management audit.
A total of 64 respondents participated in the survey on condition of anonymity. Of these respondents, 54 self-administered the survey instrument, and the rest were interviewed in structured sessions. The survey was targeted at 26 stakeholder groups, including Ministry of Education staff, their clients, and other parties who have critical interests in education delivery. The findings were aggregated, analyzed, and provided to Working Group 4 as an input into its work. The presentation by this working group on Day One of the Workshop included feedback based on survey results. Appendix VII describes the issues arising out of the survey, some of which raise important governance concerns. For the purposes of this paper, a stakeholder is any person, group, or organization that can place a claim upon an organization’s attention, resources, or output, or is affected by that output.

Day Two

Issue Identification and Discussion

The working groups' entry point into the institutional assessment were the Ministry of Education’s outputs at various points of service delivery—for example, looking at the student who needed to be enrolled, taught, tested, and promoted; the teacher who needed to be trained, employed, supervised, and paid; the school that needed to be built, maintained, and inspected; and the quality of education, which The presentation by Working Group 2 confirmed the existence of problems at all points of service delivery and showed that the problems affected all of the outputs demanded by sector staff and clients. Though symptomatic problems were not summarized by the MSP Workshop, they could be categorized under 5 problem areas (see Box 9).

However, the symptomatic problems were interwoven and complex. For example, teacher absenteeism led to shorter contact time with students. Under-performance of accounting and administrative functions resulted in failure to pay the teachers at their schools. Teachers, in turn, were compelled to travel to district, provincial, or Ministry of Education headquarters to settle their compensation issues, thus missing their classes. Incompetent resource allocation and procurement functions resulted in shortages of supplies, such as books and other teaching materials. 30

30 Intuitively, if financial and administrative services are non-performing, a School Rehabilitation Project would hardly be followed by maintenance schedules that would sustain the rehabilitated infrastructure.
FIGURE 5. ORIGINAL (PROPOSED) MSP WORKSHOP FLOW CHART

**Purpose**
- INFORMATION PRESENTATION

**Activities**
- Present Summary reports from Working Group Field Reviews (WG1 - 4)

**Outputs**
- All information is summarized into clusters for Day Two

---

**DAY TWO**

**Purpose**
- ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

**Activities**
- Task 1: relate MOE policy objectives (WG1) to record of policy implementation (WG2)
  - Task 2: relate sector-wide systems (WG3) & structural issues (WG4) to results of Task 1

**Outputs**
- Differences between policy intentions and policy outcomes are identified
  - Sector-wide systemic & structural problems that affect delivery of policy defined institutionally

---

**DAY THREE**

**Purpose**
- PROBLEM ANALYSIS

**Activities**
- Task 3: Analyze key institutional issues by means of SWOT technique

**Outputs**
- Key institutional issues to be addressed in reform program identified

---

**DAY FOUR**

**Purpose**
- IDENTIFICATION OF SOLUTIONS

**Activities**
- Task 4: Identification and analysis of change action options

**Outputs**
- Options for change action analyzed in terms of feasibility

---

**Purpose**
- PREPARATION OF ACTION PLAN

**Activities**
- Task 5: Selection of feasible options and formulation of proposed action plan

**Outputs**
- A proposed Action Plan for the reorganization and restructuring of MOE
Box 9. Five Problem Areas For MSP Workshop

- Absenteeism of both teachers and students; exodus of teachers and dropping out of students;
- Under/non-performance of virtually all functions designed to be inputs into service delivery (demanded by clients and staff);
- Shortages of virtually all sector supplies that are inputs into service delivery;
- Deterioration and vandalism of education infrastructure; and
- Misallocation and mismanagement of human and financial resources.

Syndicate Group Task 1: Assessing Institutional Effectiveness by Relating Policy Objectives to Problems at Point of Delivery

On Day Two of the MSP Workshop, participants were divided into four Syndicate Groups (SGs), which were constituted so as to allow a fair mix of participants from the Ministry of Education's different departments and professions. The syndicate groups were asked to compare the Ministry of Education's policy objectives as reported in the Management Audit (WGI report) with the record of policy implementation, using as surrogates the Problems identified at Points of Delivery (WG2 report). The purpose was to identify the disparity between policy intentions and outcomes.

The syndicate groups performed the task with difficulty; it was reported later during the plenary that this was because the instructions were unclear and the symptoms had not been summarized, categorized, and prioritized to facilitate smooth processing. In addition, the major concerns highlighted by the draft policy document that were adopted as current policy objectives were not in the form of operational objectives that could be used to determine the outputs. Nevertheless, there was evidence demonstrating that the Ministry of Education was already aware of some of the symptomatic problems; and, as illustrated by the draft policy document, measures that would provide the required solutions were being formulated.

Although the concerns of the draft policy document adopted as policy objectives could not provide the link that was expected under Task 1, all of the syndicate groups highlighted the following three issue areas:

31 Task 1 was undermined due to the ambiguities of the policy document regarding the statement of Ministry of Education objectives, a problem corrected in the course of the MSP Workshop.

39
• Current structure of the Ministry of Education;
• Size of the budget and the way it was administered; and
• Absence of standards to measure performance and achievements.

The reports observed that most of the symptomatic problems were linked to the present structure of the Ministry of Education, including the Provinces and Districts. Some of the symptomatic problems could not be linked to any of the concerns raised in the policy document—for example, concern for promoting gender equity in education; or issues related to cost sharing and in-service teacher education. The plenary therefore adopted the three issue clusters as the immediate causes of symptomatic problems at the point of delivery.

System-Wide Problem Analysis

A profile of system-wide problems was presented by Working Group 3. Like Working Group 2, the entry point was to look at outputs that were supposed to be the products of system-wide administrative functions. For example, whether personnel management decisions were made promptly and efficiently; or whether accounting functions were orderly. Though Working Group 3 was asked to identify systemic problems, it was virtually impossible to prevent them from identifying intermediate causes. For instance, when the system-wide problem would have been "delays in decision making", the report would read, ". . . a long chain of command creates bureaucracy and red tape (too many officers handling the same issue)."

Inventory of System-Wide Administrative Problems. Problems were listed under four main managerial areas: Personnel, Financial, Policy and Planning, and Organizational systems. The key issues were summarized in the presentation, and the following were of fundamental importance:

• Personnel management: long delays in discharging critical functions related to the management of human resources due to a long chain of command that left almost all decisions in the hands of the Permanent Secretary.

• Personnel inventory: faulty, due to poor or falsified employment records.

• Financial management: irregular flow of insufficient funds from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of Education; and its consequences were exacerbated by serious leakages due to a long channel through which funds passed from the Ministry of Finance through the Ministry of Education, to Provinces, to Districts, to schools; incompetent financial management by some accounting administrators who did not have adequate knowledge of accounting; and erroneous accounts due to poor record-keeping in the Accounts Unit at the Ministry of Education headquarters.

• Accounts staff: non-allegiance to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education, since staff were on secondment from the Ministry of Finance and owed their loyalty and career advancement to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Finance—raising a serious accountability problem.
• Procurement: *cumbersome and irregular* supply of all student needs because procurement was centralized at Ministry of Education headquarters; and *ambiguous* reports on expenditure because most of Ministry of Education headquarters expenditure was drawn from one vote, namely, the inspectorate vote.

• Policy and Planning: This was *weak and ineffective* because of being undermined by a long and bureaucratic chain of command which affected implementation. The unit was understaffed, and key posts remained unfilled.

• Organizational systems: *nebulous* organization and designation of structures as divisions, departments, or units, that allowed every head of a unit, parastatal, division, and department to report directly to the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education.

Like the symptoms at points of service delivery, the problems that permeate system-wide outputs are compounded. However, the inventory of systemic problems could be organized under two critical categories that underlie institutional performance, namely, financial accountability and managerial competence. Inadequate financial accountability and managerial incompetence engender the multiple problems that exacerbate system-wide impediments to delivery of support prerequisites to the learning process. Nonetheless, some symptoms, such as relatively unqualified accounting staff, illustrate problems that are rooted in government-wide systems and other ministries.

---

**Syndicate Group Task 2: Assessing Institutional/Managerial Problems by Relating Institutional Effectiveness (results of Task 1) to System-Wide Administrative Problems and Structural Issues**

With respect to Syndicate Group Task 2, the groups were asked to consider the system-wide and structural issues identified by Working Groups 3 and 4, respectively, in explaining the findings of Syndicate Group Task 1 (i.e., an assessment of institutional effectiveness that was obtained by relating policy objectives to symptomatic problems at points of delivery). The aim of this task was to identify the system-wide and structural issues most commonly held to affect the performance of each policy objective in order to enable the MSP Workshop to agree on the key issues affecting the delivery of policy objectives.

The groups did not, however, produce the expected outputs. They indicated that the task was difficult, attributing the problem to unclear instructions provided by the facilitators. Also, the Workshop Steering Committee had assumed that the syndicate groups would produce better results if they worked with detailed, unsummarized data, which turned out to be counter-productive. Nevertheless, work completed variously by syndicate groups was aggregated by the Workshop facilitators, and a summary was given on Day Three, allowing the syndicate groups’ tasks to be brought back on track. The following were the categories summarized by the Workshop facilitators:

---

32 For example, inadequate financial accountability and managerial competence act together to facilitate a centralized procurement service that hardly delivers the required materials to schools.
• **financial management**: funds were insufficient, the flow was unreliable, and when made available, funds were often “hijacked” for some other unintended purposes;

• **personnel administration**: qualified personnel were in short supply and/or generally underutilized; there was lack of training facilities and training programs; and staff records were poorly kept; and

• **the management process**: problems reported were a long chain of communication; duplication of roles and functions; and lack of prompt decision-making by management.

The Workshop facilitators explained that it was important to interface the results of Task 1 with the management problems of the Ministry of Education in order to be able to revise and possibly reformulate the mission and objectives that guide service delivery. It was clear from the summarized categories that, given the way the management process was structured and personnel and scarce financial resources managed, one would definitely not expect to find at the end an appropriate structure, financial management process, or effective standards to evaluate performance and achievement. The Workshop plenary adopted the categories as a satisfactory rendition of the condition of the Ministry of Education management support systems.

### Day Three

**Issue/Problem Analysis**

*Selecting Key Institutional/Managerial Problems.* On Day Three, syndicate groups were asked to use the summary provided by the facilitators (results of Task 2), to select the key institutional and managerial problems that were of critical importance to change-action planning. The groups, however, were asked to keep their respective lists ready for use in Task 3, which would be performed after revisiting the mission and objectives of the Ministry of Education.

*Relating Institutional/Managerial Problems to Ministry Mission and Objectives.* According to the initial design of the MSP Workshop, the results of Task 2 would have enabled participants to relate institutional and managerial problems to the mission and objectives of the Ministry of Education. Though the results of Task 2 had been summarized by the facilitators, it was found that the MSP Workshop did not have hitherto known or accepted Ministry of Education’s mission or objectives to work with. It thus became imperative to revisit the Ministry of Education’s mission and to agree on operational objectives—an unforeseen turn in the course of the Workshop. Accordingly, the MSP Workshop deviated from the original program presented in Figure 5 and proceeded as shown in Figure 6.

---

33 This was essentially a new start for the workshop and, as referred to earlier in footnote 31, the gaps in the policy document were filled by this turnaround. Furthermore the MSP workshop had to provide inputs into the PSRP’s restructuring phase, which in turn required agreement on the Ministry of Education’s mission and objectives to provide the lead to an indicative functional structure of the reforming Ministry.
Revisiting the Mission of the Ministry of Education. As part of the requirements of PSRP, the MSP Workshop had to revisit the mission and objectives of the Ministry of Education. The mission and objectives would be used as an input by the Organizational Systems Department of MDD/CO to formulate an indicative new structure for the Ministry of Education. The new structure would be at the core of the Strategic Plan for the Ministry of Education and the restructuring that was to follow. The Workshop facilitators explained that a mission was a general statement describing the basic purpose of an organization and the scope of its operations (see Box 10).

**Box 10. Elements Of Organizational Mission**

- **Purpose**: Why does/should the ministry exist; and what business is it/should it be engaged in?
- **Vision**: What is the Ministry's direction; and what would one want the Ministry to be in the next five to ten years?
- **Customer Oriented Focus**: Who are the Ministry's clients; and what are their expectations and attitudes?
- **Guidance**: What principles should steer the Ministry's strategic decisions?

The task of revisiting the Ministry of Education's mission was performed by the syndicate groups, and each submitted its proposal to the Workshop plenary. After discussions, the plenary agreed to adopt the following mission statement for recommendation:

*To facilitate the provision of education, develop and regulate educational institutions and services in order to meet the learning needs of the nation for the attainment of a knowledgeable, disciplined and skilled Zambian who is able to harness and protect the environment for socio-economic prosperity and cultural development.*

In a striking departure from the "control" element embedded in the 1966 Act, the new mission statement recommended by the MSP Workshop employs terminology that limits the Ministry's role to creating a conducive environment for education delivery. The mission signals the imminent shift in policy goals toward "facilitation" and "regulation" rather than Ministry of Education control and domination of education delivery. 

After the mission statement was adopted, the Workshop facilitators explained the guidelines for formulating the objectives, which were logical operational extensions of the Ministry of Education mission. Specifically, the objectives were required to be in line with the new mission statement: clear, specific, realistic, attainable, measurable (in terms of quantity, quality, and time), and action-oriented. To expedite the task, the Steering Committee had formulated twelve objectives on the basis of the policy principles of liberalization, decentralization, and cost-sharing.

---

34 It was widely perceived at the MSP Workshop that the Ministry of Education will gradually recede from active provision of education while granting autonomy in service delivery to decentralized and private-sector institutions.
FIGURE 6. MSP WORKSHOP FLOW CHART

**Purpose**

**Activities**

**Outputs**

---

**DAY ONE**

- INFORMATION PRESENTATION
  - Present reports of Working Groups
  - Stakeholder views presented
  - All information is summarized into clusters for Day Two

---

**DAY TWO**

- ISSUE IDENTIFICATION
  - Task 1: relate MOE policy objectives (WG1) to record of policy implementation (WG2)
  - Task 2: relate sector-wide systems (WG3) & structural issues (WG4) to results of Task 1
  - Differences between policy intentions and policy outcomes are identified
  - Sector-wide systemic & structural problems that affect service delivery defined institutionally

---

**DAY THREE**

- DEFINITION OF MISSION AND OBJECTIVES
  - sub-task: review and agree on new mission
  - sub-task: review and agree on new objectives
  - A Working Mission agreed and adopted
  - Working Objectives agreed and adopted

---

**DAY FOUR**

- PROBLEM ANALYSIS
  - Task 3: identify causes and effects of institutional constraints to achievement of new objectives
  - Causes and effects of institutional constraints identified

- IDENTIFICATION OF CHANGE ACTION
  - Task 3b: develop measures to overcome constraints
  - Change actions identified in relation to new objectives

- PREPARATION OF ACTION PLAN
  - agree on action priorities and time framed responsibility
  - MOE Action Plan: Own-managed & Restructuring
as well as due consideration of the main concerns and strategies outlined in the draft policy document. The groups were asked to improve upon or add to the twelve objectives and to come up with performance indicators for each objective. Appendix VIII provides (i) the Ministry of Education objectives proposed by the Steering Committee; (ii) the final objectives adopted in the Workshop; (iii) the worksheet used by syndicate groups to refine the objectives; and (iv) a sample of the strategic analysis of one Ministry of Education objective.35

The unforeseen task was performed by the syndicate groups, and reports were submitted to the Workshop plenary. The plenary assigned the Steering Committee to examine the objectives proposed by the groups. The objectives were polished up, and fifteen were identified and presented back to the plenary. During plenary discussions, the objectives were further refined, and finally, the fourteen objectives contained in Box 11 were adopted as Workshop recommendations.

Although some performance indicators for the objectives were presented, it was noted in the plenary that the words used by syndicate groups to formulate the indicators were not operational. Therefore, the Steering Committee was assigned to reformulate and redefine the performance indicators.36 The Steering Committee could not accomplish the task during the MSP Workshop. The Working Committee formed at the end of the Workshop was mandated to ensure that appropriate performance indicators were developed.

Relating the Mission and Objectives to the Structure of the Ministry of Education. After the new objectives were adopted by the plenary, the syndicate groups were asked to relate them to the structure of the Ministry of Education. They were instructed to try and cluster the objectives around operational structures, such as departments or divisions. The same task was performed by the MDD/CO expert group on organizational systems. The proposals of the groups were passed to the organizational systems specialists, who at this juncture, were joined by the Steering Committee. Finally, the specialists reported to the plenary with a new indicative structure of the Ministry of Education.

All fifteen objectives had been categorized under four organizational structures, namely, Policy, Research and Planning; Standards, Evaluation and Certification; Educational Services; and Management. The new structures would probably be designated as "departments" in the Strategic Plan. Appendix IX compares (i) the organizational structure of the Ministry of Education presented by Working Group 1; (ii) the recommendation of the draft policy document; and (iii) the recommendation of the MSP Workshop (which includes the list of new objectives problem/objective under their respective operational structures).

35 The focus on clarifying Ministry of Education objectives constitutes a divergence from the purpose of the SIA methodology, which leads to an analysis of segmented institutional profiles of the sector, complementing the work done by the Ministry of Education MASA.

36 To the extent that the Workshop became focused on a discussion of how best to achieve the Ministry of Education's mission/objectives, it clearly embarked on a strategic/functional planning exercise rather than one of institutional change/reform or capacity building—having become disconnected from the products of Tasks 1 and 2 (an unintended outcome).
### Box 11. Recommended Ministry of Education Objectives

1. Formulate, analyze and review educational policies within the framework of national development policies;

2. Plan, provide and coordinate the delivery of education at all levels;

3. Develop a relevant, flexible and diversified curriculum for pre-school, primary, secondary, teacher and continuing education;

4. Develop, provide and approve educational materials;

5. Assess and evaluate teaching and learning;

6. Mobilize and manage financial, human and material resources through appropriate institutions in a decentralized system;

7. Facilitate and provide non-segregative education and training to all Zambians;

8. Promote community participation in educational provision, including the exchange of information;

9. Control the quality of education at all levels of education delivery;

10. Promote literacy, adult education and a reading culture;

11. Facilitate the building, rehabilitation and maintenance of educational infrastructure;

12. Develop and manage human resources;

13. Provide administrative and ancillary support services to the education system; and

14. Promote and strengthen communication between the Ministry of Education and community.

### Focusing on Objectives

#### Syndicate Group Task 3: Problem/Objective Analysis

At this stage, the MSP Workshop had the information needed for problem analysis focusing on objective achievement. The participants had already developed a grasp of the problem profile; and the Workshop had adopted a new mission and objectives for the Ministry of Education. It was agreed by the Steering Committee that the purpose of Task 3 therefore was to consider how the
objectives of the Ministry of Education could be realized. Task 3 therefore involved a process resembling the logical framework (LOGFRAME), which included:

- Problem identification;
- Analysis of constraints; and
- Proposed change actions.

The task was divided into two sessions: In Session 1, the new Ministry of Education objectives were divided into five clusters, each of which had three objectives. Each syndicate group was assigned a cluster and asked to process each of the three objectives using a modified SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analysis that was broken down into the following stages:

- **Assumptions**: Identify the main assumptions required to realize the particular objective. The Workshop facilitators prepared a list of issues relevant to the consideration of assumptions, which were based on the outputs of Tasks 1 and 2. These included issues of personnel management, organization, financial management, structural environment, teaching and learning processes, and infrastructural assets.

- **Constraints/Opportunities**: Identify possible constraints or opportunities that may affect these assumptions. The Workshop facilitators explained that the groups needed to pull in any prevailing factors that could affect the viability or stability of the assumptions, given the experience and information available including outputs drawn from Tasks 1 and 2.

- **Causes**: Identify the causes of the constraints. Groups were asked to utilize the work done in the Workshop so far, since identifying the root-causes of the constraints was critical for outlining the appropriate solutions and actions required to clear the ground for achievement of the objective.

In session 2 on Task 3, the syndicate groups were asked to carry on the work of processing the objectives as begun during session 1. The following instructions guided the group task:

- **Change Action/Options**: Identify possible change-action options that might overcome or ameliorate the constraints. Groups were asked to utilize their SWOT analysis as well as the causes of the constraints identified in session 1 to explore change-action options.

- **Feasible Change Action/Solution**: Select the most feasible change action or solution to the constrain(s) identified. From the options, groups were asked to select the best option in relation to the objective being addressed.

Originally, the MSP workshop design called Task 3: "Analyze Key Institutional Issues and Identify/Analyze Change Action Options." This illustrates how the design was changed during the workshop as information was generated and the need to satisfy PSRP requirements became paramount.

The modifications of SWOT involved introducing elements of the logical framework analytical method, such as assumptions and constraints, as well as adding the specifics of an action plan.
- **Change-Action Initiation/Plan**: Indicate who is responsible for initiating the particular action, resources required, and the time frame. The groups were asked to specify responsibility for implementation in order to facilitate effective follow-up, including follow-up with authorities outside the Ministry of Education. They were also requested to specify the types of resources required, such as financial, personnel, and physical assets.

The syndicate groups were asked to report at the end of each session. During the plenary following session one, the groups reported that they had made progress, but the task was so stimulating that they needed additional time to process the objectives. The groups were observably absorbed in their work during Task 3. A motion to have an extra day for the Workshop was supported, but in view of the Workshop budget, the plenary asked the syndicate groups to identify one or two objectives that they could process to the end. Then the plenary mandated the Steering Committee, which included the Ministry of Education Restructuring and Decentralization Task Force, to process to the end all those objectives that would not be completed by the groups. The Committee, joined by the Ministry of Education Permanent Secretary, remained at the Workshop venue for two extra days to accomplish this work.

### Day Four

**Preparing an Action Plan**

On Day Four, syndicate groups continued with the SWOT analysis begun in session 1 of Task 3. Session 2 of Task 3 was designed to enable syndicate groups to initiate change actions that would form the basis of an action plan. As had been anticipated, the MSP Workshop (or any other Workshop) could hardly provide the climate for the formulation of a detailed action plan. Nevertheless, it was crucial for the MSP Workshop to generate a consensual change mandate that would enable a smaller working group to provide the functional and strategic details that are critical to action planning. Accordingly, the plenary mandated a Working Committee to draft a detailed action plan as well as to complete the outstanding tasks that were initiated by the syndicate groups. The Ministry of Education management was charged with instituting an organizational mechanism that would supervise the follow-up activities; hence, the Steering Committee reconstituted into the Working Committee.

A survey was conducted during the Workshop to evaluate the efficacy of the MASA process based on the Structured Learning (SL) methodology referred earlier (see footnote 19). The survey examined the perceptions of the participants about the prospects for change and utility of the MASA. The results were presented and discussed at the end of the Workshop (Day Four). The evaluation report, the hypotheses driving it, and the instrument are provided as Appendix X. In general, the participants gave favorable comments about the MASA methodology; and both the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education and MDD/CO team affirmed their satisfaction with the products of the MSP Workshop.

**PSRP Restructuring Actions.** Component I of the PSRP is completed with the restructuring of the sector agency. In the case of other ministries, MDD/CO consultants and organizational systems specialists would use the new structure recommended by the Strategic Plan
Workshop to draw up the Strategic Plan for that particular ministry. The Strategic Plan, in turn, guides the implementation of actual restructuring and reorganization of the ministry as well as other functional and strategic changes that have to be implemented.

In the case of the Ministry of Education, however, as a continuation of the participatory process inspired by the MASA exercise, MDD/CO asked the Ministry of Education to participate in developing its strategic plan. Agreeably, the Ministry of Education Permanent Secretary appointed a 6-member committee to collaborate with two consultants from MDD/CO to further develop the structure agreed at the MSP Workshop and to supervise follow-up activities.

Implementation Measures for the Ministry of Education Reform and Performance Improvement (Decentralization) Program. When processing the institutional preconditions for the realization of the Ministry of Education’s objectives identified during the MSP Workshop, reform and capacity-building measures for performance improvement emerged. The Permanent Secretary announced at the end of the MSP Workshop that since three of the four members of the R&D Task Force were already in the Working Committee, the Restructuring and Decentralization (R&D) Task Force and the Working Committee would be merged in order to avoid duplication of responsibilities and would effectively facilitate and oversee the implementation of the MSP Workshop recommendations. The post-Workshop activities were therefore expected to begin with the refinement of the Workshop products and their subsequent translation into inputs for restructuring of the Ministry of Education and the change actions meant for Ministry’s own managed capacity building, performance improvement, and decentralization processes. It is noteworthy to mention that most of the Ministry of Education’s own managed change actions that came out of the SWOT analysis are consistent with capacity building for the Performance Management and Decentralization measures that are Components II and III of the PSRP, respectively.

The recommendations also contained a time frame for achieving certain targets and flagged that it would be important to monitor progress and adherence to the action calendar. One of the factors that could cause slippages in the timetable is the availability of resources for funding certain consequential outcomes of restructuring, such as retrenchment of redundant staff.\(^3\) This problem may be acute at the moment, since the government operates on a cash budget, and it is unlikely that the financial implications of Component I of the PSRP were foreseen and budgeted. Another factor that may cause delays in implementing the Ministry of Education’s reform agenda will probably be the bureaucratic and legal decisions that have to be taken by higher authorities as well as Parliament. It was not clear at the conclusion of the MSP Workshop whether the Ministry of Education would be allowed to go ahead with implementation of change actions within its own means; or whether it would have to wait until MDD/CO launches Component II of the PSRP after all ministries have completed Component I.

\(^3\) A possible source of funding and impetus to carry out the recommended reforms and capacity-building measures for the Ministry of Education is the emerging Education Sector Integrated Program (ESIP) being considered for funding by the World Bank. The ESIP, however, would cover all of the five ministries of the education sector, which would also be undergoing reforms and performance improvement.
LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE MASA EXPERIENCE

The MASA experience provided useful lessons regarding processes of institutional change of a core sector ministry in the context of a comprehensive reform program. First, it involved learning about the relationship between the central reform management unit and the sector ministries; and second, it was an opportunity to compare and contrast ideas and initiatives as developed by a central reform management unit vis-à-vis the reforming sector agencies. Furthermore, as was seen by the redirection of the Workshop after Day Two, it is crucial that the assumptions made about sector policy and agency objectives be established at the outset, when Working Groups prepare profiles for the Workshop. The SIA methodology ensures that this provision is applied. Regarding the PSRP, it is apparent that, while Component I (Restructuring) focuses on sector ministries, it is not clear whether or not it is also intended to provide the much-needed feedback about the performance of system-wide management and support systems. It is important for the PSRP to have this kind of feedback in order to replicate the strategic link between Component I and Component II (Performance Management).

Component II of PSRP, which aims at improving overall performance of the public service, will involve the establishment of APECS (i.e., the Annual Performance Evaluation of the Civil Service; Performance Management Systems (PMS), and Management Information Systems (MIS). It would have been useful for the PSRP to tap into Component I for relevant data about the state of system-wide functions in order to develop and customize the APECS, PMS, and MIS for the Zambian public sector. Relative to the structural focus of management audits and strategic planning, as done in the other ministries, the MASA process definitely did generate significant data about the state of government-wide management support systems as well as the environment in the education sector. By combining the Management Audit, the environment-driven tiered analysis, and strategic planning, MASA provided the critical link to Component II—in terms of both inputs needed for restructuring and reorganization and measures needed to institute capacity building and reform activities that are crucial for the functioning and sustainability of performance management systems.

The Preparation Phase

Interaction between MDD and the Ministry of Education. A top-down comprehensive reform program spearheaded by restructuring, as in the case of the PSRP, introduces three assumptions: (1) that distorted organizational structure is the main cause of under-performance; (2) that management as well as service delivery (the supply side) functions of sector agencies are best reformed by a top-down strategy, with sector agency staff having little, if any, contribution; and (3) that the authorities in the ministries correctly perceive the need to improve performance, and hence the demand side for the agency’s sector services is known and fixed. As a result of the assumptions, predetermined technical components such as restructuring and reorganization, managerial improvements, and functional deconcentration to decentralized structures dominate the prescribed solutions. Although the technical components are necessary, they are not sufficient. Similarly, without conducting a diagnostic analysis of sector agencies on the basis of their interface with environmental factors, a comprehensive reform program is likely to overlook the behavioral and attitudinal elements underlying institutional evolution and reform.
Built on a participatory and group-based methodology, the MASA process improved interaction between MDD/CO and the Ministry of Education on two fronts. On the one hand, it provided a medium of dialogue between the central reform management unit and the sector ministry on sequencing the reform agenda and bringing out sector symptomatic problems as seen by the Ministry of Finance staff. On the other hand, it provided a process through which participatory diagnosis improved and enriched the agenda around which Component I of the PSRP was built. The MASA process also provided the necessary bridge from Component I to Components II and III, challenging participants to proceed beyond restructuring and reorganization of the Ministry of Education to implementing an action plan, with capacity-building activities consistent with the PSRP.

The significance of MASA's impact is evident in the way that MDD/CO was able to learn from the process and to suggest modifications for applying the MASA methodology in another education sector ministry (Ministry of Science, Technology, and Vocational Training) as part of the expanded Sector Institutional Assessment discussed in Chapter V.

Ministry of Education's Reform Initiative and Policy Document. As mentioned earlier, the Ministry of Education management had launched its own reform initiative, which was basically a deconcentration of service delivery from the old Ministry, Province, and District structures to new structures at the district level. This was a culmination of a series of internal efforts to react to the general decline in the education sector. Apart from various findings from studies (such as the ZAMIM Report), the new leadership in the Ministry had instituted regular senior management meetings, which proved to be a useful forum for discussing Ministry of Education issues among senior managers. The Restructuring and Decentralization (R&D) Task Force was appointed and assigned the task of establishing District Education Management Boards. The exercise was planned to eventually lead to the establishment of School Management Committees or Councils. The fact that the R&D Task Force was launched outside the phased implementation of PSRP Components and before the new Policy Document could be formalized through legislation shows that the Ministry of Education management had improperly sequenced reform initiatives.

Therefore, another important lesson was that the MASA process enabled the Ministry of Education management to see: a whole range of factors that would impede reform; a range of measures that were necessary to remove the impediments; and the requisites for success and sustainability of the Ministry of Education's reform, capacity-building, and performance improvement activities. For example, the realization that the new Policy Document did not have operational objectives that would provide the strategic and quantifiable means of achieving its (policy) goals came as a hard lesson that changed the course of the MSP Workshop. It was helpful for the Ministry of Education that such an important weakness was discovered early in the process of reform, and the Permanent Secretary announced at the end of the MSP Workshop that the Policy Document would have to be reviewed. Indeed, the review of the Policy Document was included in the Action Plan, with a specific timeframe for completion of the assignment.
The Workshop Experience

The MSP Workshop provided lessons on the adaptation of the IEA approach to a service delivery sector both in terms of the process and its outcome. Although it changed along the way, the program of the Workshop was designed more or less along the lines of the IEA Workshop. This led to mistakenly assuming that there was a mission and policy framework to which syndicate groups could relate in Task 1. In reality, however, given the PSRP restructuring requirements, the need emerged to revisit the mission and objectives of the sector in general and the agency in particular. The lesson here is that there is need to assign a working group during Field Review to focus on mission, policy goals, objectives, and functions of the sector agency. This is important because there may be cases in Sub-Saharan Africa where sector agencies do not have a clear mission and policy framework, or where these are not disseminated when they do exist.\footnote{Or, cases where the rulers have not assigned the government a clear vision to direct its actions—or even to justify its existence.}

Another lesson related to the Workshop process was the need to manage the information that is delivered on Day One of the Workshop, so that the syndicate groups can perform Task 1 on Day Two effectively. There is need, therefore, to include up front a prioritization and summarizing syndicate task, or to mandate the Steering Committee to summarize the information into manageable clusters. This task of aggregating group reports into manageable clusters has to be done at the end of each syndicate session in order to facilitate smooth execution of the next task. The final lesson learned was the usefulness of the SWOT methodology for processing the Workshop Action Plan. Participants highly recommended the method and appreciated its use in the syndicate group tasks.

Regarding the Workshop outcome, it was clear that relative to the requirements of the normal Component I of the PSRP, the inputs and outputs of the MSP Workshop had very detailed information. The lesson here is that the sector-focused institutional assessment has more room for sector-specific details that can be generated in a comprehensive top-down reform program. Thus, building a participatory bottom-up process into a pre-designed, top-down program equips reform managers with a mechanism that fills in the gaps that are characteristic of comprehensive, government-wide reform programs. Finally, having sector participants focus on their sector in general and on agencies in particular generates more proximity between reform managers and the reforming agencies. This proximity and cohesion enhances ownership and thereby heightens the commitment and the sustainability of the reform program.

Besides satisfying the requirements of the PSRP and enriching the reform of the Ministry of Education, the MASA process prepared the ground for initial preparatory activities for a World Bank-funded Sector Investment Program (SIP) that the Government envisaged for the education sector. The next chapter explains the framework for the second phase of the SIA, which was customized to prepare the Integrated Education Program (IEP) covering the four ministries involved in the provision of education in Zambia.
V.
PHASE II OF SIA: MASAS OF SUBSIDIARY EDUCATION-SECTOR MINISTRIES

MASA CONCLUSION FOR THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

The MASA for the Ministry of Education concluded with the submission of an Action Plan by the Ministry of Education MASA follow-up Committee (a merger of the former Restructuring and Decentralization Task Force and the Working Committee). The Action Plan includes the specific measures to achieve the objectives analyzed during the Workshop and the indicative organizational structure of the Ministry. The submissions were reviewed and utilized by MDD of Cabinet Office to prepare a Strategic Plan and a Restructuring Report. At the time of writing of this Discussion Paper, the two documents were ready for further discussion with Ministry of Education staff; and a two-day restructuring session hosted by MDD was being planned to implement the realignment and downsizing entailed by the new organizational structure and strategic orientation (mission, objectives, and policy statements). Since downsizing is dependent on the availability of severance package financing, it was not clear when MDD would host the restructuring session. Appendix XI contains: (a) a sample (in respect of objectives 1 and 2) of the specific measures, responsible Ministry of Education, officers, and resources; and (b) a timetable.

As the Ministry of Education was concluding the submissions based on the MASA exercise, the World Bank intensified discussions with the Government of Zambia to launch the preparation of an Integrated Education Program (IEP), which was likely to have an impact on certain areas of the Ministry of Education, especially as regards policy and investments in the education sector. This event affected the finalization of Ministry of Education submissions in the sense that they had to incorporate requirements of the Integrated Education Program (IEP), especially those regarding relationships with other ministries also involved in the provision of education. As the IEP is based on intensive sector donor coordination, donor-funded projects and their management by the Ministry of Education, the other ministries were also likely to change.

The main adjustment that the IEP required of the Ministry of Education was to revisit its initial Education Policy Statement and reconcile it with policy proposals emerging from other ministries that have education portfolios in their expenditures. As the MASA was substantially based on the original policy document, it was likely that certain of the agreed objectives for the Ministry of Education also would have to be revisited.

41 These include: Ministry of Science, Technology, and Vocational Training; Ministry of Youth, Sports, and Cultural Development; and Ministry of Community Development and Social Services.
THE INTEGRATED EDUCATION PROGRAM

Early in 1995, preparation of the Integrated Education Program (IEP) was launched in earnest. The program is envisaged to adopt a sector lending approach and accordingly will:

- cover the entire education sector;
- be designed by the education sector ministries;
- be consolidated through an interactive high-level dialogue between the ministries and a series of refining workshops;
- involve and be supported by interested donors from the outset of preparation;
- put the local stakeholder in charge in order to secure commitment and ownership; and
- have common implementation arrangements among donors and minimal dependence on long-term foreign technical assistance.

Given the need for local ownership and coordinated program design by sector agencies, a participatory upstream diagnostic procedure focusing both on individual agencies and on the cluster of sector agencies became critical in the launching of the IEP. Following up on the Ministry of Education MASA therefore became the logical link to undertake this up-stream work.

The task manager for the IEP (AF1PH) in agreement with AFTCB and in the light of ongoing discussions in the Africa Region on how best to initiate a Sector Integrated Program decided that a Sector Institutional Assessment would be an appropriate way to undertake the up-stream work required to launch the IEP. Furthermore, an examination of the institutional aspects of the Ministry of Education proposed policy for the education sector as emerged from the MASA exercise was seen as a suitable basis on which to revisit the Policy Document and put it to a strategic test.

CUSTOMIZING THE GENERIC PROCESS TO PHASE II OF THE EDUCATION SECTOR SIA

On the basis of the foregoing orientation, AFTCB designed a customized SIA for the IEP in Zambia. In order to ensure involvement of MDD/CO and secure its coordinating role over the four ministries involved, customization required that the SIA build on the MASA for Ministry of Education and generate information useful for the Management Audits of the remaining sector ministries.

As the remaining sector ministries were at different points in their individual management audit exercises, it was necessary to design a process that brought all of them to the same level so that the joint SIA exercise could proceed. In addition to the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services and the Ministry of Youth Sports and Cultural Development had also completed their management audits. The remaining task was to revise their Management Audit submissions to incorporate elements similar to those of the

---

42 AF1PH stands for Africa Country Department 1, Population and Human Resources Division, the World Bank.
MASA, as required by the SIA. The only ministry which needed to undertake a full MASA/SIA was the Ministry of Science, Technology, and Vocational Training.

On the basis of the generic SIA process, as described in section 2 of Chapter III (Figures 1, 2, 3), and in close coordination with the IEP task management team and inputs from Education Sector specialists from the Technical Department, a customized course of action was proposed to the Government. Appendix XII contains the customization proposed.

THE INTER-MINISTERIAL MEETING

The first formal contact with the Government of Zambia to undertake IEP/SIA discussions in a structured format and to carry out the stakeholder analysis was through an inter-ministerial meeting organized in close collaboration among the education sector ministries and the Cabinet Office.\(^4\)

The Inter-Ministerial meeting was an appropriate event to launch the IEP/SIA, and the following items were adequately covered:

- Consultation with central and sector ministries, which was intensive in the week prior to the Workshop;
- Establishment of a sectoral preparatory technical committee, which was drawn with membership from all ministries concerned (Cabinet Office, National Commission for Development Planning, and the four sector ministries—Education; Science, Technology & Vocational Training; Community Development and Social Services; and Sports, Youth and Cultural Development);
- Identification and assessment of the main concerns of key stakeholders. Although contact with outsider stakeholders was not as intensive, the private schools association and churches were represented at the Workshop;
- Preliminary information regarding identification of beneficiaries and stakeholder participants in the systematic client consultation (SCC), including two categories of beneficiaries—i.e., children who will attain basic education (9 years of formal education); and those between the ages of 7 and 14 who have been pushed out of school, dropped out of school, or never-been to school ("never-beens")—who need some kind of education before they can be admitted for skills training ready for absorption into the labor market; and
- Involvement of indigenous institutions such as the chiefs and village headmen, was recommended; it was pointed out that their participation was critical for mobilizing and enhancing community participation in the delivery of service.

\(^4\) This meeting represented a customized "Preliminary Stakeholder Analysis" as provided for in the SIA standard process. See page 15.
The Technical Committee prepared and presented a lead paper that raised questions related to four main themes:

- Target groups and their relevant programs;
- Priorities for investment in the sector;
- Coordination and collaboration among the ministries in the sector; and
- Financing education and skills training programs.

The proceedings during the Inter-Ministerial meeting helped identify: (1) the boundaries of the education sector, (2) key concerns, and (3) priority target groups for education and skills training. Furthermore, the meeting also outlined several requisites that were necessary for a sectoral approach to expenditure and investment in the education sector, such as:

- Development of a policy framework for the sector;
- Human resource development;
- Decentralization;
- Restructuring;
- Establishment of sectoral statistical data bases;
- Development of a legal framework;
- Development of inter-ministerial coordination mechanism;
- Development of community-based institutional support to education and skills training through the involvement of traditional institutions;
- Curriculum review, taking into account HIV/aids infection; and
- Costing and mapping.

By using the list of concerns, priority target groups and the requisites, the meeting produced indicative program/project areas for investment. The meeting was facilitated and chaired by Zambians, and its final report was written by the Technical Committee. At the end of March 1995, the report was circulated in draft form to the Permanent Secretaries (the Inter-Ministerial Standing Committee) for endorsement and approval.
In light of the outcome of the IEP/SIA Inter-Ministerial meeting, the sector-wide Focal Group changed relative to the one contained in the original design of the customized SIA. The Technical Committee was transformed into the sector-wide Focal Group in order to maintain continuity; and was expected to conduct the field reviews in such a way as to (a) utilize the outcomes of Strategic Planning/MASA from the sector ministries, to build on the requisites identified at the Inter-Ministerial meeting and (b) develop sector-wide profiles for the SIA forthcoming Workshop. It was also agreed with members of the Technical Committee that once the Permanent Secretaries approved the report of the Inter-Ministerial meeting, it would reconstitute into three sub-committees that would look into institutional requisites identified by the Inter-Ministerial Workshop and prepare inputs for the SIA Workshop. The sub-committee roles were:

- The first sub-committee would utilize the policy documents from the four ministries to draw up a **Sectoral Policy Guideline** for Education and Skills Training. This sub-committee would coordinate with staff dealing with policy and planning from the four sector ministries and would also include staff from the Policy Analysis and Coordination (PAC) Division of Cabinet Office. The objective was to ensure that PAC get the sectoral policy picture and incorporate it into the larger national policy framework;

- The second sub-committee would ensure that **linkage** between the sector program and the Public Service Reform Program (PSRP) is maintained by refining further the **institutional requisites** that were identified at the Workshop and that have implications for Components I (Restructuring), II (Performance Management, Evaluation and Personnel Information Systems) and III (Decentralization) of the PSRP. They are (a) human resource development; (b) decentralization; (c) restructuring; (d) legal framework; (e) community-based institutional support, and (f) inter-ministerial coordination;

- The Third sub-committee would deal with issues related to **costing, mapping, factoring HIV/AIDS into the curriculum review, and establishing of a statistical data base.** This sub-committee would also look into the institutionalization of some reliable **feedback mechanisms**, such as the Systematic Client Consultation (SCC) and the Quality Control Circle (QCC), which would help the Ministry of Science, Technology & Vocational Training to monitor the productivity of its graduates at their places of work, and to follow up on technical problems. This would help the Ministry of Science, Technology, and Vocational Training institutionalize the QCCs into facilitating regular curriculum reviews in order to improve and maintain the quality of its skills training programs; and

---

44 It is important that there be a clear indication of which type of training (under human resource development, for example) will fall under Component II of the PSRP, and which will fall under the Sector Integrated Program. Or, what structures will emerge with the sectoral decentralization (deconcentration) of functions vis-à-vis the structures that will emerge under Component III of the PSRP. Also, the **legal framework** is important because fundamental changes envisaged to emerge under both the PSRP and the IEP have to be legislated in order to ensure the sustainability of change management.
The Technical Committee would identify and select a group of outsider stakeholders who would **develop their own rendition** of education and skills training services provided by the education sector agencies.

At this stage, the SIA would involve only a few key stakeholders who either deliver services or employ the labor produced from the education sector. An initial list identified the following stakeholders:

- Catholic Education Secretariat: to represent all the churches involved in the delivery of education and skills training;
- Zambia Federation of Employers: to represent the views of the demand side of the formal sector labor (skills) market;
- Zambia Association of Farmers: to represent the views of the demand side of agricultural/rural labor;
- National Teachers Union and the Parents Teachers Association: to represent the views of teachers and parents;
- Private Schools Association and the Preschool Association: to represent the views of private schools administrators; and
- National Committee of the NGOs: to represent the views of NGOs other than those outlined above.

- Identified indigenous institutions.

The outsider stakeholders would also validate the ideas on community-based institutional support for education and skills training. Therefore data collected through surveys during the MASA processes in the Ministry of Education (1994) and the Ministry of Science, Technology & Vocational Training (1995) as well as the Indigenous Institutions Mapping to be prepared by the Technical Committee through the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services would have to be made available to this group in order to comment on **motivation, viability, and sustainability** of non-profit-oriented private sector/community participation in service delivery.

While the IEP/SIA Inter-Ministerial Meeting and follow-up activities focused primarily on matters of sector policy and the identification of targets for investment, arrangements were made to address purely institutional issues in the preparation of the SIA. At this writing, the Field Review Group of the Ministry of Science, Technology & Vocational Training started work, and the Focal Group/Technical Committee has held several meetings to organize the work of its sub-committees. At this juncture preparations are under way to plan the SIA Workshop and to fine-tune its design. A subsequent paper is planned to report on the experience of fully implementing the proposed SIA design.
APPENDICES
Appendix I

DESK REVIEW:
INSTITUTIONAL MAPPING GUIDELINES
FOR FORMAL AND INDIGENOUS INSTITUTIONS

I. Institutional Mapping Rationale:¹

- Institutional performance is impeded by disconnect between formal and informal indigenous institutions (state vs. civil service, informal vs. formal private sector, corporate vs. societal culture).

- Formal institutions transplanted from outside without adaptation to the local context lack legitimacy and enforceability.

- Informal indigenous institutions, although rooted in the local culture, need to adapt to changing outside world challenges.

- So neither institutional transplant, with heavy reliance on expatriate technical assistance, nor totally traditional institutions, is an appropriate solution to Africa's institutional crisis.

- The solution is building convergence/synergy between adapted formal institutions and dynamic (renovated) indigenous institutions through institutional reconciliation.

II. Institutional Mapping Guidelines

Institutional Mapping, developed at the Desk Review stage, should provide initial insights concerning the following four issues, and suggest hypotheses for further exploration by the involved Working Groups. The key issues and relevant questions are:

1. What are the formal and indigenous institutions which impact on the identified sector?² Information to be provided at this Desk Review stage would emphasize the category of institution, as there may be institutional differences according to regions within a country. Questions which assist in this institutional identification process include the following:

---

¹ The Institutional Mapping rationale is based upon findings of a regional research program, Africa's Management in the 1990s and Beyond: From Institutional "Transplant" To Institutional Reconciliation, by Mamadou Dia, 1995

² The term institutions is used here in the broader, more comprehensive sense of the New Institutional Economics (NIE)—i.e., a set of structured and lasting patterns of behaviors/relationships (roles) which are: (a) guided and supported by broad societal values; (b) regulated by certain norms of conduct (rules); and (c) operationalized by organizations.
• What categories of formal and indigenous institutions exist at the sector level?

• What are the formal and indigenous methods to support provision of sector services?

• What are the formal and indigenous institutional linkages between the sector service and existing production systems?

2. How strongly do clients and communities ascribe to these respective institutions? This Desk Review stage should provide background information/hypotheses for the Working Groups to further assess the preference/demand side of institutional utilization. Questions which assist in formulating these hypotheses include the following:

• What is the legitimacy of institutions being used? Are they perceived as local or transplant institutions?

• What type of enforceability is required—participation and self-enforcement or leverage/conditionality?

• What level of institutional accountability is offered to clients? Are needs being met—those that should be met?

• Do institutional incentives re-enforce service to clients?

3. What points of disconnect/convergence are there between similarly focused formal and indigenous institutions? Hypotheses developed at this Desk Review stage should attempt to guide understanding of both the negative disconnects and the positive reconciliations, and reasons for the current status. Questions which assist in this clarification process may include the following:

• What specific categories (and proportionately how many) of formal/indigenous institutions provide similar services but presently do not interact with each other?

• What differences/similarities exist in institutional values which underwrite sector services?

• What points of conflict exist between formal and indigenous institutions concerning national sector policies and related activities?

• What points of reconciliation exist between formal and indigenous institutions concerning national sector policies and related activities?

• What Participation strategies were used to define reconciliation points? What coping strategies are used to mediate points of conflict?
III. **Next Steps**

- The Working Groups (WGs) will validate/expand the issues and hypotheses provided by the Institutional Mapping exercise through consultation with clients/beneficiaries at the field level. The same Institutional Mapping issues/hypotheses will contribute to the final formulation of the Sector Environmental Survey (SES).

- The validated and expanded Institutional Mapping exercise should contribute to the assessment of total *sector institutional capacity* necessary for the SIA Workshop to fulfill its objectives. Resulting Workshop decisions taken—with all institutional information in hand—will enhance sector performance.
APPENDIX II

WORKSHOP ROLES

Workshop Steering Committee: Includes members of the sector focal group and is chaired by the PS of the core sector Ministry (Workshop Director). It also includes: the Lead Facilitator, the Lead Rapporteur and the Chief Administrator. This committee serves as a coordinating body and will interact with the chair-persons for each session. The Committee meets regularly after each day of work to evaluate progress towards the workshop goals, discuss corrective action, and may be convened by its chairperson when and as needed. It will meet after the Workshop closes, on Friday afternoon to plan follow-up activities, such as production of Workshop Report and the Action Plan. The Workshop Steering Committee is advised by the Lead Facilitator.

The Workshop Director: Is the chief organizer with overall responsibility for the workshop. He/she should be a representative of the lead Government sponsoring agency and be familiar with the organization arrangements and should also be the chairman of the Workshop Steering Committee. He/she will open each session of the Workshop and introduce the Chairperson.

Session Chairperson: Each session (usually half-day Blocs) will be chaired by a person of considerable standing among the many constituencies represented. To the extent possible each session should have a different chairperson and it will be the Lead facilitator’s role to coach and advise the Chairperson before and during sessions. At times the facilitator may have to “forcefully” recommend decisive action on the part of the chairperson in order to preserve the momentum of the group dynamics, and ensure time management.

The Lead Facilitator: Is a contracted specialist in Group Dynamics and Workshop Facilitation who advises the Workshop Director from the moment that a workshop draft-project is issued. His first task is to comment on the project and manifest his willingness to assist in implementing the workshop as designed, or with any reasonable mid-course adjustments. In addition to advising the Chairperson, he will coordinate the network of facilitation-assistants recruited from among resource persons and technical staff from the Government and donor sponsoring organizations attending the workshop.

The Lead Rapporteur: Is a person designated by the Workshop Steering Committee, who will take responsibility for ensuring that the products (proceedings) of working groups and plenary sessions are collected and organized for the Final Workshop Report. He/she works closely with the designated rapporteurs of each small working group and, in coordination with the Chief Administrator (and the Conference Organization Contractor), guides the work of the pool of word processors. He/she will also manage the posting and/or reproduction of the products of the working-groups. He/she will be the Editor of the Final Workshop Report, which should be produced and distributed within one month after the conclusion of the event, in preparation for the follow-up workshop.

The Chief Administrator: Is the person who will liaise with the Facilities, Food/Beverage and the Conference Organization Contractors on all matters pertaining to logistics and the well being of participants.
Technical Staff: Members of the counterpart group and representatives of sponsoring agencies (including donors), attending the workshop will be assigned technical staff/facilitation roles. They will be instructed to participate in a supporting role rather than a proactive role. They will serve as assistant facilitators and may occasionally be called on to assist the working-group rapporteurs. They will be expected to contribute their particular expertise as the need arises during the workshop.

Working-Group Leader: Each working group will select their discussion leaders who ensures that the group concludes its task and moderates discussions. He may choose a secretary among participants to assist him and the group rapporteur.

Working-Group Rapporteur: Each working group will select a Rapporteur who will be responsible to produce the necessary materials and make a presentation to the plenary, reflecting the work of the group. The Group leader and Secretary will be expected to assist the Rapporteur.

Principal Contractors

The following services are most likely to be contracted out to competent individuals and/or organizations:

Lead Facilitator: A suitable expert should be contracted in his/her individual capacity. His/her TORs will follow the role description above and he will be expected to work closely with the workshop Director as well as the group of assistant-facilitators. Ideally he should start working closely with the ACBU Steering Committee and the Counterpart Group as soon as possible, especially on the discussion and review of this draft-project.

Facilities, Food and Beverages: A suitable conference facility/contractor, with ease of access should be selected among several bidders. "Touristy" places should be avoided, if possible. The facility should be comfortable (air-conditioned), with an adequate auditorium with capacity for 50 persons, a room for plenary sessions with capacity for 50 persons and at least 5 suitable conference rooms adequate for the working groups to work simultaneously. Food and beverages to acceptable local standards, coffee breaks to be included. Provisions should also be made, as per local customs for an opening/closing cocktail/social event, at the end of the first/last day for socializing purposes. The "opening" choice is recommended, since the luncheon on Friday will in effect serve the same purpose, and should help in ensuring full attendance at the closing activities.

Conference Organization: A contractor should be selected to organize and provide reception/registration services, communications, audio-visuals, and secretarial (word processing) and production/reproduction of documents with a capacity commensurate to the amount of documentation to be generate during the conference, which will deliberately be limited. OVERHEAD PROJECTORS, EASELS/PAPER/MARKERS AND SUITABLE SOUND SYSTEMS ARE ESSENTIAL.
## FIELD REVIEWS, MSP WORKSHOP PROGRAM

### Preparation Of Inputs For Workshop Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>WG1: MANAGEMENT AUDIT</th>
<th>WG2: SYMPTOMATIC PROBLEMS at point of service delivery</th>
<th>WG3: SECTOR-WIDE ADMIN SUPPORT SYSTEMS</th>
<th>WG4: STRUCTURAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Field Reviews:</strong> Each WG to comprise: a group leader + 5 core members, and may co-opt other staff or members when necessary. Support from MMD/CO liaison officers. Field Reviews to be conducted over a 2 month period, and WGs to meet a minimum of 5 times</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> To prepare the Management Audit Report as required by the PSRP. <strong>Existing sources of information:</strong> MOE draft policy document, ZAMIM and ZERP O&amp;M studies, and any other document that will be found to be relevant. A customized management audit survey of schools, districts and provinces.</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> To focus on problems at point of service delivery, also consider possible causes and implications for management of education policy. <strong>Existing sources of information:</strong> MOE staff own experience in such operation activities as decentralization as well as findings of various studies (ZAMIM, NIPA and ZERP studies)</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> To focus on problems of support functions such as personnel and financial management, policy and planning; consider possible causes and implications for management of education policy. <strong>Existing sources of information:</strong> MOE draft policy document, NIPA, ZAMIM and ZERP studies; own experience with sector-wide admin. support systems</td>
<td><strong>Goal:</strong> To focus on issues in the external environment with which MOE interacts in service delivery; consider possible causes for the issues and problems and their impact on the management of education policy. <strong>Existing sources of information:</strong> MOE draft policy document, own experience in operational activities, and all relevant studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WG Profiles</strong> to be circulated to the MASA workshop participants at least 10 days before workshop</td>
<td><strong>Core Team Composition:</strong> To include inspectorate, internal audit, personnel, and curriculum development.</td>
<td><strong>Core Team Composition:</strong> To include inspectorate, provincial and district education officers and PTAs</td>
<td><strong>Core Team Composition:</strong> To include inspectorate, personnel, accounts, teaching service commission, NCDP, MOF.</td>
<td><strong>Core Team Composition:</strong> To include senior MOE staff, and others from MOE agencies as well as external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Data from Sector Environment Survey (SES).
# MASA - Strategic Planning Workshop: Outline Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>DAY ONE</th>
<th>DAY TWO</th>
<th>DAY THREE</th>
<th>DAY FOUR</th>
<th>DAY FIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning Session</td>
<td>*Formal opening of the Workshop</td>
<td>*Task1: Syndicates to identify key issues at macro level (WG1 report) and relate to issues at micro level (WG2 report)</td>
<td>*Presentation of clustered institutional issues, and procedures for the day</td>
<td>*Task5: Syndicates to draw up preferred proposals and assign time scale and primary responsibilities</td>
<td>*Meeting of the expanded Steering Committee (Action Plan Committee) to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Presentation of objectives and program of the Workshop</td>
<td>*Report to the Plenary</td>
<td>*Task3: Syndicates to analyze problems/opportunities behind institutional issues (SWOT analysis)</td>
<td>*Report to the Plenary</td>
<td>*cluster proposed options in line with PSRP framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Summary presentations of reports of Working Group 1 to the Plenary</td>
<td>*Plenary</td>
<td>*Report to the Plenary</td>
<td>*Plenary agree on priority issues for restructuring process</td>
<td>*Prepare an Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Plenary</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Discuss next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afternoon Session</td>
<td>*Summary presentation of reports of Working Groups 2, 3, &amp; 4 to the Plenary</td>
<td>*Task2: Syndicates to relate issues raised in reports of Working Groups 3 and 4 to framework agreed in Task 1</td>
<td>*Task4: Syndicates to identify options for change action, then to consider their feasibility in terms of preset criteria</td>
<td>*Plenary discussion to agree on contents of proposed action plan for restructuring and reorganization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Report to the Plenary</td>
<td>*Revisit Mission and Objectives of MOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Official close of the Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening Sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix IV

METHODS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF FIELD REVIEW WORKING GROUPS

Data Collection for the PSRP Management Audit (MA): Working Group 1

The MA is a standard PSRP (Component I) requirement for all ministries. The normal conduct of the MA involves consultants hired and supervised by MDD/CO. Under the MASA design, WG1 conducted the MOE MA, and addressed the same areas of inquiry as required by the PSRP. Accordingly, a survey instrument was designed and sent out to all Provinces for onward distribution to all Districts and Schools. The purpose of the survey was to collect data pertaining to:

- the existing organizational structure of MOE;
- staff size vis-à-vis the authorized establishment;
- the size and allocation of the actual budget;
- physical infrastructure and assets;
- mission and objectives of the ministry; its legal status;
- channels of communication; and
- the legitimate functions of its top managers.

Since the MASA working groups were encouraged to use various means of generating information, WG1 went beyond collection of physical data and solicited views about MOE from key stakeholders. Accordingly, they interviewed client ministries, individual citizens and some of the donor representatives. In addition, a representative sample of MOE staff was interviewed to gauge their perceptions about the existing organizational framework. The observations of the respondents are provided in a summarized form in the report of WG1. Finally, the group consulted various documents that were relevant to its work.¹

Midway through its work, WG1 foresaw that it might not be possible to collect and analyze the required data from all the nine provinces in time to circulate the MA report for the MSP workshop. Thus they concentrated on a sample of three Provinces plus MOE headquarters. The sample was then analyzed as a representative of the larger picture, and general conclusions drawn about the MOE's organization. Meanwhile, data collection in all other provinces continued, since it would be required to feed into the implementation of the post-MSP workshop activities, including the Action Plan as well as MOE's restructuring.²

¹ Documents include the Act of Parliament that establishes MOE; the Manifesto of the ruling MMD Party; Annual Budgets and Audit Reports; Staff Registers; etc.

² Data from almost all provinces was in Lusaka by the time participants returned from the MSP workshop.
Symptomatic Problems at Point of Delivery: Working Group 2

In looking at the Symptomatic Problems of Education at Points of Delivery, WG2 focused on different problems that are encountered by both staff and clients in day-to-day experience. Service delivery was defined as the process of bringing about "learning" by students in the education system. The "points of delivery" were identified on the basis of outputs at two levels:

- primarily, at the basic point of contact between the teacher and the student; and
- secondarily, at any point where the basic support services to schools are discharged.

Symptomatic problems therefore, fell under two broad categories, that is, those that directly pervade learning at school and in the classroom; and those that impede efficient execution of managerial functions that provide the prerequisite services to school management and the learning process. The categorization may appear as an over-simplification of symptomatic problem areas, but that was deliberately done in order to streamline the information for processing.

WG2 was overwhelmed by the magnitude of information collected regarding the symptomatic problems at the "learning" and "support services" points. This was partly a demonstration of the gravity of the situation in the education sector; and partly showed how the problems were obvious to them, both as MOE staff and as parents. WG2 consulted documents, interviewed and discussed perceived problems within and outside MOE with teachers, interest groups, individuals and selected representatives of various education institutions.

System-Wide Administrative Problems: Working Group 3

WG3 focused on sector System-wide problems, with particular attention to issues of personnel, financial management, policy and planning, and organizational systems. The group utilized previous studies done for, among others, various departments at MOE headquarters and its affiliated executing units; and also interviewed the major stakeholding interest groups. They also collected and reviewed internal MOE operational data to guide them in their deliberations. Core members of this group were drawn from mid-level managers conversant with the operations of functional departments and divisions.

WG3 collected extensive data regarding the systemic issue areas. However, the work of this group was briefly interrupted during the second week of the Field Review due to the

---

3 Teacher absenteeism is an example of a symptomatic problem that has a direct bearing on the learning process; while failure of payroll administrators to deliver pay to teachers in time and at their schools is a managerial symptomatic problem that affects the provision of a basic prerequisite (i.e. salary) for education delivery.

4 These include the Examinations Council, Continuing Education Department, Curriculum Development Center, School Guidance Services, Zambia Library Services and the Educational Broadcasting Services. Interest groups include the Teacher's College Lecturers' Association and the Zambia National Union of Teachers.
involvement of most its members in the R&D Task-Force activity. They were engaged in orientation seminars for the establishment of District Education Management Boards in the Copperbelt Province on a pilot basis. Nevertheless, they were able to produce an exhaustive report. It is interesting to note that though most of WG3 members were drawn from among MOE's mid-level functional managers, they produced an openly candid rendition of system-wide problems in the education sector.

The Structural Issues and The Sector Environment Survey: Working Group 4

The fourth working group was aided in its task by the Sector Environment Survey (SES). WG4 examined structural and environmental issues bearing on service delivery. The task centered mainly on MOE's interaction with internal and external elements that shape the interface relationship between the education sector; other ministries that play a supporting role to education delivery; and the attitude of the general public towards MOE's performance. Four interface elements were selected, namely, transparency; participation; institutional coordination; and socio-cultural attitudes.

The SES and the Education Sector Profile were developed by the Desk Review; and were guided by variables included in Box 1, 2 and 3 Chapter II, section 1, on IEAs and Tiered Analysis for data gathering on the governance and institutional environment of the education sector. First, a profile of the education sector was derived from internal World Bank documents on Zambia as well as other generic publications about education management. Then, an outline for the survey was developed out of the profile. The profile and the survey outline were utilized together to develop the survey instrument. Though the survey was primarily intended to generate data for feedback to the ultimate MSP workshop participants, it was customized to the sector's service orientation.

The essence of the customization of the survey, was to extend the application of the SES concept of generic SIAs to solicit the perceptions of key stakeholding groups in the education sector. Although the results of the survey were the primary source of WG4's work, the group consulted various documents, and closely monitored political pronouncements and media articles. Appendix IV is the survey package, which includes the Education Sector Profile, the Outline of the Survey Instrument, the Survey Instrument and the report of WG4 to the MSP

5 With MASA in progress, this was justified by the preexisting resolve to decentralize education delivery.

6 The survey was conducted by a WB consultant and a senior MOE official. As a resource person, the WB consultant provided inputs into the WGs, attended most meetings of WG4 and assisted in the facilitation of the workshop.

7 Initially, the outline covered (a) Symptomatic Problems as Points of Delivery, (b) System-wide Administrative Problems, and (c) Structural-Environmental Problems. Later, the symptomatic problems at points of delivery was dropped from the outline, because of a recent report by Zambia Institute of Management (ZAMIM) which had adequate coverage of information needed by WG4.

8 Key stakeholders interviewed include the Teaching Service Commission, Churches, NGOs, the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Teachers' Union, PTA, the Federation of Employers, Local Authorities, Traditional Institutions, Members of Parliament, Private Schools Association, key Line Ministries, MOF, CO, NCDP, the Preschool Association, and YWCA.
workshop. Furthermore, the detailed report of the Sector Environment Survey (SES which is discussed under section IV, 3, (b) was made available to workshop participants.

**Working Group Tasks**

WG tasks were executed with due care to minimize the effect of group work on the normal duties of members. The EU grant provided some financing for data collection, preparation and circulation of documents to be attained with minimal strain to MOE's budget. Discussions were characterized by an atmosphere of cooperation and serious-mindedness. Assignments were given at the end of sessions and members asked to report in the following meeting. WGs made satisfactory progress despite difficulties associated with participatory work. The following was accomplished:

- **Consultations:**

  Consultative sessions brought together all WGs and towards the end, with ECDPM consultants and World Bank representatives. WG leaders also attended consultations between MOE, MDD/CO, the WB and ECDPM, held in the last week of group work to review progress and the MSP workshop program.

- **Preparation of Reports:**

  Although group work was not intended to generate reports, the plan was to have written products (in outline form) ready for circulation at least ten days before the MSP workshop. The objective was to allow time for participants to read and acquaint themselves with the issues raised by the WGs. Typing and printing bottlenecks caused delay in the production of reports which were circulated two days before the MSP workshop leaving little time for preparation.

- **Preparation of Presentations:**

  Since the reports were unfortunately longer than expected, WG Leaders prepared short presentations (out of their executive summaries) for Day One of the MSP workshop. The presentations were aimed at highlighting the key issues, leaving participants to comment and make additions with the help of the detailed WG reports in hand.

---

9 A working group is already in itself, a "multi-constituency": the WG must not only act fairly to allow each member the chance to be heard, but also reach a consensus on various opinions contributed by members; and ultimately, adopt certain issues, perceptions and positions as "group products".
I. Education Sector Profile

**THEME:** *Deterioration and Inability to Revitalize the Education System*

Summary of Symptoms at Points of Delivery

1. **Decline in quality of education**
   --Teaching is driven by the quest to have students pass examinations, and hardly according to the curriculum.
   --Quality-enforcing inputs, such as school supervision, are weak.
   --Inspection is gravely inadequate; inspectors lack logistical support, are too few, and are poorly trained (in 1990 only 20% of primary and 12% of secondary schools were inspected).
   --High teacher absenteeism shortens hours of instruction.

2. **Inadequate supply of textbooks, teachers' guides and basic teaching materials**
   --Critical shortage of core items and supplementary materials.
   --Lack of secure storage facilities for existing materials.
   --Difficulty in distribution of materials, especially to rural schools.
   --Problems more severe in Primary Schools than Secondary Schools.

3. **Failure to rehabilitate existing facilities and build new ones**
   --Classrooms are overcrowded.
   --Teaching day is shortened to allow for triple/quadruple sessions.
   --Many schools are without washing facilities, have missing, blocked or over-used toilets, which constitute a serious health hazard.
   --Environment-related illness, including cholera, dysentery, resistant strains of malaria, and scabies are responsible for school closures or/and widespread absenteeism and low concentration on school work.
   --Due to lack of desks, pupils bring a brick or a sack to sit on; or are not registered until they bring their own desk or seat.

4. **Relative higher vulnerability for girls due to inadequate gender-sensitivity.**
   --Girls miss classes during menstruation due to improper facilities.
--Girls' raw scores in all the national examinations are consistently lower than those for boys, in every subject and in every province.
--Overall, there is lower participation of girls in education.

5. Delays in start-up of secondary school classes because of bottlenecks in the examination process.

--The Examinations Council of Zambia (ECZ) has inadequate technical capacity to play its role.
--On average, there is a three-month delay in processing of examination results.
--Underlying managerial problems undermine the operations of the ECZ.

6. Decisions that are inappropriate for efficient management of education delivery.

--Basic Schools create management and pedagogical problems because they fit poorly in the education system.
--Education expansion undertaken without adequate analysis of implications.

Summary Systemic Problems

Personnel System:

1. Teachers' records poorly kept, data on teachers unreliable or incomplete; and cannot be used as an input into staffing, deployment and personnel management.

--There are distortions associated with policies governing teacher deployment e.g. the preponderance of female teachers in urban areas due to policy guaranteeing employment when their spouses are transferred.
--Teachers spend long hours away from their schools following up on administration matters, such as salaries.

Financial System:

2. Inadequate fiscal discipline.

--Leakages in the long chain of flow of funds from MOF to the school.
--Erratic allocation of funds to various items of expenditure.

Education Service:

3. MOE has inadequate policy management and planning capacity (including weak policy analysis and under-supply of managers with the requisite skills and training).
--Absence or underutilization of structures that would provide senior officers with information for policy formulation and implementation; as well as identifying, anticipating problems and setting priorities.
--Lack of comprehensive, reliable and up-to-date data; when available, data is hardly analyzed and utilized except in the most elementary level.
--Education officers at MOE and in the field are poorly trained for their role: most of them take on new responsibilities without any systematic, substantive preparation.
--Appointment as a school head is effectively for the remainder of the individual's teaching career.
--Appointment as a school head is based largely on seniority and not on demonstrated management skills.
--Between 1975-1985 virtually no funds were spent on the maintenance of primary schools.

Summary of Structural Impediments

1. There is poor flow of information from the center to the schools.

   --Since donors have better analytical insights into the education system than MOE itself, the education development program is almost entirely donor-driven.
   --Parents and Teachers are hardly kept informed on important decisions on a regular basis and in time to adjust to changes; and are not solicited for feedback.

2. There is poor coordination between government institutions in the education sector.

   --Policies relating to teachers are currently poorly coordinated.
   --There are several other ministries besides MOE that deal with certain aspects of education delivery with little or no coordination.
   --Inadequate consultation with private educational institutions.

3. Education is not easily accessible.

   --In urban areas, more than 20% of 7-year-olds cannot be admitted into Grade I.
   --The location of urban schools effectively discriminates against poor families in educational provision.
   --Some socio-cultural attitudes work to the disadvantage of the girl-child.

4. Inadequate resource augmentation from the non-government sector.

   --Community interest in providing for primary education has waned.
--Vandalism and theft affect almost all schools.

Crisis Summary:

1. Crisis of Quality
   --shortage of education materials,
   --crumbling physical infrastructure, and
   --low morale among education personnel.

2. Crisis of Access
   --resilience of the sector to expand without new investments.

3. Crisis of Financing
   --prolonged economic decline versus population growth,
   --steep decline in government spending on education,
   --decline in real income of teachers (wages lost 40% of their purchasing power between 1971-1985; and by end 1989 had fallen to a quarter of its 1989 value), and
   --crowding out of non-salary expenditures: primary education teachers' salaries absorb about 97% of the primary education recurrent budget.
2. Outline for the Survey Instrument

System-wide functions

1. **Financial management**: (a) resource allocation; (b) expenditure (A&A, procurement) practices at national, provincial and district levels; (c) leakage of funds during disbursement; and (d) financial accountability.

   **Proposition:**
   (i) Provision of education is a function of an effective financial management system.

   --policy: what determines/guides the amount of resources allocated to the education sector?
   --size of the budget: what percentage of GNP/Public Expenditure is allocated to the ministry?
   --indicators: is resource allocation commensurate with population growth, educational needs of the economy, and government policy?
   --financial regulations: what is the status of A&A practices in the education sector (ministry, province, district, schools)?
   --procurement: how transparent/cost effective is procurement, storage and supply of education materials?
   --leakages: what/how is the role of the province and districts in facilitating disbursement of funds from the ministry to the schools?
   --accountability: could one conclude without doubts, that there is financial accountability in the education sector?

2. **Organization and Management of Education**: (a) ministry of education; (b) at provincial level; (c) at district level; (d) school management and ownership; and (e) attitude of teachers and administrators towards work.

   **Proposition:**
   (ii) Provision of education is a function of organizational and managerial capacity/effectiveness.

   --structure: how does the organizational structure of the education sector affect the primary functional objectives (planning, teaching, curriculum development, examinations and inspection)?
   --decentralization: what is the role of districts/local authorities and the private sector in providing education?
   --cost recovery: are Zambians able to contribute to education costs?
   --participation: are communities, PTAs etc. organized to contribute to planning, delivery and development of education?
   --productivity: could one conclude that the work behavior of most teachers and administrators is in accordance with their responsibilities?
3. **Access to education**: (a) catchment areas/distance education; (b) equity of access; and (c) gender/socio-cultural issues.

**Proposition:**
(iii) Provision of education is a function of *fair access* to educational facilities.

--location: what determines the location of schools?
--facilities: is the provision of new classrooms, schools, materials and teachers in line with population growth/settlement patterns?
--rural/urban contrast: are education services in remote rural areas as good as those in the urban centers?
--cross-services: any coordinated plans with public services providers e.g. health, water, energy, road, housing, community development etc.?
--selection: is there equity and transparency in selecting students to higher education?
--gender issues: what are the opportunities for females given the socio-cultural context?

4. **Teaching staff**: (a) teacher training and development; (b) personnel management, deployment and promotion; and (c) conditions of service.

**Proposition:**
(iv) Provision of education is a function of *quality and morale* of the teaching staff.

--employment: is teacher recruitment supply or demand driven?
--competence: do teachers at different levels of educational institutions satisfy their job qualifications?
--training: are teacher training programs and facilities adequate and/or appropriate?
--merit: what influences or/and determines decisions on deployment and promotion of teachers?
--motivation: are conditions of service providing an enabling framework for teachers to handle their work-load?
--management: are teachers' records maintained and regularly updated?

5. **Administrative staff**: (a) recruitment and development; (b) management system; and (c) conditions of service.

**Proposition:**
(v) Provision of education is a function of *effective administrative support* provided to the teaching process.
--employment: is recruitment of administrative staff matched to the needs of teachers/schools?
--competence: do administrative staff have appropriate skills to support educational needs?
--career development: do administrative staff benefit from staff development schemes?
--merit: is personnel management based on impersonal rules and regulations?
--motivation: are conditions of service attractive enough to retain qualified people in the education sector?

Structural environment

6. Coordination: (a) inter-ministerial e.g. Health, Water, Energy, Works, Local Authority and Housing, Higher Education and Vocational Training, CO/MDD, etc.; (b) with Provinces, Districts and Local Authorities; and (c) with communities.

   Proposition:
   Provision of education is a function of effective coordination of activities with other organizations that provide critical services.

   --horizontal/line ministries: development plans effectively synchronized so that schools are built where other crucial services are available?
   --vertical/provinces and districts: do districts and local authorities contribute to provincial and national plans?
   --horizontal/vertical: how is the education sector coordinated at different layers of authority?
   --grass-root participation: are parents, communities and NGOs fully involved in providing education?

7. Transparency: (a) in the way that administrative support functions are carried out by senior management; (b) in the way that selection of students for promotion is undertaken by MOE (especially the Examination Council); and (c) in the relationship between MOE and the general public.

   Proposition: Provision of education is a function of an effective mechanism of transparency that provides the appropriate information required by interested stakeholders.

   --enrollment and promotion of students: is it done through an open system? Is adequate and precise information on enrollment and promotion available on demand?
8. **Participation**: (a) of local communities in the affairs of their neighborhood schools; (b) of the general public in debates about education policy, service delivery, and other sensitive issues; (c) of professional associations such as PTAs and NGOs, especially those who deliver education (like churches, and private individuals who run schools) in making useful ideas to improve efficiency.

**Proposition**: Provision of education is a function of **effective participation of the public in bridging the resource gaps and providing feedback** to MOE on the condition of service delivery.

--empowerment: are communities and local authorities empowered to organize themselves and participate fully in affairs pertaining to education service delivery?
--incentives: are there any incentives to motivate the public in general and parents and communities in particular, to get involved in education service delivery?
--mobilization and sensitization: are parents, communities, local authorities and the public in general mobilized and sensitized in order to get involved and contribute to education provision?

9. **Socio-Cultural Attitudes**: (a) in terms of the value that people place on education for their children; (b) in terms of the cultural values that negatively impact education, or could play a positive role in tapped and utilized for service delivery; (c) in terms of gender issues, especially if certain cultural practices disadvantage children of either gender; (c) the general attitude of the public concerning the role of the government in providing education; and (e) in terms of the values that staff in the education sector bring into their jobs.

**Proposition**: Provision of education is a function of **positive cultural values (and effective discouragement of negative cultural values)** that facilitate the convergence of the curriculum and socio-cultural milieu.

--incentives for educating children: do parents value education as a key to advancement? Does the economy offer appropriate employment for school graduates? Does child labor interfere with education delivery?
--traditional culture: are cultural tradition an impediment for education? Are there any traditional values or institutions that could be usefully utilized for service delivery?

--gender issues: is the girl child disadvantaged? Is the boy child preferred in terms of the readiness of parents to educate their children? Is the girl child vulnerable to and unprotected against teenage pregnancy?

--welfare and free-riders: does the public expect the government to provide free education? Are scholarships and fellowships equally available to potentially bright students (irrespective of their parents’ status)?

--managerial values: to what extent do cultural values affect managerial and professional performance of teachers and supporting administrative staff?

**Note:**

The substance of the variables under *legitimacy and rule of law* are covered above, under the system-wide functions. Accordingly, accountability features under financial management; and accessibility under access to education. This however, does not preclude the possibility of developing extra hypotheses for testing the impact of the structural environment on the education sector.
3. Survey Feedback Instrument

NOTE: This instrument is designed for survey-feedback, with the objective of presenting the results back to the respondents as a group and drawing conclusions on the extent to which institutional distortions imbue the Education Sector in Zambia. This is not a normal statistical survey as in representative sample models.

Introduction:

The questionnaire is designed to confirm facts/events, gauge perceptions and values, and establish certain practices.

FACT/EVENT: Measured by FREQUENCY.
Scale: Always[1], Usually[2], Sometimes[3], and Never[4].

PERCEPTION: Measured by RESPONSE/CERTAINTY.
Scale: True[1], Mostly True[2], Mostly Untrue[3], and Not True[4].

VALUE: Measured by RESPONSE/INTENSITY.
Scale: Strongly Agree[1], Agree with Reservations[2], Disagree with Reservations[3], and Strongly Disagree[4].

CAUSES OR PRACTICE: Measured by FREQUENCY.
Scale: Always[1], Usually[2], Sometimes[3], and Never[4].

It is anticipated that the instrument and the responses will stimulate discussion about the institutional environment in the Education Sector and the way it affects the education system.
Please circle one:

THE STRUCTURAL ENVIRONMENT
(socio-environmental inputs)

I. TRANSPARENCY

1. "Some of the public schools are better than others; and excess demand for better schools creates an incentive for school authorities to extort something from parents."
   True Mostly Mostly Not
   True Untrue True

2. "Public servants in the education sector deliberately place personal interests above public service out of economic necessity since they are not rewarded properly."
   Strongly Agree with Disagree with Strongly
   Agree Reservation Reservation Disagree

3. "Selection and promotion of students are entirely impartial and determined on the basis of students' examinations results."
   Always Usually Sometimes Never

4. "More transparency in the Ministry of Education, the Examinations Council and Schools would ensure merit and equity in enrollment, promotion and selection."
   Strongly Agree with Disagree with Strongly
   Agree Reservation Reservation Disagree

5. "Education is delivered without administrative secrecy; rules are openly applied and everything is communicated to ministry staff, local governments, schools and parents."
   True Mostly Mostly Not
   True Untrue True

6. "All education sector personnel take time to explain to the public the difficulties they face in seeking to provide better service."
   Always Usually Sometimes Never
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II. PARTICIPATION

7. "Communities are politically organized and disposed to undertake such activities as participation in school affairs and provision of advice and feedback on education."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. "Government through policy, has actively integrated communities' deep interest in participating in the affairs of their neighborhood schools."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. "The private sector is eager to augment government resources in providing education, and will in fact do so if given the chance."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree with</th>
<th>Disagree with</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. "National education policy provides a clearly defined role for private sector involvement in delivering education."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. "The value attached to education highly motivates communities as well as the private sector to contribute to the burden of the cost of education."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree with</th>
<th>Disagree with</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. "Inputs from PTAs and local institutions are effectively incorporated into the design and management of the education system."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. "Decisions by education authorities in the Ministry, Provinces and Districts rely on professionally analyzed data rather than the need to satisfy relatives and political peers."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
14. "There is public awareness and policy effort to ensure that children go to school in good health and well fed; and thus well prepared for the learning process."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. "All parents strive to expose their children to preschool experience before their first grade enrollment."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. "Nobody cares about school property being vandalized because neighborhood children hardly get enrolled in nearby well maintained or rehabilitated schools."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree with Reservation</th>
<th>Disagree with Reservation</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. "Resource constraints lead to inadequate security around the schools, hence vagabonds are motivated to vandalize property."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. "Communities have lost hope in education for future prospects of their children, hence, have no incentive to volunteer against vandalism of school property."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree with Reservation</th>
<th>Disagree with Reservation</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

III. INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION

19. "Having more than one ministry in the education sector improves the management of education delivery."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. "We have effective policy guidelines that facilitate efficient coordination between the Ministry of Education, the Local Governments and School authorities."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
21. "Effective government coordination has ensured excellent budgetary allocation for national education, consistent with the mission of the Ministry of Education."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. "As schools are built, other ministries provide all related services such as health facilities, housing for teachers, water, energy and good roads."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

23. "Leaders in ministries, provinces and districts are held accountable if they do not play their clearly assigned roles and tasks in delivering education."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. "Donors have more and accurate information about the education sector than the government."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. "Data from donor-funded studies is openly disseminated to all layers of government structures as well as various groups involved in the delivery of education."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

26. "Since the government is not effectively delivering the required services, improperly coordinated donor/NGO activity tends to drive the education sector."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. "Evidently, our education system is driven by the demand of the labor market as well as accurate projections of the economy."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Untrue</td>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. "Among the rural and urban poor, parents prefer to have their children helping with farm work and small business than going to school."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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29. "Since schools are too far away, children in remote rural and high density urban areas help their parents until they are big enough to walk the distance."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. "Our agricultural production cycle has a tradition whereby during certain critical seasons rural families count on child labor."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree with</th>
<th>Disagree with</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. "Urban poverty and decline in living standards of formal sector employees is increasingly drawing school-age children into petty jobs and juvenile truancy."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. SOCIO-CULTURAL ATTITUDES

32. "Most Zambians strongly believe that education is highly rewarding and is the key to advancement and development."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. "The government sees education as a critical public investment upon which rests the future of the nation."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. "Education is pursued for enhancing skills and knowledge, and not for the sake of getting a certificate that will guarantee a government job."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree with</th>
<th>Disagree with</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. "Parents hesitate to educate girls because customarily, once they are married all benefits accrue to their husbands' clans."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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36. "Women would hardly pursue professional careers since society expects them to value marriage more than education."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree with Reservation</th>
<th>Disagree with Reservation</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

37. "Boys get priority in education because of inheritance rules; whatever they gain stays with the clan."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Mostly Untrue</th>
<th>Mostly Not</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38. "It is highly risky to spend meager resources on girls' education as chances of drop-out due to pregnancy are very high."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Mostly Untrue</th>
<th>Mostly Not</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

39. "Educating women means educating society given the preponderant roles they play in our socio-economic activities."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree with Reservation</th>
<th>Disagree with Reservation</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

40. "The public and education authorities are aware of predatory male behavior on school girls hence, something is being done to prevent the devious behavior."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

41. "School pregnancies are due to social circumstances beyond control; thus it is reasonable to provide a re-entry for teen-age mothers."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Mostly Untrue</th>
<th>Mostly Not</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

42. "Members of Parliament understand the importance of education for the future of the nation, as reflected by extensive debates and strict follow-ups on the sector."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
<th>Mostly Untrue</th>
<th>Mostly Not</th>
<th>Mostly True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
43. "Allocation of resources in the education sector is driven by power play among bureaucrats and politicians rather than by policy priorities."

Strongly Agree with Disagree with Strongly Agree
Reservation Reservation Disagree

44. "The scope of government involvement in education delivery should be re-cast; with the Ministry of Education preferably assuming a policy management role."

Strongly Agree with Disagree with Strongly Agree
Reservation Reservation Disagree

45. "The decline in education is a sectoral manifestation of grave distortions that generally affect public sector management."

True Mostly Mostly Not
True Untrue True

46. "Though absolutely aware of the environmental problems that permeate the public service, we have not evolved appropriate systems for bringing them out openly."

True Mostly Mostly Not
True Untrue True

47. "The government is instituting appropriate measures that will ultimately arrest and reverse the decline in the education sector."

Strongly Agree with Disagree with Strongly Agree
Reservation Reservation Disagree

48. "All my superiors and colleagues are seriously committed to the reform of the education sector, thus willing to sacrifice for its success."

Strongly Agree with Disagree with Strongly Agree
Reservation Reservation Disagree

49. "I am totally confident that we own this process of change, and therefore, obliged to implement all assignments with diligence."

True Mostly Mostly Not
True Untrue True
Appendix VI

ISSUES RAISED IN THE MSP WORKSHOP IN CONNECTION WITH THE MANAGEMENT AUDIT

Mission and Legal Framework

The mission and legal framework supposedly justify the existence of the sector ministry; and define the regulatory framework under which its mission is discharged. WG1 traced the mission and legal framework to the Education Act, Cap. 234 of 1966; which established MOE. In the Act, the mission is provided as "...promotion, development and control of schools, educational institutions and services." The Act has been revised thrice, namely, twice in 1970 and 1972. Under a standard format used to establish ministries by legislative acts, it provides MOE's legal framework by outlining the statutory bodies, the functions of the Minister and the Permanent Secretary. Finally, the "parent" Act empowers the Minister of Education to make subsidiary legislation to facilitate the smooth conduct of the Act.

The recent draft policy document proposes the mission as "... to provide a professional environment for the acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitudes." WG1 also traced elements of MOE's mission to the Manifesto of the ruling MMD, and in recent pronouncements of the Minister of Education. It became apparent from the recent mission proposals that a new vision about MOE's future was evolving. WG1 highlighted all these mission statements for the MSP workshop to consider; and later, MOE's mission was revisited and reformulated; and a new one recommended for adoption.

Policy Goals

The mission and legal framework in turn, provide the guiding principles for the formulation of policy goals. It is in the continuous process of relating MOE's mission and legal framework to actual needs of education delivery that new policies emerge, and these in turn, influence changes in the mission and legal framework. WG1 referred to the draft policy document which is detailed, and contains MOE's current concerns and strategies for revamping the education sector. Moreover, the document states that the new government policy on education will be guided by the following principles:

- **Liberalization:** This will entail diversification of school curriculum, production and distribution of teaching and learning materials and encouraging individual and community participation in providing education;

---

1. Given MOE's legal status, any changes bearing legal consequences have to be tabled before the Parliament.

2. Article 17 of the Act grants the Minister excessive power by stating that "... the determination of the Minister upon any matter under this part shall be final and shall not be called in question in any court of law."

3. Among the documents distributed to workshop participants MOE decided to include the draft policy document which was being finalized at the time.
- **Decentralization**: This will concern devolving power of decision making to the local levels as well as facilitating monitoring and supervision in performance and resource utilization; and

- **Cost-sharing**: This will involve encouraging communities, beneficiaries and private entrepreneurs to pay towards the cost of providing education and training.

The effort to launch District Education Management Boards for example, initiates the irreversible movement toward changing the role of MOE in order to realize the new policy goals. The MSP workshop was informed that the draft policy document would definitely be reviewed in order to incorporate the outcome of the MASA process.

**Ministry Objectives and Monitoring Mechanisms**

Policy goals would presumably inspire MOE's objectives and the mechanisms for monitoring their performance. During the Field Review, WG1 could not find a systematic outline of MOE's objectives. Based on the current organization, whereby 16 heads of units and 9 Provincial Education Officers were each reporting directly to the Permanent Secretary, WG1 observed that the objectives of the ministry were arbitrary. On the basis of WG2 and WG3 reports, monitoring mechanisms are either absent, or insignificant. For example, District Education Officers who are closer to schools are unable to perform their monitoring functions because they have no means to reach their schools. The inspectorate staff are situated at MOE headquarters and hardly move around for similar reasons. Finally, the procedure that was supposed to discipline teachers is cumbersome and vested in the Teaching Service Commission, which is outside MOE structures.

The 1966 Education Act that established MOE does not expressly mention the objectives of the ministry. It all depends on the interpretation of the Act. Likewise, the draft policy document does not provide the objectives in a clear outline. It all depends on how objectives are deduced from the wealth of strategic activities that are recommended for MOE to revamp the sector and deliver better services. Hence, the objectives had to be identified, a task that was successfully accomplished later in the MSP workshop.

**Organizational Structures**

The objectives and monitoring mechanisms are, in turn, supposed to derive MOE's organizational structure. To illustrate the extent to which MOE structure was unclear, WG1 "estimated about 10 departments" at MOE headquarters; and an annex to their report had an organizational chart showing 16 units of different status and 9 provincial education officers falling directly under the Permanent Secretary. Stakeholder views collected by WG1 described MOE as "a very disorganized ministry"; and "a ministry with plenty of overlapping functions."
WG1 referred to the draft policy document, which proposed to rationalize MOE's structure into 8 departments.

Organizational restructuring is the goal of Component I of the PSRP, and MDD/CO requires an indicative new structure to emerge out of the Strategic Planning (SP) workshop. In the case of MOE, the MSP workshop had been customized to meet the requirements of the PSRP, and at the same time, to prepare the ground for MOE's own managed change action. In addition, MOE already had the R&D Task-Force, implying that restructuring was accepted and supported. A participant caused laughter when he disclosed that he was a Provincial Education Officer without a province; and hence, restructuring should start with him. It was with that level of awareness and enthusiasm that a new organizational structure was proposed later in the MSP workshop.

Resource Base

The operational functions of MOE were supposed to determine the magnitude of resources needed to achieve the desired objectives. It was evident from the Desk and Field Reviews that MOE was operating under conditions of increasing demand for education against a dwindling resource base. In an attempt to satisfy the demand, resources were being thinly spread across the sector, resulting in arbitrary allocation and unrealistic budgets. A clear illustration was the uncoordinated mushrooming of departments and "hijacking" of funds at MOE headquarters. If the budget is to be taken as the primary management tool, then MOE's financial situation provides an intuitive insight into the way education delivery is managed.

WG1 reported an increase in the budget of MOE as a percentage of total public budget from 15% in 1990 to 22% in 1994. The increase however, was nominal; and neither reflected sustainability in service maintenance, nor a real increase in services proportionate to the increase in demand for them. For example, it was reported that salaries "swallow up" most of the budget, leaving very little for maintenance and improvement of education services. Yet, the UNICEF representative at the MSP workshop reminded participants to consider the effect of future population increase against continuing decrease in funding, which would imply reduced quality of education; less investment in education; and rapid deterioration of the teaching stock. The reminder was important because as a share of the GNP, education expenditures have declined steadily since 1982, with the exception of 1991 when there was a small recovery to 3.7%. They fell back to 2.5% in 1992 and 2.3% in 1993.

4 Even the draft policy document does not give the exact number of MOE departments. Actually, the draft proudly states, "...The MOE Headquarters boasts of several departments. The most important of these are:..." However, it criticizes the organizational structure as "... top heavy in every sense of the word."

5 WG2 reported that budget outlines do not reflect the actual needs, thus leaving "... too much room for biased allocations."

6 Zambia devotes under 2% of its GNP to education, against population growth of 3.4%; and it is in stark contrast to that of Kenya, Tanzania and Zimbabwe where education's share of the GNP in 1990 was 6.8, 5.8, and 10.6 %, respectively.
In terms of human resources, it was clear from WG1 that the exact staff inventory was not known. The report estimated that MOE employed over 70,000 workers; out of whom over 52,000 were teachers, over 10,000 were civil servants, and "the rest" were general workers. The management audit survey data that continued to trickle back from the provinces was expected to provide reliable information. WG1 was asked to ensure that a full inventory of personnel was ultimately obtained from the audit exercise.

Management Systems

Organizational structures and the resource base would presumably fashion the management systems that MOE managers could use to deliver outputs outlined in policy goals and objectives. The "sector-specific support systems" would include monitoring mechanisms which ensure that the output targets are realized. Since the management audit was focused on inventories and organizational charts, an outline of sector-specific management functions and procedure did not come out clearly from WG1's report. However, by relating the staff inventory to the organizational charts and functional structures under which they were listed, the sector's support systems could be deduced from the management audit data as follows:

- Procedures (system) for school buildings development and maintenance;
- Procedures (system) guiding procurement of education materials and teaching equipment;
- Procedures (system) for testing (examinations) and curriculum development;
- Procedures (system) for in-service teacher training and career development;
- Procedures (system) for inspection, evaluation and counseling; and
- Procedures (system) for regulating the registration of schools and enrollment.

The data however, only showed staff and asset allocation to different functional systems, and did not in itself show the limits and weaknesses of such organization. Though the leader of WG1 observed that the sector support systems were being affected by the inadequate resource base (under-staffing and insufficient budgets), the identity of problems as they influenced the processes in education delivery could only emerge in the report of WG2.
WORKSHOP ISSUES ARISING OUT OF THE
SECTOR ENVIRONMENT SURVEY

Transparency

The trademark of transparency is information, implying, its availability on demand, its regularized and known channels, and the establishment of formal government practice of getting both its staff and the public well informed. Inadequate information framework is one of the factors that undermines accountability. When the general public is not adequately informed, it develops apathy about government. Apathy intensifies the lack of accountability, and erodes the professional ethics and positive work attitudes that are critical for the performance of public service. Thus, improved access to information as well as better quality of information are crucial for holding public officials responsible for their actions.\(^1\)

There were mixed perceptions regarding transparency in education delivery. More than a third of all respondents reacted negatively to the statement that education is delivered without administrative secrecy; and that rules are openly applied, and everything is communicated to MOE staff, local governments, schools and parents. Among those who reacted positively, albeit with reservations (40.7%), there were comments pointing to the lack of proper and adequate communication channels. The responses were attributed by WG4 to the lack of confidence among MOE staff to take responsibility for their performance; a weak Public Relations Office; and the absence of mechanisms for debating education management and dissemination of such discussions on a regular basis.\(^2\) The fact that lack of transparency conceals deviant behavior was confirmed by responses to the statement that MOE staff deliberately place personal interest above public service. More than a third of them strongly agreed; while 46.3% agreed with reservations.\(^3\)

Thus, the need to improve the flow and availability of information in the education sector clearly emerged from the survey. Given the growing democratic environment, MOE could seize the opportunity and involve the burgeoning media to play a positive role in generating and disseminating information. Such improvements would facilitate interactive involvement of the general public, enhance accountability and ultimately ensure that MOE staff respond properly to the requirements associated with effective delivery of education.

---

1 Refer to World Bank Technical Paper No. 225, which identifies accountability and information as the most critical needs for good governance (p. 13-14).

2 For example, an important decision had been made by MOE (without any public debate) concerning cost sharing. Though parents are required to pay for teacher education in 1995, the decision had not been communicated to the general public as late as October 1994.

3 In another statement, most of the respondents (40.7% "true" and 38.9% "mostly true") acknowledged the existence of bribery during enrollment (especially, in well rehabilitated schools). The World Bank funds a rehabilitation project.
Participation

Respondents had mixed perceptions regarding participation of communities, PTAs, local authorities, and NGOs. However, it was clear from their responses that the potential for the participation of the public in education delivery has not been fully mobilized. Although it was observed in additional comments that hard times and poverty undermine the cost-sharing ability, most respondents (27.8% strongly agreed and 53.7% agreed with reservations) perceived that education is highly valued. Despite economic hardships, the high value attached to education ought to play a motivating role for communities to contribute to the cost burden of education. Agreeably, respondents were very positive (48.1% strongly agreed and 42.6% agreed with reservations) about the eagerness of the private sector to augment government resources to the provision of education.  

The main stumbling block seems to be the absence of institutionalized processes that would facilitate participation. When reacting to the statement that "...Communities are politically organized and disposed to undertake activities such as participation in school affairs and provision of advice and feedback on education", 31.5% responded "not true" and 24.1% responded "mostly untrue". Thus, more than a half of the respondents did not perceive communities as adequately empowered and predisposed to participate in service delivery. For example, very intuitive comments were given regarding vandalism of school property. It was observed that security guards employed by MOE are notorious for absenteeism, while those employed by PTAs (through self-help programs) are punctual and disciplined; and this happened despite PTAs paying relatively lower than MOE.  

It is ironical that the public is eager to contribute, but the government is unable to tap communities and the private sector effectively. Though it is standard to explain that institutions at local level are stifled by technical deficiency (especially in the rural areas), survey results suggest that lack of empowerment is a major disabling factor. Some respondents commented that even the decision to set up Local Councils was precipitated by the need to satisfy demands for democracy rather than sharing of operational responsibilities between central and local governments. If democracy is to serve communities, then, there should evolve watchdog mechanisms that enable people to demand accountability and, hence, better services for public resources.

Nevertheless, in aspects where communities have been allowed and encouraged to mobilize, for instance PTAs, there has been a remarkable and positive input into school management. Though the over-centralization of MOE has been pointed out as a leading factor; the absence of a deliberate and well-defined participatory strategy is a significant

4 Federation of Employers and Zambia Chamber of Commerce respondents requested a meeting with the survey team. They threw in a number of ideas, including the establishment of a Trust Fund and a Scholarship System under independent boards that would ensure that bright-but-poor children get the best education.

5 Recently, community neighborhood watch units have been formed by citizens to combat the increasing wave of crime. It indicates that with proper mobilization people can contribute actively to delivery of public services.
impediment. The significance of strategy was raised by respondents with reference to the role of the private sector as provided by the national education policy. Although most respondents perceived that policy somehow defines that role, they observed that a totally different type of mobilization was needed to secure the constructive involvement of the business community without making education delivery profit-motivated.

**Institutional Coordination**

Survey results indicate that there is little, if any, coordination between institutions at different levels. First, there is a problem of coordination among the five ministries that deliver various elements of education. Almost 60% of the respondents did not perceive that having more than one ministry would improve the management of education delivery. Second, there is a problem of coordination between MOE and MOF. Almost 80% of the respondents indicated that it was untrue that there was "effective government coordination to ensure excellent budgetary allocation for national education, consistent with the mission of the Ministry of education". Thirdly, there is a problem of coordination among sector line ministries which have to function in tandem with MOE in providing the vital support and infrastructure services to education delivery. Managers in sector line ministries are hardly held accountable for failure to execute their roles, especially in the provinces and districts.

At another level, survey results array inadequate institutional coordination between the managers of education delivery and the beneficiaries --including the economic sectors. For example, 40.7% of the respondents said it was not true that the education system is driven by the demand of the labor market. In additional comments, respondents from the Zambia Federation of Employers said that they could hardly employ school graduates without training them in basic skills, such as bookkeeping. They also pointed out that despite official declarations about diversifying the economy to rely more on agriculture (and less on mining), Zambia did not have a single secondary school with a bias towards agriculture. However, other factors mitigated the ability of the sector to adapt to the education needs of the economy. The demand for child labor, for instance, traditionally a rural phenomenon (children helping parents in farm work during certain seasons), has spread into urban areas. As families struggle to make ends meet, more and more juveniles find their way out of school and into petty trading. Poverty is a growing problem that requires the attention of national leaders.

---

6 For example, it was learned during the survey that MOE had embarked on formation of District Education Management Boards without the involvement of District Councils and Local Authorities.
7 Refer to footnote 10, for the list of ministries with education portfolio in their budgets.
8 Some of the responses were qualified with comments that lack of accountability was a government-wide problem. Civil servants are hardly held accountable for their performance.
9 WG4 in their discussions suggested that institutional coordination was exacerbated by the absence of channels of communication/information. If within MOE information flow and reporting channels are hazy, it would hardly be possible to evolve any meaningful inter-institutional coordination.
Zambia is facing increasing demand for education against a dwindling resource base. The hard challenge demands better institutional coordination that would facilitate prudent management of resources. Woefully, the survey results highlight inadequate coordination of government activity ranging from policy formulation, planning, resource allocation, implementation to harmonization of activities with donors, NGOs, Local Authorities and Communities. Even if sectoral reform and more financial accountability might improve the cost effectiveness of education delivery, there is need to maximize available resources across sectors. Intuitively, there would be better chances of this happening if the perceptions generated by the MASA process could be shared with other sector ministries. Thus, it is advisable that the PSRP attempts a mid-stream IEA.

**Socio-Cultural Aspects**

Survey results strongly indicate that negative ethical values affect education delivery. Most of the respondents (50% "strongly agreed" and 29.6% "agreed with reservations") observed that allocation of resources in the education sector is driven by power-play among bureaucrats and politicians rather than by policy priorities. It was, nevertheless, perceived that the decline in education was not isolated, but part of the general decline in public sector management. Accordingly, 53.7% and 42.6% responded "true" and "mostly true" respectively to the statement that the decline in education is a sectoral manifestation of grave distortions that generally affect the public sector. The awareness of environmental problems notwithstanding, almost all respondents perceived that there has not evolved any appropriate system for bringing problems out openly.

In a favorable response to the PSRP, most respondents had positive perceptions that appropriate measures were being instituted by the government to ultimately arrest the decline in the education sector. Nonetheless, a strong majority responded that the scope of government involvement in education delivery should be re-cast, with MOE preferably assuming a policy management role. Additional comments showed overwhelming support for decentralizing education delivery. Decentralization was based on the argument that it was a requisite mechanism for enhancing participation, transparency, accountability, and the responsiveness of the civil servants to client needs. These traits would in turn, arrest the

---

10 Pursuing behavioral change in one sector ministry is akin to "fencing it off" like an enclave. As it is evident from the survey, without proper and adequate inputs from other sectors and institutions, one ministry can hardly perform its services effectively, let alone to sustain sectoral reform.

11 By implication, this means that arresting the decline and revamping the education sector would require a comprehensive effort aimed at improving the performance of the government as a whole. It is important to note however, that the trend in sectoral reform can provide lessons for comprehensive reform.

12 In an attitudinal survey in 1992, Monte Palmer reported that government services were found by the majority of the public (client) respondents to be unsatisfactory; and the public service was found to be neither transparent or accountable.
decline in ethics, the upsurge of personal interests over public interest and various cultural influences that negatively impact on education delivery.

Finally, it was perceived by most respondents that Zambians value education highly as a key to advancement and development. Some respondents, however, mentioned the impact of current low and unrealistic wages as well as rising unemployment as factors contributing to mounting frustration about the role of education in development. In relation to educating women, most respondents perceived the girl-child as culturally disadvantaged relative to the boy-child because of the role the girl plays in helping her mother with household chores after school. Yet, almost all respondents appreciated the importance of educating women, given the preponderant roles that they play in Zambia's socio-economic activities.

Respondents' Suggested Solutions

During the interviews, most respondents suggested solutions they perceived would address some of the problems, as well as improve MOE's performance in service delivery:

- Mobilize and inform the public so that people understand that school assets are public property, paid for in taxes. Public responsibility however, can best be secured with community participation (i.e. decentralize education delivery);

- MOE managers entrusted with change and reform need to learn from countries where decentralization of social sectors to local authorities has been a success. Such countries include South Africa, which though is still beginning, has in place clear constitutional provisions and policy strategies on how to attain that objective;

- PTAs should participate in the District Board structures so as to safeguard their positive contributions in School Management Committees;

- Education budget should reflect the cost per student per day, rather than being fixed arbitrarily by MOF. This will enable the public to see and fill the resource gap between what the government can provide and the actual student needs;

- Reduction of primary education into three basic “Rs”: reading, writing and arithmetic. Given resource constraint, the curriculum should reflect how best resources can be allocated so that schools produce skills that are of immediate relevance to the economy;

- Formation and management by the private sector of an “Education Trust Fund” that will make private sector involvement in education non-profit. The system could as well provide scholarships to poor but brilliant children as well as run a bursaries program;
• Reduce government working day to equal the remuneration of public servants, that is, allowing staff to work for less hours/days so that they can spend the rest of their time in other productive activities (a version of UK’s flextime);

• Introduce an administrative analog to the cabinet to bring together technocrats from different ministries and enhance coordination. (Currently, the CO Chief Secretary calls meetings of the Permanent Secretaries on an ad hoc basis, and the content and agenda of the meetings is not known beforehand);

• MOE should help the private sector to secure land for building schools. Also MOE should include teachers from private schools in staff development programs, including training, scholarships, seminars and workshops;

• Develop biases in secondary education, with a focus on commerce (commercial skills, accounting skills) and agriculture. (It was pointed out that some donors were ready to turn the closed Kabwe Mine into a technical college, but there was no response from the government);

• Review teacher salaries and link pay to performance. (It was recalled that teachers used to be role models, playing leadership and mobilization functions; but their social status has been eroded by decline in conditions of service);

• Vandalism was perceived as a result of social anger, apathy, financial leakages, and ownership. It has been suggested that MOE should let schools hire and fire guards even if their salaries are paid for by MOE;

• Decentralization should be followed by empowerment of local authorities to help mobilize and manage resources. The government should provide technical personnel to monitor, supervise and advise;

• Involve traditional institutions, such as Chiefs, in mobilizing public awareness about education, especially, in rural areas;

• Revamp and strengthen the Education Broadcasting Services (EBS) to make use of on-going revolution in information technology; and

• Restructuring of MOE should introduce an “Education Services Division” for effective operational coordination of the central mission of education delivery.

Almost all of the respondents' recommendations found their way into the final products initiated by the MSP Workshop. This suggests that the SES was able to impact the participants as a survey-feedback mechanism. Moreover, the SES confirmed the proposition of the Desk Review, i.e., the utility of understanding the interface between transparency; participation; institutional coordination; and socio-cultural attitudes, and the six managerial assumptions, namely, the effectiveness of the financial management system; organizational
and managerial capacity; fairness of access to educational facilities; quality and motivation of the teaching staff; efficiency of administrative support provided to the teaching process; and the effectiveness of coordination functions with all institutions that provide critical inputs into education delivery.

The presentation of WG4 acknowledged that in order to improve the management of education delivery, MOE should be thoroughly restructured. However, the leader of WG4 emphasized that since serious inadequacies in the traits of good governance underlie and exacerbate MOE's poor performance, improving the technical capacity to deliver services would definitely require parallel effort at improving governance. The inextricable interaction between functional-managerial inputs and transparency, participation, proper institutional coordination and positive socio-cultural attitudes on education delivery was well grasped by the MSP workshop participants, as illustrated by the products they initiated, and their perception of the efficacy of the MASA process.  

13 Refer to “Management Audit and Self-Assessment (MASA): A Preliminary Process Evaluation” provided as Appendix IX.
MASA WORKSHOP PRODUCTS

(i) Steering Committee Objectives Proposed for MOE

1. To formulate, analyze education policies.
2. To plan and coordinate education delivery.
3. To develop curriculum.
4. To identify education materials.
5. To test and evaluate learning.
6. To control the quality of education.
7. To mobilize and manage financial resources.
8. To develop and manage human resources.
9. To manage material resources.
10. To provide support administrative services.
11. To provide education to the disadvantaged and vulnerable groups.
12. To open dialogue with the public on education information.

(ii) Adopted Objectives for MOE

1. To formulate, analyze and review educational policies within the framework of national development policies.
2. To plan, provide and coordinate education delivery at all levels.
3. To develop a relevant, flexible and diversified curriculum for Pre-school, Primary, Secondary, Teacher and Continuing Education.
4. To approve, develop and provide educational materials.
5. To assess and evaluate teaching and learning.
6. To mobilize and manage financial, human and material resources through appropriate institutions in a decentralized system.
7. To provide and ensure that education is non-segregative to all Zambians.
8. To promote community participation in educational provision including exchange of information.
9. To facilitate and provide education to the disadvantaged and vulnerable groups.
10. To control the quality of education at all levels of education delivery.
11. To promote a reading culture, continuing and in-service education and adult literacy.
12. To facilitate building and maintaining educational infrastructure.
13. To develop and manage human resources for the education system.
14. To provide administrative and ancillary support services to the Education System.
15. To promote and strengthen communication between the MOE and community.
## WORKSHEET FOR OBJECTIVE REFINEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>CONSTRAINTS/OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>CAUSES</th>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>ACTION PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO IS RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>WHO ELSE MUST BE INVOLVED</th>
<th>RESOURCES REQUIRED*</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>PROJECTED END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (a) Finance; (b) Personnel; (c) Building/Equipment; (d) Other (specify)
### GROUP 1

**Objective 2: Plan, Provide and Coordinate Education Delivery at all Levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>CONSTRAINTS/OPPORTUNITIES</th>
<th>CAUSES</th>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. That the MOE has the capacity to implement the objective, i.e:</td>
<td>1. Lack of skilled manpower</td>
<td>1. Poor conditions of service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Appropriate adequate skilled manpower is available.</td>
<td>2. Inappropriate and inadequate organizational structure</td>
<td>2. Lack of a job evaluation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Adequate funds are available on schedule.</td>
<td>3. Inadequate and irregular availability of funds.</td>
<td>3. Inappropriate Education Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Adequate teaching/learning resources are available.</td>
<td>4. Inadequate infra-structure and logistical support</td>
<td>4. Weak economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Appropriate institutional framework and infra-structure is available.</td>
<td>5. Lack of an appropriate Management Information System</td>
<td>5. Lack of clear guidelines on coordination on use of donor funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) A supportive Education Policy is in place.</td>
<td>7. Poor coordination in the use of donor funds</td>
<td>6. Lack of appreciation of the status of Education (poor attitudes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Appropriate Organizational Structure in place.</td>
<td>8. Poor work ethics in MOE</td>
<td>7. Lack of an efficient and open Appraisal System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Logical support is available</td>
<td>9. Lack of defined descriptions</td>
<td>8. Lack of incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accurate, relevant and timely data/information is available, e.g., computers, telefax, etc.</td>
<td>10. Lack of relevant information and communication technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive work ethics are present in staff at all levels.</td>
<td>11. Low morale among staff in MOE leading to high attrition rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Adequate community participation</td>
<td>12. Lack of community participation system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Up-to-date legal framework in place.</td>
<td>13. Out-dated legal framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opportunities**

1. Conducive political and economic
2. Availability of donor good will
3. Availability of independent local consultants
(ii) STRUCTURE OF MOE PROPOSED IN THE DRAFT POLICY DOCUMENT

PERMANENT SECRETARY

- Curriculum Development (CDD)
- Standards and Evaluation (SED)
- Research/Dev. & Planning Unit (RDPUD)
- Finance/Accounts (FAD)
- Administration (AD)
- Personnel PD
- Continued Ed. 7 Audio Visual Services (CEAVSD)
- Special EDU SPED

- Curriculum Dev.
- Guidelines for performance & achievement
- Syllabuses
- Prepare indicators of performance & achievement
- Est. Standards
- Monitoring
- Evaluation
- Financial Planning and Budget
- Educational Planning
- Research
- Technical Cooperation
- HQ Administration
- Provincial Admin.
- Appointments
- Promotions
- Discipline
- Correspondence
- Skills Centres
- Public Educ. through Radio, TV
- Coordinate Personnel Issues from mana. Boards
- Pre-Sch., Disabled Guidance and Counselling gender
1. To formulate, analyze and review educational policies within the framework of national development policies.

2. To plan, provide and coordinate the delivery of education at all levels.

3. To develop a relevant, flexible and diversified curriculum for Pre-school, Primary, Secondary, Teacher and Continuing Education.

4. To develop, provide and approve educational materials.

5. To assess and evaluate teaching and learning.

6. To mobilize and manage financial, human and material resources through appropriate institutions in a decentralized system.

7. To provide non-segregative education and training to all Zambians.

8. To promote community participation in educational provision including exchange of information.

9. To facilitate and provide education to the disadvantaged and vulnerable groups.

10. To control the quality of education at all levels of education delivery.

11. To promote literacy, adult education and a reading culture.

12. To facilitate the building, rehabilitation and maintenance of educational infrastructure.

13. To develop and manage human resources.

14. To provide administrative and ancillary support services to the Education system.

15. To promote and strengthen communication between the Ministry of Education and community.
I. Introduction

1. This is an evaluation of a customized Institutional Assessment (IA) process, the Management Audit and Self-Assessment (MASA) of the Ministry of Education (MOE) in the Republic of Zambia. The evaluation is based on the analysis of a survey of the MASA participants conducted at the end of the concluding workshop. MASA was conducted as part of Phase I (Restructuring) of Zambia's home-grown Public Service Reform Program (PSRP). With a sector-focus, MASA is an innovation that added an element of a participatory self-assessment to the traditional Management Audit (MA). The evaluation was primarily intended to gauge the effectiveness of a participatory process in conducting a diagnosis of sector institutions as well as its influence on attitudes towards reform, participation, commitment and prospects for implementation of the post-workshop change process; and secondarily, to examine the suitability of MASA in preparing the ground for, and coupling sector reform into the comprehensive government-wide reform --relative to non-participatory methods.

2. MASA was also intended to benefit the World Bank's Structured Learning (SL) exercise, which seeks to systematically gather and assess data regarding the effectiveness of innovative approaches to Institutional Development. The SL exercise involves careful specification of issues to be addressed, which are in turn formulated into hypotheses to be tested and validated. It also involves collecting and analyzing data to assess the validity of the hypotheses. A pioneer exercise of evaluating an innovative participatory process was done by Robert Beschel Jr. of EDIDM during the World Bank's first Institutional Environment Assessment (IEA) in The Gambia in November 1993; and his work provided the framework that has been applied in the present evaluation.

3. In the original version of the MA, the Management Development Division of the Cabinet Office (MDD/CO), which is the implementing agency of the PSRP, is responsible for overseeing that a MA is carried out, and organizing and facilitating a Strategic Planning (SP) Workshop for the restructuring ministry. Aided by the Management Audit Report the SP workshop participants brainstorm for three days; and come out with an Indicative Strategic Plan for their ministry. This is used as an input by the Organizational Systems Department of MDD/CO, for drawing up the Strategic Plan of the ministry. The strategic plan outlines the ministry's new mission, goal(s), objectives, resources that will be needed for realizing the objectives, and the operational structure.

4. In the IA/MASA innovation, the added element of a participatory self-assessment facilitated the involvement of MOE Working Groups (WGs) in pre-workshop preparatory activities. The WGs brainstormed using various sources, including documents, to produce four inputs into the SP workshop, namely, the Management Audit Report; and three detailed profiles of Symptoms at Point of Delivery, Management Systems Problems, and
Environmental Problems. The MASA-SP workshop climaxed the IA process; and through a method of tiered analysis by small Syndicate Groups, the four-day workshop initiated two products that met the requirements of MDD/CO as well as an Action Plan for MOE’s own-managed change activity.

II. Hypothesis Testing

5. Participatory methodology in up-stream project planning and preparation is advocated on two grounds: (a) in the normative sense, there is value in involving various parties who will be responsible for the implementation and sustainability of the projects as well as beneficiaries and stakeholders; and (b) in the instrumentalist sense, there is a greater likelihood of success since participation, inter alia, generates ownership of the projects/programs and hence, commitment for their effective implementation. As a sector-customized innovation, MASA was designed to substitute the involvement of a broader section of education sector staff, beneficiaries and stakeholders, for the standard management audit conducted by external consultants; and a strategic planning workshop in which tiered analysis replaces unstructured brainstorming.

6. Attachment I lists the hypotheses that were examined in the process evaluation. The central hypothesis is that an IA based on participatory method for environmental data collection and systematic (tiered) analysis, enables a more effective diagnostic procedure and subsequent reform process for sector institutions than standard management audits that are based on independent (consultant) data collection and analysis. If that is true, then IAs in general and MASA in particular, are better suited than MAs for inception of effective reform of sector institutions that provide the foundation as well as sustainability of comprehensive and strategic government-wide reform such as Zambia's PSRP.

7. Also examined were the intervening hypotheses that contain the assumptions that validate the accuracy of the central hypothesis. Participatory diagnostic process is likely to improve the flow of information; or, if there was none, help establish information channels among participants and within their sector. During pre-workshop preparatory group-work horizontal as well as vertical information flows may increase, as participating staff, who are drawn from different departments and levels of management, brainstorm together. At the MASA-SP Workshop, upward and downward flows of information between senior decision-makers, middle-managers, and the rank-and-file staff, may lead into better program/project design. Finally, it is expected that if the participatory momentum gained in the process is maintained well into the post-SP workshop reform phase, monitoring and feedback will continue to flow from lower levels to senior management officials; while managerial operational goals, objectives, directives and priorities flow downward, thus enhancing implementation and sustainability.

8. Greater information flow will raise the awareness and interest of sector staff about the change process to follow. Since the bulk of information emanates from contributions generated by each one of them, the participatory process engenders a sense of ownership and therefore, commitment. Ownership "earned" through involvement in up-stream initiatives
builds the stakes that will motivate participants to commit themselves to hard work and ensure the success of the program/project.

9. A participatory process however, is likely to have a cost element. It is most likely that during the preparatory stage, participatory projects/programs are likely to take longer and hence, become more costly. Cost accrues partly due to the time needed for group work; and partly due to the need to build consensus around change actions and make inclusive the expectations of multiple constituencies in the reform process. This may result into complicated Action Plans that will tax the capacity of the reformers. Moreover, for those who used to enjoy the prerogative of planning and managing implementation, participation might be seen as an "encroachment" of their turf; and may react with possible attempts to ignore or circumvent the process. Consequently, participatory programs may provoke opposition from government authorities that may affect their approval.

10. Finally, a cost element may emerge in relation to the ultimate implementation of a participatory project/program. Awareness and expectations build the stakes that motivate participants into involvement and commitment. Thus attempts to modify or side step the recommendations of the participants may undermine the sense of ownership and seriously affect project/program implementation and sustainability. The process is therefore likely to require in-built mechanisms to facilitate continued participation of groups right into the implementation stage.

11. Attachment II provides the list of variables that were used to assess the MASA methodology. The emphasis is on the participatory process as it establishes the ground for sectoral reforms. Though up to the time of the MASA-SP Workshop it may be too early, and hence, premature to gauge the probability of the success of education sector reform, it is still proficient to make an assessment of the MASA process and establish its effectiveness as a diagnostic tool; and the extent of its solidity as a foundation that secures subsequent reform strategies.

12. In this evaluation, five variables were selected: (i) the participatory nature of the process in terms of collective data collection and tiered analysis; (ii) the relative suitability of the MASA process for preparation of comprehensive reforms; (iii) ownership and commitment; (iv) upward and downward flow of information; and (v) process costs and expectations. Participants were surveyed and their responses were tabulated and analyzed. Attachment III lists the survey questions that were used to probe the views and beliefs of the participants regarding each of these issues; and the results are discussed below.
III. Participatory Nature of the MASA Process

13. Two dimensions are helpful in evaluating the sector-focused MASA participatory process: On the one hand, is the **breadth or scope**, by which MASA involves more people than the MA in preparing sector reforms. The breadth can be measured by comparing the number of participants vis-à-vis the total number of individuals who have a stake in the outcome. On the other hand, is the **depth or degree**, to which MASA is a better diagnostic and analytical tool for sector institutions than the MA. The depth can be determined by comparing the outputs produced at different stages of the two methods. The difficulty that may be experienced in trying to involve each and every individual who has a stake in education needs special mention, since as a social sector ministry, it touches the lives and interests of all the people. Attachment IV lists the stakeholders that were involved. It is important to look at the scope and depth of the MASA process in contrast to the traditional MA; and the carefully chosen representatives of various groups that have "leading" stakes in education delivery.

14. In terms of the **scope**, MASA was definitely an improvement over the traditional MA, because whereas the MA is conducted by an average of two to three external consultants hired by MDD/CO, the preparatory phase of the MASA process involved twenty core members. Moreover, the core working groups were free to, and did co-opt additional members. Regarding **coverage**, unlike the MA consultants who concentrate on the ministry's physical, financial and human resources, MASA Working Groups' data collection was extended to cover the entire MOE organizational system as well as external stakeholder groups involved in education delivery. In terms of **depth**, again MASA had more pre-workshop reports compared to the traditional MA. While external consultants produced only the MA report as the basis for brainstorming at the SP workshop plenary sessions, MASA Working Groups came out with the MA report as well as profiles of symptomatic problems at points of delivery, systemic problems at management level, and structural problems. Moreover, at the MASA-SP (MSP) Workshop, the brainstorming exercise was structured through a **tiered analysis** in Syndicate Groups.

15. The analysis used two main indicators to assess the relative degree of participation. The first was to consider the medium through which key stakeholders articulated their concerns and preferences. Attachment IV shows the modes of involvement, namely, the Sector Environment Survey, preparatory Working Groups (the management audit survey was conducted by one of these groups), and the MSP workshop. The right hand column of Attachment IV indicates which medium was used to involve a particular group. Out of the 50 MOE workshop participants more than 25 were involved in the pre-workshop WGs; and more than two thirds were covered by the Sector Environment Survey. There is a notable limited involvement of MOE's rank and file; and the explanation is that since the process involves a survey-feedback technique, the target was middle and high level management staff. The views of the rank and file, especially, teachers, were solicited through their union.
16. The second indicator was to use survey data to assess the extent to which the respondents perceived the process to be open and participatory. Accordingly, when asked, "Do you feel that the process to date has been truly participatory, in that there has been a free and equal exchange of views among participants in the MASA exercise including the workshop so far?", the majority of the MSP workshop participants responded positively: While 20.5% responded "definitely", 48.7% responded "mostly", 20.5% responded "somewhat", only 10.3% responded "not at all". The reservations were expressed in relation to respondents who felt that they should have been included in the pre-workshop working groups; and the absence at the MSP workshop of some stakeholders, especially, the PTA, Employers' Association, Churches, Zambia Consolidated Copper Mines (ZCCM, which runs its own schools) and the association of private schools (PRISCA). Stakeholder views however, were solicited in a Sector Environment Survey, which provided the core input into the work of one of the preparatory working groups.

17. In my view, the targeted groups for this particular process were well involved. Out of the 26 potential stakeholding groups, all of them were contacted to give their opinion. Although only 34.6% of stakeholding groups were involved in-depth, 50% of the key stakeholding groups were involved in depth. This is associated with the targeted nature of the MASA methodology, in which the intention was to deepen and broaden both the level of participation and diagnostic analysis --relative to the traditional management audit.

IV. The Relative Suitability of the MASA Process

18. Apart from acknowledging the participatory nature of the MASA process, most of the participants responded positively about the usefulness of the MSP workshop structure, and mentioned the tiered analysis as one of its major strengths. They answered positively to the questions regarding the workshop program; and were exceptionally impressed by syndicate sessions. Reacting to the question, "Did you find the syndicate sessions useful in identifying, elaborating and processing the issues to be addressed in reforming the delivery of education in Zambia?", 48.7% responded "definitely" and 48.7% responded "mostly". Besides recommending more time for syndicate sessions, respondents commended the SWOT exercise (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) as a very useful and suitable analytical method for syndicate tasks.

19. Positive responses regarding the structure of the workshop correlated with positive reaction to the efficacy of the process, namely, coverage of issues, deliberations and feedback, and ability of participants to identify concrete measures for reform. When asked, "Do you feel that the list of issues at the point of delivery of education services as delivered in the workshop so far, are in your view, valid?", 52.5% responded "definitely" and 42.5% responded "mostly". Moreover, 35.1% and 48.7% responded "definitely" and "mostly" respectively to the question, "Did you find the workshop sessions so far helpful in generating relevant discussion, deliberations and feedback regarding institutional issues in which performance could be improved?". Thus as a result of adequate coverage and processing of issues, respondents were able to rank three concrete measures that MOE should implement as
(1) restructuring of the education sector, (2) seeking budgetary increase and improving
resource allocation and (3) decentralization. Given their reading of the institutional
environment, 71.5% perceived that radical reform of MOE was "essential for Zambia to
implement its education policy and manage its education system".\footnote{It is interesting to note the absence of "conditions of service" among the top three. The fourth in line was training. This may partly be explained by participants' reading of the government's financial position, or they are waiting for phase II of the PSRP (performance management), which will include pay linked to performance.}

20. The suitability of MASA for preparation of an effective sector-reform strategy and its
ultimate linkage to comprehensive, government-wide reforms was also verified by testing the
qualitative change that individual participants have experienced due to the process. As
reflected in response percentages shown under the last bullet of para. 23 below, the process
had an attitudinal impact on more than 90% of all participants, with two thirds of them
strongly ("definitely" and "mostly") influenced.

21. Despite individual commitment to change expressed, optimism on the probability of
reforms succeeding was modest. When asked about the chances for the reform of MOE and
education delivery system succeeding, 5.1% responded "very strong", 59% responded "good"
and 35.9% responded "50:50". In qualifying their responses, some participants attributed the
limited optimism to the presence of what was termed as "dead-wood" within the ranks of
MOE's top management; and may also be partly explained by an element of mistrust
discussed in para 23. Probability of internal MOE resistance (rather than external obstruction)
was verified by responses to the question of the chances of all workshop recommendations
being approved by higher authorities, to which almost 85% were in the "very strong" and
"good" category. The responses suggest that participants perceive the threat to the success of
sector reform as relatively an internal problem of implementation than approval by higher
authorities. The feeling that some colleague within MOE was bent on frustrating change was
also expressed in responses to the questions of ownership and commitment which are
discussed below.

V. Ownership and Commitment

22. There is a critical link between ownership and commitment. In order for reform to
take place and be sustained, a solid core of senior civil servants and mid-level managers
should strongly support the reform initiative. Support cannot be forthcoming without
commitment to the reform process; and commitment in turn, can hardly evolve if the
managers do not feel that they own the change process. Thus it is commitment "earned"
through ownership that motivates those who will have a direct responsibility for
implementing the reform program.

23. Ownership and commitment are also linked to the process of changing managers'
attitudes towards work. Participants were asked questions intended to test the hypothesis that
the MASA diagnostic procedure facilitates the implementation of Phase II of the PSRP
(Performance Management), because (a) it engenders a greater level of ownership and
commitment, mobilizing internal forces for reform; and (b) it goes beyond providing the requirements for Institutional Restructuring to laying the ground for attitudinal and behavioral change that is necessary to introduce a management culture appropriate for performance and incentive management. The following were their specific responses:

- On the **importance of reform** in general, 71.8% responded that radical reform of the MOE is essential for Zambia to implement its education policy and manage its education system; while 25.6% responded that it is important to Zambia's policy management of the education system. Only 2.6% said it was not critical to improve management of the education system. Asked how urgent MOE should be reformed, 70% responded "urgently (i.e. within the immediate future)"; 27.5% responded "soon (i.e. within the next 1-2 years)"; and 2.5% responded "at some point". Nobody responded "never".

- Regarding the **necessary extent of reform**, respondents ranked "organizational restructuring and staff right-sizing at all levels" as the first; followed by "major changes to MOE's mission and legal framework"; the third, "managerial improvements within MOE's discretionary powers to improve performance" (i.e. MOE's own change activities); the fourth, "major changes in the system of incentives and conditions of service"; finally, "higher professional standards and dedication of civil servants in the ministry.

- Concerning the **initiative for the participatory approach**, 33.3% responded that the initial impetus "was clearly an initiative of MOE"; while 63.9% responded that "it was inspired and developed in close collaboration between MDD, MOE and the World Bank as part of the implementation of the PSRP. The 33.3% can be explained in terms of MOE's own activity at the time of the MASA process, and which included formation of District Education Boards; and the task was being managed in a participatory manner by a Restructuring Committee. The "inspirational collaboration" that is captured by the 63.9% vindicates that MOE was well consulted. What is evident in summing the two response groups (97.2%) is that they feel MOE fully owns the process.

- Ownership has to be reflected in the **level of commitment**; and responses on personal commitment were positive, with 86.8% describing themselves as "strongly and personally committed to the need for reform"; and the rest (13.2%) describing themselves as "sympathetic to the need for reform".

- There was however, an element of **mistrust** regarding colleagues. Only 35.3% described their colleagues as "strongly and personally committed to the need for reform"; 44.1% described their colleagues as "sympathetic"; while 8.8% described their colleagues as "indifferent or uncertain about the need for reform"; and 11.8% described their colleagues as "skeptical". The description is brighter regarding immediate superiors, with 67.6% describing them as "strongly and personally
committed"; 18.9% as "sympathetic"; and only 5.4% and 8.1% as "indifferent or uncertain" and "skeptical", respectively.

- The problem of mistrust is also discerned by comparing how respondents describe their immediate superiors vis-à-vis senior MOE officials. In contrast to favorable rating regarding immediate superiors (67.6%), only 28.2% believe that most senior MOE officials are "strongly and personally" committed. While 48.7% believe that most senior officials are "sympathetic"; 12.8% and 10.3% believe that they are "indifferent or uncertain" and "skeptical", respectively. Again, in terms of the level of priority, only 30.8% were of the judgment that most senior MOE officials attached reform of education delivery with "fundamental, over-riding importance to Zambia's development".

- The element of mistrust is again prevalent on measures that respondents are ready to take to promote reform as well as their willingness to take risks for the sake of reform. While they displayed readiness to make sacrifice and take risks; they did not perceive in their colleagues the eagerness to take similar measures. Accordingly, respondents ranked, first, that they would personally "work unpaid overtime late evenings and weekends if necessary", and second, "pursue reform efforts during normal business hours". Colleagues however, were believed to prioritize "work paid overtime", followed by pursuing reform "during normal business hours".

- Again, while 36% responded that they "would be willing to work to reform the system even at the risk of alienating my superiors", only 8.1% believed that colleagues would be willing to do the same. And whereas 41% responded that they were "willing to make a modest contribution to the process of reform, as requested"; a high 70.3% perceived that colleagues were willing to do likewise. This implies that while most respondents radiate their willingness to "go the extra mile", they see their fellow staff as unprepared to do the same.

- The good news however, is that none perceive themselves or their colleagues as not "willing to commit themselves to advancing reform at this time". The bottom line is that every respondent is ready, and thinks that others in the ministry are in a certain degree of readiness. Nevertheless, if most respondents believe that whereas their immediate superior is committed, the colleague and the most senior official are chancy, then there is need to deal with the problem of mistrust. Besides encouraging team-building/work among colleagues, open and regular lines of interaction between top, mid-level managers, rank-and-file staff and stakeholders, --including concrete "bridge-building" and sensitization measures (workshops, seminars, retreats, bulletins) are required. A process of dialogue in the education sector could greatly improve trust and cooperation.

- As already shown in para. 20, the critical question concerned the impact of the MASA process. When asked, "do you personally feel more committed to the
process of reforming the way the education system (and delivery of education) is managed than you did prior to the MASA including the workshop so far?", 40.5% responded "definitely"; 35.2% responded "mostly"; 18.9% responded "somewhat"; and only 5.2% responded "not at all". It could not be evaluated whether the "not at all" participants were already heavily committed ever before; or that they remain non-committed despite the process. However, a high 75.7% (definitely/mostly) were positively affected; hence, vindicating that the MASA process engenders a greater level of commitment.

VI. Flow of Information

24. The assumption that diagnosis conducted through wide participatory processes will facilitate the flow of information was tested in relation to (a) upward flow, that would enable program planners to design better sector reform programs; and (b) downward flow, that would enable managers and subordinates throughout the sector ministry to develop greater knowledge and awareness about the goals of the reform program. Consequently, such improvements would engender higher returns and reform sustainability. Information flow is also critical for the success of strategic management during implementation of the reform program because it provides the feedback loop that will enable senior management to tap into the knowledge and experience of their subordinates, who are (a) often closer to the organization's clients and have a better feel for their priorities; and (b) in a better position to identify dysfunctional organizational policies and procedures.

25. Replies concerning various means used to collect information during the preparatory phase were mixed (responses fairly distributed among the "definitely", "mostly", "somewhat" spectrum). Nevertheless, survey results indicate that participants were, on average, strongly inclined to believe that the MASA process had played a useful role both in improving the flow of factual information to senior MOE officials and in improving their awareness regarding the problems and concerns confronted by middle management. Whereas 35.6% and 53.8% responded "definitely" and "mostly" respectively, that the process had improved the flow of factual information from mid-level managers to senior MOE officials; 69.2% and 15.4% responded "definitely" and "mostly" respectively, that the process had improved the awareness of senior MOE officials of the issues, problems, and concerns raised by preparatory working groups (i.e. mid-level managers).

26. Survey results were however, slightly less favorable regarding the flow of information downwards and horizontally between and among various MOE departments, sections, provinces and professions. Most of the responses were fairly distributed along the "definitely", "mostly", "somewhat" spectrum; implying that probably most of the senior officials spoke relatively less in the discussions during the MSP workshop. Nevertheless, the usefulness of information flow is evident in the question regarding the utility of the process in generating relevant discussions, deliberations and feedback on institutional issues in which performance could be improved, to which 35.1% responded "definitely" and 48.7% responded "mostly". Accordingly, and as discussed in para. 19 (MASA Suitability),
participants were able to identify a range of concrete measures that MOE should implement as a result of the discussions at the workshop.

27. As indicated in para. 18 regarding the major strengths of the MASA process, respondents were impressed by the flexibility and democratic nature of workshop sessions. It is important to note the way that criticism was taken squarely and constructively. The aura of consensus and cooperation was evident when participants wished to have an additional workshop day to complete all the new agreed objectives of MOE through the SWOT methodology. Given resource constraints, the workshop resolved to select some representatives (including leaders of preparatory WGs, members of MOE's Restructuring Committee, the Lead Rapporteur, and Management Systems specialists from MDD) to stay for another two days to complete the Action Plan (Attachment VI).

VII. Process Costs and Expectations

28. The participatory process was seen as worthy of the cost by (a) testing the participants perception about the additional benefits they got out of it; and (b) the level of attitudinal change towards reform of the education sector. The element of qualitative change in attitude was captured by the question testing the relative levels of commitment before and after the MASA process, which has been discussed above (paras. 20/23). Regarding additional benefits accruing from the additional MASA effort, 29.8% responded "definitely", while 45.9% and 21.6% responded "mostly" and "somewhat", respectively. Thus it is safe to assess that participants were satisfied that the additional benefits outweigh the cost of participation.

29. The expectations of participants concerning the outcome of the MASA process were very high. Before the enthusiastic SWOT-processing of the new objectives of MOE, participants had quickly worked out the new structure of the ministry. The readiness for change was demonstrated when MOE's structure was scaled down from about 11 loosely organized sub-structures into 4 divisions. The structuring of the new four divisions was guided by the operational needs of the new objectives. Most participants were optimistic that this time MOE was indeed seriously doing, rather than talking about change. Whereas the list of possible obstacles to reform was topped by (1) bureaucratic inertia and (2) lack of adequate resources, a core constituency of senior and mid-level officers was ranked as the primary driving force for the reform program.

30. As observed in para. 21, participants perceive MOE itself as the main influence on the success or failure of the sector reform. Asked about the chances of all workshop recommendations being approved by higher authorities, 13.2% responded "very strong", 71% responded "good" and 15.8% responded "50 : 50". Nobody responded "not good". It implies that most of the participants were not anticipating attempts by higher authorities to modify or disregard the results of their participatory diagnostic work. The creation at the end of the MSP workshop of a small Working Committee, drawn from MOE's Reform Implementation Committee and MDD's Organizational Management Systems specialists to coordinate the tasks of designing the Strategic Plan (by MDD) with MOE's own change activities, is an
encouraging step towards ensuring that the expectations of the participants are not frustrated. The Working Committee should also act as a means of decreasing the difficulty of implementing sector reform as part of the complex PSRP, which requires close collaboration between sector ministries and MDD/CO.

VIII. Conclusion and Recommendations

31. The atmosphere of consensus and optimism at the end of the MSP workshop was a clear indicator that participants were, on average, satisfied with the MASA process.\(^2\) The evaluation confirms that as a diagnostic tool, MASA effectively enabled participants to understand the institutional environment that permeates the management of education delivery; and recommend solutions that they perceive amenable within their own context. Furthermore, the process was able to influence participants' attitudes towards reform, participation, ownership and implementation of the change process in education delivery, which is part of the comprehensive PSRP of the Republic of Zambia.

32. The MASA process could however, be improved by the following measures:

- The Field Review could be launched with a one day workshop, that would introduce the MASA concept to management as well as representatives of all sector departments/units; and involve in a participatory manner the selection of members of the preparatory Working Groups.

- The Launch Workshop would convey to top management the seriousness of the complex process that follows; and hence, prevent management from assigning other (unrelated) tasks to the Working Group members.

- Information presented on Day One of the MSP Workshop should be organized in a manner facilitating a smooth take-off of Syndicate Tasks on Day Two. In order to ensure greater control over the process by locals, Plenary Sessions should be chaired by sector-ministry officials or other participants, with consultants playing a facilitative role.

- There should be a time-table of shorter follow-up (one day) workshops of the same group or the post-workshop Working Committee, to keep the spirit alive. Deliberations of such follow-up activity should be documented and circulated to keep sector staff and stakeholders informed of progress.

In conclusion, in a sectoral Institutional Assessment process, it may be possible for participants to go as far as the production of a draft (albeit crude) Action Plan. Though a smaller group is necessary to translate the Action Plan into specific technical aspects for

\(^2\) MASA was highly appreciated during the closing ceremony by the Permanent Secretary, and later in conversations and wrap-up meetings by participants and MDD/CO.
implementation, the MSP workshop may adequately cover the main raw inputs. The most important contribution that IA makes is that it captures sector-specific issues that are not likely to be picked up by comprehensive reform management units at the center; or cannot squeeze their way into the priority list of a wider IEA. Thus where the government intends to undertake bottom-up comprehensive reform, the sector-focused IA will broaden the scope of understanding, detail, ownership and sustainability.
Attachment I: Hypotheses

Central Hypothesis

Effectiveness as a Process

H-1. An Institutional Assessment (IA) based on a participatory (group-based) method and guided by systematic (tiered) analysis and environmental data collection, enables a more effective diagnostic procedure and subsequent reform of Sector Institutions than Management Audits (MA) based on independent data collection and analysis involving consultative methods to derive strategic reform options.

\[ \text{Institutional Assessment} \implies \text{More Effective Diagnostic Procedure and Subsequent Reform of Sector Institutions} \]

Suitability as a Strategy

H-2. IAs in general, and MASA in particular, are better suited than MAs as diagnostic procedure for inserting reform of Sector Institutions into comprehensive and strategic reform programs such as Zambia’s Public Service Reform Program (PSRP)

\[ \text{Institutional Assessments/MA} \implies \text{Greater Suitability for Inserting Sector Reform into Comprehensive Reform Programs} \]

Intervening Hypotheses:

Institutional Assessments/MA Will Have the Following Beneficial Effects:

I-1. Institutional Assessments/MA facilitate the implementation of Phase II\(^1\) of the PSRP by (a) engendering a greater level of ownership and commitment, mobilizing internal forces for reform; and (b) they go beyond providing the requirements for Institutional Restructuring, laying the ground for attitudinal and behavioral change necessary to introduce a management culture appropriate for performance and incentive management.

\[ \text{Institutional Assessments/MA} \implies \text{Greater Level of Ownership and Commitment; and Better Attitudes/Behavior} \implies \text{Better Environment for Performance and Incentive Management} \]

\(^1\)Phase II of the PSRP: Setting up of performance management systems and Pay linked to performance.
I-2. Diagnosis conducted through wide participatory processes will facilitate the flow of information upwards to program planners resulting in better design of sectoral (ministry) reform program.

\[ \text{Institutional Assessments/MASA} \Rightarrow \text{Improved Upward Information Flow} \Rightarrow \text{Better Design of Sectoral Reform Program} \]

I-3. Diagnosis conducted through wide participatory process will facilitate the flow of information downwards to managers and subordinates, resulting in greater knowledge and awareness about the goals of the reform program throughout the sector organization (ministry).

\[ \text{Institutional Assessments/MASA} \Rightarrow \text{Improved Downward Information Flow} \Rightarrow \text{Greater Knowledge and Awareness of Reform} \]

A Participatory Process Will Have the Following Cost Implications:

I-4. During its initial phases, a wide participatory planning process will take longer and be more costly to prepare.

\[ \text{Institutional Assessments/MASA} \Rightarrow \text{More Lengthy Preparatory Phase} \Rightarrow \text{More Costly} \]

I-5. Because it creates expectations among multiple constituencies (Central Reform Management Unit, internal Ministry groupings, and stakeholders) that their particular concerns will be addressed, IAs/MASAs will lead into more complex reform Action Plans, taxing the capacity of the PSRP management unit.

\[ \text{Institutional Assessments/MASA} \Rightarrow \text{More Expectations Among Multiple Constituencies} \Rightarrow \text{More Complex Reform Action Plans} \]

I-6. Because it empowers a broad group of participants whose agenda may differ from that of a particular Ministry or Government, an IA/MASA may be problematic for approval by higher authorities.

\[ \text{Institutional Assessment} \Rightarrow \text{Broader Participant Group With Multiple Agenda} \Rightarrow \text{Lower Approval Rate by Higher Authorities} \]

I-7. Once an IA is initiated, attempts to modify or disregard the results of the diagnostic process will severely reduce the level of ownership and adversely affect the implementation of the reform program by the sector institution (ministry).

\[ \text{Intervention} \Rightarrow \text{Reduction in the level of Ownership} \Rightarrow \text{Adverse Effect on Implementation of Reform Program} \]
Attachment II: Critical Variables

**Independent Variable:**

1. Participatory Process (diagnostic effectiveness):
2. Participatory Process (strategic suitability):

**Intervening Variables:**

3. Greater Ownership/Commitment; Conducive Attitudinal/Behavioral Change:
   Hypotheses: I-1.
4. Improved Flow of Information:
   Hypotheses: I-2 (Upward) and I-3 (Downward).
5. Increased Expectations Among Multiple Constituences:
   Hypothesis: I-5.
6. Reduced Ownership and Commitment:
   Hypothesis: I-7.

**Dependent Variable:**

7. Success of Subsequent Reform of Sector Institutions:
   Hypothesis: H-1.
8. Suitability for Inserting Sector Reform into Comprehensive Reform:
   Hypothesis: H-2.
9. Improved Implementation and Environment for Performance Management:
   Hypothesis: I-1.
10. Quality of Design of Sectoral Reform Program:
    Hypothesis: I-2.
11. Greater Knowledge and Awareness of Reform Program:
    Hypothesis: I-3.
12. Lengthy and Costly Planning/Designing Process:
    Hypothesis: I-4.
13. Complexity of Reform Action Plans:
    Hypothesis: I-5.
14. Approval Rate by Higher Authorities:
    Hypothesis: I-6.
15. Increased Difficulty in Implementation:
    Hypothesis: I-7.
Central Hypothesis

H-1 An Institutional Assessment (IA) enables a more effective diagnostic procedure and therefore, subsequent reform of Sector Institutions than a traditional Management Audit (MA).

Relevant Survey Questions on Participation:
16. Was the process truly participatory?
24. Were all of the major Zambian stakeholders consulted?
36. Strengths of the participatory process;
37. Weaknesses of the participatory process;
38. Recommendations to make the process more efficient, effective or participatory.

Strategies for Comprehensive Reform Preparation

H-2 IAs in general, and MASA in particular, are better suited than MAs as diagnostic procedure for inserting reform of Sector Institutions into comprehensive and strategic reform programs such as Zambia's Public Service Reform Program (PSRP).

Relevant Survey Questions on MASA Suitability:
20. Usefulness of Workshop Plenary sessions;
21. Usefulness of Workshop Syndicate sessions;
22. Usefulness of SWOT exercise;
23. Coverage of issues at point of delivery in MASA methodology;
29. Efficacy of MASA in generating relevant discussions, deliberations, and feedback regarding institutional issues;
30. Ability of participants to identify concrete measures for reform; and
31. Qualitative change of the participant due to the MASA process.

Relevant Survey Question on Probability of Success:
9. Estimate the chances of reform succeeding; and
40. Estimate chances of recommendations being approved by higher authorities.

---

1 To derive strategic reform options, the IA process involves a group-based participatory method which is guided by systematic (tiered) analysis and environmental data collection; while MA is based on independent (consultant) data collection and analysis involving consultative methods.
Intervening Hypotheses

A Participatory Process Will Have the Following Beneficial Effects:

Ownership and Commitment

I-1 The MASA diagnostic procedure will facilitate higher returns during implementation of Phase II of the PSRP (Performance Management and Appraisal) because: (a) it engenders a greater level of ownership and commitment, mobilizing internal forces for reform; and (b) it goes beyond providing the requirements for Institutional Restructuring, laying the ground for attitudinal and behavioral change necessary to introduce a requisite management culture for performance and incentive management.

Relevant Survey Questions on Ownership and Commitment:
1. Importance of reform (general);
2. Extent of reform necessary (general);
3. Source of reform initiative;
4. Importance of reform (your department);
5. Urgency of reform (general);
6. Degree to which you are personally committed to reform;
7. Degree to which your colleagues are committed to reform;
8. Degree to which your immediate superior is committed to reform;
10. Measures you would undertake to promote reform;
11. Measures your colleagues would undertake to promote reform;
12. Willingness to take risks to promote reform;
13. Willingness for colleagues to take risks to promote reform;
23. Validity of list of issues at point of delivery;
31. Did the MASA process increase personal commitment to reform?
32. Level of priority that senior MOE officials attach to reform;
33. Level of priority that politicians (ministers and parliamentarians) attach to reform of education delivery;
34. How committed are senior MOE officials to reform; and
35. How committed are politicians (ministers and parliamentarians) to reform of education delivery.

Information

I-2 Diagnosis conducted through wide participatory processes will facilitate the flow of information upwards to program planners resulting in better design of sectoral (ministry) reform program.

Relevant Survey Questions on Information:
17. Whether the four preparatory working groups were an effective means of gathering relevant information;
18. Whether collection of Management Audit data from provinces and districts was an effective means of providing relevant information;
19. Whether the environmental survey provided relevant information and increased participants' awareness of critical issues;
25. Improved flow of factual information from mid-level managers to senior MOE officials;
26. Improved awareness of senior MOE officials to issues, problems and concerns of middle management;
27. Improved flow of information from senior MOE officials to mid-level managers;
28. Improved information flow among various MOE departments, sections, provinces, and professions;
29. Helpful in generating feedback on areas in which MOE's performance could be improved.

I-3 Diagnosis conducted through wide participatory processes will facilitate the flow of information downwards to managers and subordinates, resulting in greater knowledge and awareness about the goals of the reform program throughout the sector organization (ministry).

Relevant Questions on Information:
27. Improved flow of information from senior government officials to mid-level managers;
28. Improved information flow among various MOE departments, sections, provinces and professions;
29. Helpful in generating feedback on areas in which MOE's performance could be improved.

A Participatory Process Will Have the Following Cost Implications:

IA Costs

I-4 During its initial phases, a wide participatory planning process will take longer and be more costly to prepare.

Relevant Survey Question:
31. Whether participants feel more committed to reform as a result of the MASA process; and
39. Will the additional benefits of a participatory planning process outweigh the cost in additional time and effort invested?
IA Reform Expectations

I-5 Because it creates expectations among multiple constituencies (Central Reform Management Unit, internal Ministry groupings, and stakeholders) that their particular concerns will be addressed, an IA will lead into more complex reform Action Plans, taxing the capacity of the PSRP management unit.

Relevant Survey Questions on Expectations:
22. Whether the SWOT exercise accurately reflect your views;
23. List of issues at point of delivery of education services as delivered in the workshop so far, are in your view, valid?
24. Whether major Zambian stakeholders have been consulted, or had the opportunity to make their views heard in this process?

I-6 Because it empowers a broad group of participants whose agenda may differ from that of a particular Ministry or the Government, an IA may be problematic for approval by higher authorities.

Relevant Survey Questions:
14. Obstacles to reforming the management of education delivery;
15. Driving forces in reforming the management of education delivery;
32. Level of priority that senior MOE officials attach to reform;
33. Level of priority that top politicians attach to education reform;
34. Level of commitment of senior MOE officials;
35. Level of commitment that top politicians attach to education reform; and
40. Chances of recommendations being approved by higher authorities.

I-7 Once an IA is initiated, attempts to modify or disregard the results of the diagnostic process will severely reduce the level of ownership and adversely affect the implementation of the reform program by the sector institution (ministry).

Relevant Survey Questions:
15. Driving forces in reforming the management of education delivery;
32. Level of commitment of participants resulting from the MASA process.
Attachment IV: Involvement Of Potential Stakeholders In Management Audit & Self-Assessment (Masa), Ministry Of Education (Moe), Zambia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Stakeholders</th>
<th>Mode of Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Education/Permanent Secretary*</td>
<td>Survey, Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretaries*</td>
<td>Working Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department /Unit Directors*</td>
<td>Survey, Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior and Mid Level Specialists*</td>
<td>Working Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial/District Education Officers*</td>
<td>Survey, Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Headmasters*</td>
<td>Working Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank and File*</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministries Closely Linked to Education Delivery:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet/President's Office*</td>
<td>Survey, Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission for Development Planning (NCDP)*</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finance (Budget)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
<td>Survey, Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ministries</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministries Closely Linked to Education Delivery:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Education, University of Zambia*</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Service Commission*</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Commission/Establishment</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Groups:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs Involved in Education Delivery*</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Teachers Associations*</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of Employers/Commerce*</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media (private newspapers)</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Institutions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Parliament</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Councils</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Chiefs</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households*</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Stakeholders:
Multinational Organizations and Consultants (World Bank, EU/ECDPM)  
Bilateral Donors  

Total Number of Potential Stakeholding Groups 26
Total Number of Key Stakeholding Groups 16 (61.5%)

Number of Stakeholding Groups Involved In-Depth 9 (34.6%)
Number of Key Stakeholding Groups Involved In-Depth 8 (50%)

Note:
1. A double line indicates a detailed involvement, including participation in more than one of the main activities: the Sector Environment Survey, the Preparatory Working Groups (including the Management Audit) and the Strategic Planning Workshop, by either a substantial number of group members or their representatives. A single line connotes a relatively more narrow or selective involvement.

2. * Indicates a "key stakeholder"--that is, any group whose daily activities will be directly and immediately affected by reform of the Ministry of Education.
Attachment V: Process Evaluation Of Participation Survey
Management Audit And Self Assessment (Masa)

Please take thirty minutes to fill out the attached questionnaire. It is designed to help us assess the effectiveness of the MASA, especially in regard to attitudes towards reform, participation, ownership and implementation of the change process that will follow. It is also designed to help determine the viability of a participatory diagnostic approach to other reform projects. While aggregate results of this Survey will be fed-back at the Workshop, individual responses will remain anonymous.

1. In your judgment, radical reform of the Ministry of Education (MoE) is: (circle one)

71.8% (a) essential for Zambia to implement its education policy and manage its education system;
25.6% (b) important to Zambia's policy and management of the education system;
2.6% (c) not critical to improve Zambia's policy management of the education system.

2. In your judgment, reform of the Ministry of Education requires (rank order 1 to 6)

(2 ) major changes to the mission and legal framework;
(1 ) organizational restructuring and staff right-sizing at all levels;
(3 ) managerial improvements within the discretionary powers of the ministry to improve performance;
(4 ) major changes in the system of incentives and conditions of service.
(5 ) higher professional standards and dedication of civil servants in the ministry;
( ) other (please specify) honesty and accountability, improvement of support services and maintenance of MOE assets.

3. To the best of your knowledge, the initial impetus for the participatory approach to strengthening and restructuring Zambia's education system was: (circle one)

33.3% (a) clearly an initiative of the Ministry of Education (MoE);
63.9% (b) inspired and developed in close collaboration between MDD, MoE and the World Bank as part of the implementation of the PSRP;
2.8% (c) mostly an initiative of donors.
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4. In your judgment, reforming Zambia's capacity to manage its education system will require the following changes in your department: (rank order 1 to 5)

(1) extensive restructuring of the department's organization;
(3) significant changes in staffing including right-sizing;
(2) substantial training and orientation of staff including departmental management;
(4) extensive improvements in compensation and conditions of service;
( ) other (please specify) better working and retirement conditions, sufficient budget, commitment at all levels and attitudinal change.

5. In your judgment, reforming the Ministry must take place: (circle one)

70% (a) urgently (i.e. within the immediate future);
27.5% (b) soon (within the next 1-2 years);
2.5% (c) at some point;
0% (d) never.

6. Would you describe yourself as being: (circle one)

86.8% (a) strongly and personally committed to the need for reform;
13.2% (b) sympathetic to the need for reform;
0% (c) indifferent or uncertain about the need for reform;
0% (d) skeptical about the need for reform.

7. Would you describe your colleagues at MoE or in your department as being: (circle one)

35.3% (a) strongly and personally committed to the need for reform;
44.1% (b) sympathetic to the need for reform;
8.8% (c) indifferent or uncertain about the need for reform;
11.8% (d) skeptical about the need for reform.

8. Would you describe your immediate superior(s) as being: (circle one)

67.6% (a) strongly and personally committed to the need for reform;
18.9% (b) sympathetic to the need for reform;
5.4% (c) indifferent or uncertain about the need for reform;
8.1% (d) skeptical about the need for reform.
9. Do you believe that the chances for the reform of the Ministry and the education delivery system succeeding are: *(circle one)*

5.1% (a) very strong;
59% (b) good;
35.9% (c) 50:50;
0% (d) not good.

10. What measures will you personally be willing to undertake to promote reform: *(rank order 1 to 5)*

(1) work unpaid overtime late evening and weekends if necessary;
(2/3) work paid overtime;
(1) pursue reform efforts during normal business hours;
(4) none.
( ) other (please specify) ______________________________

11. What measures do you believe your colleagues would be willing to undertake to promote reform: *(rank order 1 to 5)*

(3) work unpaid overtime late evening and weekends if necessary;
(1) work paid overtime;
(2) pursue reform efforts at normal business hours;
(4) none.
( ) other (please specify) ______________________________

12. Which of the following statements best represents your views? *(circle one)*

36% (a) I would be willing to work to reform the system even at the risk of alienating my superiors;
23% (b) I would be willing to work to reform the system up to the point where it would risk alienating my superiors;
41% (c) I am willing to make a modest contribution to the process of reform, as requested;
0% (d) I do not feel I could commit myself to advancing reform at this time.
13. Which of the following statements best represents the views of your colleagues? (circle one)

8.1% (a) They would be willing to work to reform the education system even at the risk of alienating their superiors;
21.6% (b) They would be willing to work to reform the education system up to the point where it would risk alienating their superiors;
70.3% (c) They are willing to make a modest contribution to the process of reform, as requested;
0% (d) They do not feel committed to advancing reform at this time.

14. In your judgment, the obstacles to reforming MoE and the education delivery system are: (rank order 1 to 8)

(6) the question of political will at the most senior levels;
(1/2) bureaucratic inertia;
(4) staff and union resistance to change;
(7) graft and corruption;
(5) lack of skilled personnel;
(7) cultural and kinship considerations;
(1/3) lack of adequate resources;
(8) other (please specify) lack of information and clarity of reform process

15. In your judgment, the driving forces in reforming the management of Zambia's education delivery are: (rank order 1 to 7)

(2) political will at the most senior levels;
(1) a core constituency of senior and mid-level MoE civil servants committed to change;
(5) support from education officers, teachers, rank and file workers;
(4) local communities and PTAs;
(5) public opinion and the media;
(3) the international donor community;
(7) other (please specify) the budget

16. Do you feel that the process to date has been truly participatory, in that there has been a free and equal exchange of views among participants in the MASA exercise including the workshop so far? (circle one)

20.5% (a) definitely;
48.7% (b) mostly;
20.5% (c) somewhat;
10.3% (d) not at all.
17. Do you feel that the four working groups (1, 2, 3 & 4) were an effective means of gathering relevant information for the workshop? (circle one)

36% (a) definitely;
33.3% (b) mostly;
25.6% (c) somewhat;
5.1% (d) not at all.

18. Do you feel that the collection of data from the provinces and districts for the Management Audit was an effective means of providing relevant information for the workshop? (circle one)

17.9% (a) definitely;
35.9% (b) mostly;
30.8% (c) somewhat;
15.4% (d) not at all.

19. Do you feel that the environmental survey provided relevant information for the workshop by increasing participants' awareness of critical issues for the reform of the Ministry? (circle one)

25.6% (a) definitely;
43.7% (b) mostly;
25.6% (c) somewhat;
5.1% (d) not at all.

20. Did you find the plenary sessions so far useful in identifying and elaborating the general issues to be addressed in reforming Zambia's education delivery? (circle one)

20.5% (a) definitely;
53.8% (b) mostly;
22% (c) somewhat;
2.6% (d) not at all.

21. Did you find the syndicate sessions useful in identifying, elaborating and processing the issues to be addressed in reforming the delivery of education in Zambia? (circle one)

48.7% (a) definitely;
48.7% (b) mostly;
0% (c) somewhat;
2.6% (d) not at all.
22. Do you feel that the SWOT exercise about the education system accurately reflects your views? (circle one)

- 23.7% (a) definitely;
- 55.3% (b) mostly;
- 21% (c) somewhat;
- 0% (d) not at all.

23. Do you feel that the list of issues at the point of delivery of education services as delivered in the workshop so far, are in your view, valid? (circle one)

- 52.5% (a) definitely;
- 42.5% (b) mostly;
- 5% (c) somewhat;
- 0% (d) not at all.

(Note: If you feel that some important issues have been left out, please list them below)

1. Cost-sharing

24. Do you feel that the major Zambian stakeholders who would be involved in reforming the education system and delivery have been consulted or have had the opportunity to make their views heard in this process? (circle one)

- 23.7% (a) definitely;
- 34.2% (b) mostly;
- 28.9% (c) somewhat;
- 13.2% (d) not at all.

(Note: If you feel that some stakeholders have been left out, please list them below)

1. Churches, ZCCM and the Private Schools Association (PRISCA)
2. PTA and Students
3. Employers (ZFE), World Vision
4. Some departments at MOE
25. Do you feel that this type of participatory process, including the workshop so far, has improved the flow of factual information from mid-level managers to senior MoE officials? *(circle one)*

- 35.9% (a) definitely;
- 53.8% (b) mostly;
- 7.7% (c) somewhat;
- 2.6% (d) not at all.

26. Do you feel that this type of participatory process, including the workshop so far, has improved the awareness of senior MoE officials of the issues, problems and concerns raised by the preparatory Working Groups? *(circle one)*

- 69.2% (a) definitely;
- 15.4% (b) mostly;
- 12.8% (c) somewhat;
- 2.6% (d) not at all.

27. Do you feel that this type of participatory process, including the workshop so far, has improved the flow of information from senior MoE officials to mid-level managers? *(circle one)*

- 25.6% (a) definitely;
- 35.9% (b) mostly;
- 30.8% (c) somewhat;
- 7.7% (d) not at all.

28. Do you feel that this type of participatory process, including the workshop so far, has improved the flow of information among various MoE departments, sections, provinces and professions? *(circle one)*

- 23.1% (a) definitely;
- 28.2% (b) mostly;
- 43.6% (c) somewhat;
- 5.1% (d) not at all.
29. Did you find the workshop sessions so far helpful in generating relevant discussions, deliberations and feedback regarding institutional issues in which performance could be improved? *(circle one)*

35.1% (a) definitely;
48.7% (b) mostly;
13.5% (c) somewhat;
2.7% (d) not at all.

*(Note: If not, please identify why not)*

1. The tasks on Day two of the Workshop were unclear

---

30. Please identify three concrete measures that MoE (or/and its departments and sections) should implement as a result of the discussions at the workshop? *(rank order)*

1. Restructure the education sector
2. Seek budgetary increase and improve resource allocation
3. Decentralization of education delivery
4. Train staff that will manage decentralized system
5. Formulate and articulate clear education policy
6. Redeployment, set performance standards and improve working conditions

*(Note: Respondents were asked to give three concrete measures. Six came out as the most recurrent among the responses, and are ranked according to percentages, with the top measure scoring the highest.)*

---

31. Do you personally feel more committed to the process of reforming the way that the education system (and delivery of education) is managed than you did prior to the MASA including the workshop so far? *(circle one)*

40.5% (a) definitely;
35.2% (b) mostly;
18.9% (c) somewhat;
5.2% (d) not at all.

*(Note: If not, please explain why not)*
32. In your judgment, what priority do most senior MoE officials attach to reforming the management of education delivery in Zambia? (circle one)

30.8% (a) of fundamental, over-riding importance to Zambia's development;
56.4% (b) important;
10.2% (c) less important than other pressing issues currently confronting the country;
2.6% (d) not very important.

33. In your judgment, what priority do most members of the Cabinet and of Parliament attach to reforming the management of education delivery in Zambia? (circle one)

46.9% (a) of fundamental, over-riding importance to Zambia's development;
34.4% (b) important;
18.7% (c) less important than other pressing issues currently confronting the country;
0% (d) not very important.

34. Do you believe that most senior MoE officials are: (circle one)

28.2% (a) strongly and personally committed to the need for reform;
48.7% (b) sympathetic to the need for reform;
12.8% (c) indifferent or uncertain about the need for reform;
10.3% (d) skeptical about the need for reform.

35. Do you believe that most members of the Cabinet and of Parliament are: (circle one)

44.4% (a) strongly and personally committed to the need for reform;
50% (b) sympathetic to the need for reform;
2.8% (c) indifferent or uncertain about the need for reform;
2.8% (d) skeptical about the need for reform.

36. In your view, what were the major strengths of the MASA participatory process, including the workshop so far? (rank order)

1. Participatory and flexible
2. Tiered analysis for problem identification and solution
3. Preparatory Working Groups and their reports
4. Visionary and triggers a forward orientation
5. Mobilizes commitment
6. Democratic
37. What were its major weaknesses? *(rank order)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Day two tasks unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Worked/analyzed feedback between tasks not available in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sampling of Working Groups and Workshop participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Time too short, unable to discuss Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stakeholders attending the workshop not well prepared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations for improving the MASA process to make it more efficient, effective and participatory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve facilitation, and provide a chair for plenaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve sampling of participants to attain fair sectoral representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve mix/composition of Working Groups (MASA Teams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time for syndicate work with less interference from resource persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Do you believe that the additional benefits that will accrue from the MASA process will outweigh the cost in additional time and effort invested? *(circle one)*

- 29.8% (a) definitely;
- 45.9% (b) mostly;
- 21.6% (c) somewhat;
- 2.7% (d) not at all.

40. Do you believe that the chances of all workshop recommendations being approved by higher authorities are: *(circle one)*

- 13.2% (a) very strong;
- 71% (b) good;
- 15.8% (c) 50 : 50;
- 0% (d) not good?

41. What is your current position? *(circle one)*

- 37.5% (a) senior official (Permanent Secretary, DPS, Director, Assistant Secretary);
- 42.5% (b) mid-level manager or civil servant;
- 10% (c) other (please specify) ____________________________
SAMPLE OF MOE SUBMISSIONS FOR ACTION PLAN

(i) OBJECTIVE 1: To formulate, analyze and review educational policies within the framework of the national development policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO'S RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>WHO ELSE MUST BE INVOLVED</th>
<th>RESOURCES REQUIRED</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>FINISH DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Train staff in policy formulation, analysis and review</td>
<td>CHRDO</td>
<td>Director PU; Cabinet Office/PAC, Donors: PEOs</td>
<td>Financial, human and material (resource persons, training manuals)</td>
<td>January, 1995</td>
<td>December 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Restructure the MOE</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary Restructuring Committee</td>
<td>Cabinet Office, PEOs</td>
<td>Financial, human and material (i.e., policy guidelines and documents)</td>
<td>November 1994</td>
<td>June 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strengthen financial management practices through training and monitoring</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary Restructuring Committee</td>
<td>CA; PIAs; PEOs</td>
<td>Financial, human and material (i.e., resource persons, computers and training manuals)</td>
<td>November 1994</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Procure and rationalize the distribution of available logistical support services and equipment</td>
<td>Director MEPSU</td>
<td>ZEPH; CIS; CA; PEOs</td>
<td>Financial, human and material (i.e., buildings equipment, manuals and policy guidelines)</td>
<td>November 1994</td>
<td>December 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improve conditions of service</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>Cabinet Office, Unions</td>
<td>Financial, human and material (i.e., housing, working plans, transport equipment)</td>
<td>October 1994</td>
<td>January 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) OBJECTIVE 2: To plan, provide and coordinate the delivery of education at all levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>WHO'S RESPONSIBLE</th>
<th>WHO ELSE MUST BE INVOLVED</th>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>PROJECTED END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work out new conditions of service</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>Establishment Division</td>
<td>Financial, human and material</td>
<td>March 1995</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Design Performance Management System (PMS) and Annual Performance Evaluation System (APES)</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>MDD/Cabinet Office</td>
<td>Financial, human and material (i.e., local or international consultants, stationary).</td>
<td>March 1995</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Design appropriate organizational structure</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>MDD/Cabinet Office</td>
<td>Financial, human and material (i.e., consultants stationary)</td>
<td>November 1994</td>
<td>January 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CUSTOMIZED SIA FOR THE ZAMBIAN EDUCATION SECTOR

Preliminary Stakeholder Analysis

a) Consult with the GRZ central and sector agencies (MDD/CO, NCDP/MOF, MOE, MST&VT, MYSCD, and CDSS) to agree on the SIP/SIA approach, and modalities for inter-agency coordination;

b) Identify and assess main concerns of key stakeholders, including private institutions that manage education delivery as well as employers;

c) Conduct a preliminary identification of Beneficiaries and Stakeholders Participants in the IEP for Systematic Client Consultations (SCC);

d) Explore indigenous institutions (organizations, roles and values) which are of particular importance to educational strategy and delivery;

e) Establish Working Groups (for MST&VT) and a sector-wide Focal Group that will conduct the Field Reviews (i.e., locals);

f) Launch the Field Reviews with a one-day Training Workshop on the SIA methodology and the SIP approach;

g) Agree on donor participation, resources, and facilitators for SIA.

Information and Data Gathering

a) Conduct a Desk Review at WB/Donor headquarters using internal WB/Donor documents and other sources from Zambia in order to:

   (i) develop a Sector Profile, pulling together relevant information on sector structure, policy framework, PERs/Financial Management, resource allocation pattern and investment status, available at WB/Donor headquarters;

   (ii) develop Sector Environment Survey (SES) outline and instrument using Systematic Client Consultation (SCC) framework, and

   (iii) develop a relevant indigenous institutions (II) profile that is appropriate for education delivery.

1 In coordination with on-going SCC initiatives.
a) Conduct Field Review in the following manner:

(i) assemble four working groups in MST&VT, who will meet twice a week for six weeks, to carry out preparatory activities (with one group addressing the PSRP (Phase I) requirements);
(ii) assemble a Sector-wide Focal Group with members from each of the four sector ministries and key outside stakeholders, to:
   • provide inter-agency coordination; and
   • assess broad sector investment needs and resource allocation patterns (include NCDP/MOF, MDD/CO central agencies).

c) Conduct a SES (sector environment survey) and validate indigenous institutions profile; and

d) Incorporate into the Working and Focal Groups any of the findings of recent/on-going studies by donors and/or the GRZ on the sector.

SIA Workshop

(a) Since the SIA process intended to benefit the preparation of the IEP and generate data for Phase I of the PSRP on organizational restructuring of the ministries that have not completed management audits, Days One, Two and Three of the workshop would include:

   • presentation and discussion of MST&VT institutional profiles generated by Working Groups in the ministry.
   • processing of PSRP (Phase I) Strategic Planning inputs; and
   • action-plans for agency-specific Institutional Development and Capacity Building requisites and consensus building around investment priorities by using the SWOT analysis;
   • Sectoral Focal Group aggregates action-plans for ID/CB to reach consensus on Sector Institutional Performance. (See Figure IV: SWOT Analysis of Institutional Profiles in text).

(b) Members of the Sectoral Focal Group and the Phase I Reform Committees of MOE, MYSCD and CDSS would meet in parallel on Day One and Two to ensure that information on PSRP Phase I work on Audits and Restructuring conforms to the requirements of the SIA workshop. On Day Four, the Sectoral Focal Group and the MOE, MYSCD, CDSS Committees will join the workshop, which will then proceed in the following way:
(c) During **Day Four** the Plenary will receive presentations on:

- profile of resource mobilization/allocation and investment for the sector from the sectoral Focal Group;
- Task Manager’s indicative modalities of donor coordination;
- feedback summary of stakeholder participation (SES/II);
- selected inputs from the Desk Review; and
- statement of Sector Institutional Capacity (aggregated by the Sectoral Focal Group from action-plans of the four sector agencies).

(d) On **Day Five**, the workshop reassembles into five mixed syndicate groups. These groups are tasked with reviewing the information presented in Day Four, in order to cluster it under five basic dimensions of the integrated education sector program, providing the basis for Program Design. Syndicate Groups are organized by each of the following clusters:

- **Sector Policy**: (based on sector ministries’ new missions, policy goals, objectives and civic stakeholders demands);
- **Proposed Investment Allocation for the Sector**: (resource mobilization, allocation, financial accountability, appropriate size and distribution of education facilities/assets that require investment, and professional and vocational training needs for adjustment and market demand);
- **Institutional Reform of the Sector**: (action-plan of ID/CB measures to address identified problems of Sector Institutional Performance);
- **Decentralization**: (current government structures (province/district) and new community structures (district education management boards, school and college management committees, PTA, village pre-school committees, etc.), autonomous trust/scholarship funds.
- **Donor Support and Coordination**: (indicative program areas where donor support is most required).

---

2 Action-plans of the four sector ministries (MOE, MST&VT, MYSCD, and CDSS) will be made available at the workshop for reference by participants.
The sectoral Focal Group will meet after close of business on Day Five to agree on:

(e) On Day six, the Rapporteur of the Sectoral Focal Group presents the Outline of the IEP for Plenary vetting. The workshop will then agree to converting the Sectoral Focal Group into a IEP Design and Implementation Committee which may designate one of its member agencies as its Technical Secretariat. This committee will then meet at the end of the workshop to plan future steps.

(f) During the workshop, participants will have responded to an instrument for evaluation of the process as part of WB’s Structured Learning (SL) exercise, and results will be presented in the closing session.

Mandate for Designing the IEP

Objectives

- to initiate program design;
- to identify lead/focal agency/framework to manage and coordinate program implementation;
- to explore areas of donor interest in SIP and ID/CB outlines;
- to institute sustainable means for monitoring and institutional convergence (SCC/II).

Process Method

- establish a “Design and Implementation Committee” to supervise:
  
  (i) technical experts
  (ii) stakeholder representatives
  (iii) design sub-committees
  (iv) any other relevant central government agencies (e.g., MOF, MCDP and Cabinet Policy Unit)

Outcome

- a solid IEP with investment projects for all stakeholders;
- a solid sector ID/CB program with specific areas and instruments for client government/donor intervention;
- recommendations for system-wide ID/CB requisite measures;
Donor Follow-Up

The IEP Task Manager would organize the meeting of sector donors to confirm support to the SIP on the basis of the results of the SIA process.

Figure I (in text) lays out the MASA/SIA process for individual agencies such as proposed for the MYSCD in preparation for the combined SIA workshop which is graphically described in Figure III, in text. The combined SIA workshop was an attempt to bring together the presentation of results of the recently completed MASA/SIA exercise for the MYSCD and the adapted results of the MOE MASA and the MAs for MST&VT and MCDSS.

This SIA is particularly complex due to the number of agencies involved and their differing stages in preparation of management audits for the PSRP. By bringing these differing processes together, some uniformity would be achieved. Furthermore, the processing by Cabinet Office of the results of each MA would be expedited and improved in light of the availability of investment resources, a major handicap of the sector.

Critical to the success of this ambitious SIA is the level of consensus and understanding among the leaders of the concerned agencies, under the coordination of Cabinet Office. This consensus was achieved through a gathering of all the Permanent Secretaries of the sector Ministries, which would effectively become the focal group for the sector: a crucial mechanism for the success of the SIA and ultimately the IEP. This gathering, which took place under the title of an Inter-Ministerial PS Workshop had as objectives to agree on the outline of a Draft-National Education Strategic Plan, based on a discussion of policy alternatives and implementation cost estimates. This exercise was also expected to generate the basis for IEP components and also served the important objectives listed under section 1 of the customized SIA process on Preliminary Stakeholder Analysis (see Figure II in text). Three basic stages were identified for the IEP preparation: The first was the Inter-Ministerial workshop; the second, the SIA and its concluding workshop and a third event where the IEP would be identified in its component details, allowing appraisal to be undertaken. These three events were to take place within six months.