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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Challenge

There is global recognition that poverty is a multidimensional problem that requires strategies that are comprehensive and based on greater coordination, collaboration, and integration across sectors and institutions. The Bank has introduced new approaches and lending instruments to meet this development challenge. The new approaches and instruments are multi-sectoral and programmatic rather than sector and project specific. They are designed to enhance coordination, collaboration, and integration across sectors and themes and institutions and actors, while reducing duplication, overlap and unhealthy competition. Multi-sector and programmatic tasks are emerging as the new business line across all Bank regions. The challenge is to manage the transition from focus on sector-specific projects to multi-sector programs. Success will require working together effectively in multi-sectoral teams with clients and other development partners. Multi-sector work requires teams with diverse skills and broad knowledge on country poverty and development issues across all relevant sectors and themes. It requires effective team leadership to articulate the strategic vision and to clarify and define roles and responsibilities for an often more complex team product. This has reinforced the Bank’s emphasis on learning and capacity building for staff and clients in this area. The strategy is to support operational learning on-the-job in multi-sector teams in order to improve their knowledge, skills, and performance in attaining the Bank’s development objectives.

World Bank Intervention

The Multi-Sectoral Team Learning Program was introduced in fiscal year 2002 to support operational learning in multi-sectoral teams. The program attempts to improve the effectiveness of staff working in multi-sectoral teams by integrating learning into their operational and advisory work and their work with clients. The objectives of the team-based learning program are to:

   i. Improve the technical and behavioral knowledge and skills of teams to address multi-sectoral challenges;

   ii. Improve learning practices among team members, enabling teams to continuously improve their performance and make innovations;

   iii. Improve cross-team learning by connecting teams across regions and sectors that are working on similar tasks;

   iv. Improve client learning and increase client capacity to operate in a multi-sectoral environment. (See annex A-Logframe for the MTL program)

The MTL program objectives are expected to lead to the following types of impacts:
i. High quality team products (CAS, PRSP, Concept Note) and processes (the way teams do their work together).

ii. Enhanced partnership and effective teaming and learning with clients.

As teams generate knowledge and insights to improve their own performance, it is also expected that they would generate insights for the institution to support this type of work-based learning. The expected impacts are:

i. Changes/adaptation of Bank policies and procedures to fit multi-sector tasks, products, and lending instruments.

ii. Enhanced institutional framework to support multi-sector teams such as allocation of staff time and budgets, incentive systems, and accountability mechanisms.

iii. Transfer of learning and teaming practices to other contexts.

It is the assessment of the degree to which the MTL program is achieving these outputs and outcomes, albeit in varying component configurations among teams, that is the focus of this study.

**Target Audience**

The target audience is 29 pilot multi-sectoral teams representing four clusters, focusing on (i) PRSP/PRSC-related tasks, (ii) multi-sectoral investment programs such as CDDs, (iii) preparation of poverty-oriented CASs, and (iv) various other multi-sectoral and multi-country team tasks. Pilot team selection was on the basis of open, competitive, demand-driven interests. The selection criteria included cross-sectoral and regional representation, type of operation, a clear product with at least a 12-month delivery schedule from the time of nomination, and the team’s potential for high performance.

**MTL Program Components and Activities**

To achieve the outputs and outcomes outlined above, the MTL program carried out the following activities under four main program components.

**Component 1. Coaching:** 10 team learning coaches (TLCs) helped the pilot teams identify key business goals, related learning needs, and possible knowledge and learning resources or suppliers relevant to team learning needs. They also helped teams resolve conflicts and provided tools for teaming and learning in real time. Most significantly, they spent a considerable time on coaching the team leaders on effective leadership skills, team learning strategies and team dynamics.

**Component 2. Learning Budget:** jointly funded by the Regions and the Learning Board to cover the professional and technical learning and knowledge resource needs from the Bank or outside providers at the discretion of each team. Funds covered workshops, study tours, and joint client/Bank work sessions.
Component 3. Group Facilitation: support for teaming and learning provided by TLCs and some external private companies in the form of retreats to develop work program strategies, use of action learning strategies, or cross-team knowledge sharing and exchange.

Component 4. Institutional Support: from “regional sponsors” to address systemic issues challenges or opportunities to work effectively in multi-sectoral teams at the regional or corporate level, and to begin to develop a knowledge base for multi-sectoral team work.

Evaluation Goals, Objectives, and Challenges

The goal of this evaluation is to provide information on:
- The value of the key components in supporting work-based learning within a multi-sectoral team context.
- The success of the teams in achieving the defined results of the program, in terms of outputs and impact.
- The key factors that drive success among teams.
- Recommendations for enhancing multi-sectoral team learning.

The challenges of evaluating self-organizing and evolutionary teams. One key difficulty the evaluation team had in developing specific performance indicators for the MTL program was associated with the inherently different and self-organizing nature of the teams. The context for conducting this study and the constantly changing/evolving nature of the pilot teams did not lend itself to a consistent evaluation methodology. As many as a third of the 29 pilot teams were still in the process of being formed as they began to work with their MTL coaches. Therefore the teams varied in their learning plans and the activities that would be most appropriate and relevant for them. This evaluation covers several types of interventions, of varying scope, applied to teams in different regions, involving different processes, producing different products, and at different stages of formation. The individualized and evolutionary nature of the intervention as it sought to achieve the key outputs and impact was thus taken as an inherent characteristic of the program. This very dynamic nature of the teams also limited the use of traditional comparison group design to analyze the hypothesized changes or impacts of the program. For this reason, the study focuses on evaluating both the processes and the quality of multi-sectoral team learning, based on interviews conducted with all the Team Leaders, Team Coaches and selected Team Members.

Main Findings

The value of component activities

The MTL program was valued primarily for the following reasons:
- Providing a specific time and place for multi-sectoral conversations to identify interactions and leverage points between sectors, and in some cases to consciously involve the country client team.
- Creating a process and discipline during missions to foster team learning and improve team performance in achieving the goals of the mission.
• For teams that were having difficulties forming, diagnosing the team strengths and weaknesses and teambuilding to enable the members to begin work together as a multi-sectoral team.
• Providing the opportunity and authorization to innovate and experiment with new ways of working and learning.

**Outputs**

The program was successful in developing productive learning practices and strategies among teams involving reflection, evaluation, integration and the use of knowledge. The teams also reported that the learning program helped enhance the depth of knowledge across sectors and the development of new, broader perspectives on sectoral expertise.

• *The MTL program has created a structure and process for work-based “action learning” within multi-sectoral teams that seeks to shift the context for learning from the classroom to learning in the course of doing their real work.*

• *The action learning approach is helping pilot teams to produce a more truly integrated and refined multi-sector product.* MTL activities are providing time for teams to explore together commonalities and interconnections between sectors and helping team members see where their sector piece fits into the whole, which results in higher levels of understanding, engagement, and contribution.

• *The MTL program is creating a structure for disciplined learning on mission, which increases the ability of teams to work more efficiently and effectively during mission through a three part process: (i) a pre-mission planning session to clarify outcomes, roles, and action plans, and often to build team cohesion; (ii) a systematic method for de-briefing at the end of each day on mission, and (iii) a post-mission debriefing to evaluate and synthesize outcomes, and reflect on team processes during mission. Team members report being less sectoral, more collaborative, and able to take more initiative on mission, because they have a shared vision for the outcome and understand their role in it. Teams are adopting these learning practices as a routine way of working.*

• *Involving client teams in learning is enhancing their knowledge and understanding of the interconnections between sectors and the value and efficiency of working multi-sectorally.* Clients have a greater appreciation of the need for ongoing coordination and collaboration between sector institutions to produce a more integrated and coherent multi-sector product with greater potential development impact. Learning together is improving the ability of both Bank and client teams to decide priorities, think out solutions, make tradeoffs, and assess feasibility.
Pilot teams are enhancing or refining their technical knowledge and skills in cross-sector interactions where team members (i) teach each other about their sector within the pragmatic context of a project; (ii) ground their work in the realities of client countries; (iii) learn to ask different questions of their own sector work; (iv) develop a practical understanding of what works in which contexts; and (v) understand how to use other sectors to leverage the work in their own sectors.

Impacts

The evaluation identified many areas of progress toward the intended impacts of the MTL program and the Bank’s broader strategic goals of greater efficiency and effectiveness in supporting programmatic lending and advisory services. Because the program is still in the start-up phase, and the number of structured learning activities the teams have participated in is still limited, it is hard to determine, or attribute with a high degree of certainty, the direct impacts that the MTL program activities have had on team performance and other corporate goals. Nevertheless, TTLs and team members reported on several areas of impact as well as institutional issues that support and/or constrain working effectively in multi-sectoral teams.

- The majority of respondents interviewed reported varying impacts on the quality of team products, processes, and overall performance. These are described in Table 1 below.
- Many also reported a transfer of self-directed learning and teaming practices to other work contexts. The evidence suggests that a high potential for this form of learning will expand from the pilot teams like the proverbial ‘thousand points of light.’
- Only a small number of teams, however, stated that enhanced partnerships and effective teaming with clients were key results for their team. For the most part, these were teams in which client learning was the explicit goal or main focus of their MTL learning contract (Albania, Pakistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan, LCR New Economy). It appears that some of the most significant learning and impacts on the MTL program so far have occurred when pilot teams and client teams learn together. Those pilot teams already recognize the value involving clients in the design and preparation of the product—increased client trust, commitment, and ownership, as well as likely implementation success and sustainability.

The implications of MTL for changes in policies and institutional incentives are emerging from the operational experiences of the teams:

- A small number of respondents stated that team learning had resulted in changes in Bank policies and procedures (Uganda PRSC2), particularly in procurement and financial management, or enhanced institutional incentives to support multi-sectoral teams (Turkey Social Mitigation). This information needs to be fully documented and shared Bank-wide.
The responses generally highlighted the institutional conditions necessary to produce successful MTL products. All teams reported that learning and working in multi-sectoral teams to produce a team product had implications for how the Bank allocates staff time and resources/budgets and how it evaluates and rewards staff.
Table 1. Summary of Finding for Components, Outputs and Outcomes of the MTL Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Components</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Outputs/Impacts</th>
<th>Outcomes/Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
<td>Learning budget</td>
<td>Group facilitation</td>
<td>Institutional sponsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved technical and behavioral knowledge of teams to address multi-sectoral challenges as a result of engagement in learning and membership in a community engaged in a meaningful practice.</td>
<td>Improved learning practices and productive learning strategies:</td>
<td>The team's ability over time to continue to produce the impacts listed above, plus these effective team processes:</td>
<td>Higher quality and more effective product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Team members sharing and exchanging knowledge across sectors, identifying interactions and leverage points, and eliminating overlaps or inefficiencies in client interface.</td>
<td>- Team members working together effectively to learn and perform on mission</td>
<td>- More cohesive, motivated team</td>
<td>- Clearer articulation of the vision, strategic goals, and objectives of the product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Team members working together effectively to learn and perform on mission</td>
<td></td>
<td>- More coherent, efficient teamwork</td>
<td>- Product more comprehensive and integrated in its analysis of sectors and themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- More individual accountability and initiative</td>
<td>- More accurate, relevant, and useful product, grounded in the reality of the client country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- More coordination and collaboration between sectors</td>
<td>- Less conflicting advice and more coherent support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- More ownership of the team’s product among team members</td>
<td>- More in depth analysis of risks and challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved client learning to operate in a multi-sectoral environment</td>
<td>Improved cross-team Learning. The new ways of learning and working in teams is occurring:</td>
<td>Enhanced partnership and effective learning with clients:</td>
<td>The team’s ability over time to continue to produce the impacts listed above, plus these effective team processes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Across teams between countries (Africa MAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- More cohesive, motivated team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Across teams within countries (Congo, Yemen)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- More coherent, efficient teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Across teams within a region (Africa, Uganda)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- More individual accountability and initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Across teams producing similar products (Peru, Guatemala)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- More coordination and collaboration between sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Between individuals in different teams with similar challenges and interests</td>
<td></td>
<td>- More ownership of the team’s product among team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification and documentation of supportive policies and procedures: Concrete lessons emerging from the operational experiences on the ground of the pilot multi-sectoral teams are guiding the identification of areas where traditional policies and procedures need to change or be adapted to facilitate multi-sectoral work.</td>
<td>Enhanced institutional framework to support multi-sectoral teams (budgets, incentives, accountability, etc)</td>
<td>Changes in policies and procedures</td>
<td>The development of a learning culture where learning is fundamentally social and knowledge acquisition and development is integrated in the lives of the community. United by a common enterprise, people forge their identities and develop and share ways of doing things and other practices as a function of their joint involvement in mutual activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The availability of flexible learning budgets is providing an incentive to change staff behavior about learning in teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is still no broad recognition and appreciation of learning and working in multi-sectoral teams or institutional incentives to produce a team product.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions and Recommendations

The MTL program is an important indicator of the Bank’s commitment to improving the effectiveness of multi-sectoral and programmatic approaches to reducing poverty and addressing other development challenges. The start-up activities of the MTL program are beginning to show results in the quality of pilot team learning, in their performance, as well as in their products. Teams advocate that the Bank should continue to support the MTL Program, to give time for deeper impacts on team performance, products, and client satisfaction to be meaningfully and adequately assessed. WBIEG submits that the main thrust of the MTL program should be reinforced, but it needs to be refined to take into account lessons learned so far, to give increasing responsibility and accountability to the teams themselves for learning, and to improve the prospects for greater client learning and partnership. The principles for moving forward should emphasize a dynamic, flexible, and client-oriented approach to learning in multi-sectoral teams. Recommendations focus on what needs to be put in place to ensure that the MTL program succeeds in the next phase. Pilot teams provided information and insights on the content and organization of the MTL program itself, as well as the institutional supports and challenges that were emerging as they prepared their multi-sectoral products. These are outlined below.

Recommendations to Enhance The MTL Program

Preserve and strengthen the flexibility and responsiveness of MTL Program. The MTL program must remain a flexible and dynamic enabling force, responding to the evolving needs and challenges of individual multi-sectoral teams. This is perceived as one of its most important strengths, given the self-organizing nature of the teams and their individual goals.

- MTL coaches must use teaming and learning approaches that respond to the specific goals, focus or problem a team needs to address in producing the product at each stage.
- MTL learning funds must be flexible enough to finance team learning activities that regular work program budgets or project funds are unable to.
- MTL coaches should balance, as much as possible, good facilitation skills with technical knowledge, knowledge of World Bank operations, and foreign language skills.

_Improve the team selection and contracting process based on the experience of FY02._

In FY03 the MTL program needs to contract well with the regional VPs, to understand their goals, to help them understand the goals of multi-sector team learning and the time commitments of the MTL program, and to help the VPs make more effective team selections for the MTL program. The MTL Program should focus on selecting teams that have a clear product to produce this year, and multi-country teams in which each participating country has real multi-sector work to do. Teams may not be fully formed at the beginning of the year, but “teams” that both are not formed and do not have a product to produce should not be selected.

The contracting process needs to be improved to make budgeting clearer, more consistent and transparent. The MTL program unit should insure that each MTL team is clear about the role of all coaches assigned to work with each team on learning activities.
In the next phase of the program, work to shift the responsibility and accountability for learning to TTLs and team members themselves. A long-term goal of action learning is to build a team’s own capability and confidence to learn its way to success when facing complex challenges. This reflects and reinforces the goal of the Bank to continue to decentralize and to shift from an expert-driven mindset to a collaborative learning model. The MTL Program can help achieve this by ensuring that teams are articulating their thinking about what will make them successful and validating it at each stage of preparation of their product; structuring the quarterly progress reports to include both content and learning method; acting as a support to the teams on-going learning practice, rather than the responsible partner.

In line with the Bank’s broader strategic goal of client-led poverty reduction, make effective teaming and learning with clients the primary focus of multi-sector teams in the next phase of the program. Some of the most significant learning and impacts reported on the MTL program so far have occurred when pilot teams and client teams learn together. In the next phase, high quality products and performance should be based on joint Bank and client team learning, to enhance the value of products for clients.

In the next phase, enhance the capacity of the MTL program unit to facilitate consultation and coordination activities between the Bank, clients, donors and other stakeholders in the context of PRSPs/PRSCs and poverty-oriented CASs. This will help enhance knowledge sharing and exchange, reduce duplication of effort, and harmonize policies and procedures.

Continue to improve the coaching practice and to develop the technical understanding of MTL coaches. The MTL coaches should continue to learn from their own coaching experience with pilot teams – beginning to understand the teams’ work and challenges, experimenting, discovering effective interventions, refining their approach, and learning collectively from each other’s experience as they proceeded. They should also work on developing a good understanding of the nature of Bank operations and the products teams are producing, in order to enhance not only process coaching, but to ensure that they contribute effectively as coaches in the technical aspects of the teams work.

The MTL coaches should continue to coach TTLs to build their leadership skills in multi-sectoral teams including their interactions with their Institutional Sponsors, in order to reinforce the goals and expectations of the MTL process. In addition, they should focus on capturing small successes – overlaps identified and eliminated, leverage points discovered and used, insights gained by clients, etc., especially when they are the result of an innovative experiment. These stories can be used to encourage other teams to experiment, to reinforce the value of the new ways of working, to strengthen MTL coaching practice, as well as to inform next year’s evaluation.
Recommendations to Strengthen Institutional Support

The following stand out as the support needed to enhance the MTL learning program.

*Promote widely within the Bank and among clients the benefits of the MTL program by routinely disseminating best practices and early successes, cataloguing action learning resources and tools in and outside the Bank, and highlighting institutional challenges and how they are being addressed.*

*Develop links between the MTL program and other initiatives in the Bank with similar objectives and goals, in order to pool resources and reduce overlap and duplication.*

*Make institutional structures, procedures, work programs, and budgets reflect the new emphasis on multi-sector approaches:*

- Increase the flexibility of regular work programs and budgets to provide multi-sector teams with the time and funds to experiment and innovate.
- Provide incentives for sector managers to increase their commitment to, and ownership of, multi-sector tasks, as well as incentives to support and reward their staff to prepare and implement such tasks.
- Continue to work on modifying all management practices that inhibit working effectively in multi-sectoral teams. Significant in this regard is enhancing the shared ownership and accountability between Sector Managers and Country Managers for the multi-sectoral product.
- Adapt operational procedures and processes to a multi-sectoral approach. This may imply streamlining and simplifying financial management, procurement and disbursement procedures in light of the greater integration of sectors, and in the interest of client implementation capacity. Bank thinking and action should draw from, and build upon, the experiences of teams who have long and extensive involvement in preparing multi-sector products (for example, Uganda PRSC2, PREM, WBIGK).

*Increase the appreciation, recognition, promotion, and support of VPU/senior managers.*

The leadership of the regions and the sectors has an important role to play in the MTL program’s continued success. The Bank needs to develop a better understanding of the goals, benefits and costs (short-term and long-term) of the MTL program at the VPU level. Such understanding will help to manage, if not reduce, the short-term tension between producing a product within the prescribed time and costs, and taking the time to learn, experiment and innovate. It should also help to reduce the likelihood of sectoral turf wars that could undermine the benefits of multi-sectoral collaborations within the teams. Greater dissemination of the benefits of participating in the MTL program and of the successes of pilot teams is necessary to sensitize VPUs to how the MTL program can help further their work. Senior management should actively promote the value of multi-sectoral work and foster a culture that values and rewards team products.
I. INTRODUCTION

A. CONTEXT OF THE MULTI-SECTORAL TEAM LEARNING PROGRAM

Bank Approaches for Poverty Reduction

1.1 The Multi-Sectoral Team Learning Program was introduced in fiscal year 2002 to support the Bank’s broader strategic goals of reducing poverty, improving incomes and the quality of life in client countries, and increasing development efficiency, effectiveness, and impact. The Bank has introduced new approaches and lending instruments that recognize poverty as a multidimensional problem, requiring comprehensive strategies that are based on greater coordination, collaboration, and integration across sectors and institutions.

1.2 The approaches are region-based, country-specific, sector-wide, multi-sectoral, and decentralized. They include country-led Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), Community Driven Development Programs (CDDs), Multi-sectoral AIDS Programs (MAPs), and Multi-sectoral capacity building programs. The instruments are programmatic and provide budgetary support to countries implementing reforms. They include Poverty Reduction Support Credits (PRSCs), Capacity Building Credits (CBCs) and Local Empowerment Credit (LECs). Country assistance strategies (CASs) concentrate on developing more effective (comprehensive and integrated) approaches to reducing poverty, strengthening donor and client capacity to address poverty, and holding both accountable for results. Common indicators of progress in reducing poverty are linked to International Development Goals (IDGs) and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

Goals of Multi-sectoral and Programmatic Approaches in the Bank

1.3 The new approaches and instruments are designed to make development assistance more efficient by reducing overlap, duplication and unhealthy competition between sectors and themes, development institutions and actors. This should result in reduced transaction costs for client countries and the Bank. Multi-sectoral approaches also seek to make assistance more effective and sustainable by requiring more comprehensive and integrated analysis of development issues and problems, as well as greater consensus on development policies, priorities, objectives, strategies, models and approaches. This is likely to reduce conflicting policy advice, increase coherent support by the Bank and other donors, and increase ownership and commitment by clients.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE MULTI-SECTORAL TEAM LEARNING PROGRAM

The Challenge

1.4 Multi-sector and programmatic tasks are emerging as the new business line across all Bank regions. The challenge is to manage the transition from focus on sector-specific projects to multi-sector programs. Success will require working together effectively in
multi-sectoral teams with clients and other development partners. Multi-sector work requires teams with diverse skills and broad knowledge on country poverty and development issues across all relevant sectors and themes. It requires effective team leadership to articulate the strategic vision and to clarify and define roles and responsibilities for an often more complex team product. This has reinforced the Bank’s emphasis on learning and capacity building for staff and clients in this area. The strategy is to support operational learning on-the-job in multi-sector teams in order to improve their knowledge, skills, and performance in attaining the Bank’s development objectives.

**Goals and Objectives**

1.5 The MTL program attempts to improve the effectiveness of staff working in multi-sectoral teams by integrating learning into their operational and advisory work with clients. The objectives of the MTL program are to:

i. Broaden and refine the professional technical knowledge and skills of teams and their skills in working as a team to address multi-sectoral challenges;

ii. Develop productive learning practices and effective learning and cognitive strategies among team members, thereby enabling continuous learning to improve performance and make innovations;

iii. Improve cross-team learning by connecting teams across regions and sectors that are working on similar tasks;

iv. Improve client learning and increase their capacity to operate in a multi-sectoral environment. (See Annex A – Logframe for the MTL program)

1.6 The MTL program objectives are expected to lead to the following types of impacts:

i. High quality team products (CAS, PRSP, Concept Note) and processes (the way teams do their work together).

ii. Enhanced partnership and effective teaming and learning with clients.

iii. Changes/adaptation of Bank policies and procedures to fit multi-sector tasks, products, and lending instruments.

iv. Enhanced institutional framework to support multi-sector teams such as allocation of staff time and budgets, incentive systems, and accountability mechanisms.

v. Transfer of learning and teaming practices to other contexts.

**Target Audience**

1.7 The target audience for the program is 29 pilot multi-sectoral teams representing four clusters focusing on (i) PRSP/PRSC-related tasks, (ii) multi-sectoral investment programs such as CDDs, (iii) preparation of poverty-oriented CASes, and, (iv) various other multi-sectoral and country- team tasks. Pilot team selection was a two-phase process. First, Regional Vice Presidents (RVPs) were asked to submit nominations on the basis of open, competitive, demand-driven interests. The selection criteria set by the Learning Board for the regions included cross-sectoral representation and a clear product with at least a 12-
month delivery schedule from the time of nomination. Teams could be on-going or newly created. The second stage of team selection was conducted by a panel composed of the Learning Board, HR, and ART on Staff Learning. Selection was based on regional representation, type of operation, and the team’s potential for high performance (See Annex B & C-MTL Team Selection Criteria and Annex D-MTL Teams in FY02).

Key Components

1.8 The learning program consists of the following key components and activities:

Component 1. Coaching: 10 team learning coaches (TLCs), who help the pilot multi-sectoral teams identify key business goals, related learning needs, and possible sources of knowledge and learning resources, as well as resolving conflicts, providing tools, coaching on leadership, etc.

Component 2. A learning budget: jointly funded by the Regions and the Learning Board to finance learning and knowledge resources from the Bank or outside providers at the discretion of each team.

Component 3. Facilitation: support for teaming and learning provided by TLCs and outside companies.

Component 4. Institutional Support: from regional sponsors to address issues and challenges to working effectively in multi-sectoral teams at the regional or corporate level.

Activities

1.9 Activities to support the achievement of MTL program objectives include those listed below. They varied from team to team according to the specific problem, focus, and goal each team wanted to address.

Component One
- Diagnosis by TLCs of Bank and/or client teams’ strengths and weaknesses.
- One-on-one coaching of Task Team Leaders (TTLs) on leadership, team learning strategies and team dynamics.
- Provision of teambuilding and team learning tools and resources to teams.
- Connecting individual pilot teams working on similar tasks.

Component Two
- Funds for workshops for Bank and combined Bank/Client teams to enhance technical and teaming skills.
- Funds for study tours to transfer relevant lessons of experience, best practices, approaches, and models from other countries and regions to combined pilot and client teams.
- In-country facilitation when Bank facilitators lacked the relevant language skills.
Component Three

- Retreats to articulate vision, develop strategies, roadmaps and outcome indicators for the teams’ strategy and programmatic work.
- Pre-mission planning meetings, daily in-country reflections and debriefing meetings, and post mission debriefing meetings to refine mission goals, define roles, organize tasks, and structure action learning.
- MTL-hosted lunch meeting for the 30 pilot teams to foster cross-team learning and sharing of experiences.

Implementation Rollout

1.10 There was considerable variation in the time each MTL pilot team launched their MTL program. Three teams launched their MTL work programs in November 2001. By December 2001, only 5 of the 30 teams had launched their learning programs. The majority of MTL pilot team learning activities did not effectively begin until the third quarter of FY02. Information on team rollout is presented in the table below.

Table 2: Rollout of Pilot Teams in FY02.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Launched</th>
<th># of Teams launched</th>
<th>Total Launched to Date</th>
<th>% of all Teams Launched to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2002</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2002</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2002</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Management, Accountability, Monitoring and Evaluation

1.11 The MTL program has been presented to and discussed with Senior Management, the Learning Board, regional management teams, sector boards and various thematic groups. These constitute a crosscutting “Implementation Support Group,” which helps validate and address emerging business issues faced by multi-sectoral teams.

1.12 TLCs in the Learning and Organizational Effectiveness Unit (HRLOE) have responsibility for managing the implementation of the program. Accountability for results of the program are shared between the 29 pilot teams themselves, their managers at the country and sector level, and the Learning Board.

1.13 Activities designed to monitor the MTL program include:

- Quarterly reports to the learning Board and Regions on team activities, budget use and feedback.
- Continuous reporting on team progress and performance from TLCs assigned to the pilot teams.
- Participatory observations on the work of selected teams by an anthropologist.

1.14 For the Evaluation of the program, the Learning Board has requested WBIES to conduct an evaluation of the team-based action learning components and the attainment of the key results (i.e. outputs and impacts) of the program.

1.15 This report, prepared by WBIES, is the first evaluation study of the MTL program and represents the first phase of an in-depth and impact evaluation of the MTL.
II. EVALUATION GOALS AND METHODOLOGY

A. EVALUATION GOALS AND KEY QUESTIONS

2.1 The goal of this evaluation is to provide information on:
- The value of the key components in supporting work-based learning within a multi-sectoral team context.
- The success of the teams in achieving the defined results of the program for outputs and impact
- The key factors that drive success among teams.
- Recommendations for enhancing the success of multi-sectoral team learning.

2.2 In addition, the study provided information on the implications for policies, procedures and institutional conditions or changes significant for the success of MTL programs.

2.3 The key questions of the study are as follows.

a. Evaluation of Key Components
   - What is the quality or value of the key components of the MTL program – Coaching, Learning Budget, Facilitation of Team Work Sessions?
   - What are the challenges to achieving the desired quality in these components?

b. Evaluation of Outputs
   - To what degree do these activities result in: Knowledge and skills acquired; learning practices and strategies; cross-team learning; client learning for multi-sectoral work? What specific outputs were produced?
   - What are some of the primary challenges to attaining desired outputs?

c. Evaluation of Impact
   - What are the impacts of multi-sectoral team learning on team products and processes?
   - What are the impacts or implications for Bank policies and procedures?
   - What institutional conditions need to be in place to support this new way of working and learning to produce Bank products?
   - What drives success?

B. METHODOLOGY

Population studied

2.4 The study included all 29 pilot MTL teams, using “team” as the unit of analysis for the study. Each team was composed of one or two Team Leaders and on average 10 team members. Each team also was assigned a Team Learning Coach and had a regional Institutional Sponsor.
Challenges to evaluating the MTL program, study limitations and de-limitations

2.5 The initial WBIES design for studying the MTL program was based on the use of a comparison group design and a broad based analysis of learning processes, teaming processes and the impact of these on team products (CASES, PRSCs, etc.). This design was abandoned for a more qualitative driven process of data collection and a more in depth study of each of the teams and the documentation of emerging patterns or team configurations as each team sought to achieve the key results of the program. The reasons for this change were:

a. As many as a third of the initial 30 teams were still in the process of being formed as they began to work with their MTL coaches. Many remained unformed throughout the MTL program. This evolving process made it difficult to adopt the “comparison group design” originally conceptualized as a robust way of studying the value of team-based action learning.

b. The team learning intervention evolved based on the realities of the teams that signed up for the program funding. Thus teams varied in their learning plans and activities. There was not one uniform intervention, but rather a varied number of individualized learning plans. This evaluation covers several types of interventions, applied to teams in different regions, involving different processes, producing different products, and at different stages of formation. The individualized nature of the intervention was thus taken as a characteristic of the program.

c. This is a new type of learning intervention for the Bank. Hence it is hard for participants to compare their experience with other Bank programs. As the MTL Program Team described it:

“This program...is attempting to break new ground in integrating learning into the operational work of teams, rather than training staff in a classroom setting.”

d. Pilot efforts of this sort, with an evolving characteristic or configuration, require a more intensive observation of the teaming and learning processes and the provision of on-going feedback both to the TLCs and the Team Leaders and Members. This aspect of the study was dropped due to difficulties associated with team formation and the obtrusive nature of including evaluators in the early stages of this formation. This should be picked up in the FY03 evaluation of learning practices and strategies of well-formed teams. There currently exist a number of videotapes of teams in work session that could provide a good baseline of data for analyzing changes in team behaviors and modes of operation.

e. The original design of the FY02 study included an evaluation of three products produced for interventions with intensive team-based learning. The study has identified four team products that could be analyzed as part of an impact study to be conducted in FY03.
f. The plans for FY02 also included requesting all members of the teams to complete a questionnaire on team-based learning practices, strategies and outcomes, and their level of participation as team members. This aspect of the study was also postponed to FY03, since its design is based primarily on the variables and ideas about learning practices expected to evolve from the interviews conducted as part of the first phase of the study.

g. Likewise, a focus group session with Institutional Sponsors will be based on the findings of the study and thus will become part of the FY03 follow-up discussions on the findings of the study.

Data collection

2.6 The study is based primarily on interviews conducted with: (i) 24 team leaders or co-leaders, (ii) 10 Team Learning Coaches, and (iii) a selected number of team members. Institutional Sponsors will be interviewed subsequent to the analysis of the findings of the study on institutional issues and required policies and procedures. The interviews conducted were based on the Protocol presented in Annex E.

2.7 Given the diverse nature of both the teams and their goals, the protocols were designed without using pre-determined theoretical constructs about teaming or learning practices or the criteria that define quality products. The evaluation team’s goal was to study the emergent nature of the constructs – what the teams themselves found to be important – and to let the responses provided drive emergent patterns or theoretical constructs about multi-sectoral team learning and working. This method serves to provide a more valid basis for developing the variables that would be significant in future work using questionnaires or observation instruments.

2.8 Interviews were conducted by a team of three consultants who worked together to develop a congruent understanding of the study constructs and methods of data collection prior to conducting individual interviews.

Data analysis

2.9 Over 90% of interviews conducted were audio recorded. All interviews conducted were transcribed in a framework for a first level analysis of the data per team, based on the total set of responses from the leader, coach and team members. (See Analysis Framework – Annex F.) The second level of analysis looked across all recorded interviews to identify key themes in perceived value, outputs and impacts. This analysis was discussed with the whole team of interviewers to develop the final structure of the analysis for this report. This process resulted in highlighting a number of questions that still needed answers. The Evaluation Team met with the MTL Program Team to share the preliminary analysis, to discuss questions and issues still outstanding, and to get direction on how to get additional information. (Detailed Analysis available from WBIES.)
2.10 For the analysis of the impact of the MTL program on key products of the team, the evaluation design included:
   a. Defining through the interviews the criteria that define a quality MTL product.
   b. Using these and other Bank-wide criteria to develop a comprehensive set of criteria for evaluating MTL products.
   c. Establishing a basis for using such criteria for evaluating the products via a panel of outside experts or via the normal Bank mechanisms of project appraisals, review meetings, QAG assessment, or QER.

2.11 The evaluation of the products of pilot teams was not completed in FY02, due to the fact that, with the exception of four teams, the majority of teams do not have products completed in FY02. For the four teams, the products identified were completed by mid-June. This limited the ability of WBIES to conduct any comprehensive analysis of the products. WBIES will carry out this type of impact analysis in FY03.
III. MAIN FINDINGS

A. THE VALUE OF THE MTL PROGRAM

3.1 *Summary*

The four most common and significant perceived values of the MTL program were:

i. Providing a specific time and place to discuss interactions and leverage points between sectors, and consciously involving the country client teams in some aspect of the multi-sectoral exchange.

ii. Creating a focus and discipline during missions to foster team learning and also to improve performance in achieving the goals of the mission.

iii. For those teams that were having difficulties forming, diagnosing the team’s strengths and weaknesses to helping them to begin to work together as a multi-sector team.

iv. Providing the opportunity and authorization to innovate and experiment with new ways of working.

3.2 Generally, teams valued the TLC’s ability to focus on the team’s particular goals, needs, and problems, rather than offering a preconceived intervention, as well as their ability to integrate the process and technical aspects of the team’s work in their facilitation. One TTL commented on how he appreciated the ability of his TLC to synthesize a wide variety of inputs and tie them back to the overall strategy.

3.3 There were two main challenges to the perceived quality and value of the MTL program. One related to the limited time available for the TLCs to participate in team events or to follow up in-between these events. The other related to the time it took to complete the program’s budgeting process, which, in at least one case, outweighed the value received.

3.4 Overall, the activities of the MTL program closely mirrored the new way of working that the program was intended to help promote. As a result, the mere modeling of those behaviors had an impact on the team’s ability to work. The pilot teams’ assessments of the quality and value of each of the four MTL program components are summarized below:

3.5 *The perceived value of the TLC facilitation*

*On team learning*

- *Creating a structure for cross-sectoral conversations.* TLCs designed learning conversations during team meetings, retreats and missions to encourage team members to exchange ideas, share perspectives, discover interactions and leverage points between sectors, and to take into account the realities of the client context. TTLs and team members reported that the TLC facilitation helped them to clarify their shared vision as a multi-sectoral team and better define the product they were
producing. They created a discipline for team learning and established individual accountability. In at least one team, team members began to distribute and read each other’s inputs before meetings in order to maximize time for constructive exchange and to keep on agenda in the meeting itself.

- **Creating a structure to discipline the team's action learning on mission.** TLCs designed a process for pre-mission planning, daily debriefing and post-mission reflection. In some cases, the TLC was able to accompany the team on mission. In other cases, the team took the tools and coaching provided in the planning session and conducted their own debriefings on mission. Some teams are already beginning to adopt this as their normal way of working on mission.

- **Helping to establish an effective working and learning relationship between MTL and country client teams.** They typically combined teambuilding exercises and work to define shared vision, outcomes and a roadmap for going forward.

### On team formation

- **Helping form teams** (defining membership, goals, vision, roles and norms), build effective working relationships among team members, and create openness to learning from one another.

- **Diagnosing team strengths and weaknesses** (both Bank and client teams) in order to help the team to make hard decisions about team composition, resolve differences of opinion, and move forward.

- **Intervening in difficult situations.** In cases where there were conflicts due to individual personalities, communication, work or management styles, the TLC was able to intervene as a facilitator to reconcile differences, reorient the group, and help them to move forward.

### 3.6 The perceived value of TLC coaching services

### On team leadership

- **Coaching TTLs on dealing with team conflicts and staff performance issues.** The TTLs were often unable to move forward on team learning because of conflicts about individual personalities, communication and work styles, and performance issues within the team. In those cases, TTLs reported that the TLC’s input was very helpful in resolving these tensions.

- **Coaching TTLs on how to support team learning between MTL learning events.** TTLs found it helpful to model the behaviors TLCs had used during MTL learning events and to receive one-on-one coaching from the TLCs before and after the event.
• Providing continuity for learning and learning practices by proactively following up in-between meetings to help maintain team learning and to “proselytize” multi-sectoral learning to other stakeholders.

On Learning

• Providing tools and resources to support team learning, such as teambuilding exercises, self-diagnostic tools, a daily debrief protocol for missions, etc.

• Linking teams to other learning resources, web-based tools, etc. both in and outside the Bank.

• Fostering cross-team learning. TLCs created links between teams doing similar work and helped teams recognize the value and opportunities for transferring learning to other teams and countries. They created job aids to transfer lessons from project to project.

3.7 The perceived value of the MTL program’s learning budget

• Space and time to learn. The learning budget provided the opportunity and flexibility to build learning into the Bank’s normal product preparation and delivery process – to conduct a mission that could not be justified within the existing work program budget; to learn about each other as a team; to learn together with clients; and to learn first-hand about specific best practice models and approaches to addressing multi-sectoral challenges world-wide.

• Incentive to participate. MTL seed money provided the incentive to attract staff who may not be convinced yet of the benefits of a multi-sectoral approach.

• An “excuse” to innovate. Being selected as an “MTL team” provided a justification to experiment with new ways of working. It also provided an opportunity and a justification to partner earlier and more explicitly with clients.

3.8 The perceived challenges to achieving the desired quality of the MTL Program

• Budget and contracting issues. The policy regarding how the budget could be used was unclear and inconsistent, and seemed to evolve from month to month. This added to the time it took to complete the contracting process. The smaller the desired activity, the greater the perceived burden of the contracting process.

• Confusion between multiple coaches working with a single team. Often two or three team coaches would assist a single team, either because of an attempt to match experience and skill sets with particular activities, or because the primary coach was not always available. In those cases, if the nature of the new coach’s role was not made clear, the TTL was not sure with whom to follow up. This
confusion was aggravated if the coach was unavailable to follow up in a timely and consistent way.

- **Slowness to respond to a team’s needs.** Although the large majority of MTL teams reported being satisfied with the fit between their needs and the services provided by MTL coaches, a few teams did complain about the time devoted to teambuilding activities. In at least one case, the TLC was perceived as being inappropriately resistant to the TTL’s concerns about the cultural appropriateness of a particular facilitation technique or its relevance to the team’s substantive work.

- **Perceived lack of sufficient technical or operational experience to provide effective facilitation or feedback during MTL learning events.** One team complained that the coach attended, but did not participate in, a team event, which the team attributed to lack of technical understanding. Two additional teams reported that the coach’s lack of technical expertise made them less effective during technical discussions. It must also be noted that there were several instances in which the contribution of coaches who were relatively less experienced with the Bank were perceived as highly valuable.

- **Lack of follow-up by the coach between events.** Sustainability of learning between events and deadlines is an issue that will be discussed later in this evaluation. There is an inherent tension between, on the one hand, the value added by coaches who also do operational work and can bring that expertise to their coaching role and, on the other, the time they can commit to following up with a pilot team. As the MTL program team goes from supporting 30 teams to 60 teams next year, this may become a critical issue.

**B. THE VALUE OF THE OUTPUTS**

*Overall assessment of the value of the outputs*

3.9 The MTL Program Components – coaching, a learning budget, facilitation, and institutional sponsorship – were expected to produce outputs in the areas of: (i) improved learning practices among team members, (ii) improved cross-team learning, (iii) improved client learning and, ultimately, (iv) improved team capacity, knowledge and skills to prepare multi-sectoral tasks. Evaluation of these outputs is again based on data gathered from interviews with TTLs, TLCs and Team Members. An attempt was made to validate self-assessments on the parts of TTLs and Team Members with observations made by TLCs.

3.10 **The MTL Program used an action learning model and focused on areas that had a high potential to produce outputs for the MTL pilot teams, especially on more effective multi-sectoral interactions in team meetings, and on preparation for, and debriefing during and after, missions.** Teams developed a shared vision and a more clearly defined product, and developed a deeper understanding of the interactions between sectors and
how to more effectively integrate the multi-sector product. In at least one case, every member of the team could articulate a shared “theory of success” that guided his or her work. As a result of the work done beforehand to better plan and to build a greater sense of working as a team, during missions teams were able to work more efficiently and effectively and individual team members were able to take more initiative.

3.11 *The MTL Program made more modest progress in its goals to develop cross-team learning and client team learning.* A few teams reported seeing the potential to apply what they were learning to other countries in their region or to their work on other teams. TLCs were sometimes able to create links across the pilot teams they were working with to promote learning. This was particularly evident across teams that were producing a CAS. As of the writing of this evaluation, the MTL Program had only been able to host two cross-team learning events. The ability to make progress in client team learning seemed to depend significantly on how the original MOU was developed. In those cases where the country client team was specifically required, or expressed a desire, to be involved in the team’s learning or in producing the team’s product, client learning was improved. In the best case, the country client team was involved as a partner in defining, collecting, and analyzing data (Uzbekistan). One pilot team was able to conduct a learning tour with the client team to another country to learn from their experience in implementing multi-sectoral projects (Turkey).

3.12 *The most significant barriers to developing effective learning practices* were the sustainability of learning between MTL-sponsored events, the significant and persistent pressure to produce products on a tight timetable, and the lack of an actual functioning team or shared product. The lack of recognition of similar challenges and goals between teams and an “expert mindset” worked together to inhibit cross-team learning. Client learning was negatively impacted when there was a lack of team leadership for learning, or when there was a perceived lack of client readiness or capacity to work multi-sectorally. Rigid divisions between sector institutions in many client countries contributed to this barrier. Moreover, some pilot teams felt the need to consciously focus first on learning to work multi-sectorally within the Bank before involving clients and other development partners.

**Improved learning practices among team members**

3.13 A significant goal of the MTL program was to create a structure and process for action learning within multi-sectoral teams to support a new and inherently more complex way of working for the World Bank. The action learning model adopted by the Bank for the MTL Program seeks to shift the context for learning from the classroom to the team’s “field of action” – learning from its real work, in the course of doing its real work. Through experimentation in the early stages of this pilot process, the MTL Program has been able to develop an action learning process for the MTL pilot teams’ most common fields of action—those repeatable contexts within which team members actually perform their most important work as a team. (Figure 1)

**The Quality of Action Learning Outputs for the MTL Program**
3.14 Two fields of action that are common to the work of nearly all participating Bank MTL pilot teams, and therefore serve as a basis for action learning, include:
- Producing a product
- Going on mission

![Figure 1: Action Learning](image)

3.15 Creating an effective action learning approach for producing a truly integrated multi-sectoral product. While this evaluation covers a very early pilot project, significant progress was made in creating an effective “container” for multi-sectoral conversations, leading to more integrated multi-sectoral products. Team members reported that the traditional approach to multi-sectoral conversations was for representatives of each sector to come together to conduct a daylong series of PowerPoint-assisted technical briefings. These sessions did not provide time for the team to explore commonalities, intersections or points of leverage between the activities of each sector. By contrast, in addition to these sector presentations, MTL team learning activities also specifically designed time for this cross-sectoral dialogue. According to one TTL, “This was one of our best retreats. Usually, we produce very small minutes from a retreat. This produced much more. Several streams of work came out of it.”

3.16 In the traditional approach, the TTLs integrated the discrete inputs of each sector into the team’s product, resulting in what was described as either “a least common denominator” or “a Christmas tree” product. By contrast, the MTL-designed events shifted the responsibility to the team itself to work together to integrate the sectoral inputs. They asked the question, “What are the intersections between what we’ve been hearing today?” Team leaders and members reported being pleased and surprised by other team members’ openness to learn from different perspectives, by the unexpected number of commonalities discovered, and by how interconnected the sectors are.

3.17 In the words of an economist on one team, “Originally, we were presenting economic numbers. But we need to understand what’s really happening. You won’t find that in the numbers.” In the words of a TTL, “We have been surprised at how similar our conclusions were, despite our different backgrounds. There are more commonalities than we expected. We are discovering how intertwined everything is.” In the typical process, as one TTL described it, junior team members work hard to produce an annex, which the
TTL may not like and may choose to leave out. The MTL process is helping people see where their piece fits in, which results in higher levels of engagement and contribution. In one case, the TTL reported that the team now had a shared theory of success, and that he felt comfortable having a VP talk to anyone on his team; that the VP would hear the same story from everyone.

3.18 Creating a structure for disciplined learning on mission. In a business context with very tight timetables for delivering products, the ability to work efficiently and effectively during missions would seem to be critical to the ultimate success of multi-sectoral teams. The TLCs were able to help MTL pilot teams be more effective and efficient on mission through a three-part intervention: (i) a pre-mission planning session, which often involved teambuilding and always involved creating clarity regarding outcomes and roles and action planning; (ii) a method for de-briefing at the end of each day on mission, led either by the TLC when they were able to travel with the team, or by the TTL when they were not; and (iii) a post-mission debriefing in which the actual outcomes could be evaluated and synthesized, and the team could reflect on its process during mission. Team members reported being less sectoral, more collaborative, and able to take more initiative, because they had a shared vision for the outcome and understood their role in it. In the words of one TTL, “People jumped in when needed and pulled their weight.” In one case, the TTL reported actually being able to produce the Aid-Memoire two days before leaving the country, which was unusual. In another case, a team reported that this process had already become the natural way they work as a team. In at least two other cases, TTLs reported modeling their TLC’s facilitation style during the mission to promote openness and cross-sectoral learning.

3.19 Adoption of team learning practices as a natural way of working as a team. Because the MTL Program focused on the needs of the pilot teams and was flexible about its interventions, these interventions naturally began to focus effectively on the areas that most easily lent themselves to action learning in the context of the MTL pilot teams’ work. As a result, there are early indications that the team learning practices being introduced by TLCs are being adopted by the teams themselves, either through modeling the TLC or by using tools provided by the TLC, even when the coach is not directly involved in a team meeting. The evaluators hypothesize that more of this adoption of team learning practices will occur next year, as teams have more opportunities to copy these practices, and as the MTL Program learns from its own experiences with pilot teams how to better assist them in developing their own learning practices.

3.20 **The primary challenges to developing effective learning practices:**

- **Sustainability between events and deadlines.** There is a large gap in the learning process that exists when the team is not together. Action is still being taken, but teams report a lack of leadership or follow-through. The invisibility of this “action field” makes it more difficult to address. The value of the effort will be judged by the team’s ability to take action based on the results of the MTL events. If no action happens, or old habits reemerge (for whatever reason), this will curb enthusiasm for the MTL approach. As a result, participants saw a need for TLC presence to create the structure and discipline that the teams themselves still lack.
Connections via technology (team web sites, e-mail protocols) may help, but the MTL coaches will need to more carefully address this part of the work of the teams next year.

- **Pressure to produce products on a tight timetable.** There is a significant time investment required up-front to do multi-sectoral work and team learning that require adjustments in traditional task timetables and budgets.

- **Lack of a team.** Sometimes a sponsor chose a “team” because it was hoped that the MTL process would help form a team where there was none. In other cases, the team did not have strong institutional sponsorship and, therefore, was a team in name only. In other cases, it did not have a perceived shared product to produce (as was sometimes the case with country teams and at least one multi-country team).

**Improved cross-team learning**

3.21 Cross-team learning most commonly happens either through collecting and sharing lessons learned and best practices or by creating links between teams. In the latter case, these links are typically useful at one of two points in a team’s learning process: 1) when they are about to start a project or phase in their work and want to learn from other teams; or 2) when they have completed a project or phase and want to share what they learned in the process. Finally, teams can come together in a “community of practice” to collaborate in a learning process in real time as they launch similar projects or processes, or compare their experience after projects are complete to learn and improve next time.

3.22 The impacts of cross-team learning will be covered in a following section. This discussion, therefore, will focus on actual activities that have occurred as part of the MTL program. To date, the primary activities have involved transfer of learning by linking teams that have completed their work and teams that are beginning to do their work. These have included:

- Helping teams see their own opportunities. Teams with sub-teams are seeing the opportunity to learn across their multiple projects (Congo, Yemen). Teams are seeing opportunities within a region to transfer learning from country to country (MAP II, New Economy), and to transfer lessons from project teams to country teams (Guatemala, Iran).
- Creating links based on opportunities identified by TLCs across parallel projects.
- Capturing the experience of teams in tools (tip sheets, process designs) to document and share growing knowledge.

3.23 Actual real-time partnering with other teams to learn together as they go has been less common to date. The MTL program has hosted two events with the specific goal of bringing teams together to learn from each other, but these events have been smaller and shorter than originally envisioned. Plans have been discussed to create links using information technology.
3.24 The primary challenges to improving cross-team learning cited in interviews include:

- Lack of time to do anything not seen as directly contributing to the production of a promised deliverable.
- Lack of recognition of the similarity between teams, programs and countries, or the perception that the experiences of different teams are too different to be effective models from which to learn.
- Lack of trust across teams that acts as a barrier to sharing anything other than a complete, approved and published piece of work.
- The expert’s mindset that, on one hand, protects his knowledge and, on the other, resists going to others for their expertise.
- Logistics and communications challenges of teams with some members who reside in Washington, D.C., and others who reside in country, or between Bank employees and consultants.

**Improved client learning**

3.25 Client learning occurred in pilot teams that held it as explicit goal, or when producing a high quality, relevant and sustainable product required early, active, and deeper client participation and partnership. Figure 2 presents the range of potential interaction between pilot and client teams.

![Figure 2: Continuum of Client Learning](image)

3.26 The number of pilot teams that engaged in client learning was smaller than expected, given its emphasis in MTL program objectives and expected goals. Notwithstanding, some of the most significant learning and impacts on the product are occurring where Bank and client teams learned together (see Section C below). Teams from the ECA region engaged in more client learning than teams from other regions. At least two factors contributed to this. First, ECA pilot teams made client learning and relationships an explicit goal of the learning plan submitted to the MTL program. Secondly, ECA multi-sectoral tasks/products were designed such that they require client partnership at each stage.

3.27 Involving client teams in learning is enhancing their knowledge and understanding of the interconnections between sectors. Client involvement is also resulting in greater
appreciation of the need for coordination and collaboration between sector institutions, in order to produce a more integrated and coherent multi-sector product with greater potential development impact. Learning together is improving the ability of both Bank and client teams to think out solutions, assess feasibility, make tradeoffs, and decide priorities.

In the case of Turkey, the client team has been heavily involved in the project design from its inception. The project is now in the implementation phase. The Bank and client team participated jointly in a study tour to learn how multi-sectoral models and approaches to making conditional cash transfers (CCTs) to the poor to purchase education, health, and other social services are being implemented on the ground in Mexico. The Bank and client teams learned together lessons on issues such as how to handle unregistered births, how to optimize and monitor flow of funds, and how to reach remote villages. Clients are drawing upon what they learned from the Mexico experience to assess and solve problems in implementing pilot CCTs before expansion to national scale in Turkey. The experience of learning together has improved the Bank team’s relationship with relevant sector counterparts. In particular, relationships with counterparts in the Ministry of Health (MOH) have improved. Before the study tour, counterparts in the health sector did not, or were slow to, respond to requests from the Bank team. Now responses are immediate.

In the case of the Uzbekistan Poverty Assessment, team learning was done in two ways: (i) the client team learned about international methodologies for defining and analyzing poverty; (ii) the Bank team learned about Uzbek data definitions and methods of poverty analysis. In this way the two teams reached a level of consensus and comfort about each other’s analyses and data. This resulted not only in mutual acceptance and ownership of the product, but also in the client taking a lead role in defining how to make the data and analyses more useful to their policy makers. The participation of representatives of policy makers and those who collect poverty data in this learning activity required the client team to work cross-sectorally. Team members from the Ministry of Finance talked to team members from the Ministry of Education and began to realize the advantages of routinely working together multi-sectorally to address poverty issues.

3.28 The Primary Challenges to Client Learning

- Lack of leadership within either the Bank or client team.
- Lack of client readiness or capacity to work multi-sectorally because of the rigidity of divisions between sector institutions in many client countries.
- Lack of synchrony between Bank schedules and political cycles.
- Slow client response.
- Country unrest and political instability (though this proved to be less of a problem than the evaluators might have expected).

3.28 Moreover, many pilot teams report having adopted a phased approach to team learning with clients, which emphasized developing better cohesion and learning practices within Bank teams before involving clients and other development partners.
Improved team capacity/knowledge and skills

3.30 The primary time and place in which team members increased their knowledge and skills, individually and collectively, was within cross-sectoral conversations orchestrated by their team learning coach. In these conversations, team members were able to:

- Teach each other about their respective sectors within the pragmatic context of a project.
- Ground their work in the realities of their client countries.
- Learn to ask different questions of their own sectoral work.
- Develop a contextual understanding of what works in which contexts.
- Understand how to use other sectors to leverage their own sector’s work.

3.31 For example,

- In Bangladesh, the team realized that more effective donor coordination for the preparation of the Health Sector Development Program would lead to less duplication and overlap and more coherent support to the country. The team came to be more sensitive to the challenge of working in Bangladesh with people from different international backgrounds.
- In the Congo, the team was able to recognize how significant a role the forestry sector could play in this country, which had been under-acknowledged prior to the multi-sectoral conversations.
- In the multi-country New Economy project in LCA, team members were able to discover synergies they did not expect and, in particular, that interventions that work in theory would work well in some countries, but would not work at all in other countries. Such insights helped them to contextualize their expertise.
- In Uzbekistan, the team was able to create a more accurate and useful poverty assessment report, grounded in Uzbek reality. Learning together with the client team inspired them to more easily share data with Bank counterparts, provide written pieces on their poverty policies and programs on the ground, and explain their poverty legislation. This sharing and exchange ultimately enriched the analysis in the poverty assessment.
- In Turkey, the Bank and client teams are drawing upon what they learned from the Mexico experience to assess and solve problems in implementing pilot CCTs before expanding to a national scale.
- The Yemen PAD was more integrated into the broader framework of the Cities Development Strategy, and was able to take into account the implementation capacity of the client.
- The LCA Youth At Risk team was able to identify HIV as a key issue as a result of involving country participants in multi-sectoral conversations. These conversations also resulted in understanding the importance of protective factors (family and social) that are not specifically focused on youth.
C. THE IMPACTS

Summary
3.32 This section presents the major findings on the impact of the MTL program. It attempts to answer the following evaluation questions: In an environment where multi-sectoral tasks are becoming the predominant approach to addressing development challenges, how has the MTL program helped Bank staff so far to work together more effectively in multi-sectoral teams to support the broad strategic goals of the Bank? What supports and/or constrains working effectively in multi-sectoral teams?

3.33 Because the program is still in the start-up phase, and the number of structured learning activities the teams have participated in is still limited, it is hard to determine or attribute direct impacts that the MTL program activities have had on team performance and other corporate goals. Nevertheless, TTLs and team members reported on several areas of impact as well as institutional issues that support and/or constrain working effectively in multi-sectoral teams. The evaluation of the next phase of the MTL program will include an assessment of impacts on products and processes based on standard and emerging Bank quality criteria, systematic, direct observation of MTL processes, and third party reporting.

3.34 The evaluation identified many areas of progress toward the intended goals and impacts of the MTL program and the Bank’s broader strategic goals of greater efficiency and effectiveness in supporting programmatic lending and advisory services. The majority of respondents interviewed reported impacts on the quality of team products, processes, and overall performance. Many also reported a transfer of learning and teaming practices to other work contexts. The personal commitment and enthusiasm of individual TTLs and team members coupled with the flexible and responsive coaching, facilitation, and other learning resources provided by the MTL program are mainly responsible for this progress.

3.35 Only a small number of teams, however, stated that enhanced partnership and effective teaming with clients were key results for their team. For the most part, these were teams in which client learning was the explicit goal or main focus of team learning (Albania, Pakistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan, LCR New Economy). Not surprisingly, due to the time it takes to create institutional change, an even smaller number of respondents stated that team learning had resulted in changes in Bank policies and procedures (Uganda PRSC2) or enhanced institutional incentives to support multi-sectoral teams (Turkey Social Mitigation). The responses highlighted the institutional conditions necessary to produce successful MTL products. All teams reported that learning and working in multi-sectoral teams to produce a team product had implications for how the Bank allocated staff time and resources/budgets and how it evaluated and rewarded staff.

3.36 The summary below of areas of progress and areas where challenges remain is based on an analysis of self-reported interview responses of Task Team Leaders (TTL), team members and Team Learning Coaches (TLCs).
Main Areas of Progress in Achieving Impact

High Quality of Team Products and Processes

3.37 Most respondents reported that MTL activities had had an impact on the quality of their product, the way they organized themselves to produce the product, or the team’s overall performance in preparing the product.

Team Product

3.38 Teams reported that using the MTL approach had produced a higher quality and more effective product. The product was more comprehensive and integrated in its analysis of sectors and themes, more accurate and realistic in its understanding of client country issues and constraints, and more relevant, responsive or acceptable to country clients. Specific impacts on the quality of the product included:

- Clearer articulation of the vision, strategic goals, objectives and the scope of the product, leading to a more relevant and feasible product. (Yemen, Uzbekistan)

- Less conflicting advice and more coherent support. Greater integration of sectors and themes in a product is leading to less conflicting policy advice to clients and more coherent support. (Uganda, Uzbekistan, Yemen)

- Better coordination of donor inputs and less overlap and duplication of effort, potentially reducing both the client’s and the Bank’s transaction costs. (Bangladesh, Uganda)

- More in depth analysis of risks and challenges, in addition to benefits and opportunities, and to where the Bank can make a difference. (Congo, LCR New Economy, Guinea)

Team Product and Client Learning and Partnership

3.39 Where the client was the major focus of learning in the team, the following impacts on team products were identified:

- Greater consensus between the client and the World Bank on data concepts, definitions and methodology, on strategic issues, priorities, trade-offs, approaches and models. This led to greater acceptance and ownership of the analyses, findings, and recommendations of the product. (Pakistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan)

- More accurate product, grounded in the reality of the client country. (Pakistan, Uzbekistan)

- More relevant and useful product for policy makers (increased client acceptance and satisfaction with policy advice) and for World Bank managers in helping clients to decide on assistance priorities and type of support. (Pakistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan)
• **Greater knowledge and use of global models and lessons** by both the client and World Bank teams to test and adapt approaches, and to assess and correct problems in implementing pilot projects before expansion to national scale. (Turkey)

• **Improved prospects for successful implementation, sustainability, and likely development impact.** (Pakistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan)

**Team Processes/Performance**

3.40 Teams reported having a more deliberate and professional approach to using teaming and learning strategies to improve their efficiency and effectiveness in producing their product. Although there was a significant up-front investment in time to team and learn, in the longer-term the team worked more efficiently and saved time in carrying out the tasks required to produce the product. The TTL reported that their one-on-one coaching with TLCs was significant in reinforcing these impacts. The most commonly mentioned impacts on team processes are summarized below:

• **More cohesive and motivated team.** Greater recognition and skill of the team leader in building team cohesion (inspiring trust, confidence, commitment, open communication and collegial exchange among team members). This facilitated the sharing of information, knowledge, and perspectives, and increased the motivation of team members to perform better. It also led to better understanding of how to accommodate different personalities, management, communication and work styles within teams. (Bangladesh, Chad, Uganda, Yemen)

• **More efficient teamwork.** More use of action learning strategies (for example, providing time for pre- and post-mission planning and reflection) as the routine way of doing business within the team. This resulted in a more efficient organization of time and tasks by the team to produce the product (Azerbaijan, LCR New Economy, Pakistan, Peru, Turkey, Yemen), as well as reduced cost to prepare, supervise and support multiple projects at once. (Congo)

• **More coherent team.** There was more emphasis given at each stage of preparing the product to articulating the strategic vision and scope, defining and refining goals and objectives, assigning roles, and organizing tasks to produce the product. This resulted in a clearer definition of goals, and clearer assignments of roles at each stage of preparation of the team’s product, which ultimately saved time in preparing terms-of-references, aide-memoires and other intermediate products.

• **More coordination and collaboration between sectors.** There was greater consideration, knowledge and understanding of the perspectives of different sectors, and professional recognition and respect for the contribution of each to the team’s product. This resulted in a more effective integration and coordination of sectors and institutions. (Azerbaijan, LCR New Economy, Pakistan, Peru, Turkey, Yemen)
• More ownership of the team’s product. Within teams, each team member had greater ownership and more complete knowledge of the product—the TTL could more easily delegate leadership authority to any team member. (Congo, Pakistan, Yemen)

Enhanced Partnership and Effective Teaming and Learning with Clients

3.41 Most teams reported that it was too early to identify significant results in their team for client learning. Client learning appeared to be a secondary consideration for most pilot teams, despite the Bank’s many new frameworks and approaches that focus on clients, on strengthening donor and client capacity to address poverty, and on holding both accountable for results. In the cases, however, where teams had teaming and learning with clients as an explicit goal, they reported significant impacts. In addition to those cited above for team products, these include:

• Better relations with the client—increased trust, professional respect, and sharing of information and data. (Congo, Pakistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan)

• The client’s appreciation of the greater efficiency of working multi-sectorally and of the higher quality product. (LCR New Economy, Pakistan, Turkey, Uzbekistan)

• Both World Bank and client are better able to prepare a multi-sectoral, participatory product. (LCR New Economy, Pakistan, Turkey)

3.42 The primary challenges to involving clients in team learning were: the lack of team leadership, the perceived lack of client readiness or capacity to work multi-sectorally because of the rigidity of divisions between sector institutions in many client countries (Uganda), or the adoption of a phased approach to team learning with clients—which emphasized developing better cohesion and learning practices in Bank teams before involving clients and other development partners. (Bangladesh, Peru Uganda)

Transfer of Learning and Teaming Practices to Other Contexts

3.43 Members of several pilot teams reported that they are using teaming skills and learning practices developed in the MTL program in other Bank teams to which they belong. Learning occurred across teams between countries (Africa MAP); across teams within countries (Congo, Yemen); across teams within a region (Africa, Uganda); across teams producing similar products (Peru, Guatemala); and between individuals in different teams with similar challenges and interests. With 30 pilot teams averaging 10 team members, each spreading it to more than 300 additional teams, the potential transfer of learning by the proverbial “thousand points of light” is high.

3.44 Notwithstanding, fewer teams report learning from other pilot teams, although TLCs have put individual teams in contact with other pilot teams working on similar tasks or facing similar challenges. Moreover, the Task Team Leader for the Peru CAS had as an
explicit goal to benefit from the experiences of other pilot teams preparing CASes. The intention is to apply the learning and experience the multi-sectoral team gained in producing the Peru CAS to the preparation of subsequent CASes for Ecuador and Bolivia by the same team. The TTL for the Yemen team is also a member of the Iran pilot team and reports cross-fertilization between the two teams. The Uganda PRSC2 team has been most involved in transferring learning and teaming practices within the Africa region, to other regions, and within the context of Bank team-leadership clinics and workshops.

**Main Challenges in Achieving Impact**

3.45 Teams reported mixed impacts on changes in institutional policies and procedures and on enhanced institutional framework to support multi-sectoral work through budgets, incentives and accountability mechanisms. While many pilot teams believe that the very existence of the MTL program demonstrates the commitment of the institution at some level to a multi-sector approach, there was general recognition that the program was still in its start-up phase and more time was needed for institutional learning to occur before the multi-sector approach would have deeper impacts on the Bank’s policies and procedures and incentive and accountability systems. One respondent stated that, “in pursuing their multi-sectoral goals, pilot teams are facing problems other Bank staff will face in decentralized, sector-wide contexts. Pilot teams are learning for the organization and are spearheading the corporate vision the Bank is moving towards.”

**Changes in Bank Policies and Procedures**

3.46 The above quote appears to accurately characterize the actual approach of the Bank in this area. Rather than trying to predict or anticipate changes and adaptations of policies and procedures required to successfully carry out multi-sectoral tasks, the institution has decided instead to learn from concrete lessons emerging from operational experience on the ground among the pilot multi-sectoral teams. These lessons are apparently guiding the identification of areas where traditional policies and procedures need to change or be adapted to facilitate multi-sectoral work.

3.47 The Uganda team has had the longest experience in the Bank with preparing multi-sectoral PRSCs. The team is now presenting the Second Poverty Reduction Credit to the Board. Concrete lessons and implications for working effectively in multi-sectoral teams have emerged from this experience and are having an impact on institutional thinking and action in this area. The Uganda pilot team noted that procurement and financial management arrangements had been adapted to fit the needs of the PRSC when the old procedures did not apply. PRSP/PRSC guidelines have been developed based on what has been done in Uganda. The TTL would like to document the lessons learned working on multi-sectoral PRSCs in Uganda for the benefit of the Africa region, as well as other regions in the Bank. For the most part, however, teams noted that work program budgets and timetables and procurement and financial management procedures are still not geared towards preparing multi-sectoral products.
Institutional Framework to Support Multi-Sectoral Teams

3.48 Teams highlighted three aspects of institutional support (budgets, incentives, accountability, etc.) where significant impacts were not evident:

(i) *The way staff time, work program budgets and timetables are determined.* Teams noted that the added upfront investment in time required to learn and work in multi-sectoral teams is not reflected in work program timetables or budgets for delivering products. A few teams report that the availability of flexible MTL learning budgets could provide an incentive to change staff behavior about learning in teams. This is so because MTL learning funds are flexible and can finance learning activities that regular work program budgets or project funds are currently unable to.

(ii) *Evaluation, reward, and incentive system.* The institutional culture still predominately values individual performance on individual products, and the Bank’s evaluation and reward systems still reflect this. There is still no broad recognition and appreciation of learning and working in multi-sectoral teams or institutional incentives to produce a team product. Even so, there are instances of recognition and appreciation for working on multi-sectoral tasks. The Uzbekistan Poverty Assessment team received a spot award from their VPU for outstanding performance in enhancing partnership and learning with clients. Managers working in the new technologies/knowledge economy area have long appreciated the necessity and value of working in multi-sectoral teams. (LCR New Economy team)

(iii) *Accountability and Risks for TTLs.* An issue for multi-sectoral tasks is who owns and is held accountable for the product, and who ensures that it meets quality standards and is produced within work program timetables and costs. Accountability for multi-sector tasks is not always clear among the country manager, sector manager, network, thematic group, etc. involved. For example, ownership of the product among the various units—PREM, WBI, IFC, country and sector departments in the Bank, and the difficulty of integrating topics that had never been integrated before, were challenges for the LCR New economy team. There are also potential risks for TTLs, if the additional time required to learn and team together causes the product timetable to slip or results in cost overruns. This has implications for how many work program activities are assigned to TTLs managing multi-sectoral tasks.

3.49 As with changes in policies and procedures, concrete lessons and implications for enhancing institutional support for working effectively in multi-sectoral teams are emerging from the on-going experiences of the pilot teams and will continue to inform institutional thinking and action in this area.

D. THE INSTITUTIONAL CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS

3.5 This section presents some lessons emerging from the experience of pilot teams so far about the institutional conditions for success of the MTL Program. Most pilot teams
report that the MTL program has provided the following types of support for preparing multi-sector products to help them succeed: (i) a structure to support, facilitate and reinforce learning within and across teams, in order to better integrate and coordinate sectors and themes; (ii) a learning budget that provides both funds and incentives to learn, experiment and innovate; (iii) access to learning tools and knowledge resources both within and outside the Bank. Even so, pilot teams found it difficult to find time for learning in the tight delivery schedules for Bank products. Also, initially, the MTL budgeting and contracting process for MTL activities was not as transparent and flexible as required.

3.51 The most common institutional conditions for success mentioned include:

- Flexible and transparent work program budgets and timetables to enable multi-sector teams to take the time to learn, experiment and innovate.

- Support and recognition by senior managers (VPs), by country and sector directors, and by managers of the value of working and learning in multi-sectoral teams.

- Wide promotion and dissemination of the benefits, best practices and challenges of working in multi-sectoral teams.

The support and appreciation pilot teams are currently receiving from their senior managers, particularly sector managers, for learning and working in multi-sector teams is not uniform. Some teams report that their VPUs are valuing and rewarding the contribution of the MTL program to the team’s multi-sector product. Others report that country clients appreciate the greater efficiency and quality of the product. Still others report that the Bank’s wider institutional culture is a barrier to the progress of multi-sector work. The evaluation system still rewards individual, rather than team, performance. Allocation of staff time and budgets do not take into account the requirements for producing a multi-sectoral product.

E. OTHER FACTORS THAT SUPPORT OR CONSTRAIN OUTPUTS AND IMPACTS

3.52 Several factors supported or constrained the outputs and impacts of the MTL program. These factors, which relate principally to (i) team creation, (ii) team characteristics, and (iii) team leadership, are summarized in the tables below:
### Table 3: Team Creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a “greenfield” to create whatever was needed to create a product. Being able to select the skill sets needed, based on both expertise and demonstrated performance.</td>
<td>Trying to create a large team that is not well defined and does not have a clear mandate; trying to create a team when there is not a clear, common product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or, conversely, having a long-standing, stable team.</td>
<td>Creating teams without dealing up front with sector politics of ownership. A need on the part of the sector to control quality and receive recognition created instability of focus and team tensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting a team that has already worked together in a multi-sectoral context.</td>
<td>Problems with logistics and lack of administrative support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting the team based on “who shows up” because they are motivated.</td>
<td>Instability of staff on a regional level can affect recruiting and replacement on teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a nice mix of experienced Bank professionals and eager new people, people residing in Washington and people residing in the field. Diversity of profession as well as skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving operational people and people in the field to ensure that the product is grounded and feasible (with the tradeoff of increased difficulty getting the team together).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Team characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to a multi-sectoral approach and to breaking down sector silos.</td>
<td>Divisions, difference of opinions and advocacy along sectoral lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to listening to, and learning from, each other, and willingness to bend in order to come to a consensus.</td>
<td>Individualistic, competitive attitudes and an unwillingness to share, if it meant that individual work might be used without individual authorship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team members who proactively solicited and gave feedback.</td>
<td>Individuals who were not willing to change the way they work or who did not have good listening or interpersonal skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable, well-defined teams with clear roles, division of labor, and, especially, clear product outcomes.</td>
<td>Lack of vision or understanding of the large picture among team members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the client, and to learning from, and with, them.</td>
<td>Lack of interaction and follow through in the home office, and, as a result, falling into old habits between events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluid or unstable teams, as well as teams that really did not exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teams that did not have the right mix of technical skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The larger the team, the more difficult it was to coordinate and find time to meet face-to-face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation of staff in operational roles, as well as staff in the field, also made it difficult logistically to meet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teams consisting of a large percentage of external consultants meant that whatever was learned left with them after the product was done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Team leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ More than anything else, subjects reported that openness to learning</td>
<td>▪ Inability to manage boundary issues between sectors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from others’ points of view, and encouraging and expecting the same</td>
<td>▪ Lack of patience for the dialogue required to create a multi-sectoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude among team members, was a critical characteristic of a TTL</td>
<td>consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on a multi-sectoral team. This included listening well, taking a back</td>
<td>▪ Inability to adjust to a change of focus (which may, ultimately, be the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seat to team members and respecting their contributions, encouraging</td>
<td>result of a lack of coherence on the part of institutional sponsors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(and/or requiring) participation and information sharing, and</td>
<td>▪ In the context of co-leadership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discouraging people from working in isolation.</td>
<td>▪ Overlap or lack of communication between co-leaders, or inability to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Clear guidance and facilitation, but being focused primarily on</td>
<td>maintain a larger perspective apart from one’s sectoral agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>results and giving team members the freedom to experiment. Someone</td>
<td>▪ Sharing leadership with one’s manager, which makes it difficult to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who inspires confidence, trust and commitment.</td>
<td>as partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The ability on the part of the TTL to bring together experts,</td>
<td>▪ Disconnects in the focus of co-leaders (e.g., between micro and macro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including those who are more senior than the TTL, and create</td>
<td>focus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperation between them.</td>
<td>▪ Lack of management skills:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Communication with other stakeholders, the ability to explain issues</td>
<td>▪ Lack of clarity regarding the product, or having too large a scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and get stakeholders on board, sensitivity to client needs, and</td>
<td>▪ Decision-making, delegation, managing logistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willingness to be flexible in light of those needs and changing</td>
<td>▪ Having to devote too much time to bringing the team together (which can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumstances.</td>
<td>result from identifying a team that is too large).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Having a TTL in a role (e.g., resident representative; country</td>
<td>▪ Not being able to set realistic schedules or budgets and, related to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economist) that inherently tends to give them a cross-sectoral</td>
<td>that, not being able to advocate institutional sponsors for the time and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission and a desire to integrate perspectives.</td>
<td>resources it will take to do the work entailed in a multi-sectoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Working effectively in a co-leadership role, when necessary.</td>
<td>project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Having complimentary skill sets and being able to lead together,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without overlapping or contradicting each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Or, conversely, having one leader with good direction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Solid experience with the region and country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Other supports and constraints mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Clear milestones and deliverables.</td>
<td>▪ Semantic misunderstandings, both within the team and in working with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ The ability to speak candidly within the Bank about issues like</td>
<td>client teams. Needing to spend too much time explaining the team’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corruption.</td>
<td>definitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Support from other sectors and other Bank people.</td>
<td>▪ Cultural issues that make teambuilding more difficult – inability to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Previous multi-sectoral work on the team that created a framework</td>
<td>discuss interpersonal relations in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the new project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
F. THE KEY DRIVERS OF SUCCESS

3.53 Using the interviews as a guide, the evaluators mapped out the interrelationships between the MTL program and its primary outputs – improved team performance and quality products. They then looked at how the value produced by the program will reinforce the perceived value within the Bank and how that, in turn, will help drive the future success of the program, making the whole process sustainable. Further, the evaluators hypothesize how this cycle is further enhanced and reinforced by focusing on client learning. (See Figures below.) This set of illustrations should be useful as a conversation tool between stakeholders in the process about what to expect from the program and how best to support it. It should be of further value in planning the FY03 evaluation of the MTL program.

3.54 Using the interviews as a guide, the evaluators mapped out the interrelationships between the MTL program and its primary impacts – improved team performance and quality products. (See figure 3)

Figure 3: What contributes to effective team performance and a quality

![Diagram](image)

This diagram illustrates proposed cause/effect relationships between inputs and impacts of the MTL program.

3.55 They then looked at how the value produced by the program will reinforce the perceived value within the Bank and how that, in turn, will help drive the future success of the program, making the whole process sustainable. (See figure 4) This illustration completes the proposed “system” of interactions that reinforce the value of the MTL program. The reader should be able to start at any point in the illustration and use the diagram to tell a story about how more or less of any one element would impact the rest
of the interactions. Thus, achieving the desired impacts of higher quality products and more effective team performance should lead to greater perceived value for the MTL program, which should strengthen institutional support and, ultimately, lead to even more focus on team learning and more effective performance in the future. Or, the clearer and more shared the vision by the team, the more effective will be the team’s performance and the more coordinated will be the interactions across sectors. Conversely, a lack of clear and shared vision will impede team performance and coordination across sectors.

Figure 4: What reinforces the value of the MTL

(Note- Color coded chart is needed for one to understand the causal loops)
Illustration completes the proposed “system” of interactions that reinforce the value of the MTL program. The reader should be able to start at any point and use the diagram to tell a story of how more or less of any one element, such as “clear, shared vision” would impact the rest of the interactions.

3.56 Finally, the evaluators hypothesized how this cycle is further enhanced and reinforced by focusing on client learning. (See Figure 5) This illustration adds the proposed reinforcing impacts of consciously focusing on client learning as part of the MTL contracting process, including further strengthening perceived value and institutional support for the MTL program.
3.57 This set of illustrations should be useful as a conversation tool between stakeholders in the process about what to expect from the program and how best to support it. It should be of further value in planning the FY03 evaluation of the MTL program.

**Figure 5: How does client involvement strengthen the value of the MTL**

This illustration adds the proposed reinforcing impacts of consciously focusing on client learning as part of the MTL contracting process, including strengthened cause/effect interactions between perceived value and institutional support.
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Summary: The MTL program is important as an indication of the Bank’s commitment to improving the effectiveness of multi-sectoral and programmatic approaches to reducing poverty and addressing other development challenges. The start-up activities of the MTL program are beginning to show results in the quality and efficiency of pilot team performance and products. Teams advocate that the Bank should continue to support the MTL Program, to give time for deeper impacts on team performance, products and client satisfaction to be meaningfully assessed. WBIEG submits that the main thrust of the MTL program should be reinforced, but it needs to be refined to take into account lessons learned so far, to give increasing responsibility and accountability to the teams themselves for learning, and to improve the prospects for greater client learning and partnership. The principles for moving forward should emphasize a dynamic, flexible, client-oriented approach to learning in multi-sectoral teams.

A. CONCLUSIONS

4.2 This “year” of piloting was in reality only a few months. The findings of the study capture the early stages of the development of the program and is thus quite preliminary. The evidence nevertheless strongly suggests that the Bank should continue to invest in the MTL program for several reasons:

- The quality of the integration of sectors and themes that the MTL program is providing – through activities to strengthen team leadership and improve cross-sectoral interactions between team members – should help the Bank deliver on the promise of its multi-sectoral vision.
- The learning practices themselves are creating a coherence between the Bank’s vision and the behavior of teams and team members (shifting from an expert model to a client partnership model). Over time, these practices should introduce, within multi-sectoral teams, a more rigorous self-assessment of the link between behaviors and results.
- The search for more effective integration in these MTL-led interactions is revealing inefficiencies and overlap between sectors that will lead to cost savings and more integrated interfaces with the Bank’s clients.
- The label “MTL” itself, along with the learning budget, is providing teams with an excuse and authorization to experiment and innovate, and to promote the Bank’s new multi-sectoral and decentralized theories and ways of working.

4.3 The WBIEG also concludes that the leadership of the regions and the sectors has an important role to play in the MTL program’s continued success. The Bank needs to develop a better understanding of the goals, benefits and costs (short-term and long-term) of the MTL program at the VPU level. Such understanding will help to manage, if not reduce, the short-term tension between producing a product within the prescribed time and costs, and taking the time to learn, experiment and innovate. It should also help to reduce the likelihood of sectoral turf wars that could undermine the benefits of multi-
sectoral collaborations within the teams. Greater dissemination of the benefits of participating in the MTL program and of the successes of pilot teams is necessary to sensitize VPU to how the MTL program can help further their work (such as the Uzbekistan team’s spot award for a higher quality product and enhanced partnership with clients). For a more detailed discussion of the role of senior management, see the Section on Recommendations for Institutional Support below.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.4 The evaluators acknowledge the reality of how long it will take to change Bank policies and procedures and institutional frameworks to support multi-sector teams. This has broad implications for the nature of MTL inputs and the types of institutional support required to ensure the long-term success of multi-sectoral teams. This section focuses on what needs to be put in place to ensure that the MTL program succeeds in the next phase. Pilot teams provided information and insights on the content and organization of the MTL program itself, as well as the institutional supports and challenges that were emerging as they prepared their multi-sectoral products.

Recommendations for the MTL Program

Preserve and strengthen the flexibility and responsiveness of MTL Program

4.5 The MTL program must remain a flexible and dynamic enabling force, responding to the evolving needs and challenges of individual multi-sectoral teams. The MTL Program supports multi-sector teams when:

- MTL coaches use teaming and learning approaches that respond to the specific goals, focus or problem a team needs to address in producing the product at each stage.
- MTL learning funds are flexible and can finance team learning activities that regular work program budgets or project funds are unable to.
- The profile of the TLC balances, as much as possible, good facilitation skills with technical knowledge, knowledge of World Bank operations, and foreign language skills.

Improve the team selection and contracting process based on the experience of FY02.

4.6 The MTL Program really begins, as an intervention, in the team selection process. During this process, the MTL coaches have the opportunity to work with the Institutional Sponsors to understand their priorities for the year, and to educate them about what is involved in the MTL process. They also provide the opportunity to communicate what was accomplished last year, what the coaches have learned, what the sponsors should expect, and how they can support (or impede), or even actively participate in, the process this year.

4.7 The MTL Program should focus on selecting teams that have a clear product to produce this year, and multi-country teams in which each participating country has real work to do. Teams may not be fully formed at the beginning of the year, but “teams” that both are
not formed and do not have a product to produce should not be selected. *No amount of teambuilding will make up for the lack of a real reason to act as a team.*

4.8 In FY03 the MTL program needs to contract well with the regional VPUs, to understand their goals, to help them understand the goals and time commitments of the MTL program, and to help the VPUs make more effective team selections for the MTL program. The contracting process needs to be improved to create:

a. A better understanding at the VPU level of the goals of multi-sectoral team learning. Actually being able to talk about it will help create sustainability for the behavior change, both on the part of the multi-sectoral teams, as well as on the part of the Bank’s clients.

b. A clearer, more consistent and transparent MTL budgeting process to minimize the perceived cost-benefit trade-off.

c. Better management of the assignment of MTL coaches to individual teams for different kinds of events so that the team understands the coaches’ respective roles, and, when other coaches become involved, who is responsible for maintaining the primary on-going coaching role.

*In the next phase of the program, work to shift the responsibility and accountability for learning to TTLs and team members themselves.*

4.9 A long-term goal of action learning is to build a team’s own capability and confidence to learn its way to success in complex challenges. This will ultimately contribute to building the “bones” of the Knowledge Bank. The best early indicator of this long-term process is the team’s own ability to articulate and validate its thinking about what will make it successful in the face of current complex challenges. The MTL Program can help achieve this by:

- Ensuring that teams are articulating their thinking about what will make them successful before they go on mission or begin to work together to create a product, and getting together afterwards to determine if their thinking was validated.

- Partnering with a member of the team to shift the “stewardship” responsibility for on-going learning to the team itself, with the TLC acting as a support to the team’s work, rather than the responsible partner in the process.

- Putting more weight on the intended quarterly progress reports and structuring them so that the team is reporting on both content and method of learning. This serves two purposes: (i) it provides data for next year’s evaluation, and (ii) it provides useful benchmarks for the team’s action learning practice, to track their own progress and results. This action might require that each team be supported with an internal evaluator and documentation specialist.
4.10  **In line with the Bank’s broader strategic goal of client-led poverty reduction, make effective teaming and learning with clients the primary focus of multi-sector teams in the next phase of the program.** Some of the most significant learning and impacts on the MTL program so far have occurred when pilot teams and client teams learn together. Those pilot teams that made client learning a primary goal already recognize that involving clients in the design and preparation of the product increases client trust, commitment and ownership, as well as likely implementation success and sustainability. In the next phase, high quality products and performance should be based on joint Bank and client team learning, to enhance the value of products for clients.

4.11  **In the next phase, enhance the capacity of the MTL program unit to facilitate consultation and coordination activities between the Bank, clients, donors and other stakeholders in the context of PRSPs/PRSCs and poverty-oriented CASes.** This will reduce duplications in efforts, policies and procedures and enhance knowledge management and documentation.

**Continue to improve the MTL coaching practice.**

4.12  The MTL coaches did a very good job this year, in a short period of time, in learning from their own experience – beginning to understand the teams’ work and challenges, experimenting, discovering effective interventions, refining their approach, and learning collectively from each other’s experience as they proceeded. The MTL coaches will need to continue their own learning practice this next year. Some framing questions for their practice should include:

- How to reduce overhead for teams and speed up the budgeting process, and how to make the development of learning contracts as simple and efficient as possible.
- How to involve Institutional Sponsors in the learning process, ensuring that the contract reflects or at least takes into consideration the priorities of the region and/or sector.
- How to effectively involve the client team more deeply as a learning partner, starting with the contracting process.
- How to effectively package and use “products” (processes and tools), in which fields of action, to accomplish which outputs. Also, how to discover other common and repeated fields of action around which to build MTL products.
- How to help a team maximize the value gained (both in terms of learning and production) on missions.
- How to deepen the quality of integrative conversations, and insights gained (leverage points discovered, overlaps eliminated, etc.), across sectors and with client teams.
- How to ensure that coaches are well versed in the Bank’s operational work and prepared to contribute effectively as a coach in technical conversations.
- How to help teams sustain learning in-between events. What constitutes effective and efficient follow up between events?
- How to partner with teams to promote their own modeling and adoption of tools and practices, and reduce their reliance on the presence of a coach, so that team learning becomes a normal, valuable part of the way they work.
• How to help TTLs to see opportunities for, and gain value from, cross-team learning.
• How to deepen the way in which the coaches’ work reflects the goals of the MTL Program and the Bank’s new way of working.

4.13 The MTL coaches should continue to coach TTLs to build their leadership skills in multi-sectoral teams, including their interactions with their Institutional Sponsors, in order to reinforce the goals and expectations of the MTL process. In addition, they should focus on capturing small successes – overlaps identified and eliminated, leverage points discovered and used, insights gained by clients, etc., especially when they are the result of an innovative experiment. (Partnering with someone inside the team should help here.) These stories can be used to encourage teams to experiment and advocate new ways of working – to raise the bar and reinforce the value of this new work. The stories will also be of value to the MTL coaches to learn about how to strengthen their own practice, as well as to feed into next year’s evaluation.

Recommendations for Institutional Support

4.14 Promote widely within the Bank and among clients the benefits of the MTL program by creating a vehicle (such as an electronic newsletter) to disseminate best practices and early successes, catalogue action learning resources and tools in and outside the Bank, highlight institutional challenges and how they are being addressed.

4.15 Promote links between the MTL program and other initiatives in the Bank with similar objectives and goals, in order to pool resources and reduce overlap and duplication.

4.16 Make institutional structures, procedures, work programs, and budgets reflect the new emphasis on multi-sector approaches.

• Increase the flexibility of regular work programs and budgets to provide multi-sector teams with the time and funds to experiment and innovate.

• Provide incentives for sector managers to increase their commitment to, and ownership of, multi-sector tasks, as well as incentives to support and reward their staff to prepare and implement such tasks.

• Work to continue to modify all management practices that inhibit working effectively in multi-sectoral teams. Significant in this regard is enhancing the shared ownership and accountability between Sector Managers and Country Managers for the multi-sectoral product.

• Adapt operational procedures and processes to a multi-sectoral approach. This may imply streamlining and simplifying financial management, procurement, and disbursement procedures in light of the greater integration of sectors and in the
interest of client implementation capacity. Bank thinking and action should draw and build upon the experiences of teams who have long and extensive involvement in preparing multi-sector products (Uganda PRSC2, PREM, WBIGK).

*Increase the appreciation, recognition, promotion, and support of senior managers.*

4.17 The Bank’s institutional role and responsibility in supporting multi-sector teams is not as yet uniformly understood or appreciated by all of senior management. Some regions, notably the Africa Region, have made a visible commitment to learning and knowledge management and are actively supportive of the MTL program. Others have been less active supporters. For multi-sectoral teams to succeed, change must intensify in the following areas:

- Senior management should actively promote, and build awareness of, the institutional value of learning and working multi-sectorally among staff at all levels. Certain teams are already reporting greater appreciation by senior managers of the contribution of multi-sectoral team learning to the team’s product. This is the case when there is a clear recognition that learning and working in multi-sector teams is a prerequisite to the quality and success of the product (LCR New Economy, Uganda PRSC2).

- The Bank must foster an institutional culture that values and rewards team products. Senior management must reform incentive and performance evaluation systems to evaluate and reward staff working in multi-sectoral teams on the basis of team rather than individual products.
V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY03 EVALUATION

A. Evaluating Action Learning Processes

5.1 This evaluation sought to provide information on the processes, outputs and impacts of the MTL program through the generation of a rich set of qualitative information derived solely from interviews. The evaluation function also sought to be highly independent and the value of this approach lies in providing more objective analysis and interpretation of the information derived from the interviews. The intricacies of the nature of the MTL activities however require a higher level of participatory evaluation than was afforded in FY02 in studying action learning processes and the evolutionary process of team formation and production. The study of such processes is most significant for developing lessons to guide future interventions and for developing a body of knowledge about team/work-based learning in complex institutions such as the World Bank.

It is recommended that to respond to questions about processes, the evaluation activities in FY03 include participatory evaluation or direct systematic observation of team learning and working, this done on a grand scale and in varying contexts with different types of teams and involving clients. Key issues in these methods of research and evaluation is their obtrusive nature, (this being one prime factor why the methods were not used in FY02). Resolving this might require that the evaluation team work as part of the MTL program team. This however raises several challenges for objectivity and independence. It takes a very mature evaluation specialist to effectively balance such conflicts. Dialogue on this subject between WBIEG, the HRLOE program team and selected Team Leaders interested in such a study would lead to a workable solution.

5.2 Another way to capture processes and their outcomes is by having the team itself establish a self-monitoring process. Because of the nature of the action learning approach being used, the greater the responsibility the team takes for monitoring its own results, the greater its potential to achieve truly outstanding learning. WBIES can contribute to this output by:

- Using this year’s evaluation to help teams establish clear metrics for their own learning practice (e.g., product quality, level of client involvement, identification of multi-sectoral interactions, improvement practices, etc.).
- Building an expectation of MTL teams that they will self-report and capture learning as part of the MTL process.
- Engaging with MTL coaches on a quarterly basis to reflect on progress to date against the MTL program goals and against individual team MOUs and plans for the next quarter.

B. Looking more deeply at intermediate outputs of action learning

5.3 The FY02 evaluation of pilot teams early in their learning cycle did not allow for rigorous evaluation of intermediate outputs. A deeper look at the value chain of the action
learning process would be possible, once several iterations of MTL interventions have taken
place.

Table 7: Scheme for Evaluating Intermediate Outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Intermediate Outputs</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Design a learning structure into the action of the team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Model and facilitate the process with teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Provide tools and resources for teams to do their own work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Train teams to do their own action learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a container for learning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Recognition of links between actions and outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Improved ability to articulate and test the team’s thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating sustainable learning practices:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Learning embedded into the work flow as a natural habit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Reduced need over time for external facilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Sustainable performance improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Pragmatic innovation*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A validated body of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Definition: Innovations based on disciplined inquiry done in the context of real work, and tested by the team itself in the same context.

5.4 Early evidence, as with the Congo team, of systematic thinking about the team’s theory of success was encouraging. In FY03, the evaluation team should include the following in the evaluation process (again, much of this can be gained from the team’s own mid-course reporting):

- Look at when and how deeply the client is engaged in the learning process.
- Look for concrete value gained from cross-team interactions.
- Look at the team’s level of adoption of MTL practices when the TLC is not present.
- Look at team members’ ability to give specific examples of multi-sectoral insights about interactions and overlaps, and insights gained from learning with client teams.
- Ask team members to articulate their theory of success in their projects, their success indicators, and early evidence of whether or not it is working. Look for commonality of thinking between TTLs and team members.
- Look for openness on the part of TTLs and team members to acknowledge failures and insights gained from them, as well as from successes.
- Ask team members to share lessons learned along the way about what has worked and what has not in their work and learning processes, and what the team is doing differently as a result.
- Look for “pragmatic innovations” that have been created as a result of the MTL process.

C. Evaluating Team Products

5.5 The real impact of the MTL program is on the quality of the products (as hypothesized by the program itself). It is noted above, that this year’s evaluation could not conclude the work started on evaluating the impacts of the products. It however collected copious information on criteria that define quality products of MTL. This together with other Bank criteria should serve as the basis for evaluating products (and performances associated with products). As
noted in page 9, the design of this evaluation needs to examine the degree to which expert panel methods used in the Bank (such as QAGs and QER) could be used as an evaluation methodology within the framework of a comparison group design for MTL and non-MTL multi-sector teams. Products that will get QAGed provide an opportunity for WBIEG to partner with QAG in assessment and evaluation. The reader is referred to the program Logframe (Annex A), column three on the monitoring and evaluation plan that puts these recommendations for evaluation in the context of the program results.

5.6 The findings of this evaluation represent the MTL program at such an early stage of operation that it was impossible to account for impacts in a systematic and rigorous way. It is expected that in the next phase of the program, it will be possible to do a more structured assessment of team characteristics, team processes, performance and products and their interactive effects. Analyses of this type provide a more robust basis for drawing lessons and for supporting MTL in a more targeted manner. To do this, it is important to assemble data on team characteristics in a more systematic and routine way. MTL program staff should begin to gather data on: stage of team formation; composition of teams and profiles of team members; stability of teams; amount of time coaches spent with teams, team leadership; types of implementation of the MTL; variation in team learning practices; and team use of learning budget. It is however important to note that a valid comparison of MTL and non-MTL groups requires equal effort in documenting the characteristics of the non-MTL teams.
## Annex A: Multi-Sectoral Team Learning Program Logical Framework (Working Draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>Performance Indicators (QQT to be developed from notes below)</th>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation Plan</th>
<th>Conditions for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate Goal</strong>&lt;br&gt;(To be specified)</td>
<td><strong>Performance Indicators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Evaluation Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conditions</strong>&lt;br&gt;for Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Program Goal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 High quality team products</td>
<td>1.1 CAS, PRSP, PRSC and other products of teams meet “quality” standards to a satisfactory degree. &lt;br&gt;FY02/FY03</td>
<td>1.1. Product Analysis by Expert Panel</td>
<td>1.1. Interviews with Teams and Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Development of knowledge workers and lifelong learners with high teaming and multi-sectoral skills.</td>
<td>1.2 Staff involved in pilot effort transfer skills in other work contexts. &lt;br&gt;FY02/FY03</td>
<td>1.2. Interviews with Task Team Leaders</td>
<td>1.2. Longitudinal study of pilot team members and how they transfer knowledge to other contexts and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Enhanced partnership and effective teaming and learning with clients.</td>
<td>1.3 Staff and clients as active learners in a global community</td>
<td>1.3. Study of active learning and communities of practices in client countries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **2. Program Objectives/ Outputs** | | | |
| **2.1 Improved team knowledge and skills (technical and behavioral) to address multi-sectoral challenges** | 2.1 Teams have different configurations of increased knowledge depending on needs. | 2.1 Questionnaire focused knowledge gained accompanied by observation of how this is used in the work and product. | |
| **2.2 Improved learning practices among team members (Teams integrate learning in its work (a living learning practice))** | 2.2 Action and continuous improvement are woven together, with as little extra time and effort. Teams apply framework – Plan-Act-Reflect-Action with learning before, during and after action. | 2.2 Interviews (FY02) Observations (FY03) Team self-monitoring based on metrics provided by WBIEG (FY03) | |
| **2.3 Improved cross-team learning** | 2.3 Emerging lessons are rapidly captured, shared and adopted across teams and regions | 2.3 Interviews Product analysis of lessons applied from learning from other teams. Analysis of documentation of lessons. | |
| **2.4 Improved client learning to operate in a multi-sectoral environment.** | 2.4 Client facility for working in multi-sectoral or disciplinary teams. | 2.4 Interviews with clients. | |
Annex B: Team Selection Criteria for Regional Vice Presidencies

1. Team has support from VP to undertake team development aspects
   Reflected in delivery timeline (e.g., time for team building, process skills and cross-sectoral skill development)
2. Teams have potential for high-performance
   • It is not an effective way to deal with highly dysfunctional teams
3. Team will exist for 12+ months
4. Team members will be relatively stable
5. Team has a clear deliverable
6. Team has clear time-line for delivery
7. Team has cross-sectoral representation
8. Team has measurable deliverables
9. Team is a:
   - Country Team
   - Task Team (Programmatic Team)
   - PRSP Team
   - CDF Team
   - Multi-sectoral teams (at least 3 sectors or units)
   - Other multi-sectoral teams
10. Team is willing to participate in:
    - Team development learning
    - Strategic and cross-sectoral skill development
11. Team has Board Date in:
    - 3rd Quarter FY02
    - 4th Quarter FY02
    or
    - 1st Quarter FY03
    - 2nd FY03
12. Washington or Country-Based
13. Team is
    
    existing
    new
14. Team is adequately staffed
Annex C: Team Selection Criteria: Final Cut Selection Criteria for ART Team 2

- Delivery date
  - Determines sequencing
    - Tranche 1 Team – existing team
    - Tranche 2 Teams – new teams

- Regional Representation

- Type of Operation (e.g., SAL, AAA, Emergency Recovery, PRSC, APL)

- IBRD/IFC/MIGA (proportional to organizational size)

- Washington and/or Country-Based

- Team has high-performance potential
## Annex D: MTL Teams for FY02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER</th>
<th>Cluster LEAD</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>TEAM/ PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>HQ/ FIELD</th>
<th>TEAM LEADER</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>TLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRSP/PRSC</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>PRSC2</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Satu Kristiina J. Kahkonen</td>
<td>LEN</td>
<td>Godwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>PRSC</td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Jean Mazurelle</td>
<td>LEN</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>PRSC</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Philip Goldman</td>
<td>LEN</td>
<td>Christiane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>Living Standards Assessment</td>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Reema Nayar</td>
<td>Pov Ass</td>
<td>Maury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LCR</td>
<td>GUAPA (Guatemala Poverty Assessment)</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Eduardo Somensatto / Kathy Lindert</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LCR</td>
<td>PRSC / CAS</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>John Henry Stein</td>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Maury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MNA</td>
<td>PRSC / CAS</td>
<td>Yemen, Republic</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MNA</td>
<td>PRSC / CAS</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Paolo Zacchia</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MNA</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Charles Humphreys</td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Roger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Decentralized MS projects

| | Roger Sullivan | AFR | Community and Local Government Development | Nigeria | HQ | Talib Esmail | LEN | Maury |
| | | ECA | Social Risk Mitigation | Turkey | HQ | John Innes | LEN | Sue |
| | | ECA | Rural Infrastructure | Azerbaijan | HQ | Julia Bucknall | AAA | John |
| | | SAR | AJK -Community-Distr. Infra Services | Pakistan | HQ | Julie G. Viloria-Williams | LEN | John |
| | | MNA | Port Cities Development Program (PCDP) | Yemen, Republic | HQ | Omar Razzaz | LEN | Jamila |

### CAS activities

| | Brian Wilkinson | MNA | CAS | Algeria | HQ | Michelle Keane | CAS | Christiane |
| | | AFR | CT Support/ CAS | Chad | HQ | Robert Calderisi | CAS | Godwin |
| | | EAP | CAS | Thailand | Bangkok | Ian Porter | AAA | Brian |
| | | LCR | CAS | Peru | Peru | Andrea Silverman | CAS | |
| | | LCR | GUAPA (Guatemala Poverty Assessment) | Guatemala | HQ | Eduardo Somensatto / Kathy Lindert | CAS | Jennifer |
| | | LCR | PRSC / CAS | Guyana | HQ | John Henry Stein | CAS | Maury |

### Multi-Country Programs

| | Maury Sterns | AFR | Nile Basin Initiative | 10 Nile Countries | HQ | David R.C. Gray | LEN | Brian |
| | | AFR | MAP II - HIV/AIDS | Regional | HQ | Keith Hansen | LEN | Roger |
| | | LCR | New Economy | Argentina/Uruguay/ Chile | HQ | Jim Hanna | AAA | Maury |
| | | SAR | South Asia Decentralization Team | India | HQ | Luis Constantino | AAA | Roger |
| | | LCR | Youth at Risk | Multi-National Caribbean. Project | HQ | Wendy Cunningham | AAA | Roger |
| | | SAR | Reducing Vulnerability from Drought | South Asia | HQ | Walter Garvey | AAA | Roger |
| | | ECA | Youth Exclusion in SE Europe | SE Europe | HQ | Gloria La Cava | AAA | Roger |

### Country Teams

#### Country Teams and field-based Teams

| | Maury Sterns | AFR | CT Support/ CPPR | Guinea | | Jan Aime E. Weetjens | CPPR | Christiane |
| | | AFR | CT Support/ CAS | Chad | HQ | Robert Calderisi | CAS | Godwin |
| | | AFR | DR Congo | Congo | HQ | Emanuel Mbi | AAA | Brian |
| | | SAR | HNP Team - Health, Nutrition & Pop. | Bangladesh | Dhaka | Birte Holm-Sorensen | AAA | John |
| | | SAR | Nepal Country Team | Nepal | Kath | Kenichi Ohashi | AAA | Jamila |
Annex E: Interview Protocol

MTL Team Leaders and Team Learning Coaches Interview Protocol

Name:  Team:  Date:  Role: TTL TLC TM IS Client

TEAM CHARACTERISTICS
1. Describe the team. How large is it? How has it evolved over time?

2. How do the team’s characteristics support team learning in your multi-sectoral work?

3. How do the team’s characteristics get in the way of team learning in your multi-sectoral work?

OUTCOMES, GOALS, WORK PRODUCT
4. Describe your team’s goals, outcomes and work product.

5. How do you measure the quality of your work? What are your criteria?

6. How would you rate your work at this stage? (reality vs. ideal FOR YOUR TEAM)
   1  2  3  4  5

7. How is working in a multi-sectoral team changing your work product/outcomes?

8. What about the team is contributing to your work success?

9. What about the team is getting in the way of your work success?

10. How is action learning contributing to your work success?

CHANGING THE WAY WE WORK
11. How is working in a multi-sectoral team changing the way you do your work and learn?

12. What is contributing to your ability to change the way you work and learn?

13. What is getting in the way of changing the way you work and learn?

14. Are you finding inequities or barriers to contributions from different sectors?

15. If so, what lessons have you learned so far about what enables you to overcome these barriers?
LEARNING STRATEGIES
16. How would you rate your team’s ability to learn from its experience?
   1 2 3 4 5

17. If you think about the work you’ve done so far as a team, what has worked especially well or not as well as you would have liked?

18. What lessons have you drawn from these experiences?

19. How are these lessons affecting how you approach your work in the next few months?

ROLES/SUPPORTS
Team Learning Coach
20. How would you rate your/there effectiveness in their role?
   1 2 3 4 5

21. How have they supported your learning as a team?

22. What about how you/they do their work has not been effective?

23. What else could they do to be more effective?

Task Team Leader
24. How would you rate your/there effectiveness in their role?
   1 2 3 4 5

25. What about how you/they do their work has been effective?

26. What about how you/they do their work has not been effective?

27. What else could they do to be more effective?

28. What other supports have you had in doing your multi-sectoral work? How have they contributed?

29. What other supports would have benefited you?
### KEY RESULT AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KRA</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Any indicators of success?</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sustaining high performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improved client learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teams develop effective learning practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improved cross-team learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. VPU learning &amp; action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institutional/ system learning and action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expansion of Bank’s capacity for support of team-based learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TO WRAP UP

What are the biggest lessons your team has learned about what it takes to do multi-sectoral work?

---

### Team Members MTL Interview Protocol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Team:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Role: TTL TLC TM IS Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TEAM CHARACTERISTICS

30. How do the team’s characteristics support team learning in your multi-sectoral work?
31. How do the team’s characteristics get in the way of team learning in your multi-sectoral work?

OUTCOMES, GOALS, WORK PRODUCT

32. How is working in a multi-sectoral team changing your work product/outcomes?

33. What about the team is contributing to your work success?

34. What about the team is getting in the way of your work success?

35. How is action learning contributing to your work success? Rate MTL events on:
   - effect on team working and learning together
   - effect on quality of products your team is producing

CHANGING THE WAY WE WORK

36. Are you finding inequities or barriers to contributions from different sectors?

37. If so, what lessons have you learned so far about what enables you to overcome these barriers?
LEARNING STRATEGIES
38. How would you rate your team’s ability to learn from its experience?  
   1 2 3 4 5

39. If you think about the work you’ve done so far as a team, what has worked especially well or not as well as you would have liked?

40. What lessons have you drawn from these experiences?

41. How are these lessons affecting how you approach your work in the next few months?

ROLES/SUPPORTS
Team Learning Coach
42. How would you rate your/there effectiveness in their role?  
   1 2 3 4 5

43. How have they supported your learning as a team?

44. What about how you/they do their work has not been effective?

45. What else could they do to be more effective?

Task Team Leader
46. How would you rate your/there effectiveness in their role?  
   1 2 3 4 5

47. What about how you/they do their work has been effective?

48. What about how you/they do their work has not been effective?

49. What else could they do to be more effective?

TO WRAP UP
What are the biggest lessons your team has learned about what it takes to do multi-sectoral work?
Annex F: Analysis Framework

1. **Background**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on interview(s) w/:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Impacts: Products being produced:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On Products</th>
<th>On Team Performance</th>
<th>On learning culture of Bank*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* Individual, team, client or institutional learning

Other comments on impact:

3. **Objectives of the MTL Program**

Describe MTL interventions to date:

- Improved team knowledge and skills for MST challenges (technical and behavioral)
- Sustained high performance (KRA#1)
- Improved client learning to operate in a multi-sectoral environment (KRA#2)
- Improved learning practice among team members (KRA#3)
- Improved cross-team learning (KRA#4)
- VPU learning and action (KRA#5)
- Institutional/system learning and action (KRA#6)
- Expansion of Bank’s capacity for support of team-based learning (KRA#7)

Other comments on objectives

4. **Quality (and perceived value) of the components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning budget</th>
<th>Training/facilitation</th>
<th>Team coaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional sponsorship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other comments on quality of components

5. **Factors that contribute to/impede successful outputs and outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supports</th>
<th>Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other supports / barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>