In the 2015, countries committed to ensuring inclusive and quality education for all and promoting lifelong learning as part of meeting Sustainable Development Goals. Three years later, the World Bank warns through its flagship report, World Development Report (WDR) 2018 — LEARNING to Realize Education’s Promise, of a “learning crisis” and identifies critical policy actions to accelerate learning for all. This note identifies the contributions citizen engagement and social accountability can make to this effort. Social accountability is a process that enables the inclusive participation and collective action of citizens and civil society organizations in public policy making and imple-
mentation so that state and service providers are responsive to citizens’ needs and held accountable. Based on a review of the experiences of the Global Partnership for Social Accountability (GPSA) in implementing projects in the education sector, three primary conclusions stand out.

The renewed focus spurred by WDR 2018 on the quality of education service delivery warrants rethinking the added value of social accountability and citizen engagement. Social accountability has often been assessed for its potential to enhance education results by empowering individuals to provide information that helps governments be accountable for service delivery. However, evidence from both the field of education and the GPSA’s social accountability projects suggests that different underlying principles should inform interventions.

Social accountability and citizen engagement can address challenges associated with the implementation of policy actions targeted at the immediate and systemic causes of the learning crisis. Indirectly, this focus can contribute to learning improvements. The GPSA has found that an effective route toward supporting results is to broker multi-stakeholder coalitions composed of civil society, government, and private and international institutions that engage in collaborative social accountability processes using a problem-solving mindset.

Integrating sectoral and governance interventions, as GPSA’s collaborative social accountability efforts do, opens new pathways to obtain, scale up, and sustain results. For example, they can tackle bottlenecks and mitigate risks associated with technical education interventions such as decentralization policies. In addition, collaborative social accountability processes can help sector stakeholders discover in practice how they can nurture collective action toward better education. The GPSA’s approach is consistent with the development field’s turn toward more cross-sector programming.
Introduction

By adopting Goal 4 of the Sustainable Development Goals in 2015, countries became committed to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education for all and promote lifelong learning.” Three years later in its flagship report, *World Development Report 2018 — LEARNING to Realize Education’s Promise*, the World Bank defines and elaborates the “learning crisis” facing the education sector, its causes and dimensions, as well as possible directions forward (World Bank 2018). Building on WDR 2018, the World Bank is urging countries to make investments in human capital through quality education a critical development priority.²

This note explores the potential for social accountability approaches to address the learning crisis and suggests new ways to view them. Section 1 recaps the WDR 2018’s ideas about the sources of the learning crisis. Section 2 discusses the evolution of both the education sector’s approaches and social accountability theory and practice over the years and unpacks the concept of ‘collaborative’ social accountability.

In section 3, the note then responds to the question: How does collaborative social accountability contribute to addressing the learning crisis? Social accountability is “collaborative” when citizens, civil society groups, and public sector institutions engage in joint, iterative problem solving to improve service delivery, sector governance, and accountability. This is opposed to confrontational, advocacy-based social accountability strategies that are based on the development of civil society’s countervailing power (Kosack and Fung 2014; Tsai and Guerzovich 2015; Guerzovich and Schommer 2016).³

In section 4, the note presents the projects supported by the GPSA that seek to address education sector challenges and analyzes them through the lens of the WDR 2018.

---

² For an overview of these efforts, see the World Bank’s website at https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/human-capital.

³ Depending on a given country’s context, adversarial or mixed forms of engagement may be more effective. For example, social movements and protest led by students and teachers have contributed to accountability and other education results in Chile, among other countries (GEM 2017). The analysis of these approaches is beyond the scope of this note.
framework. It discusses how processes that introduce transparency, accountability, and civic participation can contribute to problem solving for accelerated learning. It is the intersection of sector reforms and collaborative social accountability which, in turn, can affect key intermediate outcomes and determinants of learning. In the last section, the authors conclude that the biggest potential for lasting change lies in the synergy of social accountability approaches with sector interventions, rather than in isolated efforts.
1. Sources of the Learning Crisis

To understand how governance-oriented approaches, such as social accountability and citizen engagement, can contribute to addressing the learning crisis, an understanding of the sources of the problem is required. The WDR 2018 identifies four immediate causes of the learning crisis. These are factors that are visible in schools in the various ways in which the teaching-learning relationship breaks down. These are: (i) children arrive unprepared to learn; (ii) teachers often lack the skills or motivation to teach effectively; (iii) inputs often fail to reach classrooms or affect learning; and (iv) poor management and governance often undermine schooling quality (figure 1).

Figure 1. Contradictory Interests Detract from Learning Objectives


The report also draws attention to the deeper systemic causes of the crisis. Technical and political factors (including perverse incentives and competing interests faced by education actors) pull key actors away from a focus on learning and keep many systems stuck in low-learning traps, with low accountability and high inequality.

The WDR 2018 subsequently identifies three concrete policy actions to realign education systems and accelerate learning for all: (i) assessing learning, to make it a serious goal; (ii) acting on evidence, to make schools work for learners; and (iii) aligning actors, to make the system work for learning. The report also reminds us that learning outcomes are the result of complex, long-term processes, and changes to education systems are not easy to achieve — they are often far beyond the average scope of electoral cycles or project evaluations. Education needs to work alongside other sectors of the economy and society to deliver better results over time.
2. The Evolution of Social Accountability

Social accountability is a process that enables the inclusive participation and collective action of citizens and civil society organizations in public policy making and implementation so that state and service providers are responsive to citizens’ needs and held accountable. The World Development Report 2004: Making Services Work for Poor People galvanized global efforts to strengthen citizen-driven accountability processes in order to improve delivery and responsiveness of services (World Bank 2003). It argues that services can be improved “by enabling the poor to monitor and discipline service providers, by amplifying their voice in policy making, and by strengthening the incentives for providers to serve the poor.”

Figure 2. illustrates the WDR 2004 framework as a triangle mapping two possible routes of accountability. The report advocates for the “short route of accountability,” focusing on the client–provider relationship to circumvent the difficulties faced when trying to make the “long route of accountability” work. The long, indirect route entails focusing on clients as citizens influencing policy makers who, in turn, influence providers. It also often entails addressing clientelist politics, hard-to-monitor services, and other “government failures.”

---

5 This note focuses specifically on social accountability as an entry point to think about citizen engagement more broadly, in relationship to the World Development Report 2018. Other citizen engagement approaches are relevant to the discussion and sometimes are combined with social accountability (e.g., rights-based approaches and legal empowerment, open government, civic tech, and community-driven development).
Accordingly, since 2004, social accountability projects have exponentially grown, diversified, and evolved around the world. Many sought to operationalize the short route, and hence tended to be disassociated from broader reform efforts. Evaluation of these projects show that social accountability and other forms of citizen engagement processes have considerable potential to contribute to improving service delivery. A 2016 review of 50 projects funded by the U.K. Department for International Development and operating in a wide range of contexts revealed that social accountability processes almost always lead to better services, with services becoming more accessible and staff attendance improving, including for marginalized groups (ePact 2016).
In the education sector specifically, involving communities, parents, and school actors in ways that promote local oversight on and accountability for service delivery can contribute to improved learning results under specific circumstances (Bruns, Filmer, and Patrinos 2011; Devarajan, Khemani, and Walton 2011; Joshi, and Houtzager 2012; GEM 2017; World Bank 2018). For example, student learning in Colima (Mexico) improved by creating feedback loops between multiple community stakeholders within a supportive and collaborative environment (de Hoyos, Garcia-Moreno, and Patrinos 2017). Another intervention in Mexico in disadvantaged rural communities that directly empowered parents to manage primary school grants saw reduced grade failure and grade repetition (Gertler, Patrinos, and Rubio-Codina 2012; Lopez-Calva, and Espinosa 2006). In India, an information campaign on school outcomes among parents in three states improved both oversight capacity of communities and learning outcomes, as it increased teacher effort in classrooms (Pandey, Goyal, and Sundararaman 2011).

The literature about the results of isolated interventions is mixed (Gaventa, and McGee 2013; Kosack and Fung 2014; Fox 2014; Ringold et al. 2012; O’Meally 2013; Westhorn et al. 2014; Grandvoinnet, Aslam, and Raha 2015). In social accountability, as in education, the evidence base cannot identify “what works” without understanding the political and institutional context in which the intervention is set. The WDR 2004 and research since suggested “short route accountability is not enough” to turn around complex education systems.

As explained in WDR 2018, the focus should be on the principles of how and why programs work for the desired goal (i.e., learning) rather than on the results of individual studies. The goal should be to understand why gaps appear between what the evidence
suggests may be effective and what is done in practice, and take them as guides for informing action.

Among social accountability practitioners, insights about underlying principles of why and how interventions work have started to inform second-generation programming. Table 1 contrasts first- and second-generation work. In the latter, social accountability efforts are instances of a long-term iterative interface between state officials, providers, citizen groups, and sometimes other stakeholders (Joshi and Houtzager 2012; Grandvoinnet, Aslam, and Raha 2015). With this lens, the small-scale, short-term results of a project can be designed and understood in its own terms — as an output of a fragmented intervention. Instances of “failed” state-citizen interactions can be used to support iterative adaptations to make approaches better fit the context over time (Guerzovich and Schommer 2016).
Table 1. Evolution of Social Accountability Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Second Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little attention to particularities of local contexts</td>
<td>Deeper understanding of local contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term projects</td>
<td>Longer-term, more iterative, “organic” engagements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad assumption regarding the intrinsic value of transparency</td>
<td>Refined focus on ways in which transparency translates into accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy reliance on technological tools;</td>
<td>Viewing technological tools as means, not ends;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treating them as ends in themselves</td>
<td>experimenting with multiple tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act first, learn later</td>
<td>Greater attention to accumulating and applying learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical aims</td>
<td>Strategic approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale, fragmented efforts</td>
<td>Building larger movements and/or coalitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Carothers (2016).

The WDR 2017 solidifies these insights further, putting governance — the process by which state and nonstate actors interact to design and implement policies — at the center of the development debate. The report refocuses attention on the political determinants of development results in complex systems, such as education. It argues that carefully designed and sensible public policies too often are not adopted or implemented because individuals and groups in societies fail to commit, cooperate, and coordinate to achieve socially desirable goals. Power asymmetries — driven by capture, clientelism, and exclusion — lead to barriers to the policy arena.

New approaches to governance can contribute to positive changes that achieve sus-
tainable improvements in education outcomes. Rather than replicating the short route, they set in motion social accountability processes that can reset actors’ incentives to pursue development goals, change underlying preferences and beliefs, and increase contestability. Citizens acting on their own are largely ineffective, but context-sensitive organizing and coalition building can improve their chances to affect policy implementation, including in the education sector (World Bank Group 2017).

International actors, in turn, can support rules that strengthen coalitions for reform and greater collaborative engagement between citizens and elites. Another important step in this direction is creating synergies with ongoing policies and public sector reforms (Guerzovich and Poli 2020a; Waddington et al. 2019; ePact 2016).

Hickey and Hossain’s edited volume (2019) on how politics shapes the capacity and commitment of elites to tackle the learning crisis further elaborates the policy making and implementation failures that underlie the crisis. Education is prone to being highly politicized, as it offers an important source of both rents and legitimacy to political elites. What gets enacted—and it results—depends as much or more on the politics of the reform process as on the technical design of the reform (Bruns, and Schneider 2016). Moreover, the nature and politics of learning are different than those of schooling. It is easier to design, enact and control policies and programs to build schools or hire teachers than to “craft” feasible solutions to interpersonal and transactional challenges entailed in teaching and learning (Pritchett 2013).

When the problem, i.e. quality education, is understood as craft-like, the synergies with second generation social accountability, also a craft-like task, become more apparent. Hickey, Hossain and co-authors find that the dynamics of accountability at school level, which depend on local dynamics as well as on policies from the top, have significant consequences for the effective implementation of those policies. Local level coalitions are able to drive improvements when it comes to “quality” reforms. This is an entry point for many social accountability interventions to create synergies with and strengthen the implementation of public sector reform.
In second-generation approaches that seek to build synergies between civil society and public sector led reform efforts, social accountability does not work through short or long routes. In this Note, the concentration is on approaches that work in a programmatic or operational space in the middle which aim to get traction locally first and then drive improvements. This middle is composed of “the many layers between top–levels of policy making and the service provision frontline where rule–setting processes are likely to be contested, trade-offs between competing goals likely to be left unresolved, and agreements reached likely to be subject to weaknesses in both monitoring and sanctions” (Levy 2014; Levy and Walton 2013; Levy et al. 2018). This conceptualization of social accountability reflects a broader shift in thinking about governance for development – beyond “best practice” approaches embedded in the first generation of governance for development and beyond the framework of the WDR 2004 (Pritchett 2018).

Social accountability and other participatory approaches potentially offer gains that were missing from many public sector–driven education reforms. Gains can include greater accountability as well as effective processes to address common political bottlenecks and implementation risks. The very process of co–producing social accountability, or at least collaborating with others in a hands–on process to deliver public goods and services through mutual and continuous engagement, brings in new information, shared expectations, new sources of power, translators that can speak to and broker actions from different groups, and joint responsibilities (Guerzovich and Schommer 2016). These dynamics can also be instrumental in improving the design of policies, reducing implementation gaps, and strengthening delivery systems (Guerzovich and Poli 2020a). They may also affect the sense of possibility, of agency that is critical to facilitate collective action for learning (Levy, et al. 2018). Accountability here is complex and multidirectional. It is not resorting to sanctions or sanctioning bodies before trying problem solving. In turn, sector reforms offer the potential for long–term institutionalization, which is a challenge for social accountability.
If this multistakeholder collaborative and programmatic route is promising, it is also challenging. One civil society colleague reflected on the dilemma that her organization faced when social accountability as usual did not make sense in the context and the donor (i.e., GPSA) opened the space for the organization to pivot. The organization had the opportunity to rethink their theory of action, and as she put it, “our core role as a civil society organization doing social accountability.”

Another challenge is to specify the logic by which social accountability interacts with other factors and processes in specific sectors change processes. “By contrast to reforms of core systems, this downstream focus can more straightforwardly be linked to the achievement of concrete development results, making the reforms both more readily monitorable, and more readily linked to specific constituencies” (Levy 2014). Determinants of learning include teacher absenteeism, parental engagement in learning, and school management. The question is, how does social accountability contribute to improving those determinants of quality education?

The evolution of social accountability calls for revisiting the practices’ theories of change and action. New assumptions about how change happen and how concrete actors can contribute to change must accompany social accountability’s practice. The analytical and strategic shift is particularly timely, as development moves toward cross-sector programing to deliver complex outcomes, such as learning. Social accountability practitioners should be able to explain to sectoral decision makers why and how they are part of the cross-sector, whole of society effort for learning, including the conditions under which social accountability adds value to broader reforms, policies, and programs.
3. Social Accountability and the Learning Crisis

The WDR 2018 framework presents an opportunity to elaborate how second-generation social accountability plays out in the sector’s efforts toward attaining learning for all. In arguing that accelerating learning is more complicated than it looks, because people act in reaction to the choices of others throughout a specific system, the report puts learners, communities, and civil society organizations (CSOs) at the center of a relational approach to solving the learning crisis. It reflects an emerging consensus in governance and development work about the systemic, politically informed, and complex nature of development challenges, such as improving learning (Evans 2017; World Bank 2017; Pritchett 2018). The consensus urges practitioners to consider all available entry points as well as ways to support drivers of change — including the critical role of locally driven, multistakeholder reform coalitions.

In education, solving the learning crisis requires a range of actors inside and outside the school who make adequate choices to meet their responsibilities and reach goals (World Bank 2018; GEM 2017). Single actors, or improving the quality or quantity of one input or intervention, cannot alone produce results. Learning is not something that education institutions and actors can deliver on their own (World Bank 2018).

This new understanding of drivers and entry points for improving learning provides new significance to the potential and limits of second-generation social accountability efforts. It opens a possibility to re-conceptualize social accountability as a possible component of the logic through which learning is expected to happen in the education sector, rather than emphasizing social accountability as a solution that is stand-alone and an alternative to education interventions. Learning is not something that social accountability can deliver on its own, either.7

---

7 This argument is consistent with Rocha Menocal, and Sharma (2008) who conclude that interventions are more likely to reach intermediate rather than final results.
The added value of citizen engagement and social accountability becomes clearer upon understanding how it correlates with the evolving principles that inform reform efforts in the education sector. The WDR 2018 argues that civil society actors can contribute to accelerating learning by supporting community and parent action at all levels of the system. The assumption is that engagement contributes to improved learning by targeting both the immediate and systemic causes of the learning crisis. This includes supporting efforts to assess learning, act on evidence, and align actors to improve learning outcomes.

The Note’s authors suggest that social accountability and citizen engagement are most promising when they target, in close coordination with the sector’s interventions and its underlying assumptions on why and how we assume learning happens, the immediate and systemic causes of the learning crisis.

In some instances, social accountability processes that are well-tailored to the context can complement sectoral interventions by improving the quality of design, mitigating the risks associated with the partial implementation of technically sound interventions and strengthening the education delivery system. In addition, collaborative social accountability processes can help stakeholders discover by doing how they nurture collective action and be part of a shared effort for education.
4. The GPSA’s Approach

**HOW DOES THE GPSA IMPLEMENT COLLABORATIVE SOCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY?**

The GPSA was created in 2012 by the World Bank with the aim to contribute to country-level governance reforms and improved service delivery. It supports civil society, governments, and other stakeholders in working together to solve critical governance and development challenges. To achieve this objective, the GPSA provides strategic and sustained support to implementation compacts, each anchored by a CSO working with other CSOs and community-based organizations, that apply collaborative, problem-driven social accountability. One of the potential advantages of this approach is that it combines diverse types of expertise, outreach capacities, and influence in order to work simultaneously on the range of dimensions involved in addressing complex problems (Guerzovich and Schommer 2016).

The GPSA’s model works through two main entry points to engage in country reform processes (Tsai and Guerzovich 2015; Poli and Guerzovich 2020). First, it strengthens civil society’s and other stakeholders’ key operational, analytical, organizational, and civic capacities to engage constructively in problem solving through social accountability (see figure 3.). Through its calls for proposals, the GPSA has received more than 1,500 funding proposals from civil society groups in 52 countries. The systematic analysis of these proposals, as well as a review of needs for capacity building and implementation support across its portfolio, inform the GPSA’s investments in this area (Guerzovich and Poli 2014; 2017; Poli and Guerzovich 2020). Across the board, the issue is that civil society groups have been excluded or isolated from public decision-making arenas too many times. Their ability to imagine new, more effective ways to address the problems they care about has also suffered. This is a critical gap because CSOs must apply politically informed, adaptive strategies that are needed to increase their effectiveness.
Second, the GPSA aligns interventions with the World Bank and other development partners’ ongoing reform efforts, to obtain, scale, and sustain results (Guerzovich and Poli 2020b; Guerzovich and Poli 2017). The GPSA builds on the World Bank’s direct and
ongoing engagement with public sector actors and development partners, as well as a network of global partner organizations, to create an enabling environment in which citizen’s inputs are used to solve fundamental problems in service delivery and to strengthen the performance of public institutions and civil society. The GPSA works with six Global Practices in the World Bank, including the Education Global Practice. Collaborative social accountability focused on supporting the implementation of sector reforms is the programmatic entry point toward setting the agenda for institutionalization of these processes (Guerzovich and Poli 2020a).

These two entry points are not expected to work together automatically. The idea underlying the support to CSO-led implementation compacts is that the GPSA, with the support of World Bank Global Practices and country units, would facilitate spaces of interaction between citizens, providers, and state authorities (Poli quoted in Green 2017, 33; Tsai and Guerzovich 2015; Guerzovich and Poli 2014; Poli and Guerzovich 2020). The GPSA’s goal is to support problem solving, responsiveness, and accountability by fostering reform-minded coalitions that cut across the state-civil society divide rather than focusing only on bottom-up citizen action. Linking social accountability processes to ongoing public reform efforts, including but not limited to those supported by the World Bank, can contribute to embedding those processes in country systems.

The GPSA has a portfolio of over 40 projects that engages more than 200 CSOs and thousands of volunteers across 30 countries applying this model. These civil society partnerships engage with the technical experts of the World Bank, governments, and service providers in a range of sectors — from health and education to social protection, water and sanitation, public financial management, and extractives. In each case, the GPSA’s support is tailored to the local context and targeted to the specific governance and service delivery challenge that local actors are seeking to address through social accountability processes.
The GPSA’s portfolio includes 14 projects in 12 countries that are seeking to address immediate and systemic causes of the learning crisis by focusing on concrete education problems prioritized by local stakeholders. The projects’ aims include making public expenditure on education more effective, improving school inputs such as teachers and learning materials, and improving measurement of education quality, among several other objectives. On average, the projects are 3 to 5 years in duration and supported by grants that are between $500,000 and $1 million (see table A.1 for more details).

**HOW DO GPSA’S PROJECTS CONTRIBUTE TO “ALL FOR LEARNING”?**

GPSA projects use different entry points to leverage collaborative social accountability for learning by complementing and mitigating the risks associated with the formulation and implementation of sectoral reform efforts.\(^8\) The following three sections of this chapter correspond to the three policy actions recommended by the WDR 2018 to address the immediate and systemic determinants of learning. It is important to underscore that global analysis and prescriptions are to be adapted to local contexts.\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) This note relies on information to date about the GPSA portfolio, which includes written and tacit knowledge from stakeholders, monitoring data, evaluations, and research. In others, it builds on the tacit insights that are informing the design, implementation, and context-specific adaptation of the projects. The WDR 2018 explains that evidence often does not necessarily accumulate where action would make the most difference, as other considerations affect accumulated evidence. An approach that has not been evaluated may have potential, and context-specific innovation may warrant trying out things that have not been tried elsewhere. The GPSA’s unique position in the World Bank supporting civil society work has put the program in a position to build on evidence as well as tacit knowledge to inform locally-driven social accountability processes.

\(^9\) Bashir et al. (2018) lay out four, partly overlapping, priority areas for action in the Africa Region with a stronger focus on Increasing financing of education and focusing spending and budget processes on improving quality. The work of SEND GHANA through its Making Budgets Work for Ghana Project is an example of how social accountability may contribute toward more and better-aligned resources for results (Agyemang 2018).
The WDR 2018 argues that learning outcomes are not measured enough and, as a result, education systems lack an understanding of who is learning what, and who is not. It states that the first step to improving systemwide learning is to put in place good measurements for monitoring whether programs and policies are delivering learning. Citizen-led assessments on student learning and school performance\(^{10}\) are well suited to complement official assessments\(^{11}\) to improve diagnostics and in turn, improve policy. On its own, targeted information will not produce learning but can support a multi-prong effort, coupled with technical and political actions.\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Civil society organizations, such as the ASER Center in India and Uwezo in East Africa, have deployed citizen-led assessments that recruit volunteers to measure the foundational learning of young children in their homes. Service Delivery Indicators, an initiative in Sub-Saharan Africa, also gathers independent data on both inputs and outcomes in representative samples of schools. Its data are used for diagnosing problems and targeting support for reforms in the countries involved.

\(^{11}\) The World Bank Group’s Systems Approach for Better Education Results platform (known commonly as SABER), for example, collects and analyzes comparative data and knowledge on education systems around the world and highlights the policies and institutions that matter most to promote learning for all children and youth.

\(^{12}\) The causal chain from data production to use for monitoring and improving decisions or accountability to impact is complex, with actors at different levels of the system requiring different types of information (Custer et al. 2018).
How are GPSA-supported partnerships contributing to improved learning assessments?

In Moldova, in the Scoala Mea Project, “participatory cards” (scorecards) yield data on learning quality through a set of proxies and indicators that go beyond perceptions. The cards point to the first-hand experiences of parents, students, and administrative staff related to, among others: (i) the type of information received and disseminated about learning quality; (ii) opportunities given by the school to make suggestions and influence the tools and methodologies used to foster learning; and (iii) opportunities to affect budget allocations tied to learning quality. The formulation of the indicators helps to ground the assessments on concrete experiences that school users can relate to, and they provide a basis for subsequent participatory discussions and follow-up actions.

Along the same lines, in the Transparency and Accountability in Mongolian Education (TAME) Project, the Good School Support Tool (a scorecard) yields data on parents’ perceptions of their children’s learning attitudes and performance, which they report have improved significantly thanks to the project.

The Linking Education and Accountability for Development (LEAD) Project by CARE Maroc implements the Statement of School Agreement Tool (BAM, as its Arabic abbreviation), in which parents report about school equipment, needs, and resources. A section is dedicated to learning quality, where stakeholders make observations on issues such as levels of dropouts and grade repeating as well as average test results.
Critiques of first generation social accountability contend that these tools to produce information and “thin accountability” are not enough to deliver governance or development results (Fox 2007). Honig and Pritchett (2019) contend that improving data systems for observation and verification does not mean strengthening real accountability and may backfire to deliver improved development and governance outcomes. Hence, it is important to underscore that producing information is a small component of the collaborative social accountability processes mentioned here. Additional aspects are discussed below.

**Box 1. An Example of Community-Driven Measurement Aiding Effectiveness of Reforms**

Since 2017, Save the Children in Georgia has been implementing the Improving Pre-school Education in Georgia through Social Accountability Processes Project. The 2016 Law on Early and Preschool Education requires municipalities to perform oversight and monitoring of preschools in the implementation of national standards, including education, nutrition and food safety, sanitation and hygiene, and physical environment. However, municipal authorities have weak structures to perform this role or to act on any feedback they receive from children and their parents. The project is piloting collaborative benchmarking, monitoring, and feedback activities in seven municipalities. Preschool stakeholders, including civic, educational, and municipal authorities have been consulted to develop tailored benchmarking tools and capacity building so that they can jointly assess, plan, implement, and monitor preschool services, especially quality. The project team is working with relevant stakeholders to leverage the coalitions of kindergarten representatives (principals and teachers) and parents to support the uptake of the resulting kindergarten-level information to improve the quality of — and resource allocation to — preschool education services. By making citizens and authorities equally invested in setting benchmarks as well as establishing mechanisms for continuous co-production of data on preschool achievements, the project works to reduce the chance for both technical and political barriers to reform to prevail.
Social Accountability and “Acting on Evidence to Make Schools Work for All Learners”

The immediate causes of the learning crisis are found at the school level. A range of sector-specific interventions improve the preparedness of learners and teachers, as well as school inputs and school management. These factors, in turn, contribute to learning. A challenge associated with the implementation of these technically sound policies are bottlenecks and political risks that undermine their implementation (World Bank 2017). Collaborative social accountability can complement sectoral interventions by helping to mitigate these risks.

Children ready and motivated to learn. Getting learners to school both ready and motivated to learn is a first step toward getting children to learn better. If learners are not ready, other policies and programs will have a minimal effect. Interventions to complement education reforms for learning include childhood nutrition, measures to lower the costs of schooling or add benefits (e.g., through school meals), and performance incentives through targeted cash transfers. In other words, learning is a cross-sector process that can include governance efforts and goes beyond education bureaucratic reforms.
How are the GPSA-supported partnerships working on preparing learners for better results?

The Citizen Voice and Action for Government Accountability and Improved Health Services Project in Indonesia seeks to improve publicly funded maternal, newborn, child health, and nutrition services. Collaborative social accountability reported changes related to services (e.g., availability, quality, and use) as well as policy, budgets, services, and government responsiveness. Social accountability processes contributed toward reductions in maternal and infant mortality and improvements in infant nutrition by changing power dynamics and strengthening the health system (Ball and Westhorp 2018).

In Paraguay, the country’s conditional cash transfer (CCT) program for vulnerable and extremely poor populations faced implementation challenges. The Ñañomoirũ Project is using collaborative social accountability processes to address those implementation challenges. The project’s potential lies in bringing stakeholders together to collaboratively strengthen the CCT program. Early indicators show that the project’s community awareness campaigns, as assessed by community report cards, have strengthened the CCT program. In so doing, collaborative social accountability, in tandem with other policies, is helping to increase both children and teacher attendance levels in schools.

Skilled, motivated teachers. As the WDR 2018 explains, the skills and motivation of teachers must be strengthened to enable greater effort and more learning among students. One promising emerging approach is the use of monetary and nonmonetary incentives to improve motivation.

How are the GPSA-supported partnerships tapping into entry points for supporting teachers?

The Strengthening Social Accountability in the Education Sector Project by CARE Malawi focused on absenteeism. In Chambidzi, one reason why teacher absenteeism is so high is teachers must walk long distances to and from school because no suitable housing is available nearby for them. Collaborative social accountability provided the local community a process to problem solve with the local Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and school authorities. These stakeholders did not just point to the “problem.” They did not rush to hold teachers to account through sanctions. Stakeholders learned to work together, to take responsibility for solving its problems, and to understand what role all can play in providing conditions so children can learn.

The collaborative social accountability process encouraged teachers to explain their circumstances and then help actors act so they had somewhere to stay close to the school and be better motivated to do their work. Teacher absenteeism has fallen from 50 percent to almost nil over the past four years, according to Isaac Chinyamula, the government’s district education manager and primary education advisor. Those who are absent have legitimate reasons and inform the head teacher ahead of time. This is virtually unheard of in Malawi. Not only are teachers teaching, but there are more of them. In 2014, there were only six teachers, and today there are 16 on the government payroll. Enrolment is up from 900 learners to more than 1,200 (Pickard and Thindwa 2018).

School inputs focused on teaching and learning. School inputs should complement teaching. For example, the use of books often fails to affect teaching and learning because there aren’t enough books to allow every learner to have access to them during lessons and for reading at home. In some cases, because of inadequate numbers and lack of proper care by learners, the books are just kept in the office and not deployed in classrooms.

15 Despite significant investments in education, including free primary education which increased enrollment by half (World Bank 2018, 63), Malawi faces low learning outcomes. Shortages and uneven distribution of its 61,000 trained teachers prevail in and disproportionately affect rural and poor regions. Analysis shows that many teachers lack motivation and consequently do not show up in class because of challenging working conditions, irregular and low pay, overcrowded classrooms, budget shortages, and low institutional support.
How are GPSA-supported partnerships tapping into this entry point for improving school inputs?

The Malawi Economic Justice Network, along with the Civil Society Education Coalition and existing school-level bodies, monitor availability and care of textbooks. Social accountability can contribute to increasing transparency and efficiency in managing school materials and mitigating leakages (GEM 2017). The network collaborates with the Office of the Director of Public Procurement and the Ministry of Education, particularly with the Supplies Unit and the Directorates of Planning as well as Basic Education. The data gathered at the school level are shared with authorities to inform their decisions about the selection and budgeting of textbooks and improvements to procurement and delivery logistics. Many rural-based schools have received their allocated textbooks on time for the first time in years. The project has also raised awareness among parents about the serious challenges of textbook shortages as well as the importance of textbook care. Local communities have established a system for managing textbook losses as a way to ensure that resources are maximized and the results of the efforts are sustainable beyond a single take.

SEND Ghana’s project, Making Budgets Work for Ghana, enhances transparency and accountability in the use of public resources in the education sector. Community durbars (official meetings) raise citizens’ awareness and knowledge of annual national and local plans and budgets, leading them to demand accountability in the distribution of education projects and increases in budgetary allocations (Asamoah and Soekekuh 2017). Another area of focus is the effectiveness of spending in the free uniform program. Students whose uniforms are torn are reluctant to attend school on a regular basis for fear of being mocked by their peers. Using collaborative social accountability processes to ensure the effective distribution of uniforms builds the confidence of beneficiary pupils. By creating better conditions for learning, the project improved retention.

In Uganda, the Africa Freedom of Information Center (AFIC) and its partners from the Uganda Contract Monitoring Coalition, including Transparency International – Uganda have been working on the “Enhancing value for money in social service contracts in Ugan-
da” project in three sectors (health, education and agriculture) in five Ugandan districts, namely Mityana, Mubende, Nakaseke, Ntungamo and Nebbi. One of the components of this work included citizens monitoring the execution of upgrades in school infrastructure in five Ugandan districts, funded by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). Thanks to effective training and facilitation from the project leads, school communities overcame their initial reluctance and gained confidence to ask for accountability from government. In Nyamabaare community, building materials that had been purchased for the school but ‘hoarded’ by the contractor were recovered, and the community members used them to expand the school’s buildings on their own. As a result, the school received a high increase in school enrollment, from 50 pupils before the renovations, to 543 pupils after. Similarly, the community went on to ensure that other building contracts were fully complied with, and even raised additional funds to complete security upgrades to the school.

**Management and governance focused on teaching and learning.** Schools with better management tend to have better test scores. Programs to improve school-based management have been referred to “as an effective way to achieve the short route of accountability in the education sector” (Demas and Arcia 2015). One popular measure is grant programs in which schools receive regular influxes of resources and more autonomy over budget allocations. These reforms are unlikely to deliver learning if there is no coherence between the delegation of financing decisions, information, and motivation and what local agents are asked to do, as well as coherent relationships of accountability across the system (Pritchett 2015). Hickey, Hossain and Hackman (2019) contend that school level governance matters, especially if connected to key stakeholders in the sectors’ subnational governance, to ensure that accountability mechanisms at the frontline contribute to learning. This is an important insight to be able to understand plausible synergies between technical reforms such as school-based management and collaborative social accountability, because “even where bureaucracies work relatively well, the presence or absence of engaged parents and communities can be key to sustained strong performance” (Levy et al. 2018, 29; Pritchett 2013).
School-based management and other decentralization reforms assume that citizens will engage and power relations will not affect their functioning. This is often not the case (Devarajan, Khemani, and Shah 2007; World Bank 2017). Budgets for state monitoring mechanisms is often notional and unsustainable (Hickey, Hossain and Hackman 2019). Varying motivation and capacity of actors — community members, teachers, and principals — also affects the emergence of a culture of accountability (Bruns, Filmer, and Patrinos 2011; GEM 2017). Few have dedicated incentives, time, and processes for communities to learn how to effectively engage in school management in their context (Mullainathan and Shafir 2013).

Collaborative social accountability efforts are experimental efforts to craft solutions to contextualized deficits in the management of schools and implementation of decentralization reforms by mobilizing collective action of key stakeholders relevant in each context. They often engage school authorities as well as local bureaucrats – who are a key constituency to engage in capacity building and problem solving to support implementation of reforms before they can be meaningfully held to account for delivering quality education.

As Hickey, Hossain and Hackman (2019) argue, local-level arrangements that follow these principles have limitations, especially in terms of institutionalization and sustainability, the quest for learning calls for openness to working with these kinds of arrangements. This is especially so when sub-national variations in political and governance arrangements are conducive, or can be nurtured to be conducive, to fostering improvements in learning in at least some localities. According to Grindle (2019), this means that reformers would need to reduce efforts on policy making and processes at the national level and step up efforts to build localized capacities and leadership and linkages among them.
How are the GPSA-supported partnerships tapping into school-based management reforms as an entry point to support learning?

In Morocco, the government has embarked on decentralization reform as part of efforts to improve learning outcomes. In the so-called Projet d’école (school improvement project), regional education offices have been granted increased administrative and financial autonomy to set education policies at the local level, fund school improvement plans, and address local issues prioritized at each facility. However, parents and teachers were not participating. Principals were reluctant to apply for funds, and many feared that engagement would trigger conflicts.

CARE Maroc, the Near East Foundation, and the National Federation of Parent Associations launched the LEAD Project in 2014. The project built the capacity of parent associations, teachers, and ministry officials to engage in collaborative social accountability. As communities develop their own school improvement projects, communication and collaboration among stakeholders is improving significantly, and obstacles such as weak capacity and mistrust, are simultaneously being overcome. The collaborative social accountability processes contribute to more effective implementation of the school improvement projects.

In Moldova, Expert-Grup and its local partners are working to improve the effective functioning of the education decentralization reform, including the effective working of school administration boards and management of resources granted under the per-student financing mechanism (Toderaș 2015). The intervention directly supports the engagement of school communities (students, parents, teachers, community members, and local decision makers) in the collection of data about school performance — focusing on students in the 7th to 12th grades. In the project’s public school hearings, stakeholders are able to make collective decisions on school issues and budget investment priorities. The project also maintains an online platform that provides key information on operation, budgets, and performance of schools for students, parents, teachers, and the whole community. An open budget formulation process is a foundation for accountability and improved allocation of resources (GEM 2017).
In Mongolia, rural areas are characterized by low student performance in learning outcomes and suffer from disparities in access to education. The TAME project focuses on parent and teacher engagement in 28 schools through PTAs. TAME has developed a locally relevant model to engage parents in schools’ decision making, which is difficult particularly among herder parents in rural communities. PTAs engage constructively with principals while addressing asymmetries of power and risks of political capture at the school level. Parent and teacher engagement in capacity development for school management provides greater sustainability to investment in reforms in a context where school authorities regularly change.

In all these cases, select sub-national authorities, including the regional education, and school stakeholders have expressed that the social accountability exercise benefits their work. To add value to stakeholders charged with delivering learning, social accountability did not need to produce learning on its own or prove that it was better than a technical school management reform. It had to show a feasible way of solving concrete problems. This reaction can ease the long and winded road to national policy uptake thanks to operational lessons, but by no means guarantees it in the short term (Guerzovich and Poli 2020a). This entry point and partial result seems important because the reforms at local level seem to matter to chart a pathway towards quality education.

16 This information is included in the project’s mid-term evaluation and other working project documents.
The WDR 2018 argues that better interventions at the school and student levels will sustainably improve learning only if countries tackle system-level technical and political barriers to change. Technical barriers include the complexity of the education system, the large number of actors, the interdependence of reforms, and the slow pace of change. Political barriers include the competing interests of different players and the difficulty of moving out of a low-quality equilibrium, especially in low-accountability and low-trust environments where there are few incentives for change. All these barriers pull actors away from supporting learning. They also prevent social accountability and the innovations of CSOs from becoming scalable and sustainable.

Levy et al. (2018) synthesize and illustrate the messages of the WDR 2017 and WDR 2018 to “unstick” a complex system in which children go to school but do not learn. A bureaucratically driven view of public service provision is insufficient. According to the authors, achieving learning results calls for a renewed sense among multiple stakeholders, from the school level to the policy arena, that their proactive engagement can make a contribution — large or small — toward learning. This challenge calls for a more inclusive, participatory vision among stakeholders about how to play their part in an “all for education” effort.
How are GPSA–supported partnerships tapping into entry points for whole system alignment?

The partnerships position the Dominican Republic to face the learning crisis, according to Jaime Saavedra, senior director, Education Global Practice, World Bank Group. Here attention is drawn to key aspects of the process by which seemingly dissociated social accountability, social movements, and citizen engagement efforts are supporting system–level change (Poli, Guerzovich and Fokkelman 2020). Together, these initiatives can be viewed as instances of a long–term iterative interface between state officials, providers, citizen groups, and development partners.

More than a decade ago, the World Bank and other development partners started supporting budget monitoring in the Dominican Republic. Short–term results were tenuous at best. For instance, in 2008 the teachers’ union (Asociación Dominicana de Profesores) tried to raise awareness about the budgetary constraints in the sector but was unable to mobilize other stakeholders (Dotel, Lafontaine and Melgen 2015).

By 2011, a consultation to inform the new National Development Strategy showed that improving the education system was the number one priority of the citizenry. These data put the issue on the agenda and led civil society groups and other stakeholders to form the Coalition for Education with Dignity (Dotel, Lafontaine and Melgen 2015). The coalition used budget data and analysis to show that public investment in education was only 2.3 percent of the gross domestic product, well below the level stipulated in the Education Act (4 percent). The coalition mobilized the citizenry and tapped into contextual opportunities. The campaign obtained the sought–after increase in the national budget for basic education.


18 For other cases, see the World Education Blog at https://gemreportunesco.wordpress.com/tag/country-case-study/.

19 Their efforts mitigated power asymmetries by shifting elite incentives to commit to better resourcing the sector ahead of an election, reshaped preferences and beliefs about what and how change may be possible in the Dominican Education sector and society, and enhanced contestability.
In 2013, the GPSA funded Oxfam Intermón, the coalition and other local partners (Vigilantes) to conduct a project to strengthen the citizens’ voice and impact on the education budget and service delivery. The initial approach was informed by opportunities opened years prior (Guerzovich 2015; Blomeyer & Sanz 2017). However, Vigilantes quickly faced two challenges. Civil society and public officials preferred to focus on different areas for collaboration, and the coalition demobilized. Two years into the project, Vigilantes, among other groups, had contributed to improving the organization and transparency of the budget but did not seem on the road to integrating civil society in education policy-making processes. Vigilantes, with the support of the World Bank and the GPSA, rethought its strategy. The adaptation contributed to attaining targeted results.

Vigilantes produced lessons that are informing a new iteration of GPSA–World Bank support to civil society engagement in the education sector. The GPSA, with the support of the World Bank’s Governance and Education Global Practices and the U.S. Agency for International Development, is working with Dominican stakeholders across government and civil society to implement collaborative social accountability processes that support ongoing reforms, in particular the Ministry of Education’s How Is My School Doing initiative and the National Education Pact.20

The point is, what may have started in the 1990s as isolated, tool-based transparency and social accountability interventions has added to and evolved toward collaborative, problem-solving social accountability approaches. A key distinguishing feature of this effort is, unlike prior iterations, it aligns by design the ongoing reform efforts implemented by the government and supported by international development partners with civil society work (while maintaining civil society’s autonomy to hold the government to account). All these features are an effort to build reform coalitions that, at the same time, can fit into the features of the system with the potential to inform its realign-

ment for learning. They are a small experimental investment with the potential for informing further public sector reforms. (Guerzovich et al. forthcoming).

The collaborative social accountability processes set in motion by GPSA projects in Malawi, Moldova, Mongolia, and Morocco link communities to decision makers with the support of World Bank country dialogue and analytical and operational work. In Morocco, this approach entailed finding an agreement with regional delegations about where to pilot collaborative social accountability processes, among other measures. In the case of Mongolia, TAME created links to local and provincial levels of government. In Moldova, Scoala Mea targeted decisions on school spending at the level where most discretionary education funds are held (district) and worked with the national Ministry of Education on policy.

These targeted, facilitated feedback loops do not guarantee that reforms will be scaled up wholesale, nor that they will be institutionalized as they were designed (Guerzovich and Poli 2020a). As the case of the Dominican Republic suggests, sometimes the lessons, organizational and political circumstances suggest that the lead civil society organization may need to re-design the strategy and mechanisms in order to achieve integration of civil society–led social accountability and public sector reforms.

However, select parts of collaborative social accountability processes and the resulting substantive insights about learning can become part of the policy conversation in the short and medium term. Over time, they may be adapted and adopted in the policy arena or not. In the Mongolian education sector for instance, TAME’s Parent–Teacher Association activities were scaled up by building synergies with the school grant component of the World Bank operation — the Education Quality Reform Project (EQRP, $30 million). The project’s objective is to improve the quality of education for primary school children and to strengthen school–level planning (Ali 2019).

It was envisioned as a “win–win for both projects: having PTAs formally involved in the school grants better positions them to support the effort of enhancing learning outcomes for their schools’ children, while the arrangement would allow EQRP to har-
ness social accountability mechanisms created under TAME for achieving one of its development objectives, which is to improve school-level planning” (Ali 2019). Since 2017, TAME civil society partners have been working closely to formalize the role of PTAs in implementing school grants in 31 targeted schools (equivalent to about US$ 2,000 each) during the 2019–2020 School Year. The endorsement and empowerment provided by the grants from the Ministry of Education allows each PTA to better contribute to improving student learning outcomes at primary level, based on the grant proposals they have developed. PTAs’ sense of ownership and accountability for their activities is enhanced. Political economy challenges remain, including the high turnover of officials at the Ministry as well as concerns that TAME did not adequately engage school administrators (especially principals) in its project activities as important stakeholders/collaborators, due to the project’s emphasis on PTAs’ independence and redressing power imbalances within schools.

In Moldova, the Scoala Mea’s results helped support the implementation of the Moldova Education Reform Project, a World Bank financed operation ($40 million with $10 million additional financing). Its objective is to improve learning conditions in targeted schools and strengthen Moldova’s education monitoring systems, while promoting efficiency reforms in the education sector. For example, participatory cards have served as an example for the education ministry’s newly developed questionnaires for the annual evaluation of schools and teachers. In 2017, Expert-Grup was also part of the working group elaborating the concept for remuneration in general education institutions and self-evaluation of school management. It also informed and supported the Ministry of Education to implement the “Framework Regulation on the organization and functioning of the Administrative Board of the general education institutions,” as well as its promotion in schools. These actions were based on positive practices in the beneficiary schools of the My School Project that have functional administrative boards. All these steps are linked through the recently adopted Educational Code.
The positive results have motivated other donors in the country to include these instruments in their projects or implement similar projects (Casap 2019). For example: (a) The social accountability tools were adopted by the Common Initiative for Equal Opportunities Project of the Eastern European Foundation Moldova (€2.9 million) that is going to be implemented in three districts to increase the representation of the vulnerable members of the society and budget inclusiveness. The United States Agency for International Development just launched a five-year program named ‘Comunitatea Mea’ (My Community) that aims to strengthen local governments in Moldova to become more effective, transparent, and accountable to citizens. A project similar to ‘Scoala Mea’ is going to be replicated in Romania.

In Malawi, results and lessons learned from the implementation of both GPSA projects are set to provide relevant inputs for larger World Bank operations, including a Secondary Education Project (P164223) in the pipeline ($75 million). There are also discussions to channel those lessons to the ongoing Malawi Education Sector Improvement Project ($45 million). Its objective is to improve the equity and quality of primary education service delivery in early grade levels with an emphasis on improved accountability and functioning at the school level.

All in all, collaborative social accountability processes are bringing together different stakeholders across the system to figure out how they can engage in a coalition for learning, individually and collectively. Through action, these processes help crystalize the country-specific “visions” of what “all for learning” looks like among a variety of education stakeholders — providing a way for incentivizing constructive action.  

21 One transformative function of coalitions leveraging information is their ability to change a society’s ideas as to how an education system should function for learning, away from patronage and beyond process compliance. This focus on ideas is at the center of WDR 2015 which addressed mind, society, and behavior (World Bank 2015; Levy 2018; Evans 2017).
Conclusions

Social accountability can contribute to 21st century service delivery policies where complex outcomes are contingent on cross-sector efforts. No single sector can deliver learning on its own. Thinking, monitoring, researching, and evaluating the value add of social accountability requires a different mindset to better tap into operational opportunities and contribute to delivery of learning. Much practice, including the collaborative social accountability of GPSA’s partners, is not well depicted by the short or the long route to accountability. Social accountability can add a different value for learning in three ways.

First, for key stakeholders, social accountability processes have greater promise when they focus on complementing sectoral work. Often, the function of collaborative social accountability in the education sector is to reduce the political and institutional risks that accompany implementing policies. This means addressing the causes of the learning crisis — from data to inputs — rather than contributing to learning improvements directly.

Second, aligning stakeholders is required to truly improve learning among children. Social accountability practitioners can be a part of the solution.

Third, international development partners can support multistakeholder engagement. The GPSA, for example, can take advantage of its position in the World Bank for brokering collective action by facilitating experimentation at school level, and targeted programmatic discussion.

The note builds on the principles and policy actions that, according to the WDR 2018, should inform programming in the sector. It illustrates how civil society partnerships across the world are already tapping into the entry points to reform identified by the report. Promising areas of work beyond these specific cases that merit further experimentation and learning include:
Assess learning to make it a serious goal.

Act on evidence to make schools work for learners.

Align actors to make the system work for learning.

**Questions to consider include:** What can we learn from other experiences of supporting stakeholder engagement to improve the implementation of reforms? What additional steps can the social accountability field take to contribute toward the implementation of these actions to address the learning crisis? These are questions that the GPSA has been exploring with its Global Partners through knowledge activities, including a roundtable on “The Role of Collaborative Social Accountability in Accelerating Learning for All” and a session at the 2018 GPSA’s Global Partners Forum focused on the role of social accountability for human capital.

One area of action and learning that seems particularly relevant is improving the integration of education reform efforts with collaborative social accountability. The evolution of social accountability practice and the 2004, 2017, and 2018 WDRs suggest this is a promising avenue of work. The GPSA’s portfolio, including but not limited to supporting efforts to improve the implementation of decentralization reforms in practice, provides concrete examples in a range of contexts.

The GPSA’s network of civil society partners, its position in the World Bank’s Governance Global Practice and its close collaboration with the Education Global Practice and Country Management Units suggests the program is uniquely well placed to support these multistakeholder processes at the country level and contribute to improved cross-country knowledge and learning. This comparative advantage is at the core of the GPSA’s efforts to work with and strengthen the implementation compacts’ ability to drive change by providing a space to help crystallize a collective vision for learning as well as providing a programmatic pathway to scale and institutionalization.
In the short term, the GPSA can be an instrument to help broker country-specific efforts through which civil society actors can contribute toward specific government reform efforts supported through the operations of the World Bank and other development partners. All of GPSA’s new projects align civil society efforts to ongoing World Bank operations. More could be done, for example, to ensure that social accountability processes are built upstream during the initial definition of the sectoral operations of development partners as well as in tandem with adaptations to social accountability and sectoral reforms. As the case of the Dominican Republic and others illustrate beyond specific interventions, collaborative social accountability processes and projects over time provide a vehicle to rethink and increase efforts to realign actors across the system for learning.
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# APPENDIX A

**GPSA’s Portfolio of 14 Education Projects in 12 Countries**

## Table A.1. Overview of 14 GPSA Projects in the Education Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving transparency, accountability, and participation in national budgets for better education expenditure</td>
<td>Fundación Intermón Oxfam, Ciudad Alternativa, Coalición por la Educación Digna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively**
Community-based social auditing of macro level budget lines for education (as well as agriculture, housing, and drinking water and sanitation) by public "observatories" and interface opportunities between civil society and state officials.
### Project Objective
Improving the transparency and performance of the CCT program

### Civil Society Partners
Concerned Citizens of Abra for Good Governance, Partnership for Transparency Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Philippines</th>
<th>Period: 2013–2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability:** $800,000

**Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively**
Improve service delivery as part of the CCT program, by mobilizing communities, tracking funds, and engaging with local governments and service providers to develop action plans to improve public service in education (and health).

### Project Objective
Reducing teacher absenteeism and increasing transparency in the delivery of education materials

### Civil Society Partners
CARE Malawi, Civil Society Education Coalition, Souktel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Malawi (125 schools)</th>
<th>Period: 2014–2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability:** $950,000

**Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively**
Improve education services by developing feedback tools for students and parents to assist the ministry in monitoring teachers' absenteeism in 125 schools and to assist the Office of National Procurement in monitoring procurement of TLM.
## Project Objective
Increasing transparency in the delivery of educational materials

## Civil Society Partners
Malawi Economic Justice Network, Civil Society Education Coalition

## Location: Malawi

## Period: 2014–2019

## Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability:
$705,000

### Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively
More transparent and efficient procurement and delivery of TLM by monitoring TLM contracts and their execution and assisting the ministry to improve procurement.

---

## Project Objective
Improving the quality of education from primary to upper secondary schools

## Civil Society Partners
Expert-Group

## Location: Moldova

## Period: 2014–2018

## Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability:
$696,955

### Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively
Monitor education services in 100 Moldovan schools by facilitating the engagement of students and parents with school authorities to address budget allocation.
### Project Objective
Improving budget accountability in health and education sectors

### Civil Society Partners
SEND GHANA (grant recipient)

### Location
Ghana (50 poorest districts) | Period: 2014–2018

### Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability
$850,000

### Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively
Expand the use of SEND’s participatory monitoring and evaluation methodology to combine the monitoring of education services with sector budget monitoring at local, district, regional, and national levels.

---

### Project Objective
Improve transparency of budgeting and procurement processes for the delivery of better quality education services

### Civil Society Partners
Globe International Center (grant recipient), All for Education! National Civil Society Coalition, Partnership for Transparency Fund

### Location
Mongolia (8 provinces) | Period: 2014–2018

### Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability
$650,000

### Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively
Combining the establishment of PTAs and Good School Support Tool to assess the school environment and to strengthen the collaboration between citizens and state authorities (local and national).
## Project Objective
Improving access and quality of primary school education

## Civil Society Partners
CARE International Maroc (grant recipient), Near East Foundation, National Federation of Parents and Students Associations

### Location
Morocco (Vulnerable communities in Grand Casablanca and Marrakech Regions)  

### Period
2014–2018

### Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability
$720,000

### Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively
Identify areas for improvement in primary education, while strengthening collaboration between Parents Associations and (regional and national) education authorities in 80 primary school to improve allocation of education budgets.

---

## Project Objective
Improving procurement in education, health, and agriculture

## Civil Society Partners
Africa Freedom of Information Center, Transparency International Uganda, NFOC, Uganda Contracts Monitoring Coalition

### Location
Uganda  

### Period
2014–2018

### Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability
$650,000

### Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively
Strengthen accountability and the performance of social services by combining contract monitoring tools, political economy analyses of procurement, and the institutional strengthening of Uganda Contracts Monitoring Coalition in partnership with the Office of the Prime Minister and various ministries.
**Project Objective**
Improving education in public schools through participatory monitoring

**Civil Society Partners**
Affiliated Network for Social Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Philippines</th>
<th>Period: 2014–2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability:** $750,000

**Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively**
Establishes local partnerships between government, parents and students at 46,000 schools in the Philippines to help students and parents access accurate information and give feedback about educational services to the Ministry of Education through a web-based platform, CheckMySchool.

**Project Objective**
Empowering Tekoporã beneficiaries to ensure social accountability

**Civil Society Partners**
Centro de Información y Recursos para el Desarrollo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Paraguay</th>
<th>Period: 2014–2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability:** $600,000

**Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively**
Enhance transparency and accountability of the Tekoporã CCT program by developing a citizen–government partnership and strengthening feedback loops about the program’s education (and health) services.
### Project Objective
Improving preschool education monitoring systems in municipalities through collaborative, social accountability–oriented benchmarking activities

### Civil Society Partners
Save the Children in Georgia, Civitas Georgica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Georgia</th>
<th>Period: 2017–2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability:** $680,000

#### Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively
Creating a systematic monitoring and feedback mechanism for the preschool system in 27 Georgian municipalities, gathering voices of all local stakeholders, in partnership with municipal authorities, as well as the Ministry of Education and Science to improve education quality and resource allocation.

---

### Project Objective
Improving citizen participation in planning and monitoring of education, health, and land services

### Civil Society Partners
SAHA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Madagascar</th>
<th>Period: 2017–2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability:** $700,000

#### Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively
Improving transparency and accountability mechanisms between local governments and citizens through participative planning and budgeting in 46 targeted municipalities within four regions in Madagascar.
### Project Objective
Improving primary education services through citizen feedback

### Civil Society Partners
Eco-développement

### Location: Mauritania  
**Period:** 2017 – 2021

### Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability: $605,000

**Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively**
Improving the transparency of the primary education budget by monitoring and evaluating its implementation and education quality through social accountability tools in Tagant and Nouakchott provinces of Mauritania.

### Project Objective
Improving education quality by supporting effective community participation and systematic feedback loops

### Civil Society Partners
World Vision Dominican Republic

### Location: Dominican Republic  
**Period:** 2018 – 2020

### Contribution by the Global Partnership for Social Accountability: $500,000

**Main Social Accountability Mechanism to Engage Government Constructively**
Generating systematic feedback on schools’ conditions from the school community that can be shared and used by the Ministry of Education to improve education management and, ultimately, education quality.

*Note: CCT = conditional cash transfer; INFOC = Inter Faith Organization against Corruption; SAHA = Sahan’Asa Hampandrosoana ny Ambanivohitra; TLM = teaching and learning materials.*