

Education Partnership Annual Partnership Performance Report

MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Prepared by : Sarah Leslie, Senior Program Manager Basic Education Performance and Visibility;
Natassia Kaufman, Graduate

Through : Hannah Birdsey, Counsellor, Education, Scholarships and Knowledge
Jean-Bernard Carrasco, Minister Counsellor (DFAT Development Cooperation)

Approved by : James Gilling, Minister (DFAT Development Cooperation)

Date Approved:

Aid Activity Objective

The overall objective of Australia's Education Partnership with Indonesia (Education Partnership or EP) is to support the Government of Indonesia (GoI) to ensure all Indonesian children have access to quality basic education (the nine years of primary and junior secondary schooling). Specifically, the EP supports GoI to achieve a number of priorities set out in its *Education Sector Strategic Plan 2010-2014 ('Renstra 2010-2014')*. To deliver the EP, Australia works in partnership with GoI and other development partners, including the European Union (EU) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB).

Aid Activity Summary

Aid Activity Name	Australia's Education Partnership with Indonesia		
AidWorks initiative number	INJ648		
Commencement date	5 November 2010	Completion date	30 June 2016
Total Australian \$	AUD524 million (committed amount)		
Total other \$	-		
Delivery organisation(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cardno Emerging Markets (School System and Quality – SSQ)• GRM International (Performance Oversight and Monitoring – POM)• Asian Development Bank (Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership – ACDP)• URS Pty. Ltd. (Education Partnership Outreach Services – EPOS)		
Implementing Partner(s)	<p>Government of Indonesia, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ministry of Education and Culture (MoEC)• Ministry of Religious Affairs (MoRA)		

Aid Activity Name	Australia's Education Partnership with Indonesia
Country/Region	Indonesia, Asia
Primary Sector	Education (Basic)

Overview of the Aid Activity

The Education Partnership's vision is to improve education service delivery in Indonesia. Australia will work with GoI to increase participation in schooling, improve the quality of education in public and private schools (including madrasah), and improve education sector governance. To achieve this, the following End of Partnership Outcomes (EOPO) should be demonstrable at the end of the EP:

1. Increased enrolment in Junior Secondary Education in participating districts.
2. Improved management of schools and madrasah in participating districts.
3. Improved quality of madrasah service provision (in line with National Education Standards) in targeted provinces.
4. ACDP evidence is incorporated in relevant education sector policies, regulations, plans and budgets.

To contribute to these broader goals, Australia will:

1. construct or expand up to 2,000 more junior secondary schools and create approximately 300,000 new places for junior secondary school students;
2. improve the quality of school and madrasah management by developing a professional development system which will be made available to all 293,000 of Indonesia's school principals, school supervisors and district education officials;
3. support good quality Islamic Education by helping up to 1,500 Islamic schools (madrasah) to achieve accreditation against National Education Standards;
4. work together with the European Union (EU) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) to support relevant, high quality and timely research and analysis that strengthens education policy.

The total value of the Education Partnership is \$524 million, delivered over 5 years (2011-2016).

Annual Partnership Performance Report

Report Objective:

The Annual Partnership Performance Report (APPR) presents an annual overview of EP progress at all levels of the program logic and with respect to cross-cutting and overarching developmental themes. Based on this overview, the APPR presents a set of recommendations for actions to improve the future performance of the EP.

The APPR is one of the key products of the EP's Performance Monitoring System (EP-PMS), and aims to support a commitment to, and culture of, continuous improvement in program management and performance.

Overview of the 2013 APPR:

The 2013 APPR synthesizes the result of analysis conducted by the EP's Performance Oversight and Monitoring contractor (POM). The process of analysis involved three main stages:

1. a review of documentary evidence produced within the program (e.g. monitoring reports, research reports, technical reports) utilising the analytical framework agreed in the EP's Performance Management System;
2. a series of key informant interviews to explore issues pertinent to the performance of the EP since its inception; and
3. a consultative workshop with EP stakeholders on 29 November 2013.

This is the second APPR produced by POM, and covers the period January to December 2013. The report provides POM's assessment of EP achievements, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges. It draws on an assessment of context changes, consideration of the delivery mechanism, the impact of working in partnership and consideration of the sustainability of the EP. Most importantly, the report provides recommendations for all EP stakeholders to better safeguard Australia's investment in Indonesia's education sector.

This APPR is structured differently to the 2012 APPR. The 2013 APPR has a chapter on each component which covers the areas of context and achievements and then provides an assessment of each component's performance in line with the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC) criteria. It also includes a section with recommendations specifically on the management of the Education Partnership.

Conclusions

The APPR found that the EP interventions remain broadly relevant. However, more flexible management and strategic engagement will be required for the remainder of the program if the strong output level achievements to date are to be translated into higher level outcomes. It found that while there was good progress made at the output level, it was too early to judge whether this would result in achieving the End of Partnership Outcomes.

Management Response

DFAT welcomes the analysis and recommendations presented in the 2013 APPR. The report and consultative drafting process have provided valuable opportunities for EP stakeholders to reflect on the achievements, challenges and future directions of the program.

The APPR 2013 provides 24 practical recommendations that will inform EP implementation. DFAT agrees with 21 of the recommendations and partially agrees with three.

The APPR recommendations and DFAT's management responses are set out below.

Component 1 – School Construction (C1)

Recommendation	Management Response	Actions
1 DFAT and MoEC should reaffirm their commitment to the current EOPO	Agree	At the Infrastructure Technical Oversight Group in May 2014 DFAT and MoEC reaffirmed their commitment to the current EOPO, but not to the exclusion of other objectives. MoEC noted that the program also had potential to contribute to other objectives, such as reducing overcrowding and increasing the affordability of schooling through reducing transport costs.
2 Critically appraise coordination of school construction with other access-related initiatives within MoEC with a view to maximising the extent of EOPO achievement	Agree	Opportunities for cross-sector collaboration with DFAT's social protection program (that supports GoI's scholarships for the poor and other cash transfer programs) were explored in the first quarter of 2014. DFAT has identified areas of mutual interest with potential for improved coordination (such as public awareness campaigns to increase uptake of the scholarships for the poor program). More detailed arrangements for coordination and support will be agreed once the new administration is in place in Indonesia and institutional arrangements for social protection programs are clearer.
3 Further analysis of site selection outcomes should be undertaken to provide a robust basis to improve the selection process	Agree	DFAT requested POM to conduct this further analysis, in coordination with MoEC and SSQ, in the second quarter of 2014. At the time of publication data collection was underway.
4	Agree	The site selection process was significantly improved for the selection of 2014 schools.

<p>DFAT and MoEC should strengthen the site selection process by refining factors of JSE demand and supply in the selection criteria, and ensuring a strict application of these criteria</p>	<p>For each new school proposal, an assessment was made of the district's demand analysis, and then cross checked against the existing school supply to form a judgement as to whether the new school proposal has merit. Population data was also included as a predictor of future demand for proposed new schools.</p> <p>DFAT, MoEC and SSQ teams will continue to refine and improve site selection processes for selection of 2015 schools.</p>
<p>5</p> <p>Lessons learned from EP implementation (e.g. regarding monitoring process) should be synthesised and disseminated to interested parties (e.g. MoEC and other GoI institutions/agencies involved in construction processes), should there be merit or demand</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>In 2014, DFAT, the World Bank, and the ADB supported BAPPENAS and MoEC to conduct a learning event on the provision of senior secondary education which included lessons learned from EP implementation. Further opportunities will be identified and pursued over 2014-2015.</p>

Component 2 – Professional Development of Education Personnel (C2)

Recommendation	Management Response	Actions
<p>6</p> <p>DFAT-MoEC should assign sufficient resources to the Education Personnel Professional Development program (ProDEP) so as to ensure timely delivery of results by June 2016, or should readjust the number of target beneficiaries and/or implementation strategy accordingly</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>As implementation and planning has progressed, DFAT and MoEC have a better understanding of resources available to ProDEP (from both DFAT and MoEC). DFAT and MoEC have revised the timeframe of grant implementation and propose to extend ProDEP to 2017 in order to maintain quality standards while meeting MoEC expectations for coverage.</p>

<p>7 MoEC should lobby and advocate for the professional development system to be included in strategic documents (e.g. the RPJMN and the upcoming Renstra), thereby enhancing political commitment to its implementation</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>DFAT is supporting MoEC to ensure that ProDEP is incorporated into strategic planning. The next strategic plan will be finalised in 2015.</p> <p>DFAT and its implementing partners are developing a sustainability strategy for ProDEP, and this will be discussed at technical oversight meetings in late 2014 and early 2015. The sustainability strategy will be finalised in early 2015, using evidence from implementation to determine the preferred model(s) for delivery.</p>
<p>8 Institutional Partners must better understand the financial capacity and willingness of all government levels to fund professional development services, and develop a workable sustainability strategy</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>The sustainability strategy for this component will identify the regulatory frameworks and possible sources of funding that will enable ProDEP to be implemented by MoEC. Evaluation of ProDEP implementation will generate impact information that MoEC can use to demonstrate to districts the returns from investing in this program.</p> <p>POM will consider providing a breakdown of district education financing (i.e. recurrent vs discretionary funds) in the 2013 Annual Sector Finance Report. If the data is available to undertake this analysis, DFAT and MoEC will use this data to better understand the financial capacity of district governments for implementing ProDEP.</p> <p>MoEC and DFAT are piloting online learning to reach large numbers of principals at an affordable cost. Evidence generated from the pilot will inform ongoing implementation of ProDEP.</p>

Component 3 – Support for madrasah Accreditation (C3)

Recommendation	Management Response	Actions
9 DFAT and MoRA should define and agree upon the nature and extent of systemic change expected	<p>Agree</p>	<p>This component is testing and developing a model for improving the quality of Madrasah education and the Madrasah system. Over 2014 and 2015, DFAT will support MoRA to develop a strategic plan to improve Madrasah quality, drawing on evidence from the program.</p>
10 EP support to systemic change should encourage and be based on a clear and resourced MoRA strategy for supporting Madrasah continuous quality improvement	<p>Agree</p>	<p>MoRA intend to develop a national strategy for madrasah quality improvement with technical support from DFAT. This will draw on evidence from support to madrasah accreditation and related areas of support to madrasah under other components of the EP.</p>
11 There should be an explicit and systematic targeting of beneficiary Madrasah with low initial standards (specifically TT- non accredited madrasah)	<p>Partially agree</p>	<p>A full madrasah baseline assessment can only occur after the target madrasah are selected; however, DFAT and GoI have a pre-existing agreement that only madrasah that appear to be of Level C or below will be included in the program. This decision was taken prior to the commencement of Phase 2.</p>
12 EP should continue and increase engagement with sub-national institutions to develop and seek support for non-targeted Madrasah, including engagement with KKM (madrasah working groups) and Madrasah supervisors.	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Sub-national institutions are central to improving madrasah quality. We are working to include other stakeholders in the program at a pace that will not overburden them. The focus on strengthening sub-national institutions so they can support madrasah quality more broadly is central to DFAT's work with MoRA on a national strategy for</p>

		madrassah quality improvement.						
13 EP should develop, support and monitor measures to better involve other key, but currently untargeted stakeholders (e.g. committee members, yayasan and community members) in Madrasah quality improvement strategies	Partially agree	<p>The program engages in close review of madrasah improvement plans to assess the extent to which local stakeholders are involved and agree with the proposed plan. Sub-national institutional partners play a key role in encouraging madrasah to involve madrasah committees, yayasan, and the community in development and implementation of their improvement plans. The roles of subsector stakeholders will also be explored in the development of MoRA's national strategy for madrasah quality improvement.</p>						
		<p>Component 4 – Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership (C4)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Recommendation</th> <th>Management Response</th> <th>Actions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>14 ACDP should continue to revise and diversify its product offering (activity types) such that it is responsive and timely, and offers value for money</td><td>Agree</td><td> <p>The ACDP continues to diversify its product offerings. Successful activities include: two rapid assessments of student nutrition and the scholarships for the poor program and a learning event on senior secondary education. The learning event was in response to a request from MoEC to stimulate debate on a high-priority issue for GoI.</p> <p>DFAT, together with the European Union, has supported a mid-term review of ACDP which has considered issues of effectiveness and value for money. The final report has been received and as at November 2014 we're</p> </td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Recommendation	Management Response	Actions	14 ACDP should continue to revise and diversify its product offering (activity types) such that it is responsive and timely, and offers value for money	Agree	<p>The ACDP continues to diversify its product offerings. Successful activities include: two rapid assessments of student nutrition and the scholarships for the poor program and a learning event on senior secondary education. The learning event was in response to a request from MoEC to stimulate debate on a high-priority issue for GoI.</p> <p>DFAT, together with the European Union, has supported a mid-term review of ACDP which has considered issues of effectiveness and value for money. The final report has been received and as at November 2014 we're</p>
Recommendation	Management Response	Actions						
14 ACDP should continue to revise and diversify its product offering (activity types) such that it is responsive and timely, and offers value for money	Agree	<p>The ACDP continues to diversify its product offerings. Successful activities include: two rapid assessments of student nutrition and the scholarships for the poor program and a learning event on senior secondary education. The learning event was in response to a request from MoEC to stimulate debate on a high-priority issue for GoI.</p> <p>DFAT, together with the European Union, has supported a mid-term review of ACDP which has considered issues of effectiveness and value for money. The final report has been received and as at November 2014 we're</p>						

		seeking agreement from ADB, GoI and EU as to which of the recommendations we will action.
15	Agree	DFAT has engaged with its partners in the ACDP (including through regular ACDP Technical Oversight Group meetings and progress meetings with ADB, EU and ACDP Secretariat) to better articulate what we expect to achieve through our support to ACDP. This is consistently reflected in our comments on ACDP Progress Reports and M&E Framework, in the EP Performance Milestone Framework and the EP Theory of Change and evaluation documents.
16	Agree	DFAT has appointed a part-time ACDP Program Manager with specific responsibility for cross-component and cross-program coordination. Recent examples of strengthened cross-portfolio synergies include DFAT's involvement in the support to Papuan provinces, mother-tongue education, and early childhood development studies. DFAT will continue to work with ACDP and other partners to improve communications around ACDP activities, including by initiating a weekly email update from the ACDP Secretariat to relevant stakeholders on current and upcoming activities.

Beneficiaries of the EP		
Recommendation	Management Response	Actions
17 Institutional partners should identify categories of beneficiaries whose targeting will increase the likelihood of EOPO achievement, and devise a targeting strategy for each component	Agree	<p>Since completion of the APPR, DFAT has done further work in relation to targeting. For example, in Component 1 DFAT has been supporting low enrolment districts to better plan for new school infrastructure through training and ongoing mentoring for district education officers in school master planning.</p> <p>In Component 2 the selection process for principals is based on performance appraisal and actively targets those with lower performance on key skill areas.</p> <p>In Component 3 evidence from evaluation of Phase 1 showed that the madrasah who made the most gains in quality improvement were those that had the poorest performance against the eight national education standards. This type of madrasah is explicitly targeted in Phase 3.</p> <p>We will continue to work with the Government of Indonesia to ensure targeting strategies for each component are clear.</p>
18 Institutional partners should finalise and implement a social inclusion strategy that outlines objectives, boundaries, indicators and targets; and describes what the EP aspires to, i.e. what it should be doing, not just what it is doing	Partially agree	DFAT tasked the SSQ contractor with recruiting a social inclusion advisor (to commence in October 2014). This adviser will work with each component team to identify opportunities for the program to promote social inclusion more effectively, and will subsequently support the teams on

		implementation.
19	Agree	<p>Institutional partners should clarify the extent to which equity is an objective of the EP and, where appropriate, explore EP targeting objectives and review selection criteria and targeting mechanisms</p> <p>Equity issues have been reviewed in relation to each component of the program and component-specific responses agreed. These actions are being supported by increased analysis and research into equity issues in education in Indonesia.</p> <p>For example, in Component 1 we provided support to low-enrolment districts (noted in the response to recommendation 17); and changed the data requirements for new school proposals and improved the analysis of the proposals (see response to recommendation 4) to ensure new schools are targeted to underserved populations. DFAT has tasked POM to analyse the correlation of enrolment and poverty data for targeted districts, to identify if further refinement of selection criteria would improve new school targeting.</p> <p>C2 has an explicit strategy for targeting female principals and senior female teachers to ensure they have equal opportunity to advance their careers.</p> <p>In C3 we expect improved targeting of madrasah, based on evidence generated in the first phase of the program, will improve equity outcomes given the enrolment profile of private madrasah.</p>

Management and governance of the EP		
Recommendation	Management Response	Actions
20 DFAT's management of the EP should aim to be more flexible and adaptive, i.e. be more forward looking (at opportunities) than backward-looking (at the EP design)	Agree	The Education Partnership is mid-way in its implementation. All components are now established and functioning well with good program data available. DFAT will draw on this data in its management of the EP to take advantage of opportunities to improve the implementation of the program.
21 DFAT should prioritise (varied) strategic engagement with GoI; e.g. strategic discussion on C1 and C3; advocacy of current EP approach on C2; and broader policy engagement through C4	Agree	At the mid-point of implementation, DFAT now has established relationships and trust with our institutional partners. DFAT will continue to engage in strategic discussions with our GoI partners through existing governance and management mechanisms drawing on the increasing flow of performance data available. DFAT has, and will continue to, pursue dialogue opportunities with senior GoI counterparts on issues such as GoI's Medium Term Development Plan, Curriculum 2013, and Senior Secondary Education. For example, DFAT supported a workshop on 11 September 2014 on ways to implement GoI's priorities for Senior Secondary Education.
22 The articulation and agreement on the EP logic and the finalisation and socialisation of the Performance Milestone Framework (PMF) should be prioritised	Agree	A revised EP logic was agreed in May 2014 and has been circulated to the Government of Indonesia, ACDP and EP contractors. The PMF was finalised in August 2014; the document has been shared with Government of Indonesia, ACDP and EP contractors

<p>23</p> <p>Existing governance structures need to be more effectively engaged, utilizing performance evidence to inform strategic, higher-level decisions</p>	<p>Agree</p> <p>The EP has sufficiently matured so that performance information is available now. DFAT utilised this performance information as a basis for dialogue in Technical Oversight Group (TOG) meetings and Governance Oversight Group meetings in 2014.</p>
<p>24</p> <p>Institutional partners should identify potential for stronger linkages between POM and governance structures, possibly in a secretariat role</p>	<p>Partially Agree</p> <p>POM has presented on performance issues in every Technical Oversight Group meeting in 2014. The secretariat role is undertaken by the Bureau of International Cooperation in MoEC.</p>

