

**The impact and value-addition of ADEA Working Group peer reviews**

**Evaluation Report**

**Draft**

**By**

**AYELE ADUBRA**

**Consultant**

## Table of Contents

Executive summary .....	3
1. Presentation of the peer reviews .....	8
1.1 The peer review mechanism .....	8
1.2 Education System Peer reviews.....	9
1.2.1 Background.....	9
1.2.2. Education system peer review framework .....	9
1.3.1Background.....	10
1.3.2. The EMIS Norms and Standards .....	11
2. Evaluation Methodology .....	11
3. Findings .....	13
3.1.1 Education system review in Burkina Faso .....	14
3.1.2 Education system review in the Congo .....	16
3.2.1 Ghana Peer review.....	16
3.2.2 Swaziland Peer review .....	19
3.2.3 Mozambique Peer review.....	21
4. Lessons learnt and recommendations.....	22
4.1. On the efficiency of the peer review mechanism .....	23
Recommendations for more efficiency .....	26
4.2 .On the relevance of the recommendations of the peer reviews .....	28
Recommendations for more relevance for future peer reviews .....	28
4.3. On the impact and value addition of the peer review exercise .....	29
Recommendations for a strategic repositioning of ADEA peer reviews .....	30
Conclusion.....	31
Consulted documents .....	32
Persons interviewed.....	34
Annex 1 : Interview Guides .....	38
Annex 2: Terms of reference of the evaluation.....	41

## **Executive summary**

The report presents the findings and analysis of a constructive and independent evaluation of ADEA peer reviews. The purpose of the evaluation exercise as mandated by ADEA (See ToR, Annex 2) is to evaluate the impact and value addition of two types of peer reviews, and to explore possibilities of achieving greater coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and follow up to ensure they address the needs of countries and other stakeholders.

The ADEA peer review exercise is carried out by two working groups: the Working Group on Non-Formal Education (WGNFE) based in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso; and the Working Group on Education Management and Policy Support (WGEMPS) based in Harare, Zimbabwe. The Working Group on Non-formal Education looks at the whole education system or at sub-sectors with a special focus on quality, or articulation or teacher training, or any educational issue. Whereas the WGEMPS, following a mandate given by the African Union (AU) and the regional economic communities, looks at Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) in countries. The present evaluation focuses on five countries (Ghana, Mozambique and Swaziland for the EMIS reviews and Burkina Faso and the Republic of Congo for the education sub-sector review) (ToR, Annex2).

A significant finding of the evaluation is that although all the peer review reports included recommendations, no country had designed a follow-up action plan. In the absence of action-plans, the evaluator has decided not to go down the list of recommendations in the various reports to see if they have been implemented or not, but instead, to determine the changes that have been brought in the educational environment since the peer review exercise. These changes can be considered as outcomes of the peer review exercise, thus representing an indication of potential impact of the peer reviews. The outcomes can be summarized as:

- The confirmation of some countries in strategic options that were being envisaged (Burkina Faso, Ghana and Mozambique);
- A better positioning of the EMIS unit within the educational ministry (Swaziland and Mozambique);
- Decisions made to adopt new software and improve in EMIS data collection (Ghana, Swaziland and Mozambique);

- Solutions sharing among peers for some simple problems such as data coding and entry (Ghana and Swaziland); and
- The confirmation that solutions in education in Africa can come from the Continent experts including those who deal with the issues every day. All what is needed is at the time “to sit and reflect” (All the selected beneficiary countries and peers).

The evaluation highlights a recurrent two-fold finding. On one hand, it appears that, on the whole, the peer reviews in all the selected countries have achieved what they were tasked to do in terms of purpose, specific objectives, and activities. Even when the allocated time to the country visit was shortened. But on the other hand, these peer review exercises have not gone full length and deep enough and have stopped short. This feeling of “unfinished business” represents the major lesson to be drawn as far as efficiency, impact and value-addition is concerned.

#### *Recommendations for the short term*

There is a need to finish the exercise started in all the peer reviews since 2013. It is important for the working groups to carry a follow-up activity by assisting the countries in designing a plan of action based on the prioritization of the formulated recommendations with a closer look at the existing recommendations and the analysis of their relevance to the present educational context and also by taking into account new options in the country.

#### *Recommendations for future peer reviews*

**Ensuring greater and wider participation in the process.** Due to financial constraints, the international team can never stay as long as needed. To make sure that they are provided with a complete and credible report, the national team, as nominated, has to work effectively on the self-assessment and find ways to include all the stakeholders in education.

**Ensuring the validity of the different peer review instruments.** They should be a balance between harmonization and the need to take into account the context of the countries and the need to see progress as far as capacity building is concerned.

**Ensuring that the beneficiary country participate to financing the exercise.** The process of peer review finds its legitimacy in the potential of country capacity building. For that to happen,

there is a necessary condition: country authorities' real engagement in the process for ownership and for efficiency.

**Ensuring the effective implementation of the recommendations.** All the peer reviews should integrate: 1) an effective action-plan worked collaboratively with the country. The validation workshop should include an exercise of prioritization of the recommendations, and a selection of those that may be integrated into a realistic action-plan. The action-plan will also detail the assistance needed for implementation and the roles of ADEA and other international agencies and 2) a designated institution in charge of following-up in the country.

**There is a need to reposition strategically the peer reviews as a core activity in ADEA strategic initiative in country capacity building.** During the briefing meeting on the onset of the present evaluation, ADEA Secretariat mentioned that the organization is in the process of reflecting on the value-addition of some of its activities. The time is really appropriate as countries find themselves with new challenges in education following the adoption of the sustainable development goals (SDGs). The implication of SDG 4 and the operationalization of Education 2030 Plan of action with the design of new strategic education plans make the peer reviews are more than ever needed.

In addition ADEA will gain in:

-Working more on communication and visibility of the peer review activity at the highest level in the country, with regional organizations and with other international organizations such as UNESCO, UNDP, UNICEF and the World Bank. The peer review report and the follow-up actions should not only be shared with the educational authorities at the national level.

-Organizing joint mission for the two working groups. It is important that the peer review exercise brings to the country the necessary expertise. Countries will also be more interested in a robust team with a wide spectrum of expertise. ADEA, more than any international agency, can garner experts with multiple background.

-Collaborating more effectively with the RECs in the implementation of the activity for both working groups. It is important to create and sustain an arena for the sharing of the results of the peer reviews and for making countries more responsible for following up on the recommendations of the peer reviews

The findings of the evaluation show that the ADEA peer reviews are appreciated by all the people who have been involved in it (beneficiary country education authorities and officers and the international peers). It is a unique tool for mutual learning and sharing. It has the potential of yielding better impact and help country to build their capacity and improve the quality of their education. However, there is a need to take all the steps to maximize and turn into concrete benefits what can be considered so far as potentials.

## **The impact and value-addition of ADEA Working Group peer reviews**

### **Introduction**

The report presents the findings and analysis of a constructive and independent evaluation of ADEA peer reviews. The purpose of the evaluation exercise as mandated by ADEA (See ToR, Annex 2) is to evaluate the impact and value addition of two types of peer reviews, and to explore possibilities of achieving greater coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and follow up to ensure they address the needs of countries and other stakeholders.

The ADEA peer review exercise is carried out by two working groups: the Working Group on Non-Formal Education (WGNFE) based in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso; and the Working Group on Education Management and Policy Support (WGEMPS) based in Harare, Zimbabwe. The Working Group on Non-formal Education looks at the whole education system or at sub-sectors with a special focus on quality, or articulation or teacher training, or other educational issues. Whereas the WGEMPS, following a mandate given by the African Union (AU) and the regional economic communities, looks at Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) in countries.

ADEA Strategic Medium Term Plan (2013-2017) stresses the need to: “Contribute to advancing policies, strategies, practices, and programs that promote critical knowledge, skills, and qualifications”; and to “Promote African-led education and training solutions to address national and regional needs.” (Strategic objectives 1 and 2). Furthermore, peer reviews are specifically mentioned as means to achieve the following strategic initiatives under the second strategic objective:

- SI 2.1 Advance the AU’s Second Decade of Education and other select regional and continental initiatives
- SI 2.2 Facilitate greater inter-country collaboration and regional integration
- SI 2.3 Promote greater awareness and application of existing African solutions
- SI 2.4 Advise African governments in designing and implementing African-led solutions (STMP,2013-2017)

It is worth noting that peer reviews have been part of ADEA activities in its member countries since 2004. At the time, the Ministers’ Bureau meeting decided to entrust the Working Group

on Education Sector Analysis (WGESA) with a mandate to carry out peer reviews in selected countries under the supervision of a subcommittee. Since then, the WGESA has been then restructured to become the Working Group on Education Management and Policy Support.

Since 2004, a number of countries have been involved in the peer review exercise. However, the present evaluation has selected only 5 of them (Ghana, Mozambique and Swaziland for the EMIS reviews and Burkina Faso and the Republic of Congo for the education sub-sector review). The document analysis has revealed that there was an internal evaluation within ADEA of the first three evaluations. Specifically, the evaluation targeted three main objectives:

- i. Evaluate the value added nature of the peer review systems as compared to the initial assessments for the countries concerned.
- ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the recommendations coming from the peer reviewers
- iii. Explore possibilities of achieving greater coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and follow up to ensure they address the needs of countries and other stakeholders.

## **1. Presentation of the peer reviews**

### **1.1 The peer review mechanism**

The peer review exercise used by the two working groups follows a two-phased approach. The first step in the exercise starts with a country accepting to go under review and with the signing of an agreement between that country and ADEA. This very crucial step is general triggered either after a representative of the country has participated in a workshop presenting/discussing other peer reviews (TUNIS 2010 or SADC annual meetings); or at the invitation of the regional economic committee (REC). The peer review entails the following phases and steps:

Phase One:

1. First meeting with the country authority to agree on a work-plan and elements to review under the coordination of the working group.
2. National assessment conducted by the country experts/authorities using an agreed framework for the assessment (ADEA Working group and country educational authorities)
3. Production of the country self-assessment report and the sending of the document to the ADEA Working group (with scoring in the case of EMIS)

Phase Two:

1. Country visit by international peers: working sessions with different national education authorities and various stakeholders, school visits and interviews

2. Compilation and discussion of findings using the agreed framework (ending with scoring in the case of the ENS framework)
3. Presentation of preliminary/exit report and recommendations to the county education authorities
4. Production and sending of final peer review report

#### *Financing the peer review*

One key component of the peer review is, of course, the financing of the exercise. Such an activity cannot be conducted without cost. The education system peer reviews in the two evaluated countries, have been financed by ADEA with the help of donor countries/agencies such as South Korea and UNDP. In addition, the terms of reference leading to the peer reviews stipulate that the beneficiary country should also contribute. In the case of the EMIS peer reviews, funding comes from the basket of the WGEMPS for its own activities and from contribution in kind (transport, etc.) from the beneficiary country.

### **1.2 Education System Peer reviews**

#### ***1.2.1 Background***

The first three countries to go under review using the ADEA approach were: Mauritius, Gabon and Nigeria. In Mauritius, the purpose was to look at the achievements of the 2000-2005 reform “to measure student achievement and to evaluate how well Mauritius school systems have been carrying out their own responsibilities<sup>1</sup>”. In Gabon, the review looked at the transition between primary and secondary and between secondary and tertiary with a focus on the articulation between secondary education and higher education, and the transition between preschool and primary education. Finally, in Nigeria, the exercise looked at adult and non-formal education. These first set of peer reviews were coordinated, as indicated above, by the ADEA Working Group on Education Sector Analysis (WGESA).

#### ***1.2.2. Education system peer review framework***

The mode of intervention in the countries has been defined in a document entitled: “Engager et Conduire une revue par les pairs en Afrique (Engaging and conducting peer reviews in Africa<sup>2</sup>)”. According to the document, areas to be reviewed are: formulation and implementation of education policies and mobilization and utilization of resources (financial and human). It is recommended that a special attention be paid to issues of access, quality, equity, decentralization, health education with reference to AIDS/HIV.

---

<sup>1</sup> Excerpt taken from the presentation on the peer review exercise to the Forum of African Ministers

<sup>2</sup> ADEA unpublished working document

There is no agreed single assessment framework for the peer review of the education system as in the EMIS peer review. The main characteristic of the education system peer reviews is that the exercise is very participatory. It is meant to be conducted with the engagement of the highest education authorities in the country. Both the national and international teams have to be nominated at the highest authority level after consultations between ADEA and the country. It is also stipulated, in the agreement documents, that representation at the country level should be as large as possible and should also integrate civil society organizations and teacher unions. In the same vein, consultations are given a very important place with time devoted to finding a consensus with regard to the focus of the review but also to the recommendations to be implemented by the county.

### **1.3 EMIS Peer reviews**

#### ***1.3.1 Background***

Countries capacity building in Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) was one of the priority areas identified in the plan of action of Second Decade of Education of the African Union (2006-2015). ADEA Working Group on Education Management and Policy Support (WGEMPS) has been identified by the AU as its implementing arm as far as diagnosis and capacity building in EMIS are concerned. In order to achieve its mandate to help countries build their capacity, WGEMPS works within the framework of the regional economic communities (RECs) in Africa.

The first countries to start work in EMIS belong to the Southern African Development Community. In 2008, an EMIS assessment report was produced by ADEA Working Group on Education Management and Policy Support in collaboration with the SADC Secretariat and the African Union Education Observatory<sup>3</sup>. The report covered 14 countries with the following outcomes: “determining the current status of EMIS in all its member states, developing a regional EMIS capacity building strategy and putting in place a norms and standards framework that guides effective EMIS systems<sup>4</sup>.”

The assessment, as it was envisaged, produced a tool: the EMIS norms and standards (ENS). The same work has been done in the ECOWAS region in 2010, resulting in the ECOWAS EMIS Norms and Standards<sup>5</sup>. And, in 2011, education ministers of countries in the East African

---

<sup>3</sup> SADC.2008. EMIS Assessment report covering 14 countries. SADC

<sup>4</sup> Op cit

<sup>5</sup> ADEA/ECOWAS. 2010. EMIS Assessment report covering 12 countries

Community agreed to the development of their own assessment framework<sup>6</sup>. The customized East African Community ENS will be used to review EMIS capacity in the concerned countries in the coming months.

In addition to building country capacity, the ENS is also meant to help the countries in their endeavor to stand international comparison in the field of EMIS. In the various consulted documents guiding the use of the EMIS Norms and Standards at the continental level, it is clearly stipulated that the ENS framework does not replace the other international instruments used in the domain. Below is a statement made by the SADC Secretariat. The same caution can be found in the other REC ENS documents.

SADC recognizes the role of UIS as international education statistics body and emphasized the need to recognize the different roles that different organisations and the different assessment tools play. The ENS gives member states a very strong tool to abide by; this fosters regional integration – peer review and a development of the collective even if it may be at a different pace for different member states. The SADC EMIS Norms and Standards can never replace international standards but the region needs its own tool so that the region can meet international standards.<sup>7</sup>”

### ***1.3.2. The EMIS Norms and Standards***

Originally developed by WGEMPS and commissioned by SADC following the instructions of education ministers in 2012, the EMIS Norms and Standards contain 17 principles and their corresponding 84 standards. These norms and standards cover four areas: policy and legal frameworks; resource availability and utilization; statistical processes and education information reporting. These SADC EMIS Norms and Standards (ENS) have been since “customized” in other regions. It should also be noted that the SADC countries have constituted an EMIS technical sub-committee under the impulse of the SADC Secretariat.

## **2. Evaluation Methodology**

### **2.1 Evaluation questions and data collection**

The guiding questions for data collection in the present evaluation were: 1) the satisfaction of all stakeholders with the peer review processes and results; 2) the relevance of the recommendations; 3) the kind of changes (policy reforms, human capacity building, resources

---

<sup>6</sup> ADEA/EAC. 2014. EMIS Norms and Standards Assessment Framework for the EAC Region

<sup>7</sup> Excerpt from SADC Norms and Standards

allocations, etc.) in the countries brought after the review; and 4) lessons for future operations of ADEA in peer reviews (See Annex 1).

The evaluation was based on a participatory approach. The first conceptual design was refined after inputs from ADEA Secretariat and the working group coordinators at a briefing meeting in Abidjan in September 2016. Data was collected using two main techniques: documents analysis (peer reviews reports and assessment tool guides) and semi-structured interviews (one-on-one and face to face; group and Skype interviews). Some informants especially, the international peers, requested to be sent a questionnaire. In addition and in the case of the EMIS peer reviews countries visited, the evaluator was able to go out of the ministry offices in the capital city, to meet EMIS officers and data collectors at the province, districts and school levels. These visits allowed for triangulation of the data collected with the central unit.

The field visits were conducted from 14 September 2016 to 17 October 2016. In addition to the five selected countries (Ghana, Swaziland, Mozambique, Burkina Faso and the Republic of Congo), the evaluator visited the ADEA Secretariat in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire, and the WGEMPS offices in Harare, Zimbabwe for briefing and to conduct interviews with the ADEA Secretariat officers involved in the peer reviews, the coordinators and program officers of the two working groups. In addition to this group representing ADEA and in charge of facilitating and coordinating the peer reviews, the other categories of people met during the evaluation are:

- Direct beneficiaries of the peer reviews: Ministry of Education authorities and technical staff in the respective countries
- Education program officers in the RECs
- International experts involved in the different peer reviews

The evaluator would like to thank all the persons met during the field visits for their contributions. The support given by the ADEA Secretariat, the coordination and program and administrative officers of the working groups are highly appreciated. Some of the interviews in the countries (Swaziland, Ghana and Mozambique) would not have been possible without the personal involvement of the EMIS management. May they find in this report the expression of the evaluator's gratitude.

## **2.2 Limitations of the evaluation exercise**

The first limitation of the present evaluation is that in order to evaluate the real impact of the peer reviews as far as the implementations of the recommendations were concerned, two conditions are necessary: 1) a clear action-plan designed by the country with a precise timeline for implementation and; 2) a follow-up mechanism either in the country or at ADEA level which will help identify precisely, using the peer review report as a benchmark, what new action has been taken by the country following the review. These two conditions were lacking.

The second limitation lies in the availability of the people involved in the peer reviews either in the national team or in the international team at the time of the evaluation. Especially in the case of ministry officials and technicians involved in the education system peer reviews, a majority of them were no more in their function and not even available in the country. The case of the Congo is illustrative of the situation, from the national team, the evaluator could only meet the coordinator.

Despite the above mentioned limitations, the evaluator believes that the present evaluation exercise by focusing on the process and ways to improve the peer review mechanism for greater impact and value addition highlights important lessons for ADEA. It is also hoped that this first draft will also be enriched by the various stakeholders, especially the partners in the peer reviews who could not be met.

## **2.3 Organization of the evaluation report**

Following the brief background describing the specificities of each type of review (education sector peer or the EMIs peer review) above, the report presents the findings as far as the process and the results/recommendations of the peer reviews are concerned by type of peer review and for each selected country. Then, lessons are drawn from these findings to evaluate in a meta-analysis the efficiency, relevance and impact of the ADEA peer reviews. The last section deals with recommendations for ADEA in order to make the peer review exercise more relevant, more coherent, with more impact and value addition for the countries in Africa.

## **3. Findings**

The findings of the evaluation are not reported using in stricto sensu the recommendations of each of the country report. The reason has already been mentioned in the limitation of the evaluation: the absence of a follow-up action plan. An action plan would have indeed allowed to identify what was agreed upon as follow-up actions and within what time line these actions

were to be implemented. In the absence of action-plans, the evaluator has decided not to go down the list of recommendations in the various reports to see if they have been implemented or not, but instead, to identify the changes that have been brought in the country educational sector since the peer review exercise.

### **3.1. Education system peer reviews**

#### ***3.1.1 Education system review in Burkina Faso***

##### **3.1.1.1 Background**

The peer review was initiated by the Minister of Education and Literacy in 2013 with a letter of intent asking ADEA to conduct a peer review in basic education with a special focus on issues of quality in reference to the Ten-Year Education Strategic Plan that had been adopted by the country (PDSEB 2012-2021). The first phase of the strategy (2012-2015) was coming to an end, and the country needed to refine its strategic choices in regards to: the reduction of disparities, the promotion of short duration pre-vocational training, teacher training schools reforms, curricular reforms and the time allocated to teaching and learning in the curriculum, the sharing of school facilities, and the decentralization of the educational system<sup>8</sup>.

A cooperation agreement was signed by ADEA and Burkina Faso stipulating the responsibilities of each party. The framework also indicated the composition of two national organs in charge of conducting the review: a steering committee (more political with decision-making powers at the ministerial level) and a technical committee in charge of the conducting the national self-assessment and writing the national report.

The peers in the review came from Cameroon, Niger, Mali, Korea South and the two officers from Working Group on Non-Formal Education. In accordance to the various contractual dispositions taken by ADEA and the country, the peer review set out to review and suggest recommendations on the following:

- Coherence between theory, didactic principles and pedagogical practices
- Relevance of pedagogical approaches with educational goals, objectives, and socio-economic variables (employability and labor market needs)
- Integration of vulnerable groups
- Articulation between formal and non-formal education
- Integration of national languages into the curriculum

---

<sup>8</sup> Letter of intent sent by the Minister of education to ADEA. June2013

- Capacity building in pedagogical approaches in formal and non-formal education
- Better integration of pre-vocational training into basic education system

### **3.1.1.2 Process of the review**

The process used the two-phased approach defined for ADEA peer reviews: self-assessment by country and international peer review. The duration of the national self-assessment which was reported was 20 days and for the peer review 10 working days. The reference documents for the work of the national team and thereof for the work of the international team are an independent evaluation of the country previous Ten-Year Basic Education Strategic Plan and the Evaluation Report on the implementation of the first phase of the new Strategic Plan (2012-2021). Other documents related to strategic orientations in TVET, youth and economic integration were also used.

According to the informants met during the evaluation field visits, the process was run in a very friendly atmosphere. Nevertheless, there was a major weakness: the availability of the various national technicians that were nominated in the national team. On paper, there seems to be a wide representation. But, when it came to actually performing the self-assessment, it was difficult to gather all the members of the original team. In addition, the crucial step which was the finalization of the self-assessment report through a validation workshop to ensure wide adhesion and enrichment of the report could not take place because of lack of funds.

### **3.1.1.3 Results/Recommendations of the peer review**

One major result of the review in Burkina Faso is the fact that issues coming from the self-assessment and discussions with the international team were rapidly taken into account and solutions were adopted by the country. Concretely, because the review occurred when the country was writing the second phase of its Ten-Year Strategic Plan, even before the report came out, most of what became the recommendations of the peer review had already been integrated into the new strategic plan. The informants at the decision-making level of the ministry, met during data collection, acknowledged that the peer review exercise has helped them formulate relevant policy options.

Specifically, these recommendations concern curricular reforms and the choice of pedagogical approaches in formal basic education and in non-formal education. In the Ten-Year Education Strategic Plan, there are provisions to design pathways for the articulation between non-formal and formal education. For that there is the need to design a national qualifications framework. The informants indicated during the evaluation that some steps have been taken to start developing one.

To conclude the report on the peer review in Burkina Faso, it has to be mentioned, though, that the changes in government in 2014-2015, and specifically, in the educational scene, seem to have halted the implementation of the recommendations as formulated in the peer review report. Most of the key players at the time of the peer review are no more in the same capacity.

### ***3.1.2 Education system review in the Congo***

#### **3.1.2.1. Background**

In the Congo, the peer review took three years to be concluded. In actual fact, the process initiated in 2011 by the Ministry in charge of primary and secondary education at the time, was not concretely completed until 2014. The relatively length of this review is due to a change in government and the replacement of the minister who took contact with ADEA for the review.

The purpose of the peer review was to align education policies and practices with the MDGs and with the Education for All Framework for Action. There was a special focus on teachers and school managers. At the time, the country had devised two strategic visions in education: “Nouvelle Espérance” (New Hope) and “Chemin d’avenir” (Path for the future). These two strategies were to serve as a framework for the review.

#### **3.1.2.2. Process of the peer review**

The only informant met during the field visit reported that the process went smoothly. It followed the recommended two-stage approach. However, it seems that the national team was mostly composed of academic and very few education ministry officers as was the case in Burkina Faso. All the other activities have been conducted as required. The consulted document also mentioned that the international team had only 10 days for its in-country visits and that some of the stakeholders could not be interviewed because of the school holidays.

#### **3.1.2.3 Results/Recommendations of the peer review**

The present evaluation could only identify one follow-up action of the peer review exercise. It seems that the country proceeded to choose one recommendation. Thereafter, the minister sent a letter to ADEA requesting support in the domain of ICT. The country reported having received no response from ADEA.

## **3.2 EMIS Peer reviews**

### ***3.2.1 Ghana Peer review***

#### **3.2.1.1 Process of the peer review**

In Ghana, the process followed the recommended two-phased approach. The constitution of a national team and a review conducted by peers from: The Gambia, Nigeria, The African Union and 2 officers of the ADEA WGEMPS. Ghana belonging to ECOWAS, the tool used was the

Norms and Standards Framework validated by the West African regional institution. In fact, the framework is the same as the one of the SADC region.

The real launching of the peer review with visiting peers experienced some delays due administrative procedures and the outbreak of Ebola in the region. It should also be noted that the duration of the review was shortened from 5 days to 4 due to a holiday break. The peer review team visited the country from April 27 to May 2, 2015. A validation workshop was organized on October 23, 2015. It was attended by the Deputy-Minister of Education, officials from Ghana Education Services and directors of various departments including Non-formal Education and ICT. It appears that before the validation workshop, Mr. Alpha Bah of the peer review team had the opportunity to collect more data especially outside Accra and the ministry offices. He was able to visit schools and the district of Shai-Osudoku-Dodowa.

According to all the informants, the process was smoothly run. They reported that felt very much at ease and expressed their satisfaction with the entire process. All the involved persons reported a give-and-take exercise and a non-judgemental atmosphere.

### **3.1.1.2.Results/Recommendations of the peer review**

In this section, there is a need to distinguish between two types of outcomes in the process: on one hand, some effects and on the other, the recommendations of the review exercise which are part of the report.

In Ghana, all the informants reported that the planned effects, which are at the core of the peer review: sharing of experience; mutual learning and south-south cooperation, were noticed. They highly appreciated the friendly and supportive atmosphere in which the review was conducted. They mentioned the contribution of the international experts in solving very simple issues such as simplifying record keeping in order to reduce data collection burden.

The unplanned effects that the evaluation discovered are that through the self-assessment process and the peer review, the technicians and officers of EMIS units have gained self-esteem and some kind of renewed confidence in their contribution to the development of education in their country. In addition, the peer review and the validation workshop has served to “legitimize<sup>9</sup>” the existence of the statistics and EMIS Unit.

Some important changes that have happened in the aftermath of the exercise are:

---

<sup>9</sup> This expression was used by an informant in Ghana

### *Policy and legal frameworks*

Since the peer review, with the revision of the Education Policy, the EMIS Master Strategy plan is integrated into the Ten-Year Education Strategy Plan which is under review. In addition, dispositions are made to give Ghana districts assemblies a clear mandate for an oversight of the private schools.

During the interviews, the informants at the ministry level reported that actions are taken to work more closely with the other sub-sectors of education (TVET, Higher Education and Non-formal Education) so that their data are fully captured. Previously, most of the data collected were in general education. The data for these two sectors were not completely integrated into the EMIS Unit reports. There were many challenges in collecting and producing a comprehensive EMIS report. Specifically, in the TVET sub-sector where the responsibility lies within several ministries, it was difficult to collect and to report on their data as indicated in the EMIS peer review report. At the higher education level, collaboration on EMIS was not institutionalized. The education officers interviewed have indicated that there is now more collaboration with the National Council for Tertiary Education (NACTED) and with the Council of Technical and Vocational training (COTVET).

### *Resource Availability and Utilization*

As part of a World Bank project, the ministry has been able to strengthen its capacity in data collection with new equipment and vehicles at the central level and for some of the neediest districts including the one visited during the peer review and the evaluation, Shai-Osudoku-Dodowa. At the time of the evaluation, 10 districts out of the 50 in serious need have received new computers. These computers were donated by the Ghana Statistical Service.

An important reported change in EMIS work in Ghana is the move towards adopting a new software. USAID is funding through its project ‘Social impact’ the use of EVASYSTEMS to facilitate data collection, reporting and use. At the time of the evaluation, the software was at the testing phase. If these tests are conclusive, the new software will be adopted throughout the system.

### *Statistical Processes*

The adoption of the new software will improve the statistical processes. But, other changes include capacity building of EMIS officers at the district level. The district visited acknowledged that they have attended training and that collection of data has been improved

due to less constraining rules on the use of laptops. At the time of the peer review, EMIS officers were not allowed to use portable computers. This was due to the need for confidentiality.

### *Education Information Reporting*

Among the changes brought to the EMIS work in information reporting, the evaluation has identified the revision of the questionnaire/census sent to schools to integrate more categories, for example to include information on the beneficiaries of school sponsorship. Another addition to reporting is a change in the deadline moving it from January to March. Head teachers have received training into filling the new forms.

#### **3.2.2 Swaziland Peer review**

In Swaziland, the starting point of the peer review was the invitation of the country through its EMIS Manager to WGEMPS and following some exchanges with the Working Group coordinator. At the time, and despite the fact that the EMIS Unit had gained autonomy for the Central Statistical Office (CSO) since 2008, the unit was paining to work effectively and needed support from the SADC Secretariat.

##### **3.2.2.1 Process of the peer review**

The process followed the recommended two-phased approach. The constitution of a national team and a review conducted by peers from: South Africa, Mozambique and the coordinator of the ADEA WGEMPS. The Norms and Standards Framework used is the one validated by the regional institution, SADC. It appears through the field interviews that the self-assessment phase was conducted mainly by the officers at the EMIS Unit level and did not include members of other units within or outside the Ministry of education. However, in conducting their assessment, the international peers visited and interviewed different stakeholders, notably in the ministry of finance.

The participants to the self-assessment and to the peer review interviewed during the evaluation expressed their satisfaction with the exercise. They indicated that they learnt a lot just by exchanging with the peers.

##### **3.2.2.2 Results/Recommendations of the peer review**

The most reported effect of the peer review exercise is that it helped gained visibility to the EMIS unit. It also served as an advocacy tool. The EMIS manager reported having used the

recommendations of the peer review report as a supporting document, going as far as attaching that section of the peer review report to its subsequent requests.

Some important changes that have happened in the aftermath of the exercise are:

#### *Policy and legal frameworks*

There has not been any new legal document to reinforce the EMIS Unit in its capacity to collect, analyze and disseminate education statistics. However, it appears, through the various interviews, that its role as a trusted source of education data is more and more recognized. The Unit is called upon to provide information within the ministry and at decision-making instances such as the King Cabinet meetings or for important event such as the launch of Swaziland integration of SDG 4 into sectoral planning. The management of the Unit sits at decision-making instances within the ministry. The evaluator has experienced the level of solicitation coming from the minister cabinet during the field visit.

#### *Resource availability and Utilization*

Two main changes have taken place since the peer review exercise: the increase in the EMIS Unit budget and the recruitment of more staffing as reported by the Unit Manager and confirmed by other informants. As far as staffing is concerned, to enable the Unit to operate more autonomously from the Central Statistics Office (CSO), a statistics officer from CSO has been seconded to the Unit. In addition, regional statistics officers have been recruited. However at the time of the evaluation, these regional officers were still functioning from the ministry in Mbabane. They had not been deployed yet to reinforce data collection at the province level.

In terms of budgeting, it is reported that there is now a within the ministry budget, a line strictly for the EMIS unit. This also helps in recruiting extra staff when the need arises in EMIs work within the ministry.

#### *Statistical Processes*

Data capture using school questionnaires have integrated new indicators to cover early childhood. However, still missing are data on Higher Education, TVET and private schools. It is worth noting that collaboration with the CSO is still very strong and the CSO acts as quality assurance agency.

## *Education Information Reporting*

Changes in education information reporting include the development of a functional website accessible and reported being used by information seekers such as students. However, there are challenging areas. Some system users such as the Planning Unit within the ministry, felt that there is need to integrate more data for specific queries. At the moment of the evaluation, the need was expressed in some specific areas such as: information about sanitation conditions in the schools.

Timeliness and wide dissemination of annual reports are still challenges to be dealt with. The annual report comes to the school with a delay of two years. Another challenging area seems to be reporting back outside the ministry to the region down to the school level.

### **3.2.3 Mozambique Peer review**

#### **3.2.3.1. Process the peer review**

The specificity of the peer review in Mozambique lies in the fact that the EMIS director within the ministry of education is a member of the SADC EMIS technical sub-committee. His involvement has served to start a dialogue with WGEMPS which culminated into the country accepting to go under review in 2013. Members of the peer review team came from Angola, Zambia and from the WGEMPS team. As in the other cases, the peer visited the country for five days and had working sessions with the different EMIs stakeholders. They also visited the province of Maputo and schools in the district of Machava.

#### **3.2.3.2 Results/Recommendations of the peer review**

The same effects of gained visibility and importance within the ministry have been reported by all the informants met during the field visit in Mozambique. In addition, the members of the EMIS unit met acknowledged that the exercise helped them to “revise” some notions in statistics. They said that the daily routine sometimes makes them lose sight of the norms and standards and the importance of their work. It should be mentioned that the EMIS Unit team in the Planning department indicated that UIS and USAID had also carried out reviews. But, the ADEA peer review was the only one using the peer review mechanism.

## *Policy and Legal frameworks*

No change has been reported in the field of policy and legal frameworks. There still subsists the compartmentation of data collection within several ministries. In addition and since 2015, the TVET sector and Higher Education have become new ministries. This explains the current challenges in data collection and dissemination to reflect a holistic and comprehensive view of the educational system.

#### *Resource Availability and Utilization*

The main changes since 2013 lie in the recruitment of more staff for the EMIS unit and in the acquisition of new equipment and vehicles at the provincial and district levels.

#### *Statistical Processes*

The EMIS unit has published an EMIS procedure manual for the various stakeholders within and outside the ministry of education. In addition, a new statistical software has been acquired and is the process of being tested at the province and district levels. There also has been some training for EMIS staff at the province level. The IT department is involved in the design and installation of the new statistical software.

Data capture using school questionnaires have integrated new indicators to cover early childhood and special needs education. At the provincial and district levels, there are new indicators such as pregnancy rate and a disaggregated learning achievements results.

The EMIS unit indicated difficulties in implementing the recommendation dealing with financing education. It appears that there is a need for more capacity building in the area.

#### *Education Information Reporting*

Education information reporting has been improved. There is now three annual EMIS reports. New reporting formats include the publishing of a small pocket leaflet presenting the main annual education statistics. The leaflet is widely distributed within the ministry. The evaluation could confirm the accessibility of the leaflet at the primary education sectors level.

The Planning Unit officers have indicated that there is an improvement in the dissemination of annual reports. The evaluation could verify that the 2015 annual report is available at the Maputo province level.

#### **4. Lessons learnt and recommendations**

To start this section, it is important to highlight a recurrent two-fold finding in this evaluation. On one hand, it appears that, on the whole, the peer reviews in all the selected countries have

achieved what they were tasked to do in terms of purpose, specific objectives, and activities. Even when the allocated time to the country visit was shortened. But on the other hand, the peer review exercise has not gone full length and deep enough and has stopped short. This feeling of “unfinished business” represents the major lesson to be drawn as far as efficiency, impact and value-addition is concerned.

#### **4.1. On the efficiency of the peer review mechanism**

##### ***Satisfaction of the beneficiaries with the process***

The peer reviews (process and reports) have the satisfaction of the beneficiaries. To recall, the main purpose of the peer reviews is to give an opportunity to a country using both national and international, mainly continental, expertise to reflect on issues and challenges in its educational system and implement workable and concrete solutions.

The identified results above related to the sharing of experiences, capacity building while the review is taking place just by discussing with the peers, the establishment of south-south cooperation (South Africa and Swaziland or Korea and the Congo) show that the peer review mechanism is perceived, to some extent, as efficient in helping countries to improve the reviewed sectors.

The national participants to the reviews who were interviewed, claimed that they really benefitted in terms of expertise and also gained more confidence just by going under review and confronting their views with those of the international experts.

*“We say in Africa: when you’re weeding a path, you don’t know how straight or crooked you are until somebody tells you.”*

The international experts also acknowledged that there was mutual learning. In fact, one characteristic of the EMIS peer review is to use the EMIS manager of a country previously reviewed as a member of the international team in a following peer review exercise.

The choice of the peers based on their experience of the educational system either at decision-making level (former ministers or international organizations education specialists) or technicians (EMIS managers, WGNFE or WGEMPS program officers) was felt to be adequate for the exercise. There was no mentioning of any deficiency in the composition of the international team.

### ***Country adhesion to and involvement in the peer review***

The discussions during the evaluation have brought to light: the lack of a wide-based country ownership in the exercise as sought by the peer review mechanism. The reason is the fact that the self-assessment phase was not in reality as participatory and inclusive as suggested in the documents initiating the process. In the case of the education system reviews, the example of Burkina Faso is illustrative of the weakness: Only a few members of the original appointed team ended up by doing the job. One thing is to nominate a team and make sure that all the stakeholders are represented, but another one is to ensure that all the members of the team are really available for the work to be done. In general, the national teams could have gained more insight and thereof more ownership in the process, if there has been a wider representation during the first phase.

The same weakness in representativeness can be identified in the EMIS peer reviews. The self-assessment was done mainly by the technical team of EMIS Unit. This important phase would have gained more validity if it had included the users of EMIS outside the Unit and more precisely at the province, district and school level. The views in the self-assessment are from the delivery body. It is true that during their field visit, the international team carried out some observations and interviews to triangulate the findings of the national assessment. However, the sampling of those visits is not as representative as it should be. And, the most important working document in the peer review remains the self-assessment report.

### ***Peer review instruments***

As mentioned earlier, the education system peer review does not have a single and uniformed framework for the review. The first step in the exercise during which the working group comes to a consensus with the beneficiary country on the subject and focus of the review being participatory is a good thing. However, the absence of a detailed framework for assessment with defined criteria allows for some subjectivity, which could be questioned.

This is not the case for the ENS framework. The latter is very detailed with an attempt to clarify the notions involved in the norms and standards. But even then, the ENS framework, which is claimed to be customized, does not take enough into account countries specificities. There is indeed an attempt to explain the norms and standards using examples from the country context in order to make the framework user-friendly. But, the exercise of customization does not go deep enough. The framework ends up being one size fits all. Furthermore, the evaluator has noticed that although there were two working documents to assess the EMIS capacity of

countries in the SADC and the ECOWAS regions<sup>10</sup>, the results of those assessments were not used for benchmarking in carrying out the peer reviews. .

Concerning the scoring aspect of the ENS framework used in the EMIS peer reviews, even if the exercise is viewed as a tool for benchmarking in capacity building, the absence of an action plan at the end gives the impression that, as it is the case very often with students and graded exercises in the real classroom, the attention is more on the score than on what to do in the future. The emulation aspect to do better is not present.

### *The end result of the peer reviews*

Indeed, the question that comes is: a peer review and so what? Imbedded in the process is the most important part, the culmination of the exercise into an action-plan for the implementation of the recommendations. The evaluation found that the validation of the preliminary findings during a workshop is the only and final step that was observed as a joint activity in all the peer reviews.

Moreover, there seems to be a too long period between the exit report (validation workshop) and the final report. What happens in that case, generally, is that when the final report comes out, it has all the chances to be put on a shelf. Even more so when it is produced by ADEA. The education system peer reviews are more likely to come under that particular fate as there is no other follow-up mechanism. Whereas, the EMIS peer reviews, especially in the SADC region have the opportunity to use the EMIS technical sub-committee for follow-up activities in the beneficiary country. But even then, it has been observed that, this instance is not used fully to that effect.

### *The cost and financial implication of the peer reviews*

The financial implications of such an exercise determine its efficiency. It has been observed during the evaluation that funding is more an issue in the education peer review conducted in Burkina Faso and in the Congo than in the EMIS peer reviews of Swaziland, Ghana and Mozambique. Two findings are to be brought to light: 1) the planned budget devoted to the exercise has not been respected. In both countries, money is still “due” by ADEA: 2) it is stipulated in the cooperation agreement leading to the peer review that the beneficiary country should also contribute. But in both countries, the condition was not fulfilled. The lack of funds may be an explanation for the fact that the follow-up activities have not been implemented. In

---

<sup>10</sup> ADEA/ECOWAS. 2010. EMIS Assessment report covering 12 countries

the Congo, especially, the situation is said to have resulted in a loss of interest in working with ADEA.

Another perverse effect of finances in the peer review at the national level is the fact that some of the national reviewers had more the status of “consultants” than that of national technicians working within the ministry of education. That particular aspect diminishes the chance of building the ownership needed for follow-up on the recommendations in the country. In one particular country, a recurrent complaint was: “*We were asked to do a job by ADEA. Now, ADEA has to pay us.*” Although, this occurred only in one country, it is symptomatic of the kind of pitfall to avoid in the future ADEA peer reviews.

### **Recommendations for more efficiency**

#### **For the short term**

There is a need to finish the exercise started in all the peer reviews that have been conducted since 2013. It is important for the working groups to carry a follow-up activity by:

- Assisting the countries in designing a plan of action based on the prioritization of the formulated recommendations with a closer look at the existing recommendations and the analysis of their relevance to the present educational context and also by taking into account new options in the country.  
. It might be necessary to present these reports again as the decision-making apparatus has changed in some countries. Mozambique has just elaborated its plan of action, but it has not been validated yet.
- Responding to the request for assistance made by some countries, namely the Congo and making sure that any pending issue related to the peer review is really attended to.

#### **For future peer reviews**

**Ensuring greater and wider participation in the process.** Due to financial constraints, the international team can never stay as long as needed. To make sure that they are provided with a complete and credible report, the national team as nominated has to work effectively on the self-assessment and find ways to include all the stakeholders in education. This particular requirement of representativeness and credibility should find its operationalization while signing the various agreement documents at the initial stages of the peer reviews. It might be necessary to define with the country, the “modus operandi” of the national team.

**Ensuring the validity of the different peer review instruments.** They should be a balance between harmonization and the need to take into account the context of the countries with also the need to see progress as far as capacity building is concerned. The assessment tools should capture holistically the issues under review. For that, there is a need to revise the instruments. The new global education agenda calls for an update of the instruments and frameworks.

**Ensuring that the beneficiary country participates to financing the exercise.** The process of peer review finds its legitimacy in the potential of country capacity building. For that to happen, there is a necessary condition: country real engagement in the process for ownership and for efficiency. This condition can only be fostered if the country participates financially to the peer review. The clause is stipulated in the consulted agreement documents, but the only contribution that some countries have made so far is in kind, transport mainly.

**Ensuring the effective implementation of the recommendations.** All the peer reviews should integrate:

1. An effective action-plan worked collaboratively with the country. This is not new. And in fact, it is included in all the documents explaining the mechanism of peer reviews. But, as it has been indicated throughout the evaluation report, this last step has not been effective in any of them. It should be made an integral part of the terms of reference of the international team. The validation workshop should include an exercise of prioritization of the recommendations, and a selection of those that may be integrated into a realistic action-plan. The action-plan should include a timeline, human, financial and other conditions for implementation, as well as a monitoring scheme. The action-plan will also detail the assistance needed for implementation and the roles of ADEA and other international agencies.
2. A designated institution in charge of following-up in the country. Even if in the case of the EMIS peer reviews, the naturally designated structure is the EMIS Unit, the process should be made more formal by making sure that there is an explicit mandate. This structure should be nominated at the highest level, but be composed of mostly technicians of the ministry of education less subjected to turn over because of change in the government.
3. A greater involvement of regional economic community is necessary to ensure follow-up on the recommendations but also they can serve as an arena for emulation for the other countries. Not all the countries will be peer reviewed by ADEA. Nevertheless, the

findings and even more the follow-up actions taken by the reviewed country will serve as lessons for the countries in the region. The SADC EMIS technical sub-committee has already that role. Even, if the technical committee does not meet as regularly as needed. It should be made effective for all the regions and for the two types of review (EMIS and Education system).

#### **4.2 .On the relevance of the recommendations of the peer reviews**

The informants were unanimous on the relevance of the recommendations formulated in various reports. This is particularly the case when the peer review is conducted at the specific request of the country (Burkina Faso, Swaziland and Mozambique). In those cases, the peer reviews occurred at a moment when the Ministry of education and different stakeholders in education had embarked in reviewing and harmonizing the different legislations ruling the sector or subsector, or when there was an expressed need for capacity building as was the case in Swaziland. The Congo could have been in the same context. But, the actual process of the review was delayed. And, when the results came out the key players in education who were at the onset of the review were no more in decision-making position.

However, in the light of the perceived short length of the country visit and the snapshot nature of the international review, there is a feeling that not all the aspects of the education sector under review can be grasped by the peers.

#### **Recommendations for more relevance for future peer reviews**

**Ensuring that the international team has the self-assessment report and all the relevant policy documents of the country well in advance.** A detailed knowledge of the country political context and education realities will help to focus the peer review and the recommendations. This entails also that even before the team enters the country, there has been a lot of communication exchanges between the national team and the international team. The establishment of communication with the delegation will also facilitate the sampling of the in-county informants and places to visit.

**Ensuring that the countries are able to unpack some of the recommendations and see all the implication in their implementation.** The composition of the international teams for the peer reviews under evaluation is not diversified enough. There is a need then to make sure that all the expertise needed are represented once the focus of the peer review is decided (education

planning, costing of activities, curriculum designing, or teacher training). If the needed expertise cannot be gathered due to some reasons during the international visit, it might be important for ADEA to provide more technical expertise after the international mission, by helping the country to revisit and operationalize the recommendations thus facilitating their implementation.

#### **4.3. On the impact and value addition of the peer review exercise**

The first observation to be made in this section is to recall the absence of a follow-up action-plan with targeted performance and indicators. The lack of such a document renders the evaluation of impact very difficult. In addition, another reason for the difficulty found in assessing the impact as prescribed by the terms of reference of the present evaluation is the relatively short time after the peer reviews for the evaluation. All the reviews under this evaluation occurred within the last 3 years and the oldest final reports were sent to the countries in 2015.

Furthermore, in Burkina Faso, Ghana and Swaziland, when during the interviews, the evaluation question directly referred to the specific changes brought about as an implementation of the peer review recommendations, the responses were quite ambiguous. It turned out that some of the changes that have happened were envisaged by the country even before the peer review.

It is true that there is no benchmark and no indicators to measure impact. It is also true that most of the changes described above in Section 3 of the present report, cannot strictly be attributed to the results of the peer reviews. However, in the responses given, it appears that the peer reviews came to comfort the decision-makers in the choice of the already planned options. This is why the evaluator has chosen to describe these changes as outcomes of the peer review exercise, thus representing an indication of potential impact of the peer reviews. The outcomes can be summarized as:

- The confirmation of some countries in strategic options that were being envisaged (Burkina Faso, Ghana and Mozambique)
- A better positioning of some units such as the EMIS unit within the educational ministry (Swaziland and Mozambique)
- Solutions sharing for some simple problems such as data coding and entry (Ghana and Swaziland)

- The confirmation that solutions in education in Africa can come from the Continent experts including those who deal with the issues every day. All what is needed sometimes is at the time “to sit and reflect” (All the selected beneficiary countries and peers).

Furthermore, the evaluation of the value addition of ADEA peer reviews compared to some other reviews performed by other organizations such as NEPAD, UNESCO or USAID shows that the nature and process of these reviews are not the same. NEPAD with its African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) is based at the macro political level of government. Even, when there is a section on the education capacity of the country, the results are not shared at the ministry level with the technicians. UNESCO and USAID generally conduct reviews led by out of the continent experts. Local expertise and capacity building while performing the review is not the objective of those reviews. It should be added that because UNESCO and USAID perform their reviews as an integrated activity for a strategic intervention in the country, they are more focused and they have means to fund the follow-up activities.

### **Recommendations for a strategic repositioning of ADEA peer reviews**

During the briefing meeting on the onset of the present evaluation, ADEA Secretariat mentioned that the organization is in the process of reflecting on the value-addition of its activities. A finding of the evaluation is that there is a need to reposition strategically the peer reviews as a core activity in ADEA strategic initiative of country capacity building. The time is really appropriate as countries find themselves with new challenges in education. The implication of SDG 4 and the operationalization of Education 2030 Plan for action with the design of new strategic education plans make peer reviews more than ever needed and relevant. In addition to the above mentioned recommendations, ADEA will gain in:

-Working more on communication and visibility of the peer review activity at the highest level in the country and within regional organizations and other international organizations (UNESCO, UNDP, UNICEF and the World Bank). The report and the follow-up actions should not only be shared with the national educational authorities.

-Organizing joint mission for the two working groups (WGEMPS and WGNFE). Up to now, the two working groups have conducted the reviews separately. It is important that the peer review brings to the country the necessary expertise. Countries will also be more interested in a robust team with a wide range of expertise. ADEA, more than any international agency, can garner experts with multiple background.

-Collaborating more effectively with the RECs in the implementation and follow-up of the activity for both working groups. It is important to create and sustain an arena for the sharing of the results of the peer reviews and for making countries more responsible for following up on the recommendations of the peer reviews.

### **Conclusion**

The findings of the evaluation show that the ADEA peer reviews are appreciated by all the people who have been involved in it (beneficiary country education authorities and officers and the international peers). It is a unique tool for mutual learning and sharing of experiences. It has the potential of yielding better impact and help country to build their capacity and improve the quality of their education. The importance and benefit of a continental cooperation is stated in all the consulted documents. In that sense, all the evaluated reviews have followed the prescribed requirements to offer African-led solutions to the countries reviewed. However, it has to be noted that if African-led solutions have been offered in all the evaluated reviews, they have not been put to use. So, it is important for ADEA to create all the conditions for the solutions not to be wasted and for the peer reviews not to end up being “an intellectual exercise<sup>11</sup>”

---

<sup>11</sup> An expression heard during the data collection.

## Consulted documents

ADEA. “Engager et Conduire une revue par les pairs en Afrique (Engaging and conducting peer reviews in Africa). Unpublished working document

ADEA. *Revue par les pairs en éducation en Afrique. Burkina Faso: Améliorer l'Education de base en lien avec les choix stratégiques du PSEB, de la décentralisation et du Continuum*

ADEA. *Revue par les pairs en éducation en Afrique. République du Congo: Revue liés aux objectifs de l'EPT et aux OMD*

ADEA/African Union. (2010). *Economic Community of West African States EMIS Assessment Report covering 12 countries*. Produced by ADEA Working Group on Education management and Policy Support

ADEA/African Union. (2008). *Southern Africa Development Community EMIS Assessment Report covering 14 countries*. Produced by ADEA Working Group on Education management and Policy Support

ADEA/EAC. (2014). *Education Management Information Systems Norms and Standards Assessment Framework*. Produced by ADEA Working Group on Education management and Policy Support

ECOWAS/ADEA (2011). *Système de Gestion des informations du secteur de l'Education : Normes et standards pour le cadre d'évaluation ;* Produced by ADEA Working Group on Education management and Policy Support

ECOWAS/ADEA. (2015) *Ghana EMIS Peer Review Report On Implementing the AU/ECOWAS EMIS Norms and Standards*. Produced by ADEA Working Group on Education management and Policy Support

Ministry of Education of Botswana/ADEA. *EMIS Peer Review Report On Implementing the SADC Norms and Standards Swaziland*. Produced by ADEA Working Group on Education management and Policy Support. Botswana

Ministry of Education of Mozambique/ADEA. *Mozambique. EMIS Peer Review Report On Implementing the SADC EMIS Norms and Standards*. Produced by ADEA Working Group on Education management and Policy Support

Ministry of Education of Swaziland/ADEA. EMIS Peer Review Report On Implementing the SADC Norms and Standards Swaziland. Produced by ADEA Working Group on Education management and Policy Support

## **Persons interviewed**

### ***ADEA Secretariat***

Oley Dibba-Wadda, Executive Secretary

Shem Okore Bodo, Senior Program Officer

Raky Gassama-Coly, Knowledge Management Officer

Prosper Faye, Human Resource and Administration Office

### ***ADEA Working Groups***

Makha Ndao, WGEMPS Coordinator

Ibrahima Bah-Lalya, WGNFE Coordinator

Youssouf Maiga, WGNFE, Program Officer

Angela Arnott, WGEMPS Program Officer

Chemwi Mutiwanyika, WGEMPS Program analyst

Brighton Mutasa WGEMPS Program officer

### ***Regional economic Community***

Lomthandazo Mavimbela, Education Officer, SADC Secretariat

### ***International experts***

Mamadou Ndoeye, Former ADEA Executive Secretary

Bheki Mpanza, Chief Director, EMIS Department, Ministry of Basic Education

Alpha Bah, Head of EMIS and ICT Structures, Ministry of Basic and Secondary Education

Ilidio Buduia, Consultant, former EMIS Unit director

### ***Countries***

#### ***Burkina Faso***

Yombo Paul Diabougua, Secretary General, Ministry of Education and literacy

Seni Ouedraogo, Chief of the Department on quality in education, Ministry of Education and Literacy

Anatole T. Niameogo, President of the Board of directors, GNFE

Ibrahima Sanon, technical Advisor, Ministry of Education and Literacy

Emmanuel Goabaga, Director of FONAEF

François Youkbaré, Officer, Administration and Finance Directorate, Ministry of Education and Literacy

### ***Ghana***

Enoch Cobinnah, Chief Director, Ministry of Education

Divine Ayidzoe, Director of Statistics Research and information System

Edward Dogbey, Division of Statistics Research and information System, member of the national team on EMIS

Samuel A. Okang, Division of Statistics Research and information System, member of the national team on EMIS

Samuel Amito, Division of Statistics Research and information System, member of the national team on EMIS

Salman Faris, Division of Statistics Research and information System, member of the national team on EMIS

- District of Shai-Osudoku-Dodowa

Joshua Asare-Nyadu, Assistant Director Statistics/planning Unit (EMIS)

Rev Solomon Quaye, District Statistics officer

Vida Otuko, Data entry staff

### ***Swaziland***

Patrick N. Muir, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Education

Jabulani Shabalala, EMIS Director

Amos Zwane, Director, Central Statistics Office

Menzisi Mabusa, Economist, Economic Planning and development, Poverty Reduction, Monitoring and Evaluation Division

Mboni C. Dlamini, Executive Secretary, Swaziland Higher Education Council

Hanson Dlamini, Senior Statistics

Trusty Simelane, EMIS Officer

Nelsine Dlamini, Statistician

Lindiwe Metwa, EMIS officer

Nfanukhona Nkambule, EMIS Supervisor

Zinhle Ndzimandze-Dlamini, Deputy Principal, Mbabane Lutheran Primary School

### ***Mozambique***

#### *Ministry of Education*

Ilidio Buduia, Consultant, former EMIS Unit director

Constancion Adelino, EMIS Director

Ricardo Cuco, EMIS officer

Benildo Franscisco, EMIS Unit Officer

Kauxique Mangalal, ICT Specialist, Advisor to the minister of education

Argentino Numes, Director of Primary Education

#### *- Province of Maputa*

Alfredo Cortega Zita, Statistician

Mareia Isabel Mate, Planning officer

Senia Simbune, Planning officer

Bertina Cuco Thelmo, Statistician

Sebastiao Franscisco , Planning officer

Simao Hivindji, Planning officer

Nelson Mavehe, Statistician

José Hode, School Principal, Machava Sede Secondary School

*Congo*

Fidèle Mialoundama, Conseiller, Ministère de la recherche

Bruno Kikebosso, Chef de Cabinet, Ministère Enseignement Primaire, Secondaire et de l'Aphabétisation

Marie-Louise Moutsinga, Conseiller Technique, Point Focal Partenariat Mondial pour l'Education

## Annex 1 : Interview Guides

Interview Guide: Education authorities, ADEA Secretariat and working groups

1. Introduction: Roles and responsibilities in the peer review process
2. Evaluation of the process
  - Composition of the in country team
  - Composition of the peer review
  - Duration of the process
  - Activities of the process
  - Resources allocated to the process
  - Satisfaction of the beneficiaries
3. Strengths and weaknesses of the process
4. Results of the peer review
  - Recommendations: easy to implement?
  - Implementation of recommendations
    - Changes brought by the reforms
    - Difficulties and challenges encountered in the implementation
  - Follow-up mechanism on the recommendations
5. Comparison with other peer reviews

Do you know of some peer reviews dealing with education systems?

Has your country benefitted from other peer reviews? In which sector?

Can you compare the ADEA peer review with the other?

In terms of process

In terms of results

In terms of follow-up actions

6. Recommendations for future of peer reviews to make them more efficient and relevant to the countries

### **Interview Guide: International Experts**

7. Introduction Roles and responsibilities in the peer review process
8. Evaluation of the process
9. Strengths and weaknesses of the process

What according to you are the strengths and weaknesses of the peer review process?

- Composition of the in-country team
  - Composition of the peer review
  - Duration of the process
  - Activities of the process
  - Resources allocated to the process
10. Results of the peer review  
What do you think are the results of such a mechanism?
    - Recommendations are concerned: easy to implement?
    - Do you follow the Implementation of the recommendations in the countries?
      - Have the changes brought by the reforms been reported at REC level?
      - Difficulties and challenges encountered in the implementation
    - Follow-up mechanism on the recommendations

11. Comparison with other peer reviews

Do you know of some peer reviews dealing with education systems?

Has your country benefitted from other peer reviews? In which sector?

Can you compare the ADEA peer review with the other?

12. Recommendations for future of peer reviews to make them more efficient and relevant to the countries

In terms of the process

In terms of the results

In terms of follow-up actions

## **Annex 2: Terms of reference of the evaluation**

### **Consultancy: Evaluation of the Impact and Added Value of ADEA's Peer Reviews conducted by WGNFE and WGEMPS**

#### **Terms of Reference**

In line with its strategic objective of advancing policies, strategies and programs that promote critical knowledge, skills and qualifications, and as part of its role of advising African governments in implementing national education and training policies and strategies, ADEA responds to direct requests from countries to conduct national peer reviews. It does this through its Working Group on Non-Formal Education (WGNFE). A second parallel peer review by ADEA is through the Working Group on Education Management and Policy Support (WGEMPS, focusing on Education Management Information Systems (EMIS). This is within the framework of ADEA's support to the African Union in monitoring the implementation of its continental and regional frameworks.

Over the years, WGNFE has conducted national peer reviews, with the latest being in Burkina Faso and DRC (and Angola is next in line), to improve the countries' policies and practices for the development of quality education and training for all. The peer reviews are also aimed at building the capacities of education system managers, and are an important tool for good governance in education. As mentioned earlier, a strong EMIS is key to monitoring the implementation of the African Union's continental and regional frameworks. Thus, the establishment of robust and reliable education statistics production systems capable of effectively supporting education policy planning and development is a primary objective of undertaking EMIS peer reviews to benchmark country status against the norms and standards endorsed by African ministers of education in the regional economic communities of EAC, ECCAS, ECOWAS and SADC. To-date, WGEMPS has undertaken peer reviews, using national EMIS experts, in Botswana, Swaziland, Mozambique and Ghana, with Mali line up in the coming months. Reports from these peer reviews have been validated by the respective countries and some of the recommendations incorporated in the national plans for implementation.

This consultancy therefore aims to evaluate the impact and value addition of these two types of peer reviews, and to explore possibilities of achieving greater coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and follow up to ensure they address the needs of countries and other stakeholders. Specifically, the consultant will develop a clear plan for undertaking the evaluation, and should include the following tasks to be performed by the consultant, under the direction of the Senior Programs Officer at the ADEA Secretariat:

1. Conduct a desk review of reports of all the peer reviews conducted so far by WGEMPS, the two peer reviews conducted by WGNFE for Burkina Faso and Congo Brazzaville, and provide a comparative analysis.
2. Evaluate the value added of the peer review systems as compared to the initial assessments for the countries concerned.
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the recommendations coming from the peer reviewers.
4. Conduct a survey plus skype interviews with the following categories of people – involved in the process in the various countries – to solicit their views in terms of focus and approach methodology of the peer reviews, and to determine the extent to which the peer reviews have met their needs and expectations.

- a. Relevant staff at the ADEA Secretariat, and Coordinators and staff of WGNFE and WGEMPS who have been involved in the peer review exercises.
  - b. Direct beneficiaries (concerned Ministry of Education policy and technical staff in the respective countries).
  - c. National, REC and AUC experts who have been involved in the peer review process.
  - d. Selected country-level partners who have been involved in the peer review process.
  - e. The peer review funding partners.
5. Analyse peer reviews conducted by other players in education, or which has an education component (e.g. the African Peer Review Mechanism – APRM) and compare with the ADEA peer reviews.
  6. Provide a draft evaluation report to the ADEA Secretariat, with clear recommendations, for review.
  7. Finalise and submit the final report to ADEA Secretariat.

Deliverables:

1. Draft evaluation report with recommendations.
2. Final evaluation report