

All Children Reading-Asia—USAID Systems Strengthening Review

Annex B: Analysis Framework Rubric

[Access the final report of the review and accompanying materials here.](#)

1. Set Goals and Reform Strategy			
Element	Questions to consider	Weak progress (Red)	Strong progress (Green)
<p>1A. Define Clear Goals</p> <p>Has the Activity helped the system to focus its work on achieving a clearly articulated and shared ambition?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the Activity helped the system define what it is trying to do terms of ambitious outcome goals for students? Has the Activity helped the system translate its goals into clear measurable (SMART) targets? Has the Activity helped the system plot realistic "trajectories" of interim targets rooted in evidence from past experience or research? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Activity was understood purely as a set of inputs and outputs - it did not engage the system in a conversation about its goals for students. The Activity has not helped the system move beyond vague, hard-to-measure statements of intent. To the extent that the Activity has helped the system set targets, it has not helped the system visualize what the path-to-goal will look like. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Activity has helped normalize the practice of grounding the system's efforts in ambitious and clearly articulated, long-term, sustainable student learning outcome goals. The Activity has helped normalize a practice of setting specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-limited (SMART) targets to express the scale of change the system is trying to deliver for students. The Activity has helped the system develop robust techniques for setting targets, including interim targets, based on rigorous benchmarking and a strong understanding of past system performance.

1. Set Goals and Reform Strategy			
Element	Questions to consider	Weak progress (Red)	Strong progress (Green)
<p>1B. Determine the Reform Strategy</p> <p>Has the Activity helped the system to set coherent strategies and plans to achieve its goals?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the Activity enabled the system to deliberately prioritize a coherent set of strategies through which it will achieve its goal(s), supported by a clear theory of change and actionable plans? Has the Activity helped the system to make strategic choices that are evidence based and appropriate to the system's level of maturity? Has the Activity helped the system to build on existing donor/country-led efforts to improve educational performance? Has the Activity helped the system to plan for financial sustainability? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Activity has not supported system leaders to set priorities or articulate their own theory of change; system efforts are disconnected from each other and/or the system is "trying to do everything". The Activity has not helped system leaders to better understand which policies and practices are most/least likely to work in its context. The Activity has not helped system leaders make connections between efforts to improve educational performance in country. The Activity has not helped system leaders to quantify the level of resources needed to achieve their long-term goals or identify how their reforms will be funded/resourced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Activity has built system leaders' capacity to prioritize and articulate their strategies as part of a coherent theory of change to achieve the system's goals; these are captured in robust plans that are capable of driving the day to day work. As a result of the Activity, system leaders consistently make strategic choices and "innovation bets" based on a robust understanding of what has driven performance to date, and the evidence base for policy options, including the appropriateness of potential innovations to the system's current level of maturity and relevant connections to wider drivers of educational outcomes (e.g., health, nutrition, housing). The Activity has built system leaders' capacity to set strategies that connect and harness the collective impact of both donor/country-led efforts and investments to sustainably improve educational performance. The Activity has built system leaders' capacity to quantify resource needs, identify sources of funding and build a flow of resources that is reliable and secure.

1. Set Goals and Reform Strategy			
Element	Questions to consider	Weak progress (Red)	Strong progress (Green)
<p>1C. Visualize the Delivery Chain</p> <p>Has the Activity helped system leaders to understand the chain of actors through which implementation must occur?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the Activity enabled the system to better visualize the chain of actors, and the relationships between them, through which the system's strategies will be implemented at scale? Has the Activity supported the system to align their "delivery chain" behind the system's goals for educational outcomes, and identify potential risks and weaknesses in the chain? Has the Activity enabled the system to identify and setup "feedback loops" of data and intelligence along the delivery chain to better understand whether implementation is happening as planned? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Activity has not helped the system to visualize its delivery chain, there is little understanding/differing views of how the strategies will be implemented or the role that various actors must play in that process. The Activity has not helped the system to analyse the delivery chain for risks associated with incentives, capacity, and commitment, there are no plans in place to mitigate such risks. The Activity has not helped the System identify feedback loops; System, may monitor whether the work has happened and whether outcomes are changing, but there is little attention to the steps of implementation in between. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Activity has helped the system to clearly visualize the chain of actors through which implementation will occur, there is agreement and a shared understanding in the system about the chain's structure. The Activity has helped the System to analyse the delivery chain to identify potential weak links, misaligned incentives and funding flows, capacity/resource constraints and other risks, and develop robust plans to manage these risks. The Activity has helped the System to identify feedback loops to help monitor various parts of the chain; it regularly collects data from these feedback loops and uses it to inform the work.

2. Drive Delivery			
Element	Questions to consider	Weak progress (Red)	Strong progress (Green)
<p>2A. Use Data Effectively</p> <p>Has the Activity strengthened the system's capacity to generate, analyze and use data?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Activity helped the system to understand HOW it is performing on key metrics? • Has the Activity helped the system to understand WHY it is performing the way it is on key metrics? • Has the Activity enabled the system to understand the extent to which policies and interventions are working and providing value for money? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data are not readily available or are not analysed regularly - even in relation to the aspects of student learning/system performance which were the focus of the Activity. • The drivers and root causes of performance are poorly understood - even in relation to the aspects of student learning/system performance which were the focus of the Activity. • The evidence bases for understanding the extent to which policies and interventions have worked or are working is weak - even in relation to the aspects of student learning/system performance which were the focus of the Activity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Activity has helped establish new sources of robust data and/or tools/techniques for analysing data that are regularly being used by system staff and leaders to identify strengths, weaknesses and trends in performance (including benchmarking performance within the system and against peers). • The Activity has helped establish new approaches to investigating trends in performance that are well used by system leaders to understand root causes and inform decision making. • As a result of the Activity, system leaders have access to a much stronger evidence base to understand what is working (generally and for different localities and groups of students), and are using evidence to assess value for money of different approaches, and make policy and investment decisions.

2. Drive Delivery			
Element	Questions to consider	Weak progress (Red)	Strong progress (Green)
<p>2B. Monitor Performance and Solve Problems</p> <p>Has the Activity established effective routines and approaches to review progress and solve problems early?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Activity supported the system to set up regular, structured conversations to review progress and drive implementation forward? • Has the Activity supported the system to put in place a process for identifying and prioritizing problems in implementation before they become too big to handle? • Has the Activity helped the system to maintain its focus on student outcomes through challenges and distractions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conversations for monitoring progress occur infrequently, if at all; system leaders lack a clear picture of how implementation is going - even in relation to the aspects of student learning/system performance which were the focus of the Activity. • The Activity did not help the system establish a clear approach for identifying and addressing problems or build the problem-solving capacity of system staff. • Despite the Activity, the system does not maintain a consistent focus; priorities shift frequently with the “political winds”, and leaders do not demonstrate a commitment to any agenda. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Activity has established an approach to regularly monitoring and discussing progress which is being used consistently to drive implementation, surface challenges and enable accountability and action to address underperformance. • The Activity established a clear process for identifying, prioritizing and taking action on problems before they derail delivery, and provided system staff with the tools to analyse and resolve problems effectively; these processes and tools are well-used and valued in the system. • The Activity has helped system leaders build momentum for ongoing reform and maintain their focus and resolve in the face of challenges, distractions and crises.

2. Drive Delivery			
Element	Questions to consider	Weak progress (Red)	Strong progress (Green)
<p>2C. Harness the Power of Relationships</p> <p>Has the Activity strengthened the system's capacity to identify, cultivate and maintain key stakeholder relationships?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Activity enabled the system to better identify its key stakeholders, including the 7-10 influential people most critical to achieving its goal(s)? • Has the Activity created or enhanced stakeholder networks, forums or communication channels capable of supporting long-term reform? • Has the Activity enabled the system to tackle system-level relational and political barriers to change? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Activity has not helped the system to better understand its stakeholders. • The Activity has not added to or enhanced the mechanisms for engaging stakeholders in the system; there is fragmentation and duplication of efforts. • The Activity has focused on providing technical advice and support, but has not equipped the system to address the relational and political factors that can impede change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Activity has equipped the system with a precise map of its stakeholder relationships, including the 7-10 influential people most critical to achieving its goal(s); this analysis has proved to be of ongoing value for system leaders. • Networks, forums and/or communication channels created through the Activity continue to act as invaluable mechanisms for system leaders to seek support, commitments, expertise and resources for their reforms - including from local stakeholders (partner country governments, civil society, students) and international donors/organizations. • The Activity has included valuable, pragmatic advice and support to help system leaders manage and overcome relational and political barriers to change (e.g., traditional hierarchies or vested interests).

3. Create an Improvement Culture			
Element	Questions to consider	Weak progress (Red)	Strong progress (Green)
<p>3A. Review Capacity to Deliver</p> <p>Has the Activity supported the system to regularly and deliberately review its existing capacity to drive progress?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Activity helped the system to understand its institutional capacity to implement? • Has the Activity helped the system to identify challenge areas for focus using data and stakeholder feedback? • Has the Activity helped the system leaders to adopt a culture of regular reflection and continuous improvement? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Activity has not supported the System to consider the capacity needed to implement its goals. • Challenge areas are identified based on anecdotes and assumptions, the Activity has not supported the system to take data or feedback from stakeholders into account. • The Activity has not supported the system leaders to adopt a culture of reflection and improvement; any assessments of capacity have been one-off, outside-in and have not been influential in decision making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Activity has supported the System to intentionally review its capacity to deliver in the broadest sense (including human, technological, financial and operational capacity) and have a clear sense of the capacity it will take to achieve its goals. • The Activity has supported the system to have a realistic view of challenge areas based on data and feedback from a range of internal and external stakeholders, and identify the roles in its delivery chain that are key to building and sustaining improvements in capacity. • The Activity has supported the system leaders to develop a habit of regularly reflecting with their teams on improving structures and ways of working and identifying clear next steps.

3. Create an Improvement Culture			
Element	Questions to consider	Weak progress (Red)	Strong progress (Green)
<p>3B. Build System Capacity All the Time</p> <p>Has the Activity enhanced the system's ability to build its own capacity?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the Activity supported the system to set up structures and processes to support the continuous building of capacity? Has the Activity increased local leadership and innovation capacity? Has the Activity supported the system to develop its capacity to provide stewardship, oversight, and appropriate safeguards for non-state providers and public-private partnerships in education? Did the Activity leverage, build on or feed into other country or donor-led capacity building efforts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are few opportunities for staff and stakeholders to learn and practice new skills needed for their work. Organizational structures and processes inhibit staff learning and growth, staff have no personal or professional incentives to improve. The Activity did not increase the technical/implementation skill of local leadership, create ownership of reform efforts or empower existing and new leaders to innovate and independently drive reform. The Activity has not supported the country government to build capacity and mechanisms to regulate other education providers, public-private partnerships are disincentivized. Any systems strengthening work as part of the Activity took place in isolation and did not leverage other capacity building efforts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Activity has supported the system to create opportunities for staff and other stakeholders to formally learn new skills. Organizational structures and processes promote learning and improvement and make it easy for staff with the right skills in the right place to drive implementation. The Activity empowered local leadership by creating ownership of reform efforts, increasing their technical/ implementation capacity, and enabling new and existing leaders to independently drive reform, and test, evaluate and scale promising innovations. The Activity has supported the country government to streamline regulation of non-state education providers and public-private partnerships which can enhance the reach and quality of education and to incentivize private sector to contribute to resolution of education challenges. All systems strengthening work as part of the Activity was informed by a careful analysis of the landscape; there is clear evidence of how the Activity multiplied the impact of other capacity building efforts in the system and vice versa.

3. Create an Improvement Culture			
Element	Questions to consider	Weak progress (Red)	Strong progress (Green)
<p>3C. Leverage Educational Technology</p> <p>Has the Activity helped to leverage educational technology and address the digital divide?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the Activity built the capacity of the system to leverage educational technology? Has the Activity helped the system to address the digital divide and understand the barriers to remote/digital learning? Has the use of/investment in educational technology (and the EdTech Ecosystem framework) via the Activity resulted in increased system resilience? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Activity has not supported the system to acquire the infrastructure or technical capability to leverage EdTech. The Activity has not supported the system to address the disparity in access and use of educational technology across different regions, there is no understanding of why some schools/regions do not leverage digital learning. The Activity has not supported the system to leverage EdTech to increase resilience, there is no practical complementarity of EdTech with traditional learning in classrooms, and EdTech cannot substitute for traditional learning if needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Activity has supported the system to acquire the infrastructure to access EdTech and built capacity of system actors to use EdTech in ways that add significant and demonstrable value to learning. The Activity has supported the system to address the disparity in access and use of EdTech across different regions, there is a clear understanding of why some schools/regions do not leverage digital learning and robust plans for how these barriers will be dismantled The Activity has supported the system to leverage ed tech to complement, support, or substitute for traditional learning in classrooms as needed, significantly and demonstrably increasing system resilience; system leaders been supported to make strategic policy decisions about ed tech, informed by an understanding of the innovation ecosystem that can support EdTech to scale in their context.

<p>3D. Promote Equity and Inclusion</p> <p>Has the Activity strengthened the system's capacity to deliver equitable outcomes and inclusive learning?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Activity supported the system to design education programs that are accessible, inclusive, and culturally and conflict-sensitive? • Did the Activity increase the system's capacity to ensure more equitable provision of learning opportunities? • Did the Activity support the system to ensure learning environments are safe, violence-free, and inclusive? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Activity has not supported the system to use assessments of equity and inclusion to inform policy making or program design. • The Activity has not supported the system to be more equitable: data on excluded groups is missing, teachers do not have the right training, learning materials, infrastructure, and use of technology does not support equitable provision of learning opportunities. • The Activity has not supported the system to ensure safe, violence-free and inclusive learning environments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Activity has supported assessments of equity and inclusion (which demographics/geographies are excluded and why) which now consistently inform policy making and programming (design of programs and infrastructure, practices in and out of school, allocation of resources) in the system. • The Activity has significantly increased the system's capacity to be more equitable, for example by data collection on excluded groups, the allocation of resources, the training and support for teachers, accessibility of learning materials, infrastructure, transportation, and assistive technologies • The Activity has encouraged and incentivized national and local governments to incorporate safety and wellbeing considerations (including resilience to conflicts and natural disasters, addressing the needs of learner with disabilities and reducing gender-based violence) into policy making and program implementation.
---	---	---	--