Enhancing the effectiveness of public spend on school education

FICCI Committee on School Education

February 2014

I.   Objective and Context

As per a recent national survey, almost 25 crore children are studying in 14 lakh schools across the country. The challenge of imparting education and appropriately skilling the children at school level has prompted FICCI to constitute a **Committee on School Education,** chaired by **Mr. Ashish Dhawan,** Founder, Central Square Foundation and Founder – ChrysCapital. The focus of the Committee would be to look at advocacy, quality and implementation issues.

As per the discussions at the first meeting, the agenda of the Committee is divided into 5 major activities and this working group is focused on "**Enhancing the effectiveness of public spend on School Education**".

The Working Group has studied the existing reporting and evaluation framework of the Department of School Education and Literacy under the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) with regard to expenditure and outcomes of key schemes and activities. Further the group has examined the goals of school education system captured in the Twelfth Plan document and other papers released by the MHRD referred to in **Annexure 1**.

The group has found that the Results Framework Document (RFD) is an important tool that can be leveraged to enhance the effectiveness of the public spending on school education.

The key members of the group are as follows:

- Mr. Ashish Dhawan, Founder, Central Square Foundation
- Mr. Amitabh Jhingan, Partner & National Leader- Education, Ernst & Young Pvt. Ltd
- Ms. Ramya Venkataraman, Partner & Education Leader, McKinsey

The group has also had interactions with members from Accountability Initiative, Azim Premji Foundation, Center for Civil Society and many more whose efforts are constantly channelized towards the betterment of school education.

The group has connected with each other via meetings and working group sessions to deliberate on the current reporting and evaluation framework surrounding the school system and how the RFD tool can be better utilized by the States to effectively track and monitor the implementation of various schemes, timely fund flows, key indicators affecting the outputs and outcomes at the learning level and decisions taken at the school level.

The objective of this note is to identify additional metrics that can be incorporated into the State/Central School Education Results Framework Document (RFD) to more effectively set targets and measure the holistic performance of the school system and various schemes. This note includes the rationale for incorporating each of the metrics into the RFD to further strengthen the performance and evaluation system.

II.   Description of the Results Framework Document (RFD)

What is the RFD?

- The RFD is a performance evaluation tool that was introduced in 2009 by the Performance Management Division (PMD) of the Cabinet Secretariat.
- An RFD provides a summary of the most important results that a department/ministry expects to achieve during the financial year. This document has two main purposes: (a) move the focus of the department from process-orientation to result-orientation, and (b) provide an objective and fair basis to evaluate department's overall performance at the end of the year.
- The Performance Management Division (PMD) reviewed international best practices and designed guidelines and checklists for preparing the Results Framework Document (RFD). Further the PMD has conducted around 30, intensive hands on training programs on the RFD for around 2500 senior officers in partnership with IIM Ahmedabad and IAS Academy at Mussoorie.
- 74 ministries and departments of the Central Government of India are required to prepare the Results Framework Document (RFD). In addition, several states (Jammu & Kashmir, Haryana, Assam, Karnataka, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala and Punjab) have started creating an RFD across key ministries and departments.

What are the sections of the RFD?

A description of the RFD format is as follows:

Section #	Title	Description	Rationale
1	**Ministry's / department's Vision, Mission, Objectives and Functions**	- Vision and Mission of the ministry - Objectives that the ministry is targeting to achieve - Functions of the ministry	- This section captures the overall goals of the ministry - For e.g. Quality: Improving standards of education
2	**Inter se priorities among key objectives, success indicators and targets**	- Objectives that are the focus of the current RFD - Weights assigned to each objective - Targeted actions to achieve each objective	- This section is the core of the RFD. - It captures all the goals, actions and targets of the ministry

Section #	Title	Description	Rationale
		(policies, programs, schemes) • Success Indicators and Units for each action • Assign relative Weights to Success Indicators • Target values for each success indicator between the range of Poor to Excellent	
3	**Trend values of the success indicators**	• For every success indicator and the corresponding target, RFD must provide actual values for the past two years and also projected values for two years in the future.	• This section enables the user to assess whether the targets set for each indicator in section 2 are in line with past achievements and future projections
4	**Description and definition of success indicators and proposed measurement methodology**	• Provides detailed definitions of various success indicators and the proposed measurement methodology	• Enables the user to understand the meaning & relevance of the success indicator
5	**Specific performance requirements from other departments that are critical for delivering agreed results**	• Captures the expectations from other departments that impact the department's performance and are critical for achievement of the selected Success Indicator.	• Identifies the support that is required from other departments / ministries to achieve the success indicator
6	**Outcome / Impact of activities of department/ministry**	• Captures the outcomes and the expected impact the department/ministry has on national welfare	• This section is included for information only

How is the RFD used?

Evaluation Methodology
- At the end of the year, the High Power Committee (HPC) on Government Performance will look at the achievements of the government department, compare them with the targets, and determine the composite score.
- The Composite score shows the degree to which the government department in question was able to meet its objectives.

Department Rating	Value of Composite Score
Excellent =	100% - 96%
Very Good =	95% - 86%
Good =	85% - 76%
Fair =	75% - 66%
Poor =	65% and below

III.   **Challenges with the current RFD and recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of the RFD**

Based on our analysis of the RFDs created by the Department of School Education and Literacy (MHRD) and several State RFDs for School education, we have identified the following challenges & gaps:

- There is a need to break the overall objectives of the ministry (e.g. Access: Expansion of quality school and adult education) into sub-goals to be able to effectively identify specific action items to achieve each of them.
- A majority of the success indicators included in the RFDs are of the input/activity type. Therefore the efforts of the government towards achieving the objective are captured through these indicators but there are no indicators to capture the outcomes of those efforts (e.g. what was the increase in enrolment).

- There are no financial allocation/expenditure linked indicators in the RFD. Inclusion of these indicators is critical to understand how the government in allocating resources to achieve these objectives.
- There is no explicit linkage between the identified actions in the RFD and compliance towards the norms set by the relevant Right to Education (RTE) act and rules.
- The linkage between the actions items and the associated central/state government schemes needs to be explicitly specified.

In order to address these challenges & gaps, we have three key recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of the RFD:

1) There is a need to explicitly specify goals for each of the objectives of the Department/ministry in the RFD. That is, specify sub-goals for each of the 4 stated objectives of the Twelfth plan for education: Access, Equity, Quality and Governance. An example of the objectives and sub-goals for the Department of School Education & Literacy (MHRD) or the State Directorate of Education (DoE) are as follows:

Objective	Possible sub-goals
Access	• Increase enrolment • Increase attendance • Measures to help schools meet the required PTR and infrastructure norms • To increase retention rate of children
Equity	• To bridge social and gender gaps • To reduce drop out rate and bridge gaps in learning levels of students from weaker sections
Quality	• Enhance the learning level of students • Enhance the teaching learning process • Ensure availability of adequate resources for a conducive learning environment
Governance	• State's support to improve governance and accountability • Strengthening local governance and community involvement, improving educational leadership and management at the district, block and school levels

2) For each of these sub-goals, there is a need to identify a holistic range of success indicators/metrics to effectively set targets and measure performance in the RFD

We propose that metrics across the 5 types mentioned below should be utilized to set targets and assess progress against these sub-goals:

Metric Type	Description	Sources*
Input metrics	Metrics that establish infrastructure and resource capacity to deliver the optimal outcomes	DISE, SEMIS
Intermediate output metrics	Metrics that indicate health of the education set up in terms of intermediate outputs that can be tracked leading up to the target outcomes	DISE, Outcome budget, SEMIS, ASER
Outcome metrics	Desired outcomes of the input initiatives in terms of performance	DISE, SSA- JRM, NAS, ASER
Financial metrics	Metrics linked to availability and efficiency of spend of fiscal resources for the purpose of education	Union budget for past few years, MHRD, various central scheme websites, PAISA, ABE
Policy metrics	Performance at an aggregate level against desired policy objectives; Transparency and efficacy of performance monitoring	RTE: The 3rd Year (Department of School Education & Literacy, MHRD), Right to Education (RTE) Report Card (Pratham)

*Comprehensive list of sources and references mentioned in Annexure 1

3) Even though action items and success indicators vary year on year based on the specific priorities of the education department, a set of key success indicators needs to be retained in the RFD across years to ensure that progress towards achieving these goals is visible. Further these indicators will ensure that focus of the department towards these key indicators is sustained.

IV.   Suggested metrics and Rationale

In order to further explore our three recommendations to enhance the effectiveness of the RFD mentioned in the previous section, we have identified sub-goals for each of the 4 stated objectives of the Twelfth plan for education: Access, Equity, Quality and Governance and a holistic range to metrics to assess progress against the same.
For each of these suggested metrics, we have indicated whether the data source for that metrics currently exists and whether it is currently part of the RFD.

Please note that the following lists of metrics are not the comprehensive success indicators for every RFD. Our intention is to identify an illustrative set of metrics that can be further refined based on discussions with the Department of School Education & Literacy (MHRD) and the relevant State Directorate of Education (DoE).

MHRD Objective	Sub Goal	Type	Metric	Unit	Metric Exists	Metrics Implemented
Access	Increase enrolment	Financial metrics	% Budget spent per school on new capacity (school buildings, classrooms, drinking water facilities, toilets)	%	SSA, RMSA	
		Intermediate output metrics	% of eligible secondary school students with access to school within 8 kms (access to secondary school)	%	AISES survey	
		Outcome metrics	GER/ % enrolment at elementary / secondary level	%	DISE, SEMIS	Y
	Increase attendance	Intermediate output metrics	Average student attendance at elementary / secondary level	%	ASER, State DoE	
	Measures to help schools meet the required PTR	Input Metrics	% Completion of infrastructure (model schools sanctioned in the state under State Govt./ PPP, girls hostels)	%	MHRD	Y

MHRD Objective	Sub Goal	Type	Metric	Unit	Metric Exists	Metrics Implemented
	and infrastructure norms					
		Intermediate output metrics	% Schools that are RTE compliant on all infrastructure parameters	%	DISE	
			% Schools / Number of Single teacher schools in the state	%	DISE	
			Average pupil teacher ratio (PTR) per school	No.	DISE	
			Average Student Classroom ratio (SCR) per school	No.	DISE	
	To increase retention rate of children	Financial metrics	% Budget spent on maintaining existing infrastructure (school buildings, classrooms, drinking water facilities, toilets)	%	SSA, RMSA	
		Outcome metrics	% Dropout rate at elementary / secondary level	%	SSA-JRM	
		Policy metrics	Innovative Policies for leveraging the private sector, technology and parents for successful implementation and quality assurance of MDM (NGOs, Mothers, IVRS)			
Equity	To bridge social and gender gaps	Intermediate output metrics	% Increase in enrolment of students from weaker section (CwSN/ students from EWS/ girls/ minority groups) across elementary / secondary level	%	DISE, SEMIS	Y
			Ratio of girls to boys enrolment at elementary / secondary level	No.	DISE, SEMIS	Y

MHRD Objective	Sub Goal	Type	Metric	Unit	Metric Exists	Metrics Implemented
	To reduce drop out rate and bridge gaps in learning levels of students from weaker sections	Financial metrics	% Spend on Scholarships in the state going to students from weaker sections (CwSN/ students from EWS/ girls)	%	State DoE	
		Outcome metrics	% Decrease in drop out rate of students from EWS/ CwSN/ girls	%	SSA-JRM	Y
		Policy metrics	% Budget spent by SCERT / DIET or Number of training programs/modules for teachers on how to teach children from weaker sections (CwSN)	%	State SCERT portal	
			State policy for schools to partner with NGOs to provide support to CwSN			
Quality	**Enhance the learning level of students**	Outcome metrics	% Students (of the total student population in the state) receiving National level scholarships (NTSE, National Olympiads, CBSE Scholarships etc.)	%	State DoE	
			% of students who score above 65% and above 85%	%	State DoE	
			Score in first language and maths (average, standard deviation) on Third Party Assessments of learning levels			
		Intermediate output metrics	Introduction of innovative pedagogical methods to improve learning level of students (activity based learning, teaching specific groups as per learning level)			

MHRD Objective	Sub Goal	Type	Metric	Unit	Metric Exists	Metrics Implemented
	Enhance the teaching learning process	Financial metrics	% Teachers receiving the TLM grant in the first six months of the academic year	%	State DoE, PAISA	
		Intermediate output metrics	% Average teacher attendance at elementary / secondary level	%	State DoE, ASER	
			% of teachers with D-Ed / B-Ed/ M-Ed and appropriate degree in relevant subject	%		
			Number of teacher educators for teachers (ratio) in the state	No.	State DoE	
		Policy metrics	Policy around SCERT/ DIET to partner with external experts for innovative teacher training programs (management, content, delivery, CCE, computer training)			
			Policy to lengthen the school day for the school administration to complete non- teaching tasks			
			Policy to enable the use of quality parameters in recruiting teachers			
			Policy to enable third party assessment of Teachers			
	Ensuring availability of adequate resources for a conducive learning environment	Financial metrics	% State education budget spent on teacher/ BRC/ CRC/ headmaster training	%	State DoE, SCERT	
			% Utilization of budget for SDG/ SMG	%	SSA	

MHRD Objective	Sub Goal	Type	Metric	Unit	Metric Exists	Metrics Implemented
		Input Metrics	Average # of days spent on teacher training / headmaster training / BRC/ CRC Training per year	No.	SSA State portal, SCERT	
		Intermediate output metrics	% Schools in state which supply free text books on the day of the start of the school year	%		
			% Teachers who pass the TET (all teachers - new and existing)	%	TET website	
Governance	State's support to improve governance and accountability	Financial metrics	% GSDP on education	%	State DoE	
			Total budget spent per student at elementary level / secondary level	No.	PAISA	
		Policy metrics	Policy to enable PPP (involvement of the private sector in management of schools)			
			Policy for the state to conduct Third Party Assessments of learning levels			
			Policy to enable resource allocation based on bottom up identification of needs/ priorities			
	Strengthening local governance and community involvement, improving educational leadership and	Financial metrics	% State education budget spent on monitoring and academic support (inspectors, BRC, CRC, SMC, SDMC)	%	State DoE, SSA-JRM, SSA state portals, DISE, SEMIS	

MHRD Objective	Sub Goal	Type	Metric	Unit	Metric Exists	Metrics Implemented
	management at the district, block and school levels					
			Quantum of funds available to the SMC/ SDMC	No.	Same as above	
		Intermediate output metrics	% Schools with a SMC / SDMC	%	Same as above	
			Average attendance rate of members from SMC/ SDMC	%	Same as above	
			% Vacancies in teacher posts/ BRC/ CRCs/ School inspectors	%	Same as above	
			Average number of schools per School Inspectors/BRC/CRC in the state	No.	Same as above	
			Average number of SMC / SDMC meetings held every year in the state	No.	Same as above	
		Outcome metrics	% Achievement of the SDP plan formed by SMC / SDMC	%	Same as above	

V. **Key Questions and discussion points for operationalization of the recommendations:**

1. **Have you been involved in the RFD creation/review process at the MHRD/State DoE?**
2. **Do you believe that the RFD is an important tool for performance evaluation?**
3. **What are your thoughts on the 3 key recommendations of this note (identifying sub-goals for each of the objectives, set targets & measure progress against a holistic range of success indicators and retain key indicators in the RFD each year)?**

4. What is your feedback on the set of indicators that have been identified in this note?
5. How do you think the suggested metrics will be useful for the department/ministry (e.g. prioritization, bringing in a more holistic approach, ensuring consistent focus on the key goals and associated success indicators across several years)?
6. Is there flexibility to add the columns for "Sub-goal" and "Type of Metric" into the RFD format?
7. What would be the next steps to refine the suggested metrics and operationalize the same into the RFD and other performance evaluation systems at the state/district level?

Annexure 1:

Documents and Sources of reference:

- **Analysis of Budgeted Expenditure 2008-2011, MHRD**
- **Analysis of Budgeted Expenditure 2007-2010, MHRD**
- **Elementary Education in India- Progress towards UEE, Flash Statistics 2011- 12, District Information System for Education (DISE)**
- **Results Framework Document for Department of School Education and Literacy, 2012-13, MHRD**
- **SSA website, RMSA website**
- **Union Budgets for Department of School Education and Literacy, 2007-08 till 2012-13**
- **PAISA report 2012**
- **ASER Report 2012**
- **Statistics of School Education, 2010-2011, MHRD**
- **Outcome Budget 2011-12, 2013-14**
- **Performance Monitoring and Evaluation System (PMES) website, Cabinet Secretariat, Govt. of India**
- **RFD for Department of School Education 2012-13 (Haryana)**
- **RFD for Department of School Education 2012-13, (Jammu & Kashmir)**
- **Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-2017) Social sectors- Education, Volume III**
- **7th and 8th All India School Education Survey, NCERT**
- **Flash Statistics, 2010-11 for Secondary Education, State Report Card, Secondary Education Management Information System (SEMIS)**
- **Budget Briefs of SSA, MDMS, 2012-13, Accountability Initiative**
- **Educational Statistics at a Glance, Govt. of India, MHRD released in 2012**
- **India Rural Right to Education (RTE) report card, Pratham, 2011**
- **RTE: The 3rd Year (Department of School Education & Literacy, MHRD, 2014)**

Abbreviations:

SSA- Sarva Shiksha Abhiyaan
RMSA- Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyaan
MDMS- Mid Day Meal Scheme
ASER- Annual Status of Education Report
CCE- Continuous and Comprehensive Evaluation
BRC/ CRC- Block Resource Center/ Cluster Resource Center
SC- Scheduled Caste
ST- Scheduled Tribe
OBC- Other Backward Class
CwSN- Children with Special Needs
SDG- School Development grant
SMG- School Management grant
SMC- School management Committee
SDMC- School Development and Monitoring Committee
DIET- District Institute of Education and Training
SIET- State Institute of Education and Training
TLM- Teacher Learning Material
SDP- School Development Plan
GSDP- Gross State Domestic Product
RTE- Right to Education
NAS- National Achievement Survey
NGO- Non- Governmental Organization
PAISA- Planning, Allocations and Expenditures, Institutions: Studies in Accountability
DoE- Directorate of Education