Ghana - Community Services - Education

Report generated on: April 26, 2017

Visit our data catalog at: https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY
Ghana

EVALUATION TITLE
Community Services - Education

EVALUATION TYPE
Performance Evaluation

ID NUMBER
DDI-MCC-GHA-SI-EDU-2017-v02

Version

VERSION DESCRIPTION
Anonymized dataset for public distribution

Overview

ABSTRACT
The objectives in this ex-post performance evaluation target how the education sub-activity was implemented, if and how it has been sustained, and its perceived outcomes. To meet these objectives, MCC and Social Impact, Inc. (SI), outlined four evaluation questions:

1. What are the current conditions of MCC investments made for the education sub-activity? How do the conditions of MCC investments compare to non-MCC-supported sites?

2. How did the implementation process and/or post-completion maintenance contribute to current conditions of MCC investments?

3. What other factors explain both perceived school-level outcomes and the current conditions of schools?

4. What are the perceived outcomes of the investments in school infrastructure?

To answer the evaluation questions, SI supplemented existing data with two distinct but related data collection activities: first, a school conditions survey to answer Evaluation Question 1, and second, cross-case studies to answer Evaluation Questions 2, 3, and 4.

Overall findings show that on average, MCC schools are in better condition than non-MCC schools, while schools in the Southern zone are in better condition, on average, compared to those in Afram zone and Northern zone.

Qualitative data shows that differences in implementation and maintenance practices had an effect on the current condition of schools. Lack of maintenance funding and community buy-in were identified as major barriers to maintenance. Respondents also highlighted misuse of school facilities by community members (across all zones and schools), harsh weather (primarily in Afram and Northern zones, but all school types), and environment (primarily in low scoring MCC schools) adversely affected school conditions. However, PTAs and SMCs in high scoring MCC and non-MCC schools were more proactive in addressing these factors than those at low-scoring MCC schools. The perception across all zones in all study schools was that improvements in infrastructure positively affected enrollment, attendance, completion and learning.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY
Ex-Post

UNITS OF ANALYSIS
School

KIND OF DATA
Sample survey data [ssd]

TOPICS

Topic	Vocabulary	URI
Education		

KEYWORDS
Ghana, School Infrastructure, School Conditions, Education

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE
Data was collected from school in the three zones where MCC interventions took place: Afram Basin, Northern Region and Southern Horticulture Zone.

UNIVERSE
All the schools that had been considered for the MCC education intervention.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
Social Impact	

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Review of Metadata
Social Impact	SI		Independent Evaluator

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION
Version 2.0 (March 2017)

DDI DOCUMENT ID
DDI-MCC-GHA-SI-EDU-2017-v02

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD
Ghana Compact I

PROGRAM
MCC's Ghana Compact Rural Development Project intended to reduce poverty through economic growth and as part of the compact, three projects focused on agriculture, transportation and rural development in 30 districts across the Northern Agricultural Zone (Northern Region), the Afram Basin Zone (Ashanti and Eastern Regions), and the Southern Horticultural Belt (South-East Coastal Plans). Each of these three large projects included a series of twelve activities as well as several sub-activities. One of these sub-activities was on education, which involved the construction and rehabilitation of school infrastructure in 218 selected schools in Ghana. The theory of change behind the education sub-activity specified that the

improved school infrastructure would increase enrollment and retention and reduce dropout rates. This in turn would improve the future earning potential of the graduates and increase overall welfare. This evaluation focuses on the life of the investment made by MCC. Specifically, it seeks to answer four questions: a. How might have the implementation process and/or maintenance post-completion contributed to current conditions of schools? b. How might other factors explain both perceived school level outcomes and the current conditions of schools? c. What are the current conditions of MCC investments made for the Compact #1 Education Sub-Activity? How do the conditions of MCC investments compare to non-MCC supported sites? d. What are the perceived outcomes of investments in school infrastructure?

MCC SECTOR
Education (Edu)

PROGRAM LOGIC
MCC's compact with the GoG was intended to reduce poverty through economic growth by achieving two primary objectives: - Increase production and productivity of high-value food and cash crops in the intervention zones in Ghana. - Enhance the competitiveness of high-value food and cash crops in the local and international markets. The education sub-activity was one of three sub-activities that fell under the community services activity of the Rural Development Project. Overall, the community services activity was designed to improve social infrastructure such as education facilities, water, and electrification. It aimed to “enhance the sustainability of the Agricultural Project by providing the necessary infrastructure to improve [the] health of communities, to enhance skill development through the access to education, and to facilitate small scale post-harvest processing of agricultural products.” The education sub-activity, split into two phases (with Phase 1 beginning in 2007 and Phase 2 in 2009), focused on rehabilitation or new construction of classroom blocks, construction of restroom facilities, installation of polytanks for rainwater catchment, and the furnishing of the newly constructed and rehabilitated spaces. MCC and MiDA were operating on the hypothesis that an investment in education infrastructure would result in improved access to schools and better learning environments, which would lead in turn to increased enrollment, reduced dropout, increased attendance, and higher completion rates. These intermediate outcomes could then be linked to the overarching programmatic objective of an increase in long-term earnings by increasing the education level of community members. This underlying theory was most explicitly explored in the cost-benefit analysis where employment was linked with years of education-that is, completion of kindergarten (KG), primary school, junior high school (JHS), and secondary school. Although the linkage between education and economic growth was implied, the cost-benefit analysis did not specifically explore the linkage between education and an increase in agricultural productivity.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS
Focused solely on school rehabilitation, the education sub-activity did not include direct services to participants and thus had no program participants per se. However, the entire compact specifically targeted rural farmers and their families. Direct beneficiaries of the sub-activity included students, parents, teachers, and school leaders. Originally targeting 23 districts, the number of districts was expanded to 30 following a redistricting and creation of new districts. The program was ultimately implemented in 30 districts across the Northern Agricultural Zone (Northern Region), the Afram Basin Zone (Ashanti and Eastern regions), and the Southern Horticultural Zone (Akwapim South, Awutu Senya, Gomoa East, and Gomoa West). These sites were chosen because they had a high percentage of farmers as well as a high percentage of income entering the community as a result of farming.

Sampling

Study Population

All the schools that had been considered for the MCC education intervention.

Sampling Procedure

MCC schools: All 221 schools that received MCC funding were included in the study.
Non-MCC schools: All 337 remaining schools that (1) had been considered for MCC funding but didn't receive it and (2) that MiDA could provide names for.

Deviations from Sample Design

N/A

Response Rate

MCC schools: All 221 schools surveyed
Non-MCC schools: 192 schools out of 337 could be surveyed. This is because many of the schools in the list provided by MiDA were duplicates (already included in the MCC funded list).

Weighting

N/A

Questionnaires

Overview

Quantitative questionnaire: School Conditions Survey
The school conditions survey was a systematic examination of current school infrastructure conditions against international standards, GoG building guidelines, and the MiDA maintenance manual. The enumerators scored different aspects of school infrastructure, including the condition of school grounds, classroom blocks, equipment and furniture, and toilet facilities and polytanks. Ratings of condition were made on a three-point system-poor, average, and good-and each rating was followed up with a photograph of the object being rated.

Qualitative questionnaires: Key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), and community score cards (CSCs) were conducted with parents, students, teachers, school leaders or headmasters, district education officers, individuals responsible for operations and management, construction consultants and implementers, MiDA and MCC staff, and a representative from the Ministry of Education. Questions were asked to understand the processes that may have led to the current conditions of school infrastructure, and perceptions of key stakeholders on the relationship between the investments made and school-level outcomes such as enrollment, attendance, completion, and learning.

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2016-06-15	2016-07-07	School Conditions Survey
2016-09-19	2016-10-21	Qualitative Interviews

Data Collection Notes

School conditions survey: The team of enumerators and supervisors were trained on the survey instrument in Accra by SI staff and TNS senior management from 8-10th June 2016. During the training, enumerators practiced conducting the survey using tablets. Following the training, there were two days of piloting at schools in urban and peri-urban locations where enumerators were accompanied by the SI team. Each day of piloting was followed by a detailed debrief session where all inconsistencies were discussed and corrected.

Qualitative survey: The qualitative surveys were conducted by two teams. One team was led by the PI for the evaluation who was accompanied by a translator and note-taker. The second team was led by SI's local education expert who was also accompanied by a translator and note-taker. Prior to the interviews, the PI and local education expert met with those accompanying them to discuss and explain the questionnaires. Both teams visited two schools to pilot the school level questionnaires prior to starting data collection.

Questionnaires

Quantitative questionnaire: School Conditions Survey
The school conditions survey was a systematic examination of current school infrastructure conditions against international standards, GoG building guidelines, and the MiDA maintenance manual. The enumerators scored different aspects of school infrastructure, including the condition of school grounds, classroom blocks, equipment and furniture, and toilet facilities and polytanks. Ratings of condition were made on a three-point system-poor, average, and good-and each rating was followed up with a photograph of the object being rated.

Qualitative questionnaires: Key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), and community score cards (CSCs) were conducted with parents, students, teachers, school leaders or headmasters, district education officers, individuals responsible for operations and management, construction consultants and implementers, MiDA and MCC staff, and a representative from the Ministry of Education. Questions were asked to understand the processes that may have led to the current conditions of school infrastructure, and perceptions of key stakeholders on the relationship between the investments made and school-level outcomes such as enrollment, attendance, completion, and learning.

Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
TNS Ghana	TNS	

Data Processing

Data Editing

Data cleaning was done for the school conditions survey. This included:
- consistency checks and removing duplicate entries
- coding and labeling variables
- checks on ratings by enumerators
- corrections made to 'Don't Know' ratings where a rating could be given from the photograph

Other Processing

Data was collected on tablets using Survey CTO. The survey was programmed by SI and included built in consistency checks. The full set of raw data was downloaded by SI directly from the Survey CTO server. No changes were made to the raw data by the data collection firm.

Data Appraisal

No content available