WORKING PAPER

ERICC APPLICATION OF THE RISE DIAGNOSTIC FOR TEACHER MANAGEMENT IN JORDAN

September 2024

Emilee Rauschenberger, PhD (Queen Rania Foundation), Lindsay Brown, PhD (New York University-TIES), Carmen Belafi, MA (Independent Consultant, the International Rescue Committee), Celine Ammash, MA (New York University-TIES), Hala Sarabi (MA, Queen Rania Foundation)

ABSTRACT

The study presented here applied systems thinking to the context of Jordan to assess the wider factors and potential misalignments affecting teacher management in the country. The study was conducted by a team of researchers from New York University-TIES and the Queen Rania Foundation (QRF) in Jordan as part of the Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crisis (ERICC) Research Programme Consortium (referred to in this report as the ERICC team).

The ERICC team set out to apply the RISE Diagnostic Framework to the case of Jordan's education sector, ultimately adapting and applying the tool to identify and prioritise misalignments within the country's teacher management system. In doing so, the RISE Diagnostic Framework helped the ERICC team to map the varying purposes for which different parts of the teacher management system were aligned.

The RISE Framework proposes that education systems consist of four key relationships of accountability between different principals and agents: *Compact* (Relationship between the highest authorities of the state and education authorities including the Ministry of Education, or MoE); *Management* (Relationship between the education authorities and frontline providers of education i.e., schools, principals, teachers); *Voice and Choice* (Relationship between frontline providers of services and recipients of services); and *Politics* (Relationship between citizens and the highest authorities of the state). Of these relationships, the study was limited to examining the first two relationships, *Compact* and *Management*, in the context of teacher management in Jordan.

Based on the RISE diagnostic analysis, the ERICC team finds that Jordan's teacher management system appears to be primarily aligned for *access* and *process compliance*, with pockets of stakeholders attempting to bring greater focus on, and alignment for, *learning outcomes*. Seven misalignments are identified, primarily within the *Management* relationship. In addition, the team identifies three recommendations and considerations for future applications of the diagnostic in conflict-affected contexts: (1) limited accessibility and interpretation challenges of MoE policies and the invisibility of policies related to refugees' education provision; (2) the tool likely requires additional piloting in order to operationalise best practices; and (3) a system-wide diagnostic has tension between inclusivity of minorities and overall influence within the system.

Disclaimer

Suggested citation

Use and reproduction of material from ERICC publications are encouraged, as long as they are not for commercial purposes, and as long as there is due attribution. Suggested citation: Rauschenberger, E., Brown, L., Belafi, C., Ammash, C., & Sarabi, H. (September 2024). ERICC Application of the RISE Diagnostic for Teacher Management in Jordan. ERICC Working Paper. URL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS

CSB	Civil Service Bureau
DCU	Donor Coordination Unit
DFAT	Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
EMIS	Education Management Information System
EQAU	Education Quality and Accountability Unit
ERICC	Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crisis
ESP	Education Strategic Plan
FAA	Financial Affairs Administration
FCDO	UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
HRD	human resource development
IRC	International Rescue Committee
JOD	Jordanian dinar
MoE	Ministry of Education
NCCD	National Center for Curriculum Development
NGO	non-governmental organisation
NYU-TIES	Global TIES for Children at NYU
QRC	Queen Rania Center
QRF	Queen Rania Foundation
QRTA	Queen Rania Teacher Academy
RAMP	Early Grade Reading and Mathematics Program
RDL	Research Directorate Leadership
RISE	Research on Improving Systems of Education
STD	Supervision and Training Department
TCT	temporary contract teacher
UCL	University College London
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the study

The study presented here was conducted by a team of researchers from New York University-TIES and the Queen Rania Foundation (QRF) in Jordan as part of the Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crisis (ERICC) Research Programme Consortium (referred to in this report as the ERICC team). Funded by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), ERICC is a multi-year, multi-country research programme that aims to contribute to the research evidence base on the most effective approaches to education in contexts affected by conflict and/or protracted crisis. The ERICC team set out to utilise the RISE Diagnostic Framework in the case of Jordan's education sector, ultimately adapting and applying the tool to identify and prioritise misalignments within the country's teacher management system. In doing so, the RISE Diagnostic Framework helped the ERICC team to map the varying purposes for which different parts of the teacher management system were aligned. Overall, the primary purpose of the study was to pinpoint incoherences within the teacher management system, which serves significant refugee populations as well as Jordanian nationals, and to highlight possible solutions and ways forward to address these misalignments, which can compromise the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of education systems. A secondary purpose of the study was to consider how systems thinking can be applied to protracted crisis contexts and to inform improvements between the humanitarian–development nexus.

The RISE Diagnostic Framework

The Research on Improving Systems of Education (RISE) was a multi-country research endeavour running from 2015 to 2023, conducting research to better understand how countries can address and overcome the global learning crisis. The RISE research agenda is based on applying a systems approach to education research, which postulates that many education systems do not produce better learning outcomes due to a lack of coherence and alignment within and between components of the system itself. The RISE Framework and implementation guidance aims to support researchers in diagnosing, prioritising, and building consensus around points of misalignment within the education system. The RISE Framework proposes that education systems consist of **four key relationships of accountability** between different principals and agents, only the first two of which were the focus of this study:

1. **Compact:** Relationship between the highest authorities of the state and education authorities (including the Ministry of Education, or MoE).

2. **Management:** Relationship between the education authorities and frontline providers of education (i.e., schools, principals, teachers).

3. **Voice and choice:** Relationship between recipients of services (i.e., parents, children, and communities – the "principal") and frontline providers of services (i.e., school leaders and teachers – the "agent").

4. **Politics:** Relationship between citizens (the "principal") and the highest executive, legislative, and fiduciary authorities of the state (the "agent").

The latter two (Voice and Choice, Politics) were not explored in this study due the fact that the school system is highly centralised, with citizens having limited involvement and impact in feeding back to schools or higher government authorities. In addition, the relationship between citizens and the government is a sensitive topic that was beyond the scope and resources of the study to explore. As a result, the study focused exclusively on the Compact and Management relationships within the education sector.

Each of these accountability relationships has five components, or **design elements**, that help describe and define it in more detail. These elements are delegation, finance, information, support, and motivation. Combining the accountability relationships and design elements creates a matrix, which serves as the analytic framework to identify system misalignments within or between the design elements and relationships.

Methodology: Data sources and collection

While adapting the suggested approach to applying the RISE Diagnostic to Jordan, the ERICC team took a number of steps prior to field data collection. First, between August and October 2022, the team carried out the following:

- **A preliminary desk review** of secondary sources, primarily policy documents and research reports, to understand the existing policy landscape within Jordan. Within this investigation, special attention was paid to areas of incoherence within or between documents as possible topics/themes for further exploration.

- **A preliminary analysis** (the pre-diagnoistic) in which the RISE Framework Annexes were used to help the team identify areas of consensus and areas of uncertainty where additional information was going to be needed.

- **A workshop with Ministry of Education officials** to further investigate and probe deeper on certain issues, questions, and enquiries within the priority areas short-listed for investigation.

- **A presentation of a selected list of topics** to ERICC's Research Directorate Leadership team that summarised the outcomes of the desk review, pre-diagnostic, and workshop, after which it was determined that **Teacher Management** was the most relevant and potentially fruitful topic to apply the RISE Diagnostic.

The ERICC team then conducted field data collection throughout November 2022, which included the following:

- **Ten key informant interviews** with government officials (n=7) and relevant non-governmental/international organisations (n=3) working in teacher management areas.
- **Eight focus groups of personnel** who work in schools, including:
    - full-time MoE teachers (n=14) who work in first shift schools mainly serving Jordanians
    - temporary contract teachers (n=15) who have been hired by the field directorates and primarily work in second shift schools that serve Syrian refugees
    - supervisors (n=16) who observe and support subject teachers (of both types) across a geographical area
    - principals (n=15) working in shift schools.

Findings: Diagnosis of misalignments for Jordan

Based on the RISE Diagnostic performed by the ERICC team, Jordan's educational system appears to be primarily aligned for **access** and **process compliance**, with pockets of stakeholders attempting to bring greater focus on, and alignment for, **learning outcomes**. Still, there were key areas identified that represent possible misalignments between design elements and/or accountability relationships that are affecting system outcomes. These include misalignments within the two accountability relationships (**Management** and **Compact**) explored in the study, which focused on Jordan's teacher management system. Among the design elements of the **Management** accountability relationship, the following misalignments were identified:

1. Among the design elements of *delegation*, *information*, and *support*, there were three related misalignments pinpointed:

    a) Between the objective to create and maintain the integrity and relevance of the Education Management Information System (EMIS) database (a task delegated and required by the MoE of its frontline workers) and the lack of support given to those agents in terms of providing access and training in utilising the database.

    b) Between the stated purpose of EMIS to inform system improvement and use of the EMIS data system, particularly at lower levels of the system.

    c) Between the policies promoting higher quality that are communicated by the Ministry and the type of data collected to measure quality. More specifically, despite quality teaching and learning being (de jure) communicated priorities of the system, data collection does not focus on quality but on inputs and "thin" descriptors (e.g., the number of teachers having completed a training). "Thick" descriptors (e.g., the ways in which these trainings were helpful to improve teaching practices and pedagogy) are not collected for quality assurance.

2. Among the design elements of *delegation* and *information*, there was misalignment between the curriculum frameworks, learning materials, and exams on one hand and the learning levels of children on the other.

3. Among the design elements of *delegation*, *information*, and *support*, there was misalignment between key stakeholders that espouse different views of their delegated objectives, needed information, and support functions. In particular, the goals and measures of school inspections do not align with the work of supervisors and other stakeholders.

4. Among the design elements of *information*, *motivation*, and *support*, there was misalignment between the way in which teachers' performance is evaluated for possible promotion in the new ranking system and the reality of teachers' access, motivation, and use of training as well as the motivation of supervisors who provide training.

5. Among the design elements of delegation, finance, motivation, and support, there was misalignment between the MoE's stated goals in regard to the improvement of the teacher workforce and the persistent use of temporary contract teachers, who are the least experienced and least trained.

6. Among the design elements of *delegation*, *finance*, and *support*, there was misalignment between the stated goals of the Financial Affairs Administration (FAA) and its technical

capacities and resources (essentially support) to carry out its duties in a timely fashion.

Among design elements of the **Compact** accountability relationship, the following misalignment was identified:

7. Among the design elements of *delegation* and *finance*, there was misalignment between the articulated and delegated aims of the political leaders and the fiscal resources provided to the MoE.

Recommendations for greater alignment of teacher management in Jordan

Based upon the misalignments identified, the following recommendations are offered to support greater alignment within the system for improved quality of teaching and learning:

Recommendation 1

a) The Ministry of Education's Queen Rania Center (QRC) could review and update EMIS access policies and their implementation to ensure temporary contract teachers and other frontline workers have unrestricted access and appropriate training to carry out their EMIS-related duties. Regular periodic audits of teachers' understanding and skills may be considered for the long term to ensure that teachers and other school staff are able to use EMIS effectively as the platform continues to evolve and improve.

b) EMIS data documenting student performance and attendance has the untapped potential to help teachers, school leaders, and field directorates identify ways to improve on student learning engagement. Currently, students' assessment results are snapshots of students' outcomes that are not proactively monitored to adjust lesson plans and teaching strategies to increase learning. The MoE could consider how to train and incentivise teachers and principals to utilise EMIS data on student learning outcomes to collectively plan and implement ways to raise the levels of student learning across grade levels. More specifically, the MoE might consider developing professional training to be provided on its online platform to guide and illustrate to teachers and principals how data from EMIS can inform classroom instruction and school planning, including school-wide improvement plans. In addition, at the field directorate level, the MoE could consider ways to promote the use of EMIS for more accurate and timely monitoring of students' attendance and academic achievement for more effective educational planning and targeted school support.

Recommendation 2

The National Center for Curriculum Development (NCCD), in partnership with the Ministry, could consider ways to better coordinate across the different authorship committees tasked with developing the curriculum across all levels and subjects, ensuring the needed experts (subject matter experts, gender specialists, special education experts, assessment experts) are included to ensure the incorporation of differentiation strategies into curriculum frameworks and guidance. This can assist teachers in understanding how to adapt the curriculum and their teaching methods to meet the diverse needs and levels of students. The RISE data indicated that in Jordan there are often gaps in students' knowledge and abilities, in part due to the closure of schools during the Covid-19 pandemic. Thus, although there have been no studies of the impact of curricula, teachers report they often struggle with helping students access the curriculum.

Note that to address gaps in students' knowledge and skills that hinder their academic progress, schools or the wider system might also consider prioritising the mastery of foundational skills across all grade levels. Students need to have mastered basic literacy and numeracy in order to advance to higher order content in the curriculum (not only in maths and languages, but in all other subjects). This also necessitates that education authorities (NCCD and MoE) define learning as a cumulative experience. As a result, improving learning outcomes (especially in higher grades) starts with improving learning in the early grades, as this unlocks all future learning.

Recommendation 3

The MoE might consider assessing the design and mandate of the school inspection authority, Education Quality and Accountability Unit (EQAU), to better align the unit with the work of other departments, including the Supervision and Training Department (STD). The STD, local teacher training organisations, and programmes such as the USAID Early Grade Reading and Mathematics Program (RAMP) work towards the MoE's new perspective on teacher accountability, which is linked with greater training and support. Their efforts at improving teachers' practice can potentially be undermined if their guidance is set aside in favour of the concerns and recommendations for improvement issued by the EQAU, whose powers to discipline ensure compliance. To avoid this scenario in which the judgement and guidance of EQAU assessors and others contradict each other, the MoE could consider how to better align the goals, assessment practices, and data collected amongst the EQAU and other stakeholders. The MoE could require the EQAU's assessors to collaborate with the STD in sharing data and tools, consider and reflect on schools' context and constraints when making judgements, and make recommendations that prioritise student learning over process compliance.

At the same time, the EQAU might consider ways in which its work complements and can inform the STD, its partners, and learning-focused initiatives such as RAMP. The MoE should consider if and how the EQAU's work might benefit from linking to supervision E-tools introduced by RAMP and the EMIS database (which it currently does not access). With regards to delegation, the MoE might also reconsider its efforts towards decentralisation, which do not seem to align with the EQAU's work and its interpretation of its own mandate, thus making the transition to a more starfish-structured governance system less feasible.

Recommendation 4

The STD might consider reviewing its schedule of training and strive to add more training sessions in locations and times that are accessible to temporary contract teachers and those in rural schools. In addition, the STD might consider regularly seeking feedback (e.g., confidential surveys) from teachers who attend training courses to assess the relevance and applicability of course content as well as the effectiveness of the trainer in teaching it. The STD might also consider having supervisors, principals, or other teacher trainers follow up with teachers after they attend a training to assess the degree to which the teachers were able to implement and improve their practice after the training courses. Through implementing such strategies, the STD could revise and improve its courses and better support teachers in implementing what they learned to improve teaching and learning.

Recommendation 5

There needs to be greater accountability for supporting and integrating temporary contract teachers (TCTs) in the profession. The unequal and parallel system in which temporary teachers work demotivates them and impacts the quality of teaching and learning. While aiming to reduce the portion of the teaching workforce that is currently on temporary contracts (approximately 20%), the Education Training Center (ETC) (responsible for in-service teacher training and supervision) and field directorates (tasked with hiring and managing TCTs) might consider how such teachers could earn and accumulate points for their rankings if they go on to be hired as permanent teachers. Doing so could provide motivation for temporary contract teachers to improve their practice and encourage supervisors and principals to better support promising contract teachers. Field directorates might consider ways to ensure principals are not overworking TCTs, who are more vulnerable based on their precarious employment and the position of power the principals have over their evaluation and school placement. This could include feedback loops (e.g., a hotline for concerns or complaints) available for TCTs.

Recommendation 6

The MoE and the international donor community might consider an audit of the technical needs of the MoE's Financial Affairs Administration and staff in related departments. The audit could also assess the potential use of and cost savings from introducing greater automation and digital services within financial departments to promote greater efficiency and effectiveness in executing its core function of dispersing funds on a timely basis.

Recommendation 7

Political leaders might consider ways in which the MoE budget allocation may be increased or optimised in coming years to support a focus on improving students' learning outcomes. In addition, leaders might also consider prioritising a much more limited number of goals (including improving learning outcomes) from the comprehensive list that forms the Education Strategic Plan (ESP) and channel available funding there. Having a long list of priorities dilutes the impact that already limited funding will have. In addition, the Donor Coordination Unit (DCU) may consider how to improve communication between the MoE and donors to ensure donors do not exacerbate this problem. Instead, the DCU could work with donors, the Education Minister, and the MoE to help set a manageable number of common priorities in order to better leverage donors' resources and avoid the duplication of efforts. The Minister in particular could take a key role in advocating amongst donors for priorities that match and bolster the MoE's current goals and strategies.

Revisions to RISE for use in contexts of conflict and protracted crisis

The ERICC team made and suggested several revisions to the RISE Diagnostic tool and implementation process, which are discussed in the report. However, it is important to note that overall, the RISE Diagnostic proved quite relevant for a lower/middle-income, relatively stable country such as Jordan.

Revisions for the RISE Diagnostic tool

Researchers might consider adding, or accounting for, the following actors and relationships that are not explicitly included in the RISE Framework to date, which will ultimately help in understanding and identifying alignments and misalignments between the humanitarian and development sectors for conflict affected settings.

1. **Addition of global actors.** The RISE Framework focuses primarily on national contexts and the major actors, relationships, and policies that govern those contexts. However, in areas of crisis and conflict, there are often global actors – such as international and/or multilateral donors, United Nations agencies, and international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) – that

operate within and influence the education landscape. The team noted that there are rarely effective and efficient mechanisms for coordinating among these actors, either across global actors or between global and national actors. As such, this is a source of incoherence within the education system landscape that requires further consideration.

2. **Addition of NGO/donor relationship with the MoE.** The RISE Framework investigates several important relationships, including that between the executive branch(es), the MoE, and teachers and schools (defined as "Compact" and "Management"). However, donors and NGOs are not mentioned as significant actors within the RISE System Diagnostic, nor are their relationships named or explored with other actors in the education system. Given (a) the influence that donors can or often strive to have with ministries of education in low- and middle-income countries, and (b) the movement to integrate previously parallel refugee education systems – largely run by NGOs – into formal schooling, the ERICC team believes that these relationships should be further considered in areas of conflict and crisis.

3. **Addition of education actors and local policies "outside" the formal system.** Given the RISE Framework's focus on national systems, the implementation guide, coding annexes, and publications are primarily interested in those who influence and are managed by formal policy. However, in areas of conflict and crisis, several important actors operate outside of these boundaries. For example, in Jordan, the majority of second-shift students are taught by temporary contract teachers, who are largely not governed by national MoE policy but rather by a patchwork of opaque policies at the regional level. Similarly, those who work in NGO programming are likely not MoE-sanctioned teachers, but rather trained facilitators. They often interact with refugee students in camps and non-formal programming. In addition to including these actors, where possible, we have noted that in these cases, the absence of centrally mandated policies is contextually notable rather than the presence of incoherent policies. As a result, refugees and who teaches them are not an explicit focus of teacher management policies.

Revisions to the RISE Methodology

A number of revisions were made to the methodology of the RISE Diagnostic in order to apply it to the Jordanian context:

1. Not forming an initial steering committee. In countries that both are relatively small and have a highly centralised education system, potential members of such a steering committee are also likely to be part of the pool of research participants (e.g., interviewees).

2. Adaptation of RISE Annexes in Excel into Word templates to be more practically useful for the pre-diagnosis analysis and/or engagement with stakeholders.

3. Engaging stakeholders through questions derived from the framework (rather than the framework itself).

4. Utilising focus groups in conjunction with interviews.

Some of these may be helpful and relevant to other countries considering using the RISE Diagnostic in their country context, while other revisions may not apply.

Recommendations and conclusions for use in conflict and protracted crisis contexts

- **Limited accessibility and interpretation challenges of MoE policies.** The ERICC team recommends the country policies be sourced primarily by in-country teams, who will be more familiar with whether certain policies are written down, where they are housed, and how to interpret the documents. The ERICC team also cautions that the desk review may ultimately provide less information than is hoped under the circumstances, and that more emphasis should be placed on interviews and focus groups in order to understand how the system functions.

- **The RISE tool likely requires additional piloting in order to operationalise best practices.** Given the tool's stage of development and the ERICC Consortium's intention to use it in new contexts (low-income and conflict/crisis affected), the team cautions that these applications should be viewed as pilots. This is not to say that valuable data will not result from the pilot research, only that future research teams should prepare to iterate both the framework itself and likely the methodologies as they learn more about how to best implement them.

- **System-wide diagnostic has tension between inclusivity of minorities and overall influence within the system.** A system diagnostic is, by its nature, investigative of the functioning of the inter-related components of a topic or theme. This purpose requires capturing many components, perspectives, and actors in order to understand the system as a whole. However, time and resources are limited in any project, which restricts the number of people that can be interviewed, the types of actors accessed, and the perspectives brought to bear on a topic. As such, the team prioritised those who are most prominent, which necessarily omits actors who are important – particularly within a project such as ERICC, which focuses on marginalised populations – but minoritised. With a project such as ERICC that aims to impact policy and practice at scale while also focusing on marginalised populations such as refugees and internally displaced persons and operating with a limited time and budget, researchers must think carefully about the tension between the system they are looking to diagnose and how they define influence and importance within that system.

I. INTRODUCTION

This report details the RISE Diagnostic study undertaken in Jordan by a collaborative team of researchers from September 2022 to September 2023 as part of a wider research programme known as the Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crisis Contexts (ERICC). Funded by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), ERICC is a multi-country research consortium led by the International Rescue Committee (IRC) and University College London (UCL) that aims to conduct rigorous research on what works, for whom, when, and at what cost in all ERICC focal contexts in order to present specific recommendations to positively impact education policy and practice. Countries in focus include Bangladesh (Cox's Bazar), Jordan, Lebanon, Myanmar, Nigeria, South Sudan, and Syria.

The ERICC Consortium selected Jordan as a context in which to conduct the RISE Diagnostic. As a country that has absorbed some 1.3 million Syrian refugees since 2011, Jordan represents a country facing a protracted crisis with a national education system that is stretched to its limits due to its efforts to ensure educational access for Syrians. As the RISE Framework was not originally developed to be applied in contexts of crisis or conflict, the ERICC Consortium set out to test the framework's applicability within Jordan while also learning more about its system needs and priorities to inform future research. In addition, through conducting the RISE Diagnostic, the ERICC Consortium also aimed to identify key misalignments in the education system, ultimately in the area of teacher management, and highlight possible policy solutions that may address such misalignments and improve student learning.

A. Overview of RISE

A1. What is RISE?

Research on Improving Systems of Education (RISE) was a multi-country research endeavour running from 2015-2023, conducting research to better understand how countries can address and overcome the global learning crisis. The programme comprised seven Country Research Teams (Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tanzania, and Vietnam) and two Political Economy Teams, bringing together researchers from a range of universities and policy institutions. RISE was funded by FCDO, the Australian Government's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) as well as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.[1]

A2. What is the RISE Systems Framework?

The RISE research agenda is based on applying a systems approach to education research, postulating that many education systems do not produce better learning outcomes due to a lack of coherence and alignment within and between components of the system itself.[2] The framework was initially introduced by Research Director Lant Pritchett in 2015, and developed further by RISE researchers over the next few years (Pritchett, 2015; Silberstein and Spivack, 2023). The main goals of the diagnostic are to:

- **Diagnose**

  Facilitate the use of systems thinking to diagnose the components of the education system that are not working together as well as they could be to deliver learning.
- **Prioritise**: Facilitate high-level prioritisation of one or two key areas of the system for reform in order to create better alignment around improving learning outcomes.

[1] For more information about RISE, see https://riseprogramme.org/about-rise.
[2] See https://riseprogramme.org/systems-thinking.

- **Build consensus**: Foster a common understanding across stakeholders of both the diagnosis and the priorities.

The RISE Framework proposes that education systems consist of **four key relationships of accountability** between different principals and agents (Silberstein and Spivack, 2023):

1. **Politics**: Relationship between citizens and the highest authorities of the state.
2. **Compact**: Relationship between the highest authorities of the state and education authorities (including the Ministry of Education).
3. **Management**: Relationship between the education authorities and frontline providers of education (i.e., schools, principals, teachers).
4. **Voice and Choice:** Relationship between service recipients (i.e., parents, children, communities) and frontline providers of education (i.e., schools, principals, teachers).

In turn, each of these relationships has five components, or **design elements**, that help describe and define it in more detail (ibid., p. 8):

- **Delegation:** What does the principal want the agent to do? What are the principal's objectives for the agent?
- **Finance:** What resources (including financing) does the principal provide to the agent to meet the objectives?
- **Information:** What information does the principal use to measure how well the agent has met these objectives?
- **Support:** How does the principal support the agent to meet the objectives?
- **Motivation:** In which ways does the principal support the agent's extrinsic and intrinsic motivation to achieve the objective?

Combining these accountability relationships and design elements creates a 5x4 matrix, which serves as the analytic framework to identify system (in-)coherences within or between the design elements and relationships. Though it must be noted that Compact only includes three design elements; it includes delegation, finance, and information but does not include the design elements motivation and support (unlike Management, which includes all five elements). Similarly, Voice and Choice only contains the design elements - leaving out the element of support.

The RISE Diagnostic is embedded in the RISE Systems Framework and uses the 5x4 matrix to identify misalignments in the system and highlight points for policy intervention to improve system coherence. The RISE Diagnostic highlights two important types of misalignment that can emerge during system analysis. The first is when elements of the system are aligned with each other, but towards a goal other than learning. The second is when elements of the system are misaligned with each other. These misalignments can occur within one accountability relationship (for instance, in the **Compact** relationship, delegation and finance could be misaligned) or across different accountability relationships (for instance, what is delegated to frontline providers via the **Management** relationship might be at odds with what is delegated to them via the **Voice and Choice** relationship).

The ultimate goal is to better align education systems for learning. However, the RISE Diagnostic differentiates between six common alignments: (1) coherent for learning; (2) aligned for access and attainment; (3) aligned for selection; (4) aligned for socialisation; (5) aligned for process compliance;

and (6) aligned for other purposes such as patronage. Note that most education systems pursue more than one objective at the same time.

A3. Recommended Implementation of the RISE Diagnostic

To carry out the RISE Diagnostic, Spivack et al. (2023) developed a toolkit in which the following phases of research are described: (1) inception, (2) desk review, (3) stakeholder workshops and interviews, (4) analysis, (5) prioritisation workshop, and (6) final report. The Diagnostic aims to shed light on three key areas:

1. **The main alignment(s)** of each accountability relationship between different actors in the education system.
2. **Key misalignments** within the education system.
3. **Priorities for intervention** to improve system outcomes.

While striving to meet the overarching goals of the RISE Diagnostic, the team conducting the RISE study in Jordan modified these suggested phases and activities to better fit the context and make effective use of the limited time and resources available. A discussion of these changes is included in the Methodology section.

A4. The ERICC Diagnostic Team for Jordan

The Diagnostic team for the present study included an international team as well as local research teams, initially comprising researchers from the Queen Rania Foundation (QRF), a non-profit education research organisation based in Amman that often collaborates with the Ministry of Education (MoE) in Jordan on studies, and academic researchers at Global TIES for Children at NYU (NYU-TIES). After the pre-diagnostic and data collection, the data analysis and final reports were carried out by the QRF team with support from an IRC consultant and expert in the RISE Framework.

While the developers of the RISE Framework recommend that a steering committee comprising stakeholders from government and other parts of the education system be formed to advise research teams, this was not implemented for the RISE Diagnostic in Jordan due to the human resource limitations of the Ministry of Education. However, government stakeholders were consulted and involved in the pre-diagnostic stage of the RISE Diagnostic and continued to advise the QRF on the ERICC, of which the RISE Diagnostic was a part. Other key stakeholders of the system were included in the RISE Diagnostic through the collection of their perspectives and insights in interviews and focus groups. While the process was not as participatory throughout the diagnostic as envisioned by the developers of the RISE Framework, the ERICC team strove to collect and include ample stakeholder perspectives into the final analysis and recommendations.

B. RISE topic selection in Jordan

B1. Preliminary desk review

The main objective of the desk review was to use secondary sources to understand the existing policy landscape within Jordan. Within this investigation, special attention was paid to areas of incoherence within or between documents as possible topics/themes for further exploration. The following represents important documents that were reviewed rather than an exhaustive list.

The ERICC team began with the documents they understood as guiding the direction and aspiration of national education policy, including:

(1) The Ministry of Education's Education Strategic Plan (ESP) (2018-2022) (extended to 2025)

(2) The Ministry of Education's Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the Education Strategic Plan (2022)

(3) Education for Prosperity: A national strategy for Human Resource Development (2016-25)

Beyond these guiding documents, the team reviewed the Ministry's publicly available documents that guide current policy, including:

(1) Nationwide Assessment in Public Schools

(2) Education Law of 1994

(3) Curriculum Framework, 2020

The team also reviewed grey literature that provided important perspectives on the functioning of the system, including:

(1) Jordan Education Political Economy Analysis (DAI Global UK, 2022)

(2) Budget Brief, Public Education Sector (UNICEF, 2019)

(3) Education Reform Support Program-for-Results (The World Bank, 2017)

(4) Teacher Management in Refugee Settings, Jordan (UNESCO, 2022)

B2. Preliminary analysis: the pre-diagnostic

After the review of documents in the desk research, the ERICC team conducted a preliminary analysis of the education system with the RISE Framework, following the methodology set forth in Spivack et al. (2023). The purpose of the preliminary analysis was to help the team identify areas of consensus and areas of uncertainty where additional information was going to be needed. To do so, the team utilised the analysis annexes provided by RISE. Upon reviewing Annex 4 (Compact), Annex 5 (Management), and Annex 6 (Voice and Choice), the QRF and NYU-TIES jointly decided to focus primarily on Annex 5 (Management) and Annex 4 (Compact), as these had elements and sub-elements that were most directly related to the Jordanian context. It was decided that most of the elements in Annex 6 (Voice and Choice) could not be applied to Jordan as there is very limited participation or empowerment of families and communities in the school system. This is mostly due to the centralised and top-down nature of the education system and government system in general.

At this point, both the QRF and NYU-TIES team members found it challenging to answer the questions for each sub-element without a focus on a particular topic. The answers to the Annexes could easily vary depending on what aspect of the education system one was looking at. For this reason, it was jointly decided to select two topics for the pre-diagnostic assessment: (1) teacher management and (2) boys' schools (due to the persistent gender achievement gap). These were selected based on their presence as two of the seven key themes identified in the country scan deliverables and confirmed as important areas for research by national stakeholders in the first National Workshop (held on 9 August 2022).

Thus, with a focus on these two topics, the ERICC team continued with the pre-diagnostic analysis using only Annex 4 (Compact) and Annex 5 (Management). The coding exercise entailed answering the guiding questions under columns I through M and selecting the most appropriate column from descriptors for each sub-element (e.g., "coherent for learning", "aligned for selection", "aligned for process compliance, or “aligned for patronage/interest groups”) within each element of delegation, finance, information, motivation, and support. Each member of the NYU-TIES team coded the annexes individually, and the QRF team members discussed and filled them in jointly. The teams at QRF and NYU-TIES then compared results, noting where there were disagreements, forming hypotheses about notable incoherences, and identifying areas where additional information would be needed.

The ERICC team noted that the desk review was challenging to conduct for certain aspects of the system. For example, there was little publicly available information regarding budgets and financing. Furthermore, while there were/are many reforms underway, it was challenging to understand what the status of these reforms was, particularly as many of them were interrupted due to the Covid-19 pandemic. These were noted for follow-up with MoE officials. During this process, Annex 4 (Compact) and Annex 5 (Management) were adapted into Word document templates, to provide an easier-to-use tool to complete the pre-diagnostic (which the QRF team used in their analysis).

Once this pre-diagnostic analysis was completed and collaboratively discussed between the QRF and NYU-TIES teams, the QRF team advised from past experience that such a complex and theoretical exercise would be too time-consuming and challenging for MoE officials and other stakeholders to engage with. Instead, the QRF and NYU-TIES teams moved forward by developing key questions across the two topics that arose during the pre-diagnostic assessment, upon which a workshop was organised with key officials from the MoE.

B3. Workshop with Ministry of Education officials

Two workshop sessions (one in the morning and one in the afternoon) were held on 3 October 2022, with a total of 16 middle- and senior-level MoE employees from different departments within the Ministry. The purpose of the workshop was to further investigate and probe deeper on certain issues, questions, and enquiries within the two identified priority areas of the framework (teacher management and boys’ schools).

Prior to the sessions, the ERICC team agreed that the framework as it stands may not be easy to operationalise, understand, or discuss with practitioners. It was therefore modified and simplified in order to deliver the idea and concept easily. This was done by trying to guide the workshop through a list of guiding questions to structure the discussion.

Each session included eight MoE officials and lasted for approximately two hours. The open dialogue format allowed for more insights to be revealed from the multiple attendees along with the ERICC team from NYU-TIES and the QRF. The interactive nature of the session also helped generate additional questions that MoE department officials asked in response to colleagues.

B4. Presentation of selected list of topics to Research Directorate leadership

Following the workshop with MoE officials, the ERICC team reviewed focus workshop notes and carried out a debrief of the topics explored in the workshop. The team noted that select ministry officials were particularly interested in principals’ time use, in particular how they use their time, demands on their time, and how this affects the operation of the school. The team noted that this was not a topic that had emerged during the desk review and one would be worthy of further consideration. It was also highlighted that officials had noted several times that informal programming was available to students who were not attending formal schools. The team again noted that this was quite relevant to the themes within the ERICC Consortium and would require additional investigation. The team also noted that Ministry officials did not seem particularly interested in the topic of boys' education. They stated that there had been prior research into one possible intervention for improving boys' schools but beyond that, there is no specific focus on, or policies or interventions that currently address, boys' chronic underachievement.

Following these debriefs, the ERICC team decided on three topics for advancement: (1) teacher management, (2) principals' time use, and (3) informal education for out-of-school students. Following discussion, the NYU-TIES members drafted memos to the ERICC's internal Research Directorate Leadership (RDL) providing (1) a summary of the topic, (2) the connection to drivers of learning, (3) the connection to conflict/crisis context, and (4) the pros and cons of topic selection.

Feedback from the RDL indicated that teacher management was the most relevant and potentially fruitful topic. While non-formal schooling/out-of-school children were incredibly relevant to ERICC themes, this represents a small portion of the population of students, most of whom are above the ERICC target age of primary and early secondary. Principals' time use was less directly related to drivers of learning than teachers, and the policy incoherence(s) not as evident.

C. Data collection for RISE Diagnostic Analysis

C1. Data collection approach and considerations

To best capture the data needed to apply the RISE Diagnostic Framework to the area of teacher management, the ERICC team (NYU-TIES and QRF) decided it was necessary to forgo a large number of interviews in favour of a mix of interviews with key informants and focus groups with key groups from the field. Focus groups in particular were seen as a better approach to gain insights from the field, as participants could interact and comment on each other's answers.

This mix of interviews and focus groups was also felt to be a more efficient use of time. The timeline for data collection was tighter than originally planned due to unanticipated events at the beginning of the inception period that delayed the start of work of the RISE component. The process of using and adapting the framework to the Jordanian context and narrowing down the topic to apply the framework also took longer than anticipated, as this was not as straight-forward as imagined. Once the topic focus (teacher management) was chosen in late October, data collection was planned and promptly commenced in November 2022. The NYU-TIES and QRF teams collaboratively developed the interview and focus group protocols prior to data collection (see Appendix A for a complete list of the dates of all interviews and focus groups conducted and with whom).

C2. Key informant interviews

Interviews were conducted with two types of key informants: (1) government officials; and (2) relevant NGOs/international organisations working in teacher management areas, particularly those dealing with issues of evaluation and teachers in refugee settings due to a number of inconsistencies in these areas.

For the first group, a total of five central MoE department personnel were interviewed and two personnel from the (regional-level) field directorates were interviewed. Although five field directorates were approached and agreed to an interview, only two ultimately granted the QRF team an interview. One additional government department – the Civil Service Bureau, a separate government agency independent from the MoE but which hires teachers and other civil servants – was contacted multiple times but did not grant an interview.

In addition to government personnel, four organisations were targeted for interview: (1) RTI International, which delivered the USAID Early Grade Reading and Mathematics Program (RAMP); (2) a local teacher training provider, (3) the World Bank, which has a keen interest in teachers and is an influential actor in the education sector; and (4) the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), which manages official Syrian and other registered refugees in Jordan. The QRF team were able to conduct interviews with representatives from the first two organisations (RTI and a teacher training organisation). A representative from the World Bank was approached for interview but was not able to participate in one at the time of data collection. Finally, UNHCR was helpful in its response to an interview request but indicated that it did not have any involvement in the area of teacher management within the camps or host community schools that serve Syrian refugees.

C3. Focus groups

In November 2022, the QRF team carried out eight focus groups with personnel from the field who work in schools. These included (1) full-time MoE teachers who typically work in first shift schools mainly serving Jordanians, and (2) "daily paid" or temporary contract teachers who have been hired by the field directorates and primarily work in second shift schools that serve Syrian refugees. Each focus group contained a mix of both men and women as well as teachers representing different areas of the country. In addition, there were separate focus groups for (3) principals of either first or second shift schools, and (4) supervisors who are based in field directorates and visit teachers for purposes of support and evaluation. Two focus groups were run for each of these four groups.

II. FINDINGS OF THE RISE DIAGNOSTIC IN JORDAN

The findings from the RISE Diagnostic are presented here in three sections. The first two sections present an overview of each relationship of accountability (Management and Compact) and the alignments of its design elements as assessed through primary data. The third section presents an overview of the process, discusses the outcomes of identifying Jordans' misalignments, and outlines recommendations for addressing these misalignments.

A. The management accountability relationship

Within the RISE Framework, "Management" refers to the relationship between education authorities and organisations as the principal (MoE and subordinate agencies) and the frontline (principals, teachers) as the agent. Note that the Management relationship is complex due to the fact that there are several organisations and agencies comprising the principal (i.e., delegating their goals) in a multi-layered governance system. Management, like all other accountability relationships in the RISE Framework, consists of five design elements: *delegation, finance, information, motivation, and support* (see Table 1).

Table 1. Management accountability relationship design elements and sub-elements

Management *Relationships between education authorities and organizations (principal) and frontline providers of education such as teachers and school leaders (agent)*[3]		
Design elements	**Definition**	**Sub-elements (within the relationship)**
Delegation	The goals the principal wants the agent to achieve	1. High-level targets 2. Alignment of curriculum, exams & learning 3. Most important responsibilities 4. Local discretion granted to schools/teachers (spider versus starfish)
Finance	The resources the principal has allocated to the agent to achieve their delegated objectives	5. Teachers: How are teachers financed? 6. Inputs: How are inputs financed? 7. Accountability: What is counted & considered? 8. Fund allocation: How are funds allocated? (spider versus starfish)
Information	How the principal assesses the agent's performance in their delegated objectives	9. EMIS 10. Purpose of exams 11. Exam design 12. Accountability for teachers & principals 13. Information use
Motivation	How the principal motivates the agent, including the ways in which the agent's welfare is contingent on their performance against objectives	14. Intrinsic: Teacher professional status 15. Extrinsic: Career advancement, job security

[3] Agencies here can include local education authorities, service delivery partners, and other organisations the MoE works with to carry out its delegated tasks.

Support	The preparation and assistance that the principal provides to the agent to achieve the delegated objectives	16. Internal coherence: Instructional materials 17. External coherence: Training links with other design elements 18. Form of instructional materials and support (spider versus starfish) 19. Accountability for delivery of teacher training

In total, under the Management accountability relationship, there are 19 sub-elements to examine to support analysis. The goals of analysing the design elements and sub-elements are (1) to uncover incoherences between design elements; and (2) to identify the goal(s) around which there exists alignment in the system. Out of the six possible types of alignments, five are relevant for the Management relationship[4] (see Table 2). Most education systems pursue more than one objective at the same time.

Table 2. The five categories of alignment in management[5]

Alignment Category	Description
1. Coherent for learning	Relationship is aligned around all children learning. Clear goals for learning are articulated, financed, and supported.
2. Aligned for selection	These "filtration" systems select the lucky minority of children who will graduate and win a place at university or in the labour market. They prioritise exam scores and signalling.
3. Aligned for access	These systems focus on expansion (getting all children in school). While these systems may talk about "quality", it is usually not defined in relationship to learning outcomes and is instead connected to a laundry list of "thin" inputs (i.e., things measured by EMIS).
4. Aligned for process compliance	Relationship is dominated by a focus on completing logistical tasks such as keeping to scheduled activities and meeting reporting targets. While these may have originally served a purpose, they are now bureaucratic compliance for the sake of compliance. The technical core and purpose are weak or lost altogether, and instead the relationship is dominated by support functions (e.g., human resources, IT, or procurement).

[4] See description under 2.b. "Aligned for selection" is not relevant for the analysis of the Management relationship.
[5] Table adapted from Planning and Analysis Tools [.xlsm] available from the RISE Education Systems Diagnostic Platform (https://riseprogramme.org/tools/rise-education-systems-diagnostic).

5. Aligned for another purpose: Patronage or interest groups	Relationships are aligned for a purpose other than education. Short-term clientelist objectives may be dominant or relationships may be dominated by special interest groups. In patronage systems, politicians and those in power use the system as a patronage mill (i.e., to hire teachers or to build schools for certain constituencies). In special interest systems, ensuring that the special interests' needs are met is paramount. This system pretends to be another type on paper, but de facto does not deliver schooling or learning for all.

A1. Delegation

The element of delegation across RISE's accountability relationships refers to the goals the principal – in this case, the MoE and other (subordinate) education authorities – gives to an agent to accomplish the principal's objectives. This has been described as the relationship between a system's "technical core", which embodies and drives the system's purpose, and the "support functions" needed to achieve that purpose. For example, in Jordan, the MoE represents the technical core where policy goals, rules, and allocations are decided, while regional offices and schools represent the support functions through which delegated tasks are executed. The purpose of the technical core can be defined as "the strongly held set of beliefs by those within the organization or system about why the organization or system exists and what it is supposed to achieve" (Kaffenberger, 2022). While this purpose, including its goals, can be explicitly stated in policy documents or other formal pronouncements, often the system's or organisation's true purpose is implicit and can differ significantly from or even contradict the stated purpose.

Meanwhile, the support functions "create and maintain the infrastructure and operating conditions that enable the technical core to carry out activities" including roles such as human resources, procurement, legal support, accounting, and IT (ibid., pp. 5-6). The support functions have the "technical skills and know-how necessary for achieving the purpose" and "can reveal the true purpose the organization is working towards" (ibid.). The true purpose of the technical core is often visible in the hiring and retention of agents, which "will align more with the implicit purpose than the stated/nominal purpose when these two differ" (ibid.). Within the RISE Framework, the stated aims from the core – or what is officially written on paper or in legislation – is referred to as "de jure", while the practices that happen in reality are referred to as "de facto". The difference between de jure and de facto requires close attention and understanding of the delegation sub-elements.

Within Management's delegation design element are three sub-elements: (1) **High-level targets**: What are the priorities for the education system as articulated by education authorities? What would success look like for frontline workers (in schools)? (2) **Alignment of curriculum, exams, and learning**: How do curriculum and exams align with each other and with student's learning levels? What priorities do education authorities set for the curriculum? (3) **Most important responsibilities**: What areas of the education authority hold the most valued or important functions within the organisation(s)? (4) **Spider versus starfish/local discretion granted to schools:** How does the centre relate to the frontline? Is there a "spider" system in which all decisions are taken at the centre, or a "starfish" system where the frontlines are able to move independently?

Through these sub-elements, the ERICC team worked to identify what exactly Jordan's education authorities prioritise. Again, understanding the system core's priorities, explicit and/or implicit, enables the identification of divergences between articulated, de jure goals and implemented, de facto goals found in the implementation processes of education authorities vis-à-vis the school level.

To understand the purpose and priorities within the education system's core in Jordan, the ERICC team drew on interview data from seven key stakeholders working within the central level, or core, of the system. This included four stakeholders from the following MoE departments: the Education Quality and Accountability Unit (EQAU), the Supervision and Training Directorate (STD), the Curricula Department, and the Queen Rania Center for Education and Information Technology (QRC). Two other stakeholders interviewed came from a non-governmental, non-profit organisation that has led in providing high-quality professional development for teachers and principals (hereafter referred to as "teacher training provider"), and one stakeholder was from RTI International, the international non-profit organisation that implemented RAMP within Jordan to improve early grade reading and mathematics outcomes between 2015 and 2020.

The MoE has declared its priorities and vision for the education system through the Education Strategic Plan (2018-2022),[6] developed and released in 2018 (Ministry of Education, 2018). Within it, the MoE states its mission as the following:

> *"Provide equal opportunities for a high-quality education that provides learners with scientific, creative and critical thinking. Teamwork, life-long education, provide values and skills to become active citizens, belonging to their homeland and contributing to the world with humanity and prestige."*

The Education Strategic Plan (ESP) goes on to set out its goals within six domains, four of which relate to primary and secondary education ("Access and Equity", "System Strengthening", "Quality", and "Human Resources").[7] Each of these domains is linked to particular areas of reform as specified by themes of the National Strategy for Human Resource Development (HRD) and strategic goals are set for each domain (see Table 3). It is worth noting here that Jordan's ESP contains a comprehensive list of education issues that prioritises nearly everything, which is typical of government sector plans, particularly when donors are involved. For the RISE Diagnostic, the crux lies in how the MoE communicates (and implements) reform priorities beyond this comprehensive list, which requires researchers to assess which policies and practices are de jure (i.e., what is officially written on paper or officially legislated) versus de facto (i.e., what actually happens in practice).

---

[6] Note that in 2022, the MoE published a Mid-Term Review of the Education Strategic Plan in which it tracked its progress on the goals, indicators, and targets set out in the plan; the stated mission and articulated goals of the original plan were not altered. However, in light of the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, the Education Strategic Plan was updated to extend from 2018 to 2025 (instead of 2022).
[7] Note that the other two domains are Early Childhood Education and Development and Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET), neither of which fall under the scope of the RISE Diagnostic for Jordan. The ERICC team only focused on the education system providing primary and secondary education.

Table 3. How the MoE's Education Strategic Plan corresponds to the National Strategy for Human Resource Development[8]

ESP domains and stated goal	Sub-domains and linked HRD themes
Access and equity "To ensure access and equality for both male and female sexes by absorbing all age groups in education for all residents in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan" (Ministry of Education, 2018, p. 30)	Infrastructure
	Non-formal education
	Special needs education (including inclusive education)
	Refugee education
System strengthening "To promote the educational system for innovation and excellence based on effective educational policies, based on achieving the priorities of the Jordanian education sector" (ibid., p. 39)	Decentralisation (included in the wider focus on as institutional performance management)
	Education Management Information System (EMIS)/management of information systems
	Legislation, policy (namely, risk and crisis management)
Quality "To improve the quality of education for the preparation of good and productive citizens who are loyal (feeling of belonging) to their country" (p. 50)	School feeding
	Community participation
	Curriculum and assessment
	ICT
	School leadership
	Accountability
	Safety

[8] National Committee for Human Resource Development. (2015). Education for Prosperity: Delivering Results: A National Strategy for Human Resources Development (2016-2025). https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/176e64_5ad5680491ba47deb1579b450950ac46.pdf

Human resources "To provide, develop and sustain qualified human resources for the educational system" (p. 65)	Develop comprehensive programme for current teachers
	Set up special law for licensing and professional practice for school leadership post
	Amend teacher classification, evaluation, and promotion law

Looking across the domains, their stated objectives, and related indicators and targets, the ESP seems to be focused on the development of the system, its processes, capacities, and provision as measured by inputs and outputs. The focus of the **access and equity** domain is squarely on the need to expand infrastructure quantity and quality to ease overcrowding and extend access to more vulnerable groups including refugees and children with disabilities. This is seen as an essential factor in improving the quality of education as the ESP highlights that the strain on space and resources has compromised school quality. **System strengthening** is primarily focused on improving information management systems through capacity building and promoting better institutional performance (including moves towards decentralisation), though the targets for both are vague, based on box-ticking and counting actions accomplished. For example, one activity for "Raising the level of institutional performance of the MoE" was "implant a culture of excellence and innovation at all occupational levels", with the indicator and target being to raise the number of employees given appreciation awards (Ministry of Education, 2018, p. 43). This, unfortunately, does not help measure improvement in institutional performance and represents a "thin" measure of accountability. Similarly, targets regarding improving EMIS also only measure its "readiness" and the extent of delivery of EMIS training for personnel, without stating how or for what purpose the data should be used or targets for its quality or relevance. Relatedly, in regard to the Quality domain, neither the MoE's stated goal nor its sub-components are tied to increasing student learning and achievement. It is laudable that the ESP shows a high self-awareness of its system weaknesses and challenges, noting in the Quality domain points such as:

- *"The actual assessment of performance is shallow and does not comprehensively measure the performance, skills and knowledge of students" (p.50)*
- *"Poor school leadership in many schools" (p. 57)*
- *"Decisions are focused on the development of infrastructure and routine procedures at the expense of upgrading and development of leadership and educational competencies for both sexes" (p. 57)*
- *"Community customs and traditions, including tribalism and nepotism sometimes impact the effectiveness of educational leadership" (p. 57)*

Even earlier, in its introductory chapter providing a "situational analysis" of Jordan's national and educational context, the ESP states: "The repetition rate for males is also significantly higher than that of females, starting from grade 7, perhaps pointing towards the poor quality of education provision in male schools from this grade onwards" (p. 10). Thus, officials are aware that one of the primary reasons for students dropping out of school is the low quality of teaching, which works directly against its central goal of increasing access for all.

Yet, despite such acknowledgements of critical obstacles to recalibrating the system to support and raise student learning, the activities, indicators, and targets are more aligned again for system expansion and development, with measures of progress relatively "thin" and tied to the development of frameworks, the conduct of studies, and the number of workshops, certifications and other inputs recorded. Thus, while the low quality of teaching and, hence, poor student performance is one factor leading to the dropout of students, the technical core of the system appears to be more aligned for providing access and process compliance in both its high-level targets and stubbornly centralised structure.

One of the ways in which the MoE has attempted to increase the accountability and quality of the system prior to the ESP was to create the Education Quality and Accountability Unit (EQAU). This unit was tasked with developing school inspection criteria for teaching quality and adherence to the national curriculum and its guidance (DAI, 2022). When interviewed, the EQAU stakeholder seemed to highlight the unit's dual focus on access and compliance, ensuring inputs are in place to allow teachers to teach and for processes to be followed.

> *"[The EQAU evaluates] the teaching and learning… We send out the comments, and they [schools] get the point, for example, that there are no supervisory visits being made, or there is no follow up from the competent supervisor. They are the **ones who follow up, because they are the ones to be blamed** for the shortcomings."*
>
> *"The Unit's main goal is to improve and advance the quality of educational/learning process for the students at the schools. Certainly, we follow up on all aspects that serve the interest of students. Is it possible to seek to improve the educational process when we have a **dilapidated classroom**? How can I teach without providing the schools with **heating**? How can I teach without ensuring the **security** of the students? How can I teach without **establishing partnerships** with the local community or without maintaining a relationship with the parents to support the students' learning and to follow up on them?"*
>
> *"This is the purpose; it is to improve things."*

All three quotes, but particularly the last one, seem to sum up the approach to quality – despite all the standards and emphasis on assessing "teaching and learning", the overall goal seems one of simply finding problems and correcting them, with little consideration of the "why" or "how". Essentially, the goal is to follow a procedure that documents that the EQAU found problems and demanded that they be corrected. There is limited awareness of how the inspection procedure relate back to the overall goals of teaching and learning. In addition, there is little consideration of the community context, the lack of materials or supervisory support, or other factors limiting the ability of schools to reach set standards. Instead, problems/shortcomings are simply found and improvements mandated by the EQAU. This appears to align the system most with process compliance in the absence of more complex/thought-out measures of actual teacher effectiveness, students' needs, and learning outcomes. This point was further highlighted in the focus groups with permanent MoE teachers, one of whom explained:

> *"Once when [EQAU assessors] visited our school, they inspected the attendance book. We sometimes write in pencil just in case the student is late, and we can erase it. She commented on that point and why we used a pencil and not a pen. That is a negative point against us. But since some students arrive late, so why should I have her listed as absent when she was not in the first place?" (Permanent teacher, Focus group 2)*

The teacher continued on this point, stating that the assessor also docked the principal a point for not giving a teacher a “thank you letter” for something positive she did and not posting it on the School’s Facebook site, the primary portal through which many schools communicate with parents and other community members. These instances highlight the micro-level, input-based, and process compliance-focused nature of school inspections – a theme also identified in DAI’s 2022 political economy analysis report, which stated “the quality of these inspections is inconsistent, and the inspection criteria focus more on infrastructure issues than teaching quality and adherence to the curriculum. Inspections are rarely followed up on.” (DAI, 2022, p. 33).

The lack of follow-up directly contradicts what the EQAU representative detailed, which was a process through which school inspection reports are *“shared automatically to the directorate, [who] works together with the school on the procedural plan, and the school sends us the hard copy.” The interviewee continued, “[w]e have committees and everything is documented. The Operations committee prepares the schedule/program; the Tracking committee follows up on the reports.”* It is possible that this extensive process is followed; however, the resources of the EQAU are not yet sufficient to ensure adequate follow-up. The EQAU representative highlighted that the unit has 140 assessors that are centrally located with staff deployed each day to various regions, but not all regions are covered as there is a shortage of assessors.

Despite this limitation in human resources, the EQAU’s perspective on the quality of teaching and learning is particularly important as it appears to wield considerable power within the centralised education system. According to the EQAU interviewee, the unit is semi-autonomous, answering directly to the Education Minister, and its school inspection reports are published on the MoE’s website. In addition, the unit seems to wield one of the few disciplinary actions available to the MoE:

> *“I send comments and notes to the Directors of Education to carry out the necessary correction measures. The comments are not easy; they are very accurate and critical. I send the comments directly to the Minister, and the Minister forwards them to the Secretary Generals[9] or to the concerned administrations for action. A month ago, we transferred 11 teachers from one school because they were disrupting the school through strikes and instigations, etc. Now, they are frightened, concerned that the EQAU would dismiss them. It's good that they have awareness now.” (EQAU interviewee)*

Perhaps due to this power and position in the system hierarchy, the EQAU representative noted the unit had *“also become a big attraction for job seekers; everybody wants to work as an assessor; it's amazing, they tell us that nobody's work compares to the assessors' follow up practices and seriousness.”*

Finally, it is important to note the EQAU seems to resist decentralisation of its work, with the EQAU interviewee stating:

> *“As for the types of visits, I am in favour of central visits. There has been a proposal to set up offices in the regions, but frankly, the evaluators did not welcome the idea of having any superior other than the Head of the Unit. They said: "we are the evaluators, we work under the Head of the Unit, and this is how we would like things to be." They didn't think it was appropriate for one of them to become their chief evaluator/ superior.”*

[9] There are two Secretary Generals, the highest-level civil servants in the Ministry of Education.

Thus, despite the MoE's stated goals of greater decentralisation and the promotion of more school-based autonomy and local accountability, the EQAU appears to be against this idea, preferring to retain its centralised position within the hierarchical system. In terms of the delegation element of the RISE Framework, this comment further highlights the system's spider-like centralisation of power, knowledge, and decision-making. This comparison is made by the RISE Framework because the system resembles "a spider [that] uses its web to expand its reach, but all information created by the vibrations of the web must be processed, decisions made, and actions taken by one spider brain at the center of the web" (Pritchett, 2013). The spider serves as a contrast to a starfish, which is a radically decentralised organism with no central brain but an adaptive nervous system. Spider-like systems grant little autonomy or discretion to schools and teachers. In addition, in the RISE Framework literature, a "spider" system is a large organisation that is funded by the government to deliver basic education and operates in typical Weberian bureaucratic fashion. For a spider organisation, school-level accountability is basically for "enrollments and the operation of 'schooling' without reference to learning outcomes that have any traction. … These 'spider' systems have, for the most part, been fantastically successful at their purpose of expanding schooling" (Pritchett, 2015).

This description brings together the dual priorities of a spider system, which are the expansion of access – a key stated goal by the ESP – and process compliance of teachers and principals that ensures power and decisions are kept at the central level.

The Supervision and Training Directorate (STD) has a critical role in carrying out the MoE's stated mission, as this unit is responsible for overseeing the upskilling, professional development, and supervisory support of all teachers through subject specialised supervisors. In addition, the unit manages general supervisors who provide similar support on a whole-school basis, including coaching and assistance to principals. In addition, the STD designs, approves, and coordinates in-service training given by the supervisors, often working alongside donors who want to fund, create, and deliver particular training. The unit has supervision departments in each of the 42 field directorates that work under the umbrella of the Central Supervision Directorate at the MoE. The work of the supervisors is still grounded in centralised policies, however, with supervision conducted according to a standardised template called the "classroom observation tool", which consists of 25 indicators and is used by the supervisor during classroom observations. According to the STD representative interviewed, the tool:

> *"does not contain negative comments and does not mention 'weaknesses'; rather, it makes reference to what is positive and identifies 'opportunities for further improvement'… This exercise allows the supervisor to form a view of the teacher in the classroom. This tool helps the supervisor identify a teacher's need; if he notices that the teacher requires training in teaching skills, he would determine the next actions that are needed to enhance the teacher's skills in that area."*

The STD works regularly with the Curricula Directorate to ensure that teachers are trained and supported in delivering the curricula, especially those that have recently undergone reforms. While the National Center for Curriculum Development is a separate agency that develops the curricula for all subjects, the MoE Curricula Directorate is tasked with preparing all curriculum materials such as textbooks as well its frameworks and the guidebooks. In short, in terms of the Curricula Directorate's responsibilities, "*everything related to the curriculum is part of our role; the entire educational content*".[10] When asked about how aligned the curricula are with the exams the students take, the Curricula Directorate representative noted that this was a question for the Directorate of Exams but

[10] Interview with Curricula Directorate representative, 7 November 2022.

went on to explain that the Curricula Directorate was responsible for preparing "*a test or an evaluation which must reflect the students' comprehension of the subject*". This high level of specialisation and compartmentalisation of functions, housed within different units, suggests that the MoE is similar to a Weberian bureaucracy in that it is highly structured and formalised, with clear rules, regulations, and lines of authority which govern it. Within this type of organisation, process compliance and loyalty are rewarded, horizontal communication along with personal initiative and participatory decision-making is discouraged, and ineffectual rules or procedures are difficult to remove. This, again, highlights the spider-like nature of the system. In many ways, this type of organisation also defies alignment because each unit or agency focuses on its own internal logic rather than perceiving itself as parts of a bigger system that needs to work together in the service of students (and teachers).

Notably, when asked about whether teachers were restricted to a certain time frame for the completion of the curricula, the Curricula Directorate representative gave contradictory answers:

> *"Based on the new developed plan, we attempted to add instructions on the timeframe, and on the amount of material that the teacher must convey to the student in the best manner. Some of the books were reduced in size/volume, but not in quality, and we have introduced new strategies on the subjects / textbooks to enable the teacher to convey the material to the students fully and completely within the 2-3 months."*

Then, when asked a follow-up question about the flexibility of timing if the teacher felt that the students were slow in understanding the materials and in need of repetition, the interviewee answered:

> *"The teacher is the master of his classroom; he [sic] has autonomy in the field. Some teachers may deliver the subject in a short time and others may work differently. We do not pre-determine timeframes for the teacher. … What concerns us more is not the time but whether the student was able to receive and comprehend the subject or not."*

However, the interviewee from Curricula Directorate then added:

> *"[Within] our Exams Department, we are working on a program that seeks to ensure that the material is delivered fully to the student, irrespective of the time or duration needed, whether it takes one or two days; or one or two classes. Most important is for the material to be delivered and received."*

The question as to whether the delivery of the curriculum or student understanding of the curriculum content is a top priority is not novel as many school systems, schools, and teachers grapple with balancing the pacing, rigour, and breadth of subject curricula. Insights from the information element below seem to indicate there is little actual tracking of students' learning progress within the curriculum, and other data on student outcomes – including international assessment data – is rarely utilised by the system. This, along with the comments from teachers, principals, and supervisors that curriculum progression is tracked and a significant factor in all levels of evaluation, indicates that curriculum delivery is the central priority for the system. This, again, suggests that high-level goals, important responsibilities, and curriculum/exams are aligned for ensuring access and process compliance, rather than student learning or patronage. However, an "overambitious" curriculum that leaves many students behind can also be a strong indicator of a selection system, as such a system does not care about universal learning goals and accepts that the majority of students will be left behind for the benefit of a few select ones that advance academically and ultimately succeed.

While key MoE perspectives and practices have been examined, it is worth noting here that two centrally located voices stood out as more aligned for student learning. These were the two non-governmental organisations interviewed – a non-governmental teacher training provider and RTI – both which have had key roles in recent years in shaping the teachers within the school system.

The teacher training provider representatives described using student test data from national exams, data from international organisations such as UNICEF, annual needs assessment surveys collected from teachers and principals, and international research and trends to develop their training materials and the content of the training. This represents a more data-driven approach to designing training than that of the STD, which works more closely with curriculum officials to align their training. And while the teacher training provider does not have a formal role in the MoE's teacher evaluation systems – either in EQAU's inspections or in principal-led annual teacher appraisals – its representative spoke about the inability of the evaluation process to help teachers improve their practice for better student learning outcomes:

> *"[Those evaluating teachers need] to make a gap analysis and to know the current status for each teacher, where they are and where they have to move or to improve. [Then] monitor that the gap has decreased, then I know that their performance is improving. … I will assess what happens inside the classroom as this is the most important place in the school, the classroom. So how they teach, how they support students, and also the achievement of the students. The results of the students have to be a part of the teacher's assessment because if there is no proof of the student's achievement that means that there is something wrong happening with the teaching as it is a causes-and-effect relationship. Teaching affects learning. So, it is a whole and has to be in a holistic and comprehensive assessment evaluation system [we need]."* (Teacher training representative)

The quote highlights the teacher training provider's multidimensional view of teaching and learning rooted in context and individuals' needs and how to tailor and track support for teachers with the aim of increasing student achievement.

The teacher training provider's stated goals and criteria for the success of principals also represents a view that prioritises learning, in contrast to the MoE's prevailing treatment of principals as school managers. As one of the interviewees explained:

> *"It was a huge shift when we started with the instructional leadership and to move the compass inside the classes and to focus on the teaching and learning process. This was a huge shift for school leaders because they were focusing on the management, on managing the schools, but not on the instructional leadership. So, our vision now is focusing on instructional leadership because all the research illustrates the effect of the instructional leaders on improving students' performance. … We talk about communication skills, about time management. … We are now talking about transformational leadership, instructional leadership, and distributed leadership. So, there are many kinds of leadership but the most important thing will, in the end, be to help the students to be better students, the teachers to be better teachers … This is our vision in all the programs that we provide for the principals."* (Teacher training representative)

Like the teacher training provider, the aim of RTI International's recent work in Jordan implementing RAMP has been to improve the alignment of instruction – especially in terms of curriculum, teacher training, and students' learning levels – in order to improve learning outcomes, though its work has focused on the early grades. RAMP was implemented in Jordan and funded by USAID from 2015 to 2020. During the implementation phase, RTI worked closely with a range of stakeholders who had varying priorities (not all of them learning) and varying degrees of openness to the type of innovation that RAMP presented. It worked with different institutions such as the National Center for Curriculum Development (NCCD) and the EQAU to align the curriculum, instructional materials and teacher training and also worked with different levels of education authorities (MoE, districts, schools) to coordinate and facilitate implementation. Interestingly, RAMP seems to have had difficulty getting the EQAU to adopt some of the learning-oriented changes introduced by the programme, underscoring the evidence from the EQAU interview regarding the unit's missing alignment for learning and lack of cooperative approach with other stakeholders in the system.

> *"We worked at the MOE level with the Accountability Unit. We have trained the assessors on the indicators of RAMP programs, so when they go to the schools, they know what they should look for. We have a bit of a challenge with the Unit at the MOE… [they are] not very encouraged or not willing to add more indicators."* (RTI representative)

The interview with RTI also highlighted a need for a second alignment, namely, of donors and implementers.[11] There seems to be insufficient alignment between the programmes of different donors, creating a fragmented landscape and potentially competing priorities that cannot be harmonised, especially at school level.

> *"We need at the system level, to coordinate the actions and the programs of donors and implementers. So maybe RAMP will come up with one program, and GIZ with another program, or UNICEF, so forth. So this group of teachers would receive some training, and another group of teachers would receive something else, and maybe the two are not aligned. There's a real need for the activities and programs to be aligned, or coordinated, so they would not contradict one another [or overburden some groups such as the supervisors]. The supervisors are not only doing supervision tasks, but they are also doing other tasks outside the scope of their work by monitoring the teachers and supporting them [in implementing RAMP]."* (RTI representative)

Overall, an examination of the delegation element through the priorities (both explicit and some implicit) of the education system's technical core – the MoE and close partners – reveals an alignment primarily for access and process compliance. The high-level targets for teachers are most concerned with the numbers of teachers, their qualifications, and compliance with procedural metrics, including ensuring that the curriculum is delivered on pace. Enrollment and progression rates are the main goal along with rule compliance. Stakeholders, such as the EQAU for example, operate in a logic of process compliance. The EQAU described school visits as a logistical checklist and compliance exercise and placed emphasis on the control the unit has over agents at the school level. While MoE-supporting partners (e.g., the RTI RAMP initiative) aimed to link the ESP policy goal of quality to actual student learning, these efforts have had limited influence. Still, both stakeholders in the system emphasise the importance of quality teaching and learning, make a credible effort to support the improvement of

[11] Note that depending on the level at which donors operate within a country, it could count as "Compact" (e.g., working at the central government/ministries level) or "Management" (e.g., working with the district level, working with the MoE on implementation, working at the school level).

teaching and learning, and gather data relevant for learning (rather than "thin" descriptors and data on inputs). Finally, considerable evidence was found to support the description of the Management relationship as a spider rather than a starfish, meaning a relationship characterised by a centralisation of power and control at higher levels of education authorities, with little to no room for discretion, autonomy, adaptation or innovation at the school level. Ultimately, high-level targets prioritise maximising enrollment and progression of students through the levels of schooling. Prioritising this at all costs can lead many students to struggle academically and fail – a strong indicator of a system is aligned for selection.

A2. Finance

The element of finance refers to the resources the principal has allocated to the agent to achieve their delegated objectives. In the case of the Management relationship in Jordan, the finance element refers to how the MoE allocates its budget to frontline providers of education – namely, to field directorates and schools – to carry out educational activities. Finance has four sub-elements: (1) **Teachers**: How are teachers financed? (2) **Inputs:** How are inputs financed? (3) **Accountability**: What is counted and considered? (4) **Fund allocation:** How are funds allocated? (spider versus starfish). The ERICC team collected information about the finance element through documentary analysis, focus groups with principals and interviews with field directorates and relevant MoE departments, including the Financial Affairs Administration (FAA).

Within Jordan's public education sector, financial resources to implement the educational vision of the country are severely limited. According to a UNICEF brief on the MoE' budget, in 2017, 77% of the total education expenditures was spent on basic education (grades 1-10), 13.6% on secondary (grades 11-12), 3% on vocational education, and only 1% on "others", which includes KG2 provision along with special education, sports activities, and adult education. In total, approximately 89% of the MoE's total expenditure in 2017 was spent on personnel salaries, a percentage that is rather consistent from year to year and accounts for the MoE's ability to plan its annual budget to a relatively high degree of accuracy. These numbers have reportedly stayed stable: an analysis by the UK's Department for International Development in 2020 noted that actual education expenditure remained unchanged between 2013 and 2019. At the same time, the enrollment numbers of students increased from 1.1 million to 1.4 million, implying that actual per pupil expenditures dropped significantly during that period. Similarly, a 2021 assessment by the World Bank indicates that, between 2018 and 2020, the total public expenditures attributed to MoE spending annually remained steady at 12.9% (World Bank, 2021).

First, the MoE clearly suffers from an overall lack of financial resources, and therefore needs to make adjustments within its administration (for instance, it is unable to pay for transport to/from training courses for teachers). This fact was noted in the ESP (Ministry of Education, 2018, p. 98) and articulated by the FAA, which stated that fiscal constraints were the primary challenge to fulfilling the unit's purpose "to efficiently finance the education process and optimize available resources earmarked for the Ministry of Education" in ways that support the strategic goals of the MoE.

> *"The main challenge facing, not only the Budget Administration, but all government departments in the country is the existence of perpetual and recurring financial deficits in earmarking financial allocations to the MoE. This results in meager fiscal ceilings… and deficits… that obstruct the disbursement of financial claims."* (FAA interviewee)

The FAA representative also noted that the unit's ability to handle disbursements of financial claims and other day-to-day transactions was further hindered by a lack of digitalisation and training within the FAA.

> *"One of the items of the economic vision is the development of employees and the workflow, in terms of automation/ digitization. The MoE is …[in] need of electronic archive systems, a paperless system, electronic linkages, and more digitized functions. I believe that this is one of the main challenges."* (FAA interviewee)

> *"The MoE also requires further training and capacity building of the administrative staff. We do not enjoy our rights at the MoE because we are a logistical administration, and not a technical administration. Normally, training and support is directed towards the technical teams in the field and focused on teachers, but administrators also require training because we assist and support the technical teams and contribute to the education process."* (FAA interviewee)

Other education stakeholders stated that lack of financial resources was a challenge for their work.

> *"Our challenges begin with funding, because the education sector needs big amounts of funding. … The MoE covers large numbers of employees, including administrative staff, teachers, etc. and big numbers of students. Education in Jordan, as in many countries across the world, is a service … of the state. This service requires funding because there are no dividends and because it is considered a state duty, just like health services. Therefore, good funding helps overcome a big portion of the challenges."* (STD interviewee)

Although funding constraints are beyond the control of the MoE, and hence relate to the Compact relationship between the MoE and government executive bodies, the lack of financing becomes tangible at these lower levels of the administration. The hindrance of financial disbursements from the MoE was evident in the accounts of temporary contract teachers, who are hired on contracts for a limited time to either fill a temporary vacancy in a regular MoE school (e.g., to serve as a substitute) or to teach in double shift schools serving Syrian refugee students in host communities or refugee camps. These temporary contract teachers, who are supposed to receive their salaries monthly as permanently employed teachers do, stated they had finally received their first pay cheques in November. This was frustrating and difficult for them since they had been waiting for their pay since starting work at the beginning of September. They further highlighted that the MoE indicated they might lose their pay cheques over the winter term holiday, among other cost-cutting measures, which further their increased frustrations and insecurities around their jobs.

Second, in the context of scarce resources, the MoE seems not to fund certain training programmes for teachers working with refugees (i.e., temporary contract teachers), and USAID has had to substitute for this lack of funding to make the RAMP training available to all teachers. This contradicts the STD's perspective that all teachers enjoy the same privileges with regard to training and support. Moreover, temporary contract teachers of refugees are funded by different sources and at different rates than regular teachers, depending on where they teach. Notably, the salaries of those teachers working in refugee camps are paid by international donors (see Table 4).

Table 4. Funding sources for the salaries of different categories of teachers[12]

Categories of teachers	Source of funding
Civil service teachers	MoE Budget
Contract teachers general (e.g., substitutes, teachers in double shift schools in host communities)	MoE Budget, via the "extra education account"
Contract teachers in refugee camps in the morning shift	European Union integrated into MoE budget under "budget support"
Contract teachers in refugee camps in the afternoon	German donors

In addition, temporary contract teachers are paid less than permanent teachers. The following comments by temporary contract teachers highlight the awareness of disparity in how they are financed:

> *"From July to September, we were without a job or salaries"* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1).
>
> *"We work just like them [permanent teachers], as some have more than double or triple our salaries"* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1).
>
> *"We take 280 Jordanian dinars [as salary per month], give us 380 Jordanian dinars, and let us feel our value."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1).
>
> *"No temporary contract teachers for Syrians are satisfied with their situation. This school year they were late with our salaries … all teachers without exemptions do not have the will to come to school."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1)

Training for temporary contract teachers is also not covered by the MoE; such teachers reported covering training courses costs themselves. In this area, donors have stepped up to provide and/or pay for needed training for the teachers of refugees who are on temporary contracts.

> *"We realised that the MoE, due to the financial cost, does not include [temporary] contract teachers who teach refugees in the induction training program. So we included resources in our budget so that the contract and substitute teachers can be included in the MoE-provided induction training."* (RTI interviewee)

[12] Source: Interview with representative of the Financial Affairs Administration, 8 November 2022.

> *"A lot of trainings were cancelled because the MoE cannot find the financial resources to cover the expenses; transportation, etc. we have worked with the MoE and created an e-training system; that means online training system, and this system is something that MoE really appreciates because it decreased the cost of training and it is accredited, and the system is now being used by many donors and organizations."* (RTI interviewee)

Third, in terms of cost breakdowns between teacher expenses and inputs, the ESP presents data from 2013–2016 in which it highlights that spending on basic education (grades 1-10) consists mainly of staff salaries (83%) (Ministry of Education, 2018, p. 19). The FAA interviewee confirmed that this is still the case, with teachers' wages constituting 86% of the current expenditure of the MoE budget for 2022 and 78% of the overall budget. In addition, while data on funding allocations at the district level is not available, the FAA stated that a school's budget is determined by the number of students enrolled at the school.

The system also does not seem to allow for much financial decision-making at lower levels. According to principals, schools typically receive an advance of between 75 and 150 Jordanian dinar (JOD) in discretionary funds to implement arising maintenance needs. However, principals must first obtain approval for use of the funds through a school financial committee and must provide receipts and invoices for all expenditures. Thus, principals report that in reality they have little discretionary funding to address specific school context needs, and grants obtained from the field directorates for particular needs that arise may be delayed.

Teachers and principals in particular felt the strain of financial deficits on both their salaries and inputs. In focus groups with both permanent and temporary contract teachers, the differences in pay, resources, and working conditions between these groups of teachers were repeatedly brought up. However, both groups complained about low pay and a lack of learning materials, working facilities, and access to free photocopiers. Both groups also expressed frustration with the preferential treatment of individuals who had personal connections that helped them jump the hiring queue.

> *"Being hired as an extra education [temporary contract] teacher depends on favoritism and being well connected. The supervisor or directorate of education hires their relatives, so the priority is for well-connected people. After that they look at the common people depending on their exams by turn, for instance from 1-50, if there is a vacancy, [etc.] … At the end being assigned [a permanent teaching position] is played hugely by the ministry. Exams are just a formality."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1)

> *"I got a grade of 90 on the exams and another teacher with me got a 60, but she was assigned before me as she knows people in the directorate. She even was able to choose a school close to her house whereas it took me a year to get assigned."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1)

> *"The civil service bureau is the same as the extra education, the concept is good connections and nepotism."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1)

> *"Let me talk about my sister. She graduated and, through my brother's connections, she was hired in the same year. I have been here [working as a temporary contract teacher] for 11 years, and I was not assigned."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1)

In sum, while the data on finance sub-elements collected by the ERICC team is limited, it suggests that this element of the Management relationship is primarily aligned for access. In terms of how teachers are funded, rules driving school funding allocations are based on enrollment, and the high portion of spending on teachers' salaries does not support selecting, retaining, or motivating more effective teachers. Instead, the relative job security of permanent teachers discourages the necessary turnover of those with low motivation and performance, while the unequal pay and precarious employment of temporary contract teachers is a source of frustration and demoralisation for many. Financing for teachers is also highly aligned for process compliance, since teachers are generally hired based on their fulfillment of required qualifications and adherence to the selection process requirements rather than on any evidence of relationship to performance outcomes. The financing of inputs for teachers are also aligned for access and process compliance as they are made available without regard to performance outcomes, with many teachers attending training sessions to help them rise in the ranks rather than improve their teaching practice. In addition, the allocation of funds clearly is centralised with little to no autonomy or discretion at the school level to use funds as needed, highlighting the spider-like nature of system financing. Finally, in terms of how the use of funds is accounted for, the system is aligned for access and process compliance in that it tracks teacher and non-teacher spending with little financial experimentation or reform. Allocations across the budget are relatively similar and proportional across financial years. According to UNICEF's 2017 Global Budget Brief Guideline, such a high portion of total expenditures on personnel costs (>80%) each year likely represents an inefficient use of resources, as there is insufficient money left for capital expenditures and other non-salary spending to improve education quality.

A3. Information

The element of information within the Management component refers to how the principal assesses the agent's performance with regards to the delegated objectives. Within the Management relationship, this refers to how the MoE gathers information about students, teachers, and principals to assess frontline delivery of education. Information has five sub-elements: (1) **EMIS:** What information is included in the EMIS system? How do authorities use this information? (2) **Purpose of exams:** What is the purpose of exams in the system?; (3) **Exam design:** How are the exams in the system designed? What do they emphasize? (4) **Accountability for teachers and principals:** What kind of information about teacher and school performance is collected? And how is it used? (5) **Information use:** How is information used by education authorities?

Data on this element was collected by the ERICC team primarily through key informant interviews with the QRC, the EQAU, the STD, and others as well as through the focus groups with teachers, principals, and supervisors.

First, the QRC interviewee indicated that the EMIS system (OpenEMIS) includes "all data related to students, schools and supervisors as well as the directorates" and is a database that is "constantly updated with the students' numbers, nationalities, transfers, etc." EMIS also includes student performance data, which is evaluated using both periodic national and international assessments as well as classroom assessments given throughout each semester. Teachers and supervisors report developing these classroom assessments based on curriculum materials and guidance as well as in collaboration with their peers. These assessments emphasise the memorisation of curriculum content and application of concepts, according to participants in the permanent teachers focus groups. However, they also highlight that the curriculum is often above the levels of the students, and while they strive to adapt their teaching and exams accordingly, they still feel the pressure to keep pace with the suggested curriculum timeframes. Teachers are required to regularly upload classroom assessments scores to EMIS, though temporary contract teachers reported that they were not provided free access to EMIS but had to pay for an account to input scores. This contradicts the QRC interviewee, who indicated that EMIS was available to most frontline workers and families: *"the principal has an account, teachers* *have accounts, parents have accounts, and they all have access at all times."* Permanent teachers also indicated that, while they have access to their students' background data on EMIS, they do not have access to the students' assessment data from other teachers. Thus, EMIS accounts must come with varying degrees of access to information.

The QRC interviewee relayed that EMIS also contains teachers' files, which include data such as their date of graduation, date of appointment, whether on the Civil Service system or on the extra teaching system (for temporary contract teachers), as well as teachers' job scale and rank. Interestingly, however, the EQAU interviewee indicated that its unit did not have access to or use EMIS. Thus, school inspection reports and the information related to teachers in those reports is not available through EMIS. This does not mean that there are duplicate systems, since EQAU reports contain an assessment of the school, including data on teachers, while EMIS serves as a database of educational inputs, student outcomes, and other measures and statistics. However, the fact that data is not shared between the EMIS system maintained by the QRC and the inspection reports collected by the EQAU appears to highlight the lack of integration and accessibility of data across different MoE departments.

How student performance data from assessments and exams is used is less clear, with teachers and supervisors reporting that they hear little about international assessments (e.g., PISA, PIRLS) prior to or after the exams are administered. The ESP notes that "the actual assessment of [student] performance is shallow and does not comprehensively measure the performance, skills and knowledge of students, especially the students with disabilities" (Ministry of Education, 2018 p. 50). The ERICC teams' document review suggested that no official policy exists to analyse student examination results, although the outcomes of the National Examination (*Tawjihi*) are typically analysed in the MoE's Division of Statistical Analysis and a National Examination report is eventually distributed throughout the system. However, these high-stakes exit exams do not seem to inform the daily practices of teachers or principals, though both the teacher training provider interviewed and the STD mentioned they are considered when designing training curricula and materials.

Overall, findings from different interviews support a picture of a system focused on inputs and "thin" descriptors of quality. Data gathered at the frontline is mostly logistical (number of teachers, number of students, number of teachers completing a training course, infrastructure readiness), and there was little evidence of meaningful data being gathered on student learning and the improvement of learning outcomes. There is also little evidence that the results of national and international assessments feed back into the system, and classroom assessments are not used to track and improve performance. The Management relationship is largely based on a logic of process compliance, primarily built around accounting-based rather than *account-based* accountability (Honig and Pritchett, 2019). Accounting-based accountability emphasises information in the form of quantifiable, standardised, "thin" measurements, often of inputs rather than outcomes. In contract, account-based accountability emphasises information in the form of detailed, context-specific, non-standardised, "thick" descriptions of what an agent did and why they chose to do so.

A4. Motivation

The element of motivation within the Management component refers to how the principal motivates the agent to implement and achieve the delegated objectives. This design element consists of two sub-elements: (1) **Intrinsic motivation:** What is the professional status and professional norms in the teaching profession? (2) **Extrinsic motivation:** What is the structure of teacher careers and career progression in the system (including the issue of job security)? The ERICC team collected data on this element primarily through focus groups with teachers, supervisors, and principals.

First, in terms of intrinsic motivation, teachers often expressed frustration that their work was not held in higher esteem by education authorities, especially those on temporary contracts. While permanent and temporary teachers both expressed that they often felt unappreciated, the latter also felt undermined and controlled by their principals and their precarious employment status.

> *"The control of the administration on us [as temporary contract teachers], whether in the morning or afternoon shift teachers is bigger. Any discussion with the administration will lead to your termination."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 2)
>
> *"Once the administration writes our technical report we cannot even be assigned as replacement teachers or extra education [temporary contract teacher] anywhere. [This is unlike the situation of] an official [permanent] teacher with a committee to weigh situations in favor of either the teacher or the administration."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 2)
>
> *"[If you get a low evaluation] you are placed on the blacklist as they say."* (Temporary Contract Teacher, Focus group 2)
>
> *"At any moment they can give up on you."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 2)
>
> *"There is no job stability."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 2)

Although some teachers expressed a desire to teach children, such intrinsic or professional motivation was dampened by their prevailing working conditions, which they reported as overcrowded, poorly resourced, and at times chaotic. Some also indicated heavy workloads, with one stating that he taught 560 students in 14 sections. In addition, temporary contract teachers indicated that they can be fired for being sick for three days and they cannot raise any issues for fear of being fired. They are also denied the opportunity to progress professionally because ranking and promotional tracks are not available to them. Hence, their development of a professional identity appears to be thwarted by lack of worker rights and job protection. A handful of temporary contract teachers expressed a desire to leave the profession, with one lamenting "but where would we go?". Others voiced their desire to find a better job alternative (both within and outside of education) and feel demotivated by the fact that their salary is not enough to support a family on a single income.

However, many still commented on their desire to take training courses despite the facts they had to pay for them, the courses are not designed with their needs in mind, and completion of the course does not count toward any promotion criteria.

> *"[If there is a course that you might benefit from,] we will [take it]. Why not?"* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1)
>
> *"Any skill development I will take it, no problem."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1)
>
> *"Anything for the students inside the classroom, we will take."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1)
>
> *"Why did we come here today? I came all the way from Ramtha. In the message [for the focus group], it mentioned that it is a workshop on the problems of the extra education teachers for Syrians as we came to discuss the issues we are facing. We are willing to put effort into learning a new skill as we have come a very long way."* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 1)

Despite the intrinsic motivation to take courses for the sake of improving, temporary teachers often found that they were not allowed to participate in training available to permanent teachers.

> *We did not fully take [the new teacher course]; they [official, permanent teachers] took it all. We only took the first part as they [MoE trainers] did not allow us to. They said when you get assigned you can continue.* (Temporary contract teacher, Focus group 2)

Permanent teachers were also not satisfied with current incentives offered through the ranking system, as they could only rise through the ranks gradually, with incremental pay increases. Since substantial pay increases are impossible given the limited financial resources of the MoE, teachers are at times provided letters of thanks or awards to incentivise them and show appreciation for their efforts. These tokens of appreciation and recognition were mentioned by both teachers and principals, the most prominent among them being the Queen Rania Award for Excellence in Education.

However, teachers did not say if the awards actually motivated them to improve their practice or whether they saw the value in awards as evidence to go in their portfolio for future promotion applications. Other incentives mentioned in the ESP, such as the Royal Scholarships for Teachers' Children, were never mentioned by teachers, principals, or supervisors.

A number of diverse education stakeholders – from teachers to supervisors and principals, as well as the teacher training providers interviewed – felt the linking of training courses and promotions had corrupted the purpose of the training, leading teachers to seek out courses for promotional reasons only.

> *"The most dangerous and risky thing that is happening right now is linked to the ranking. Teachers now are just attending the training because they just want to have this requirement to get a rank. … We want them to come to training because we want them to improve themselves, and that they want to learn and implement what they learned, and not for the rank."* (Teacher training provider interviewee)

In regard to teacher motivation, the teacher training provider interviewees suggested that changing teachers' perspectives was key to improving students' learning outcomes.

> *"The biggest obstacle in teacher practice development is the teacher's attitudes; their direction towards training is very negative because they do not feel that there is an outcome. Even if the teachers get training and develop their practices, the financial outcome is weak, the teaching environment lacks a lot of resources that support a teacher. … Sometimes they do not feel that there are rewards from the training and what is the benefit of having these training sessions."*

The teacher training provider interviewees added that teachers are demotivated by poor training sessions that are, at times, "irrelevant to the reality of the school in different environments".

While the professional motivations of principals were not explicitly a focus within data collection, the teacher training provider representatives highlighted that the MoE's temporary contract teachers lowered the morale of principals.

> *"Temporary contract teachers affect the morale of principals as well, as one of the teacher training provider interviewees relayed: "The large number of temporary teachers in their schools are [an obstacle for principals]. [Principals] do not have the authority to object to the temporary teachers, [but] they need teachers who can stay for a long time in the school because they feel that they spend a lot of time training those teachers and next year they are not at their schools."* (Teacher training provider interviewee)

In sum, the overall lack of teacher motivation and the failure of education authorities to meaningfully incentivise teachers to improve their practices highlights how the element of motivation is primarily aligned for access and process compliance. Typical under this alignment, respondents to this study noted that teaching is a relatively low-status profession, there is significant monitoring of teacher rule-following and attendance, and teachers are largely treated as interchangeable (particularly given that teacher transfers are one of the few disciplinary actions available to the MoE). While the MoE is arguably forced to rely on temporary contract teachers to achieve its expansion and universal access goals while dealing with significant budgetary constraints, the parallel but unequal system created by the use of temporary contract teachers has further disincentivised many frontline workers, including principals who must deal with a revolving door of teaching staff. Again, the differences in pay and job security between civil service teachers and temporary contract teachers is significant. For instance, temporary teachers do not get paid during summer vacation or sick leave, and they reported that their salary is only between one third and half that of a civil service teacher. The low salary, in combination with high job insecurity and fluctuation, is not sufficient to retain and motivate temporary contract teachers and make them feel valued and respected.

A5. Support

The element of *support* within the Management component refers to the preparation and assistance that the principal provides to the agent to complete the delegated objectives. Within the Management relationship, support refers to the pre- or in-service training and resources frontline workers (e.g., teachers, principals) or mid-level departments (e.g., field directorate staff) receive to carry out their jobs. Support consists of the following sub-elements: (1) **Internal coherence:** What kind (type, quality, relation to curriculum, exams, class needs) of instructional support materials are available? (2) **External coherence:** What kind (type, quality, relation to curriculum, exams, teachers' needs) of teacher training is available? (3) **Form of instructional materials and support (spider versus starfish)**: How does the system provide teacher training and instructional support? (4) **Accountability for delivery of teacher training:** What kind of accountability is used to monitor teacher training?

In terms of internal coherence, evidence from the MoE suggests that instructional materials are somewhat aligned with the curriculum and exams as there is a conscious effort to do this within the central-level directorates.

> *"If we design a training program, or if our partners provide training material, it must align with the MoE teachers' standards. For example, there is a training program on evaluation strategies, and this component exists in the criteria. Lately we began training on democracy concepts, and this too exists in the specialized criteria of Social Studies. Any training program is incorporated in the topic that fits into the teachers' criteria. If a training material is presented by the partner organizations or the service provider, it must firstly be evaluated and approved by the TSD. If the program is created by the TSD, it must also align with the standards and the capacities required for the teachers."* (TSD interviewee)

However, while instructional support materials link the curriculum to teaching and exams, the materials are often not aligned with the learning levels of their students. Teachers reported frustration with mismatch between curriculum content, time frame guidance, and students' ability to absorb the material.

> *"I would like to point out that some of the new curriculums assigned by the Ministry of Education does not adhere to the timetable. For example, a math lesson for 8th grade is subject heavy and will not be completed within the timeframe assigned to it."* (Permanent teacher, Focus group 1)

> *"With more than 35-40 students in the classroom, the teacher will be unable to follow up on homework, explain the lesson to the students, or follow up with them in class. As a result, I believe I will be unable to complete the curriculum and fully present the subject."* (Permanent teacher, Focus group 1)

> *"I have 23 years of experience in education, since 2000. The problem that we computer teachers suffer from is that 4 years ago, [we] were [allocated] two lessons [a week to cover material]. But now it is only one lesson. In one lesson, I cannot evaluate the students. … It is better if computer classes return to two lessons [per week]."* (Permanent teacher, Focus group 1)

In terms of external coherence and availability of training, conflicting evidence was found in different interviews. While the STD interviewee claimed there were no differences in the availability and quality of training available for temporary contract teachers and permanent teachers, both the RAMP representative and teachers focus groups mentioned differences. For instance, the MoE seems to be unwilling or unable to pay for some training courses for temporary teachers unless partners make them available for free. Permanent teachers also complained about access to courses, with one teacher told they were at too high of a ranking or level to be allowed to take a course and another finding that training would not be offered at her school as it was too small. Similarly, the STD reported that it is short of supervision staff and supervisors within the focus groups complained that caseloads were too high for everyone to be seen. Hence, support through training and supervision is not equally available across schools or regions. The quality of the training and supervision also seems to vary. STD training was often deemed not relevant by teachers in focus groups, while others spoke of wanting to take, or being very happy they took, Queen Rania Teacher Academy (QRTA) training courses, which seem to be well-respected among teachers and principals alike.

In terms of the accountability for delivery of teacher training, the STD is responsible for training and works with a number of partners within, and at times outside, the MoE to design and deliver training either by the STD or partners. All training must be approved and accredited by the STD and, by and large, supervisors are responsible for delivering the training in schools during or outside of school hours. While there seems to be an accounting of the delivery of sessions as well as an accounting for teachers' understanding of the course materials (via an end-of-course exam), these represent "thin" inputs of accountability. Once approval for training content and materials is given by the STD, there typically are no mechanisms in place to ensure the training was relevant for all attendees or that practices from the training were applied to by the teachers' in schools. The one exception found to this trend was RAMP, led by RTI, which developed new evaluation tools that align training, supervision, and evaluation to assess its impact.

> *"RAMP worked with the Supervision Department, and they designed a classroom visit tool for early grade teachers and this tool was an e-tool where the supervisors have computers with them. The tool [is connected] to the e-system, [which allows] all [the supervisors'] reviews during the classroom visit [to be] transferred electronically to the system where the head of Supervision can see the performance of teachers in the field district. [Then] based on the data collected and analyzed, they prepare the response – capacity building programme – for teachers who are in real need."* (RTI representative)

> *"The MoE really appreciates this [e-tool and system] from RAMP [and] thinks it's very good. They will expand the use of this e-supervision system to other grades. So we are currently in discussion with the MoE and the company to transfer the system to the MoE, so that it will be used by all teachers and supervisors. The challenge is to guarantee the e-pad for all the supervisors. This is a challenge."* (RTI representative)

These quotes illustrate the STD's willingness to reassess its work to better align it for improvements in teacher effectiveness, and hence student learning. However, the second quote also reminds stakeholders that funding can be a prominent obstacle that needs to be overcome to achieve such aspirations.

Overall, most of the sub-elements within support are aligned with access and process compliance. Teacher training and support is put in place, but its quality is not typically accounted for. There is also no systematic follow-up to support teachers in implementing training courses or to ensure they have the resources needed to do so. While the STD, donors, and other providers of teacher training work towards aligning the curriculum, teaching materials, and exams, the problem remains that the curriculum does not account for students' learning levels, and hence teachers need to tailor instruction to make material more accessible. This is also a frustrating situation for teachers because they need to deal with competing priorities that cannot be reconciled in the classroom. They are left with an unsatisfactory situation of knowing they cannot achieve all goals delegated to them, namely, (1) complete the curriculum, (2) improve student learning, and (3) achieve high results in exams. In addition, there are significant differences in support between permanent and temporary contract teachers. Ultimately, training and support is controlled centrally with little to no discretion for, or participation from, teachers in shaping the curriculum, training, or evaluation tools.

B. The compact accountability relationship

Within the RISE Framework, Compact refers to the relationship between the highest executive, legislative and fiduciary authorities of the state (the "principal") and education authorities and organisations (the "agent"). In the case of Jordan, Compact refers to the relationship between the MoE (as the agent) and other authorities of the state. These include the Civil Service Bureau (CSB), responsible for hiring teaching staff; the Ministry of Finance, which allocates funding to public ministries; and the government's political leadership, which appoints the Minister of Education. In Compact, only three design elements are included in the RISE Diagnostic: *delegation, finance and information (see Table 5).*[13]

Table 5. Compact accountability relationship design elements and sub-elements

Compact *Relationships between the highest executive, legislative and fiduciary authorities of the state (the principal) and education authorities and organisations (the agent)*		
Design elements	**Definition**	**Sub-elements (within the relationship)**
Delegation	The goals the principal wants the agent to achieve	1. **High-level targets:** What does the executive set as the goals of the system? 2. **Human Resources:** How does the executive set out human resource goals? 3. **De jure/de facto delegation gap:** Is there a gap between articulated and actual goals?
Finance	The resources the principal has allocated to the agent to achieve their delegated objectives	4. **General:** How is finance for education structured? 5. **Teachers:** How is financing for teachers structured? 6. **Non-teachers:** How is finance for other education inputs structured? 7. **Discretion:** Where and to what extent is discretion for finance in education distributed throughout the system?
Information	How the principal assesses the agent's performance in their delegated objectives	8. **General:** How is information for education structured? 9. **Quality:** How does the system determine that education is of sufficient "quality"? 10. **EMIS:** What information is included in the EMIS system?
Motivation	Not applicable	

13

Support	Not applicable

The categories of alignment in the Compact relationship differ slightly from those of the Management relationship, with alignment for selection or process compliance removed and alignment for socialisation added (see Table 6.)

Table 6. The four categories of alignment for compact[14]

Alignment	Description
1. Coherent for learning	Relationship is aligned around all children learning. Clear goals for learning are articulated, financed, and supported.
2. Aligned for access	These systems focus on expansion (getting all kids in school). While these systems may talk about "quality", it is usually not defined in relationship to learning outcomes and is instead connected to a laundry list of "thin" inputs (i.e., things measured by EMIS).
3. Aligned for socialisation	Relationship is characterised by socialisation or ideological goal. These types prioritise socialising children into a set of values. Can be co-aligned with an access agenda.
4. Aligned for another purpose: Patronage or interest groups	Relationship is aligned for a purpose other than education. Short-term clientelist objectives may be dominant or relationship may be dominated by special interest groups (often teachers' unions) These systems have lost a core educational purpose. In patronage systems, politicians and those in power use the system as a patronage mill (i.e., to hire teachers, or to build schools for certain constituencies). Often those who can opt out of the public system (resulting in a large low-cost private school sector). In special interest systems, ensuring that the special interests and needs are met dominates. This system pretends to be another type on paper, but de facto does not deliver schooling or learning for all.

B1. Delegation

Delegation within the Compact relationship refers to the goals the principal (in this case, state authorities) give to the agent (in this case, the MoE). The element consists of three sub-elements: (1) **High-level targets:** What does the executive set as the goals of the system? (2) **Human Resources:**

[14] Table adapted from Planning and Analysis Tools [.xlsm] available from the RISE Education Systems Diagnostic Platform

(https://riseprogramme.org/tools/rise-education-systems-diagnostic).

How does the executive set out human resource goals? (3) **De jure/de facto delegation gap:** Is there a gap between articulated and actual goals? The ERICC team was only able to collect limited information in this area as interviews with political leaders or executive bodies (including the CSB) proved impossible to obtain. Thus, to assess this element, the team looked closely at the links between the MoE and other state authorities via key policy documents.

First, while the ESP (2018-2022) sets out a five-year plan for the education sector, the articulated policy goals espoused in other government strategies form the foundation of the ESP. Through the ESP, the MoE seems to integrate the objectives of no fewer than four national plans: the National Strategy for Human Resource Development (2016-2025), the Jordan Vision 2025, the Jordan Response Plan for the Syria Crisis (2016-2018), and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The National Strategy for Human Resource Development (2016-2025) appears particularly influential in the formation of the ESP as the latter's domains are mapped onto its objectives. With that said, the language is often vague and Monitoring and Evaluation targets and indicators are often simplified quantitative measures that seem to have less to do with the lofty goals of these government documents. Still, in terms of high-level targets and human resource goals, the government's multiple strategies seem to speak to one national vision towards which all agencies are aligned for quality. Each articulates a vision in which children get what they need to become economically and socially successful individuals who also contribute to the expansion of the local economy and the building of a nation (see Table 7.)

Table 7. The foundations of the stated goals of the MoE's ESP (2018-2022)

Previous policy document	Description	Stated goals aligned with ESP in regard to primary and secondary education
Education for Prosperity: Delivering Results: A National Strategy for Human Resources Development (2016-2025)	National plan to improve human resources across public sectors in Jordan	**Vision** (p.17): "[E]nsure that current and future generations possess the capacity to develop the skills and capabilities they need to live happy and fulfilled lives and collectively realize the ambition of a prosperous and resilient Jordan, capable of adapting to internal and external challenges". **Objective** (p.17): "By 2025, ensure that all children **complete equitable and quality primary and secondary education**, leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes".
Jordan Vision 2015-2025 (ESP, p. xiii)	A long-term national vision based on economic and social goals that the Kingdom of Jordan aspires to achieve	"**[E]ducational outcomes, the knowledge, skill and attainment levels of our pupils**, is vital to the cohesion and vibrancy of our society and strength and competitiveness of our economy". Recognises that Jordan's education system "has significant potential to become with very good job creation

		characteristics, but Jordan will need to focus on **raising the quality of its educational institutions**”.
Jordan **Response Plan for the Syria Crisis** (2016-2018)	A three-year plan of high priority interventions to enable Jordan to respond to the effects of the Syria crisis without jeopardising its development trajectory	“To ensure **sustained quality educational services** for children and youth impacted by the Syria crisis”. To achieve this, the Ministry “will work to **boost the capacity of the public education system** with much needed extra learning spaces, remedial/catch-up classes for those children who have missed out on weeks or months of schooling and access to improved and diversified certified alternative learning opportunities for children and youth”.
Education 2030 Framework for Action (2015)	Roadmap adopted by 184 UNESCO Member States in November 2015 in Paris to ensure implementation of Incheon Declaration (2015), which emphasises Access and Equity goals	“[V[ision is to transform lives through education, recognizing the important role of **education as a main driver of development** and in achieving the other proposed SDGs”. **SDG4:** “Ensure **inclusive and equitable quality education** and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all”.

Second, however, there appears a possible gap between de jure and de facto delegation. While the national plans for raising educational access and quality appear unified in their vision and commitment to reform, the political will and stability to oversee the long-term implementation of these plans is arguably missing. This is evident in the constant reshuffling of ministers by consecutive prime ministers that ensures a revolving door of education ministers. Given the centralised, spider-like organisation of the MoE, a change in leadership represents a significant setback and interruption, and oftentimes a reordering of the Ministry’s priorities. Such seismic shifts compromise the MoE’s ability to pursue its long-term policy plans and can affect the morale of those working at the lower levels as they see their previous plans marginalised or abandoned by the new leadership. Perhaps for this reason, there has also been a high rate of MoE staff turnover in the last decade that has compromised policy continuity, leading to a loss of institutional knowledge within the system (Arnot and Seeger, 2021). This, some report, has led a number of senior officials of the MoE to hoard institutional knowledge rather than ensuring it is shared and institutionalised in knowledge databases (ibid.).

Furthermore, there exists a division of responsibilities and power between the MoE and the Civil Service Bureau with regards to teacher management, effectively preventing the MoE from pursuing more drastic reforms that start to align teacher policies for learning. This incoherence has been noted by education stakeholders who are frustrated with the MoE’s inability to set entry requirements into the profession.

"The MoE favors the Education diploma in addition to the specialization degree because it has been found that teachers who have obtained this diploma have a bigger impact on the education process than teachers who have not. When a teacher combines a BA in a specialization and a diploma in education, he [sic] is able to mix the knowledge of four years studying for his BA as well as for the diploma, which includes simulations and practical work. This - combining both [subject and pedagogical] studies - has contributed to raising the quality of teachers." (STD representative)

Echoing the sentiment above, the representative of the teacher training organisation also voiced the need for the MoE to raise standards in hiring, ensuring prospective teachers are prepared in both subject knowledge specialisation and training in planning, assessment, and classroom management. This, along with raising the achievement standards for high school graduates aspiring to become teachers, is an avenue through which education stakeholders believe the quality of teachers and teaching can be raised. It is not aligned with the CSB's approach, which requires applicants to wait for their "turn" to be hired and gives little value to their past achievements compared with their place in the hiring queue (see Table 8). However, the CSB's criteria for hiring are in line with other government employees in other public sector fields, representing conflicting human resource goals between the MoE and other executive bodies. It must also be noted that the CSB's management of teachers has focused primarily on bureaucratic measures such as length of service and seniority, and the Bureau tends to resist reforms that "focus on specialisation and skills-based promotion pathways" (DAI, 2022, p.41).

Table 8. CSB's selection criteria for appointment as permanent teacher[15]

Selection criteria	Weight
1. The year in which the candidate graduated	35%
2. The year of applying for employment (individuals who have applied early are given additional points)	25%
3. The candidate's civil service examination results	20%
4. Academic qualifications	10%
5. Candidate's secondary grade point average	10%
Total	**100%**

[15] Created from data in Ministry of Education (2018, p. 15).

Overall, the *delegation* element of Compact appears to be most aligned for access as rhetoric and human resource goals espouse a vision of a quality education for all that is ultimately rooted in "thin" inputs. These high-level targets, including human resource goals, relate to inputs that include attracting sufficient numbers of qualified teachers, delivering quality education, and expansion of the system to increase access for all. There is concern among some education stakeholders that the CSB's hiring criteria do not link prospective teachers' experience, qualifications, and skills with hiring, representing a missed opportunity to raise the quality in the teacher workforce. Within Compact, the goals outlined by the government are not aligned to attract and retain good teaching (as they would be under a system that is coherent for learning) and nor do the high-level targets and goals call for ensuring that teachers and their teaching align with particular social or ideological objects (as they would if aligned for socialisation). Finally, the government's stated goals refer to equity and inclusivity in narrow terms of access and attainment.

B2. Finance

The *finance* element of Compact refers to the resources the principal provides to the agent to achieve the delegated objectives and includes four sub-elements: (1) **General:** How is finance for education structured; (2) **Teachers:** How is financing for teachers structured?; (3) **Non-teachers:** How is finance for other education inputs structured? (4) **Discretion:** Where and to what extent is discretion for finance in education distributed throughout the system?

The ERICC team was unable to collect substantive data on how the wider Jordanian government structures and allocates the financial budget for the MoE. The MoE's Financial Affairs Administration representative described the process through which budgetary allocations were developed without elaboration on the wider relationship dynamics.

> *"The MoE budget comes from the state and is determined on an annual basis. Normally, it is a three-year budget; two indicative years and one projected year. Each year the budget is re-projected and updated for the next three years. All the MoE technical administrations as well as the 42 directorates take part in drafting the budget… For the [upcoming year's] general budget, a circular is usually sent by the Prime Minister in May, asking all ministries to prepare its budget outlines and ceiling. The head of the Financial Resources Planning Department begins to gather information on the needs and to allocate funds for the directorates and then sends the complete MoE budget to the General Budget Department, which takes part in the approval process. The budget then goes through the legislative processes and then obtains the Royal Decree."* (FAA representative)

This process appears to give ministries, including the MoE, some discretion over and participation in determining their budget. However, given that the ESP and other analyses of the MoE's budget (UNICEF, 2019) highlight that MoE budget line allocation percentage is fairly consistent from year to year, there is likely less discretion given to the MoE in reality than the budgeting process would suggest. It must also be noted that, in 2017, approximately 89% of the MoE's total expenditure was spent on personnel salaries, which means that even if the MoE wanted to change priorities and create alignment in the system, it simply does not have the financial resources to incentivise change or to innovate. As a result, budgeting is likely more of a process in which MoE officials determine which activities to prioritise within the small percentage of the budget that is not allocated to salaries, rather than a comprehensive assessment of resources needed to reach the aims of the ESP.

Although most education systems spend the bulk of their budget on personnel salaries, UNICEF's 2017 Global Budget Brief Guidelines suggest that personnel costs of more than 80% of total expenditure likely represents an inefficient use of resources. This is detrimental to the education system as it means that insufficient money is left for capital expenditures and other non-salary spending to improve education quality. The overarching points are: (1) the MoE does not seem to have much say in how much money the national government ultimately allocates; and (2) the financial resources the MoE allocate each year are not sufficient to either carry out a mandate to improve the quality of the system or to implement radical changes. The MoE notes in the ESP this glaring financial gap between projected costs and expected allocated budget, which amounts to approximately 400 million JOD (Ministry of Education, 2018, p. 98). This suggests the *finance* element is most likely aligned for access and/or even socialisation, but not for learning.

B3. Information

Information is the third and final design element of Compact and refers to how the principal *assesses* the agent's performance in their delegated objectives. It consists of three sub-elements: (1) **General:** How is information for education structured? (2) **Quality:** How does the system determine that education is of sufficient "quality"? (3) **EMIS:** What information is included in the EMIS system?

The ERICC research team was not able to collect any primary data on this element within the Compact, and the document analysis yielded little insight into the sub-elements noted above. In a recent report on the political economy of the education sector, a relevant point was made in regard to the lack of data sharing between the MoE and other ministries (DAI, 2022, p. 32-33). The report highlighted that, in addition to the MoE's EQAU inspections, schools are inspected by the Ministries of Health, Labour and Finance, and these inspections are not coordinated effectively. This represents a missed opportunity to avoid duplication of inspections and highlights the lack of sharing of information across ministries and departments.

Overall, the information element of Compact is likely aligned for access as organisations involved in education regularly produce and communicate reliable *information* on enrollment, grade completion, high-stakes exam results in timely cycles, as well as other "thin" inputs. Any measures or monitoring of "quality" of schooling are based on these "thin" inputs that are informed by accounting-based accountability and simplistic targets. Lastly, information appears aligned for access since EMIS is used primarily for tracking inputs and enrollment, not learning over time. In addition, the data is fed back to the central level where allocations are made, and not utilised at lower levels of the system to inform and improve teaching and learning. Most importantly, there is a misalignment within this relationship between *delegation* and finance. Even though good education and well-trained teachers might be communicated as a priority from the highest executive authorities to the MoE, there are not enough financial means allocated for the MoE to meaningfully pursue these goals.

C. Education system misalignments and recommendations

C1. Overview of misalignments and their identification

The overarching purpose of using the RISE Diagnostic Framework is to map all the interacting elements of an education system to be able to pinpoint where misalignments exist.[16] In conceptualising the education system as a set of relationships of accountability, the RISE Framework can be used to identify

[16] Note that early in the development of the RISE Framework, alignments and misalignments were sometimes referred to as coherences and incoherences, respectively. Instead of using these terms synonymously, only alignment/misalignment will be used.

various types of systemic misalignments. Since there are multiple purposes for which a design element can be aligned, there can be numerous misalignments found within a single education system. RISE scholars theorise that education systems with strong accountability relationships aligned around a learning objective across their elements are most effective at delivering learning (Crouch, 2020).

Two types of systemic misalignments that frequently hinder education systems from delivering learning outcomes are: (1) interactions between the parts of the system producing alignment with an objective other than learning; and (2) interactions between the parts of the system being misaligned with each other. The latter type of misalignments may be found *between* design elements within a single accountability relationship (e.g., Management, Compact, Voice and Choice) or may exist across design elements in different accountability relationships. Regardless of where they are found, misalignments can produce unintended results for the system, skewing or counteracting efforts towards planned goals.

To identify the misalignments within the education system, the RISE Framework requires that the accountability relationships and design elements be arranged in a 5x4 matrix, with the major design element in designated rows and the accountability relationships represented by columns (see Table 9). This matrix can provide a visual map that highlights where elements are not aligned. Using such a table, three main types of misalignments are identifiable (Spivack et al., 2023):

1. Misalignment within a relationship (column), where different elements of the relationship are oriented towards different goals.
2. Misalignment within an element (row), where the same element is oriented towards different goals in different relationships.
3. Misalignment between two relationships (columns) that are each internally aligned.

Table 9. The 5x4 Education System Framework (for diagnosing misalignments)[17]

	Principal (P)-Agent (A) Relationship			
5 Design elements of each accountability relationship	**Management** Education authorities and organisations (P) and frontline providers (schools, school leaders, teachers) (A)	**Compact** Highest executive, legislative and fiduciary authorities of the state (P) and education authorities and organisations (A)	**Voice & choice** **Service** recipients and providers of service (schools, school leaders, teachers) (A)	**Politics** **Citizens (P)** and the highest executive, legislative and fiduciary authorities of the state (A)

[17] Source: Adapted from Pritchett (2015).

Delegation: The goals the principal wants the agent to achieve				
Finance: The resources the principal has allocated to the agent to achieve their delegated objectives				
Information: How the principal assesses the agent's performance in their delegated objectives				
Motivation: How the principal motivates the agent, including the ways in which the agent's welfare is contingent on their performance against objectives				
Support: The preparation and assistance that the principal provides to the agent to achieve the delegated objectives				

C2. Diagnosis of misalignments and accompanying recommendations for Jordan

Based on the RISE Diagnostic, Jordan's teacher education system appears to be primarily aligned for *access* and *process compliance*, with pockets of stakeholders attempting to bring greater focus on, and alignment for, *learning outcomes*. Still, there were key areas located within the 5x4 table that represent possible misalignments between design elements and/or accountability relationships that are affecting system outcomes. For the location and description of these alignments along with related recommendations as to how they might be addressed by stakeholders, see Table 10.

Note that for misalignments between Management and Compact, the current analysis of Jordan does not have sufficient data regarding the role that the Ministry of Finance or other executive leaders played in target setting, budgetary allocation, and other critical functions. As a result, it is not possible to identify the potential misalignment across these relationships in this case.

Table 10. **Identified misalignments in Jordan's education system: locations, descriptions, and recommendations**

#	Location of misalignment	Description of misalignment	Recommendation(s)
1.	**Within management:** Between the design elements of delegation, information, and support	There is a misalignment between the objective to create and maintain the integrity and relevance of the EMIS database (a task delegated and required by the MoE of its frontline workers) and the lack of support given to those agents in terms of providing access and training in using the database. There is an additional misalignment between the stated purpose of EMIS (to inform system improvement) and use of the EMIS data system, particularly at lower levels of the system. Support is needed in building the capacity for more frontline and mid-level works to meaningfully use the data. There is further misalignment between the policies promoting higher quality that are communicated by the Ministry and the type of data collected to measure quality. More specifically, despite quality teaching and learning being (de jure) communicated priorities of the system, data collection does not focus on quality but on inputs and "thin" descriptors (e.g., the number of teachers having completed a training). "Thick" descriptors (e.g., the ways in which these trainings were helpful to improve teaching practices and pedagogy) are not collected for quality assurance.	**Recommendation 1a:** The Ministry of Education's QRC could review and update EMIS access policies and their implementation to ensure temporary contract teachers and other frontline workers have unrestricted access and appropriate training to carry out their EMIS-related duties. Regular periodic audits of teachers' understanding and skills might be considered for the long term to ensure that teachers and other school staff are able to use EMIS effectively as the platform continues to evolve and improve. **Recommendation 1b:** EMIS data documenting student performance and attendance has the untapped potential to help teachers, school leaders, and field directorates identify ways to improve on student learning engagement. Currently, students' assessment results are snapshots of students' outcomes that are not proactively monitored to adjust lesson plans and teaching strategies to increase learning. The MoE could consider how to train and incentivise teachers and principals to utilise EMIS data on student learning outcomes to collectively plan and implement ways to raise the levels of student learning across grade levels. More specifically, the MoE might consider developing professional training to be provided on its online platform to guide and illustrate to teachers and principals how data from EMIS can inform classroom instruction and school planning, including school-wide improvement plans. At the field directorate level, the MoE could consider ways to promote the use of EMIS for more accurate and timely monitoring of students' attendance and academic achievement for more effective educational planning and targeted school support.

2.	**Within management:** Between delegation and information	There seems to be a misalignment between the curriculum frameworks, learning materials, and exams on one hand and the learning levels of children on the other. This points to the neglect of student learning data in informing the planning and adjustment of the curriculum, teaching, and exam design to meet students where they are in terms of levels of learning. This misalignment has probably been exacerbated by the learning loss experienced by students during the Covid-19 pandemic, during which Jordanian schools closed for roughly two years.	**Recommendation 2:** The NCCD (in partnership with the Ministry) could consider ways to better coordinate across the different authorship committees tasked with developing the curriculum across all levels and subjects, ensuring the needed experts (subject matter experts, gender specialists, special education experts, assessment experts) are included to ensure the incorporation of differentiation strategies into curriculum frameworks and guidance. This could assist teachers in understanding how to adapt the curriculum and their teaching methods to meet the diverse needs and levels of students. The RISE data indicated that there are often gaps in students' knowledge and abilities, in part due to the closure of schools during the Covid-19 pandemic. Thus, although there have not been studies of the impact of curricula, teachers report they often struggle with helping students access the curriculum. To address gaps in students' knowledge and skills that hinder their academic progress, schools or the wider system might also consider prioritising the mastery of foundational skills across all grade levels. Students need to have mastered basic literacy and numeracy in order to advance to higher-order content in the curriculum (not only in maths and languages, but in all other subjects). This also necessitates that education authorities (the NCCD and MoE) define learning as a cumulative experience. Improving learning outcomes (especially in higher grades) starts with improving learning in the early grades, as this unlocks all future learning.

3.	**Within management:** Between delegation, information, and support	There is a misalignment amongst key stakeholders that espouse different views of their delegated objectives, needed information, and support functions. More specifically, the EQAU (which serves as a school inspection agency) has a rather authoritarian perspective on its educational mandate, in which educational quality is closely tied to compliance in the process, requirements, and rules set out by the MoE, which do not account for schools' diverse contexts. Thus, its view of the role of inspections, the type and use of information collected, and the extent to which support is provided to teachers and schools differs markedly from other stakeholders – namely, the STD, RTI/RAMP, and the selected teacher training organisation – that are working to raise educational quality. These latter organisations consider educational quality to be a multifaceted concept that must be judged according to the context and school history. As a result, tensions and contradictions seem to exist between these agents and their work, and communication to frontline workers exemplifies contradictory goals and messages. While the EQAU judges schools primarily on their process compliance and stresses schools need to adhere to their guidance or face punitive consequences, other MoE departments and education stakeholders assess schools based on a deeper understanding (based on qualitative insights) of communities and their schools' journeys and cultivate relationships to support improvements in educational practices and outcomes. In other words, there are contrasts between the two perspectives with regards to (1) their approach to school improvement and definition of quality (evident for instance in the type of data gathered at school level); and (2) their relationship with agents at the frontline. This could be symptomatic of a broader incoherence in the education system, where some stakeholders want to align for learning while others do not prioritise learning but rather process	**Recommendation 3:** The MoE might consider assessing the design and mandate of the EQAU to better align the unit with the work of other departments, including the STD. The STD, local teacher training organisations, and programmes such as RAMP work towards the MoE's new perspective on teacher accountability, which is linked with greater training and support. Their efforts at improving teachers' practice can potentially be undermined if their guidance is set aside in favour of the concerns and recommendations for improvement issued by the EQAU, whose powers to discipline ensure compliance. To avoid this scenario in which the judgement and guidance of EQAU assessors and others contradict each other, the MoE could consider how to better align the goals, assessment practices, and data collected amongst EQAU and other stakeholders. The MoE could require the EQUA's assessors to collaborate with the STD in sharing data and tools, consider and reflect on schools' context and constraints when making judgements, and make recommendations that prioritise student learning over process compliance. At the same time, the EQAU might consider ways in which its work complements and can inform the STD, its partners, and learning-focused initiatives such as RAMP. The MoE should consider if and how the EQAU's work might benefit from linking to supervision E-tools introduced by RAMP and the EMIS database (which it currently does not access). With regards to delegation, the MoE might also reconsider its efforts towards decentralisation, which does not seem to align with the EQAU's work and its interpretation of its own mandate, thus making a transition to a more starfish-structured governance system less feasible.

		compliance in a hierarchical, top-down system granting them power and tight control over the frontline.	
4.	**Within management:** *Between information, motivation, and support*	Another potential misalignment lies in the way in which teachers' performance is evaluated for possible promotion in the new ranking system. Linking training course completion with rank progression has led to no significant improvements in the level of teachers' performance, and this is reflected in the level of students' performance. In addition, there is unequal access to training, with temporary contract teachers and teachers in remote, small schools reporting the least opportunities to attend MoE training.	**Recommendation 4:** The STD might consider reviewing its schedule of training and strive to add more training sessions at locations and times that are accessible to temporary contract teachers and those in rural schools. In addition, the STD might consider regularly seeking feedback (e.g., confidential surveys) from teachers who attend training courses to assess the relevance and applicability of course content as well as the effectiveness of the trainer in teaching it. The STD might also consider having supervisors, principals, or other teacher trainers follow up with teachers after they attend a training to assess the degree to which the teachers were able to implement what they had learned and improve their practice. Through implementing such strategies to obtain teachers' feedback on courses and follow up teachers' practices, the STD could revise and improve its courses and better support teachers in implementing what they learned to improve teaching and learning.

5.	**Within management:** *Between delegation, finance, support, and motivation*	The MoE's reliance on temporary contract teachers in the face of financial constraints and unfilled vacancies represents a misalignment between the MoE's stated goals in regard to the improvement of the teacher workforce, including increasing support to, and motivation of, teachers. Temporary teachers have come to represent a parallel teacher workforce that operates in even more sub-par conditions than their civil service counterparts. They also represent a waste of time and resources, rather than a saving. There is a constant need to hire and a rehiring cycle conducted by field directorate staff; teacher training and mentoring is lost when teachers are fired or transferred from their posts; the efforts of teachers are lost when their skills and motivation go unnurtured; and most importantly, the quality of teaching students of temporary contract teachers is generally lower than that of students with more secure and supported permanent teachers.	**Recommendation 5:** There needs to be greater accountability for supporting and integrating temporary contract teachers (TCTs) in the profession. The unequal and parallel system in which temporary teachers work demotivates them and impacts the quality of teaching and learning While aiming to reduce the portion of the teaching workforce that is currently on temporary contracts (approximately 20%), the ETC and field directorates (tasked with hiring and managing TCTs) might consider how such teachers could earn and accumulate points for their rankings if they go on to be hired as permanent teachers. Doing so could provide motivation for TCTs to improve their practice and encourage supervisors and principals to better support promising contract teachers. Field directorates might consider ways to ensure principals are not overworking TCTs, who are more vulnerable due to their precarious employment and the position of power the principals have over temporary teachers' evaluation and school placement. This might include feedback loops (e.g., a hotline for concerns or complaints) available for TCTs.
6.	**Within Management:** *Between delegation, finance, and support*	A misalignment exists between the stated goals of the Financial Affairs Administration (FAA) and its technical capacities and resources (essentially support) to carry out its duties in a timely fashion. Although operating in an environment of tight fiscal constraints, the efficient processing of financial transactions on a regular basis could improve motivation and support across the entire system. Addressing this misalignment would entail better supporting the FAA in developing its digital infrastructure and technical skills.	**Recommendation 6:** The MoE and the international donor community might consider an audit of the technical needs of the FAA and staff in related departments. The audit could also assess the potential use and cost savings of introducing greater automation and digital services within financial departments to promote greater efficiency and effectiveness in executing its core function of dispersing funds on a timely basis.

7.	**Within Compact:** *Between delegation and finance*	A clear misalignment exists between the articulated and delegated aims of the political leaders and the fiscal resources provided to the MoE. The executive bodies of the Jordanian state provide insufficient funding to fulfill the stated educational aims and goals of the state, as articulated in various policy documents, including the ESP.	Recommendation 7: Political leaders might consider ways in which the MoE budget allocation may be increased or optimised in coming years to support a focus on improving students' learning outcomes. In addition, leaders might also consider prioritising a much more limited number of goals (including improving learning outcomes) from the comprehensive list that forms the ESP and channel available funding there. A long list of priorities dilutes the impact that already limited funding will have. In addition, the DCU might consider how to improve communication between the MoE and donors to ensure donors do not exacerbate this problem of setting an excessive number of goals for the education. Instead, the DCU might work with donors, the Education Minister, and the MoE to help set a manageable number of common priorities in order to better leverage donors' resources and avoid duplication of efforts. The Minister could play a key role in advocating amongst donors for priorities that match and bolster the MoE's current goals and strategies.

III. REVISIONS TO RISE FOR USE IN CONTEXTS OF CONFLICT AND PROTRACTED CRISIS

The ERICC team made several revisions to the RISE Diagnostic tool and implementation process, which are discussed below. However, it is important to note that overall, the RISE Diagnostic proved quite relevant for a middle-income, relatively stable country such as Jordan.[18] The team noted that this may not generalise to other country contexts within the ERICC Consortium, many of which have fewer resources than Jordan and/or are experiencing more acute crises, as opposed to the protracted crisis context of Jordan. However, RISE and ERICC both have had country research teams in Nigeria, and the RISE Systems Framework was applied by RISE researchers in Nigeria, for instance (Adeniran et al., 2023).

The Nigeria Country Research Team also conducted political economy analysis in different states in Nigeria (also affected by crisis and instability in different ways), so there could be synergies between RISE and ERICC for research on Nigeria (Ezegwu et al., 2023; Bano, 2022).

For a full list of research outputs on Nigeria, see:
https://riseprogramme.org/research?f%5B0%5D=country%3ANigeria

A. Revisions to the RISE Diagnostic tool

Researchers might consider adding, or accounting for, various actors and relationships that have not been explicitly included in the RISE Framework to date. For conflict- and crisis-affected settings, understanding alignments and misalignments between the humanitarian and development sectors would be key.

A1. Addition of global actors

The RISE Framework focuses primarily on national contexts and the major actors, relationships, and policies that govern those contexts. However, in areas of crisis and conflict, there are often global actors – such as international and/or multilateral donors, UN agencies, and INGOs – that operate within and influence the education landscape. The team noted that there are rarely effective and efficient mechanisms for coordinating among these actors, either across global actors or between global and national actors. This is a source of incoherence within the education system landscape that requires further consideration in areas of conflict and crisis.

A2. Addition of NGO/donor relationship with the MoE

The RISE Framework investigates several important relationships, including the relationship between the executive branch(es), the MoE, and teachers and schools (defined as “Compact” and “Management”). However, donors and NGOs are not mentioned as significant actors within the RISE system diagnostic, nor are their relationships named or explored with other actors in the education system. Given (a) the influence that donors can have or often strive to have with ministries of education in low- and middle-income countries, and (b) the movement to integrate previously parallel refugee education

[18] In mid-2023, Jordan was reclassified from an upper-middle-income to a lower-middle-income country by the World Bank.

systems – largely run by NGOs – into formal schooling, we believe that these relationships should be further considered in areas of conflict and crisis.

A3. Addition of education actors “outside” the formal system

Given the RISE Framework’s focus on national systems, the implementation guide, coding annexes, and publications are primarily interested in those who influence and are managed by formal policy. However, in areas of conflict and crisis, several important actors operate outside of these boundaries. For example, in Jordan, the majority of second shift students are taught by contract teachers, who are largely not governed by national MoE policy but rather by a patchwork of opaque policies at the regional level. Similarly, those who work in NGO programming are likely not MoE-sanctioned teachers, but rather trained facilitators. They often interact with refugee students in camps and non-formal programming. In addition to including these actors, where possible, we have noted that in these cases, the *absence of policies* is contextually notable rather than the *presence of incoherent policies*.

B. Revisions to the RISE methodology

A number of revisions were made to the methodology of the RISE Diagnostic in order to apply it to the Jordanian context. Some of these may be helpful and relevant to other countries considering using the RISE Diagnostic in their country context, while other revisions may not apply.

B1. Not forming an initial steering committee

Although forming an initial steering committee of national stakeholders to collaborate with the implementation of the diagnostic is advised in the RISE methodology, this guideline did not work in the context of the ERICC inception period in Jordan. The key educational stakeholders that likely would have needed to have been involved in the steering committee consisted of most (if not all) of the same stakeholders already engaged in the ERICC national workshops, key informant interviews, data system interviews, and RISE interviews. As a relatively small country with a centralised system, forming a steering committee would have been difficult and would have over-extended the key individuals and organisations we needed in other capacities. Such stakeholders were unlikely to have the capacity or time to meaningfully digest and collaborate on enacting RISE’s conceptual framework given their other job responsibilities. Finally, among these stakeholders, particularly MoE officials, there was evidence of “workshop fatigue” that made a request to participate in a RISE steering committee seem unreasonable, especially given the Ministry’s rather busy summer supervising the first in-person Tawjihi exams since the pandemic.

B2. Adaptation of annexes in Excel into Word templates

The RISE Diagnostic methodology suggests engaging stakeholders in considering the RISE conceptual framework and answering questions contained in the Annexes to enable further analysis of systemic incoherences. As large, complex Excel sheets, it was felt that this tool was not practical for engaging with officials, educators, or other key stakeholders. In fact, QRF team members felt they would also benefit from adapting the table into a more suitable format for discussion and the recording of ideas on the numerous sub-elements of each element across the Annexes. Thus, the Annexes were adapted into Word templates. QRF used these templates for their pre-diagnosis analysis and believe that they could be a potential tool to use with future stakeholders. However, they would benefit from further review and revision for that purpose. Again, given the size and complexity of the Annexes themselves in Excel, it seemed unlikely that external stakeholders would be able to engage with these tools directly. These templates are available upon request.

B3. Engaging stakeholders through questions derived from the framework (rather than the framework itself)

Like the above-mentioned adaptation, the ERICC team came to the conclusion that the RISE conceptual framework and its Annexes were not an ideal way to engage national stakeholders for the purpose of the RISE analysis. This was due to their limited time availability and their limited experience in using RISE or other theoretical frameworks in an applied manner. Instead, the ERICC team collaboratively developed the interview and focus group protocols that asked targeted questions derived from the RISE Framework.

B4. Utilising focus groups in conjunction with interviews

Although the RISE Methodology suggests workshops and key informant interviews as the primary means of collecting data, the ERICC team elected to conduct focus groups amongst key segments of frontline educational workers. This allowed participants to provide a range of testimonies based on their experiences in an interactive manner that prompted further questions and insights. These reports of the realities in the field complemented the more high-level and policy-oriented information obtained from interviews with key informants.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR USE IN ERICC CONTEXTS

A. Limited accessibility and interpretation challenges of MoE policies and the invisibility of policies related to refugees' education provision

Collecting current policy, as written, from the Ministry of Education is a critical step in conducting the RISE desk review. However, this process proved challenging for ERICC researchers attempting to conduct the RISE Diagnostic in a context affected by conflict or protracted crisis. Despite having access to the MoE official website, which housed many policies, there were notable absences of policies critical to certain topics. For example, there was little to no budget information and no official policies or budgets relating to refugee education publicly available. This is likely due to the sensitive nature of the issue of budgets and financing for the education of refugees, to which the international community contributes to varying degrees. There were also laws or policies mentioned in documents, such as the Political Economy Analysis of the Education Strategic Plan, that the ERICC team could not find on the MoE website or anywhere else on the internet. Second, MoE policies sometimes appear to be more aspirational than descriptive of current policy, which hindered the ERICC researchers' ability to understand how current policy functioned.

Again, these challenges are likely to be exacerbated in contexts with more recent crises or where the political system is less established. The ERICC team recommends that country policies be sourced primarily by in-country teams, who will be more familiar with whether certain policies are written down, where they are housed, and how to interpret the documents. The team also cautions that the desk review may ultimately provide less information than is desirable under the circumstances, and that more emphasis should be placed on interviews and focus groups in order to understand how the system functions.

B. Tool likely requires additional piloting in order to operationalise best practices

The RISE Diagnostic tool is in its infancy in terms of its use as an applied research tool rather than a conceptual framework. As such, there is a lack of best practices for how to implement a systems diagnostic utilising the tool (e.g., exemplar research protocols, guidance regarding coding practices, determination of major incoherences). However, since its inception, researchers have applied the RISE Diagnostic in ten different countries and contexts and the results and lessons from these experiences have provided valuable insight into some of the challenges and lessons for conducting future RISE Diagnostics in new contexts.

Given the RISE tool's stage of development, in addition to the ERICC Consortium's intent to use the tool in new contexts (low-income and conflict/crisis affected), the team cautions that these applications should be viewed as pilots. This is not to say that valuable data will not result from the pilot research, only that the future research teams should prepare to iterate on both the framework itself and likely the methodologies as they learn more about how to best implement them.

C. System-wide diagnostic has tension between inclusivity of minorities and overall influence within the system

A system diagnostic is, by its nature, investigative of the functioning of the inter-related components of a topic or theme. This purpose requires capturing many components, perspectives, and actors in order to understand the system as a whole. However, time and resources are limited in any project, which restricts the number of people that can be interviewed, the types of actors accessed, and the perspectives brought to bear on a topic. As such, the ERICC team prioritised those who are most prominent within the teacher management system. However, this necessarily omits actors who are important – particularly within a project such as ERICC, that focuses on marginalised populations – but minoritised. For example, an omitted group in the case of Jordan was NGO facilitators, who work with refugees outside of the formal public school system. These actors likely have little influence on the system as a whole, but this lack of influence in itself may be noteworthy.

In a project such as ERICC, which aims to impact policy and practice at scale while also focusing on marginalised populations such as refugees and internally displaced persons and operating with limited time and budget, we must think carefully about the tension between the system we are looking to diagnose and how we define influence and importance within that system.

REFERENCES

Adeniran, A., Onyekwere, S. C., Okon, A., Atuhurra, J., Chaudhry, R., and Kaffenberger, M. (2023). *Instructional Alignment in Nigeria using the Surveys of Enacted Curriculum. RISE Working Paper No.* 23/143. https://doi.org/10.35489/BSG-RISE-WP_2023/143

Aghajanian, L., Penfold, C. and Fitzpatrick, R. (2020). *Assessing the new roles of supervisors, Jordan - Final Report*. Education Development Trust.

Arnot, T. and Seeger, A. (2021). *The Jordan Ministry of Education's response to the Syria refugee crisis*: *case study*. International Institute for Educational Planning. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380459

Bano, M. (2022). *Curricula that Respond to Local Needs*: *Analysing Community Support for Islamic and Quranic Schools in Northern Nigeria.* RISE Working Paper No. 22/103. https://doi.org/10.35489/BSG-RISE-WP_2022/103

Crouch, L. (2020). *Systems Implications for Core Instructional Support Lessons from Sobral (Brazil), Puebla (Mexico), and Kenya.* RISE Insight Note. https://doi.org/10.35489/BSG-RISE-RI_2020/020

DAI. (2022). *Political Economy Analysis* [unpublished report].

Ezegwu, C., Okoye, D. and Wantchekonpalo, L. (2023). I*mpacts of Political Breaks on Education Policies, Access and Quality in Nigeria* (1970 – 2003). RISE Political Economy Paper PE08. https://doi.org/10.35489/BSG-RISE-2023/PE08

Honig, D. and Pritchett, L. (2019). *The Limits of Accounting-Based Accountability in Education (and Far Beyond)*: *Why More Accounting Will Rarely Solve Accountability Problems.* RISE Working Paper No. 19/030. https://doi.org/10.35489/BSG-RISE-WP_2019/030

Kaffenberger, M. (2022). *The Role of Purpose in Education System Outcomes*: *A Conceptual Framework and Empirical Examples.* RISE Working Paper Series. 22/118. p.5-6 https://doi.org/10.35489/BSG-RISEWP_2022/118

Ministry of Education. (2018). *National Education Strategic Plan (*2018-2022).

National Committee for Human Resource Development. (2015). Education for Prosperity: *Delivering Results*: *A National Strategy for Human Resources Development (2016-2025).* https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/176e64_5ad5680491ba47deb1579b450950ac46.pdf

Pritchett, L. (2013). The rebirth of education: Schooling ain't learning. Center for Global Development. https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/rebirth-education-introduction_0.pdf

Pritchett, L. (2015). *Creating Education Systems Coherent for Learning Outcomes.* RISE Working Paper No. 15/005. https://doi.org/10.35489/BSG-RISE-WP_2015/005

Silberstein, J. and Spivack, M. (2023). *Applying Systems Thinking to Education: Using the RISE Systems Framework to Diagnose Education Systems.* RISE Insight Note.
https://doi.org/10.35489/BSG-RISE-RI_2023/051

Spivack, M., Silberstein, J. and Hwa, Y. (2023). *The RISE Education Systems Diagnostic Toolkit: Planning and Analysis Tool.* RISE.
https://riseprogramme.org/sites/default/files/2023-02/RISE%20Education%20Systems%20Diagnostic%20Toolkit_Glossary_20230131.pdf

UNICEF. (2019). *Budget Brief 2019: Public Education Sector in Jordan.*
www.unicef.org/jordan/reports/budget-brief-2019-public-education-sector-jordan

World Bank. (2021). *Education expenditure, environment dynamics and the impact of COVID-19 on learning in Jordan.*
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/410761619642824370/Education-Expenditure-Enrolment-Dynamics-and-the-Impact-of-COVID-19-on-Learning-in-Jordan

APPENDIX: THE RISE PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION TRACKER

The table below summarises the details of all the focus groups (Fgs), key informant interviews (KIIs), and workshops carried out during primary data collection during October and November 2022 by the research team applying the RISE Framework in Jordan.

#	Item	Number of people	Date (day/month)	Transcript pages
1	Fg 1 – MoE teachers	7	6/11	27
2	Fg 2- Principals	7	10/11	17
3	Fg 3- Principals	8	10/11	16
4	Fg 4- MoE teachers	7	11/11	22
5	Fg 5 – Daily Paid Teachers	8	11/11	22
6	Fg 6- Daily Paid Teachers	7	11/11	18
7	Fg 7- Supervisors	8	13/11	23
8	Fg 8- Supervisors	8	13/11	21
9	KII training and supervision	1	7/11	11
10	KII curriculum	1	7/11	4
11	KII EQAU	1	8/11	10
12	KII budget	1	8/11	4
13	KII QRC	1	9/11	6
14	KII field directorate	1	14/11	8

15	KII field directorate	1	14/11	
16	KII field directorate	Not available		
17	KII field directorate	Not available		
18	KII field directorate	Not available		
19	KII CSB	Not available		
20	KII RTI - USAID RAMP	1	21/11	
21	KII LOCAL TEACHER TRAINING ORG	2	21/11	
22	KII WB	Not yet available		
23	KII UNHCR	Declined		
24	MOE WORKSHOP 1	8	3/10	
25	MOE WORKSHOP 1	8	3/10	
TOTAL RESPONDENTS		86		

ABOUT ERICC

The Education Research in Conflict and Protracted Crisis (ERICC) Research Programme Consortium is a global research and learning partnership that strives to transform education policy and practice in conflict and protracted crisis around the world — ultimately to help improve holistic outcomes for children — through building a global hub for a rigorous, context-relevant and actionable evidence base.

ERICC seeks to identify the most effective approaches for improving access, quality, and continuity of education to support sustainable and coherent education systems and holistic learning and development of children in conflict and crisis. ERICC aims to bridge research, practice, and policy with accessible and actionable knowledge — at local, national, regional and global levels — through co-construction of research and collaborative partnerships.

ERICC is led by the International Rescue Committee (IRC) with Academic Lead IOE, UCL's Faculty of Education and Society, and expert partners include Centre for Lebanese Studies, Common Heritage Foundation, Forcier Consulting, ODI, Osman Consulting, Oxford Policy Management and Queen Rania Foundation. During ERICC's inception period, NYU-TIES provided research leadership, developed the original ERICC Conceptual Framework and contributed to early research agenda development. ERICC is supported by UK Aid.

Countries in focus include Bangladesh (Cox's Bazar), Jordan, Lebanon, Myanmar, Nigeria, South Sudan and Syria.

ERICC
EDUCATION RESEARCH IN CONFLICT AND PROTRACTED CRISIS

Supported by UKaid from the British people