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1. Introduction

The citizen-state contract and its forms has been talked and written about for centuries. As the saying goes, nothing is new under the sun -- but recently, much has been made of social accountability, that is, the extent and capability of citizens to hold the state accountable and make it responsive to their needs. In fact, at a recent global event on the topic, the keynote speaker noted that social accountability is, so far, the defining concept in 21st century governance talk. Well the century is young, but one could be optimistic.

At Twaweza in East Africa we have focused on social accountability from the organization’s start. At first, we worked exclusively on inspiring citizen agency: we would provide information and inspiration as the tools, and citizens would figure out what was the best path to action. In the years since, we learned that we under-estimated entrenched power and political dynamics which overshadow citizen and civil society capacity to act and which cannot be overturned by information alone; we also learned that we must engage constructively with the existing power structures, craft the path through the thick relationships, and build alliances carefully. After all, a functional and responsive state is an essential component of the ecosystem we envision. Along the way, it also became (obviously) clear that neither “citizens” nor “state” are monolithic and that subtle differentiation is needed to understand any specific group or actor’s roles and behaviors, and the opportunities for and barriers to changing these.

Coming around to the idea that it’s the social contract that needs to be enhanced (not just the strength of a particular faction), our work now focuses on improving real opportunities for citizens to engage, and promoting constructive responsiveness from public authorities (with relevant differentiation according to the specific problem we are working on). We are calling this public agency: spaces and processes in which citizens and authorities jointly shape decisions for the future of their communities and countries.

We were able to really learn these insights – i.e., use them to re-define our strategy, our programming – because we believe intensive learning from success and failure, both big and small, is really the only honest way to engage in development work where we aspire to big goals and spend other people’s money to get there. You can find a succinct summary of our lessons learned in the front pages of our strategy document. That document also shows our revised theory of change, where public agency occupies the “sweet spot” in the overlap of the top three long-term goals we say we will contribute to. But drawing the picture is one thing, turning it into practice is another. This brief paper describes the first phase of taking public agency from theoretical to practical in our work in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.
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2. The winding road of experiential learning

As Twaweza, we are already part of numerous national-level conversations: via our Uwezo and Sauti za Wananchi platforms, we collect insightful data and opinions by and from citizens on issues that matter, and we package the data into persuasive information for policy makers, media, and other information intermediaries. This gives us a seat in some of the important conversations on policy and guidance in the education sector in particular, and governance more generally. But how those policy discussions actually get implemented (or not), and the arena in which this plays out is a deeply localized one. To really get into the thick of it, it was clear we need to engage more directly “where the rubber meets the road” – that is, at the sub-national level. Our policy influence at the national level, while gratifying, can take too long to translate into fruitful decision, action and results where citizens ‘feel’ their government most directly – which is in local basic services, and local government. We aim to seed a conversation, energize a space for deliberations; ideally, we aim to catalyze a cycle of productive collaboration in which various government actors, as well as various groups of citizens, together decide on solutions to local problems, and see them through.

The above outlines our public agency experiment in principle.

In practice, we’ve focused in 2016 the experiment around a salient issue in each of the three countries where we work, and we have challenged ourselves to apply much more locally the tools we are best at: making use of data, insights, and information in new, locally-relevant ways; and supporting, challenging and facilitating our local implementing partners, as they are embedded in the local environment and relationships. We have also deliberately – and to the best of our ability – applied the principles of adaptive learning and adaptive management. This is because the entire process is one of learning for the organization, and these principles (and tools) allow us to plan, and to embed learning into every step of the way (without bogging us down!), to ensure thoughtful and regular fine-tuning of the design as well as implementation.

We started with an idea, a conversation, which morphed into a number of intense deliberations about how do we, Twaweza, conceptualize and address citizen agency. It is in the center of our Theory of
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Change, yet how are we actively pursuing it? We work in two domains – education and open government – but does public agency cut across, or does it belong in any single one of them? Does it rely on the work of particular units, or is it the ultimate measure of what Twaweza, overall, achieves? And how about scale – we have always wanted to avoid boutique-projects, but starting something new and different for us, what scale is appropriate, and how do we think even at this early stage beyond the pilot, so that we test an approach that has real-life applicability?

These discussions had to balance weaving a common conceptual thread throughout Twaweza, while encouraging localized, country-based learning and reflection. One of the core decisions we took early on was to create country-based teams composed of staff from various units that would be jointly responsible for piloting this new approach. The team leader was the Twaweza country lead, which gave ownership to the country teams, ensured high-profile for the work, but also tied the work together at the central level (country leads are members of the overall Twaweza senior management team).

Another core decision was to keep the conceptual development of the idea in the shared, common space between the three countries, while doing “deep dives” into country realities to understand context, opportunities and barriers. We had to resist the temptation to splinter the evolution of the core concept into three different country projects, because we needed to ensure that the idea was owned across the organization and because we wanted to stay true to certain core Twaweza principles, such as applying the “reverse logic” to thinking about the problem at hand and analyzing the key actors involved, the process of iterative planning and involvement of various units across the organization before “housing” the initiative within any one unit. The trick was to dig deeply through fieldwork, then come together to put the unearthed insights onto a common table, sift through them and organize into overarching guiding principles. Once we had agreed on common principles, we were able to relax the central hold on the process, and allow considerable finessing and adjusting for each country pilot. The monitoring and learning component, however, followed a fairly uniform overarching structure for all three countries. This was done deliberately, to allow for similar depth of inquiry in each country, as well as the possibility of comparing insights across countries.

The core components of the process and the timeline are shown in the table below. The shaded lines show components which had a central function of bringing the 3 countries together, while the white ones show the country-specific components. The following sections describe some of the core steps in more detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Type of process</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idea for Public Agency is formulated, introduced to country teams</td>
<td>Led by a small central group</td>
<td>January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the concepts, reading, discussing, situating in Twaweza’s work; forming country-based PA teams, articulating first draft</td>
<td>Country-based PA teams</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping missions to 2 districts in every country, to road-test the first draft and the concepts</td>
<td>Country-based PA teams</td>
<td>Early March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating feedback from missions into draft concept; adjusting and refining the concept; planning for a wider and deeper exploration</td>
<td>Central process drawing on country insights</td>
<td>Late March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Twaweza fieldwork in 10 districts per country, combined with Immersion exercise</td>
<td>All-Twaweza country based teams</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country-based reflections, discussions, refining of concept</td>
<td>All-Twaweza country based teams</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person meeting of country teams to interrogate the concept with the field observations, then synthesize into common principles and guidance</td>
<td>3 country PA teams jointly</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country-based design of activities, plans, budgets, etc., following common principles and guidance</td>
<td>Country-based PA teams</td>
<td>July-August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting partners; setting up learning plans &amp; independent research – common across countries*</td>
<td>Country-based PA teams</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First phase of pilot</td>
<td>Country-based PA teams</td>
<td>October-November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthcoming: Mid-phase reflections, including from independent research, and early indications of Twaweza &amp; partner ability / motivation for the project</td>
<td>3 country PA teams jointly</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthcoming: Continuing of first-phase pilot through April 2017</td>
<td>Country-based PA teams</td>
<td>Jan-April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthcoming: Follow-up monitoring and research; diving into lessons, data, insights – for re-design, expansion, or closing.</td>
<td>3 country PA teams jointly</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*While the design of specific activities and planning was country-specific, the learning plans (including articulating hypotheses, monitoring components, etc.), as well as the engagement of independent research followed a common design across countries, to allow for comparing the lessons & findings.
3. A long journey is made up of small steps

First, set up scoping missions in the three countries where we work.
- We coalesced, across country teams, on the core components of public agency we wanted to explore.
- We deliberated on which districts to visit, based on our previous knowledge and depth of experience, particularly through working with local partner organizations.
- We appointed two teams per country (made up of 2-3 colleagues from different units), visiting two districts, for approximately 3 days each.
- We developed and used a common presentation of the public agency idea across all teams (and countries), a set of common guiding tools, and common reporting formats.

What did scoping missions look like in practice?

1. First task was to connect with the local civil society organizations we had been working with in previous years as part of the Uwezo learning assessment. These are our implementing partners; without them, our hands are tied. But what would they think about the concept of public agency? We spent a whole afternoon with them, presenting, discussing and questioning.
   a. How does the idea of a public agency pilot resonate in their context, with their work? Does there seem to be alignment with the partner’s own core work, with their theory of change?
   b. How well networked is our partner with the district authorities, with other civil society in the district, with the schools and communities? Is the partner well positioned to engage in a meaningful and sustained manner across the different actors?
   c. What will be the challenges in implementing such a pilot, from logistical to content to engagement? How could these challenges be addressed?

2. Second task was to meet with a selection of key government officials in the education sector – we chose education because it’s our forte, and also because our partners, through the Uwezo assessment, have been working within education – including the main bureaucrats in charge of education in the district. We wanted to ask whether there were currently any practices which brought citizens and authorities together, and what would they think of that concept.

3. And third, to meet with a sample of head teachers and teachers and explore also with this group how they interacted with authorities up the line, with citizens and parents, and what they thought of opportunities to deliberate and shape decisions.

- We debriefed with the team working on organizational concept, pooling the insights into common threads, while noting key differences. This was essential feedback for the next phase.
Second, revise the initial concept, explore deeper, cover a wider geography.
We revised our thinking based on the insights from the scoping missions. We explored the issues deeper, as we honed the questions, and added themes and stakeholders we realized we had left out earlier.

Four core questions emerged as the critical ones to explore deeper:

1. Is there public agency already? That is, are there already examples, instances of citizen (civil society) and authorities jointly solving local problems? If so, what characterizes them, and what is known about results of such instances?
2. What is the role of information in making decisions, in promoting agency? Where does it come from, what kind of currency is it – who has access, who values it?
3. What is the engagement potential from local authorities – both the technocrats in the education sector, and local politicians?
4. How motivated, and how able, are our district partners to work on the public agency pilot with us?

We explored wider, as we fanned out across 10 districts in each country. The widening was important, as we needed to check the assumptions in a variety of settings, otherwise we would run the risk of thinking about initiatives that are tailored to too few specific contexts. One of the important things we learned through this widening was which components must be constant across, and which can – and ought to – be varied.

In this step, we took advantage of our annual Immersion exercise – an organization-wide, week-long deep-dive into a rural setting in the countries where we work. We tailored the exercise to the public agency pilot process, which allowed us to engage staff across the organization (from accountants to program officer to the executive director) in the fieldwork and in the subsequent deliberations about the findings. It also allowed us to visit multiple districts in each country in a short time-span. The Immersion 2016 report is forthcoming.

Practically:
- We deliberated on the selection of 8-10 districts per country, reflecting both on the scoping missions as well as on strength of our local partner organizations
- We assigned all staff in each country to teams (colleagues from different units), visiting the selected districts, for approximately 3 days.
- We briefed and trained all staff in the common presentation of idea across all teams (and countries), common guiding tools (including outcome mapping of the key district-level stakeholders), and common reporting formats.
- Afterwards, we debriefed with country teams, working on pooling the insights into common threads, while noting key differences.
Ear to the ground: Who did we meet? What questions did we ask?

With district/county education officers:
  a) What data is available on core education statistics? How is the data used in decision making? Is any data publicly available?
  b) How do the officials in the district office communicate with schools, receive data from schools?
  c) What are the challenges facing education in the area and what is considered priority?
  d) Do civil society or individual citizens participate in any of the district-level processes (planning, budgeting, etc.), and what is the official’s opinion on this?

With ward education officers/Ward administrators:
  a) How do they see the status and situation of schools and education in their ward?
  b) What is their role in supporting schools; do they have a say in any resource allocation; what role do they occupy between schools and districts?
  c) How is the relationship between ward education officers and schools characterized?

With the head teachers and teachers in schools:
  a) How is the school doing overall – pass rates, number of children, classrooms, teachers, etc.?
  b) What is the relationship with the ward and district officers in setting priorities, getting support for the school?
  c) What is the state of parental involvement in this school, how does the school management committee function, how does the school involve parents?
  d) Is any information publicly available/visible at the school (grants, budget, expenditure, etc.)?

With the school management committee of the school, including parents:
  a) How do the members see status of education in their communities; the status of the school?
  b) How often the committee meets, what the discussions are like, what is the relationship between the committee and the head teacher?
  c) Can we get a sense of whether it’s an active, open space for participation and debate?

With village/local leaders of the communities where the schools are located
  a) How do they see status of education in their communities; the status of the schools?
  b) What is their role in deciding priorities for the community, including education? What is the process – are formal meetings called and how often, are minutes kept? Can you see a copy of the last minutes?
  c) How involved are the local leaders with schools in particular? How do they see the role of the head teacher? Role of parents?
Insights from the fieldwork across Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda

Is there public agency already going on in addressing education? What does it look like?

• There is limited to no interaction between citizens (i.e. parents) and officials higher in the system – either at ward, or district/county level in the three countries.
• However, the very local space – that of the village/community meetings – seemed to embody the potential for public agency, as issues are openly discussed, and solutions sought. But, often the solutions end at “submitting requests or recommendations” higher up the chain, stifling local action.
• There were numerous examples of citizens taking action against officials (e.g. removal of severely negligent teachers), when they had had enough.
• In majority of cases, the school administrators are quite powerful vis-à-vis parents and community members. There didn’t appear to be public agency in the sense of communities and officials coming together to constructively solve problems in education.

What information is available, what is desired, and what kind of currency is it?

• Considerable amount of administrative data is available at the district/county level; it gets funneled up the system from schools to wards to district to national offices. This data is available through “appropriate” channels – i.e., a formal letter of request.
• Few entities outside government request this kind of data, and all are NGO / CSOs. There was little or no evidence that the public knows what and where the information exists, let alone actively seeks it.
• There is very limited expressed desire or interest for independent or other types of information.
• Public officials tend to be selective in exposing data. Certain types of the data are posted publicly, e.g. exam results, lists of schools, etc. Expenditure data is overall not available.
• No evidence of local media accessing or using the data in any way.

What is our district partner motivation and capacity for public agency approach?

• Partners are well connected to the district authorities, they know and have good relationships with wards and schools.
• They are also well networked with other NGO’s and other civil society in the district (though there is also competition for the same resources and for ‘political’ influence and relevance).
• Many have considerable experience in community engagement activities, but few had worked in bringing authorities and citizens together for constructive dialogue.
• Authorities are mostly contacted and engaged for permits, while citizens are mostly engaged to carry out the projects.
• Most partners are relatively small organizations that take up contracts from a variety of larger organizations or donors, so their work spans a range of issues. On the one hand, this could be interpreted as lack of independent focus. On the other hand, these are astute organizations which learn to respond to the market and survive well with limited resources, and which through a variety of projects also accumulate a vast experience in how to work with different actors, how to use a variety of tools, and how to get things done.
• In sum, we found these organizations to be capable; we are not sure of their motivation for public agency perse (as opposed to it being just another project) – but in a sense, that is the challenge for us: is this idea captivating, does it build on existing energies, can it galvanize beyond just what the purse offers? ...

How do local leaders react to the idea of public agency in education?

• All technocrats are deeply immersed in the state bureaucracy, which is for the most part self-fulfilling. Incentive to change is unclear.
• Education officials’ reactions to opening some of the official deliberations about education to citizens (parents) ranged from mild disbelief at the idea, to downright opposition to it.
• Districts are largely disconnected from schools, mostly obtaining required information through Ward officers and paperwork.
• Local elected leaders, on the other hand, have more appetite for carving their space vis-à-vis the central government; likely this is correlated with their political affiliation.
• The ward-level elected leaders are potentially a group to focus on, although their incentives are political, and therefore range widely.
• In fact politics are ever present as thick, interwoven ropes that tie actors together (or keep them apart) in not always obvious ways. Some of it is party politics, some of it is personalities, some of it is power plays and vested interests. Reality, in other words, is rather messy, but ignoring it means playing in the fantasy world.
Third, dive into synthesis... analysis... deconstructing and reconstructing.... forming country pilot plans.

The public agency core teams from each country met together for 2 days for these deliberations. We described what we found during the fieldwork, offloaded our impressions and information. Importantly, we also drew on evidence from all over the world in terms of what seems to work in promoting citizen-authorities interactions, and we mixed it in with our own observations and experiences. There were several critical junctures to be wrestled through.

1. **Is it about spaces, or issues?** Is public agency about creating the right kind of spaces in which citizen and authorities can interact, or is it choosing a pressing issue (development outcome), and working on it in a way that brings together citizens and authorities?

2. In getting to “where rubber hits the road,” **how localized is the change we seek?** In other words, do we want to test whether change can be brought about at the level of communities? Are we satisfied with change at that micro-level? Or is it at the level of wards, and districts?

3. And very practically we had to wrestle through **issues of coordination and management.** We are a mid-size organization – big enough to have specialized roles, too small to have huge teams. We inherently depend on each other to move our strategy forward, but for practical purposes must manage our time and tasks within the confines of job descriptions, responsibilities, budget lines, and deliverables.

One of the harder concepts to agree on was whether we were doing public agency to further our work towards one of our education goals, or whether we were doing it for the sake of itself, to promote good governance more general. Passions flared. For now, we reached a compromise: we are after both kinds of outcomes, and we are agnostic about which one comes first. We also agreed that for this first pilot, we will find an issue that spans both education and governance.

Distilling this down to guiding principles, we agreed that the public agency pilot in each of our three countries, needed to fill the following criteria:

1. **Find an issue which can be “traced” through the entire system** – i.e. it’s relevant directly in schools, but also important at ward and district, and also has resonance nationally.
2. **It must have a citizen voice component.** This will likely be focused at the community level, but can also include district, and national (where Twaweza plays a role). Look whether the various levels can reinforce each other.
3. **It must be an issue for which there is possibility of change** – is it already a topic of debate, concern, implementation?
4. **Look for the opportunities within the system** where the issue can be tackled: the more windows of opportunity up and down the levels, the better.
5. **Be specific about what would change look like.** Changing policies, budgets? Changing attitudes, norms, and behaviors? Whose behavior? Include actors from community, ward, district and national levels in this analysis.
6. **Think hard and vet with others what would be the incentives to change,** and what might be barriers to change. Include actors from community, ward, district and national levels in this analysis.
7. **Pilot, test, go back to the drawing board, puzzle it out, then do it all over again.** Just as it says.
4. From exploration to practice

In Tanzania and Uganda, we chose teacher absenteeism as the issue of focus; in Kenya, we also added pupil absenteeism. In all three countries, teacher allocation (distribution) has also come to the surface, and we will explore whether it can be addressed through the public agency approach. The issues intersect both the education and governance domains. These are issues that are visible and pressing at the community, district/county and national levels. They have the potential to galvanize various actors around it, and are correlated with improved learning outcomes for children.

We will address these issues by enhancing spaces and processes in which citizens and authorities jointly shape decisions for the future of their schools and communities. The pilot in each country takes place in 2 districts; they have begun in mid-2016, and likely need 6-9 months to generate sufficient insights and early indicators to gauge the success of the approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Kenya</th>
<th>Uganda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus issue</td>
<td>Teacher absenteeism from school and class</td>
<td>Teacher &amp; pupil absenteeism from school and class</td>
<td>Teacher absenteeism from school and class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main intervention components</td>
<td>An independent verification of teachers presence through classroom spot-checks, with local civil society and parents, combined with administrative data, will allow for selection of “most present” teacher in each participating ward. The selected teachers will be recognized publicly locally, at district level, and nationally.</td>
<td>An independent verification of teachers and pupil presence through classroom spot-checks, with local volunteers and parents representatives, combined with administrative data, will allow for selection of “most present” teacher and “best performing school in pupil attendance” in each participating ward. The selected teachers will be recognized publicly locally, at school, ward and county levels.</td>
<td>An independent verification of teacher presence through household visits (and checking of children’s workbooks), will allow for selection of “most present” teacher in each participating ward. The selected teachers will be awarded at the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example of short-term hypothesis</td>
<td>The communities (local leadership, parents) around the treatment schools will demonstrate an increase in interest and engagement in school management, particularly as related to teacher accountability but also teacher welfare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some early lessons in the management of our district partners

In working together with the district partners on the pilot plans, we have had to depart from our usual way of managing these relationships. Previously, we had engaged the partner organizations with very well-defined and specifically costed lists of activities and deliverables. This made sense in the context of our previous collaboration, which was to administer a complex and rigorous national survey (Uwezo), and to oversee the local launch of the results. But this model wasn’t well suited to the public agency pilot which has overarching objectives but by its nature allows a lot of different paths to reach those objectives (i.e., local variations in execution). We also needed to free up the partner and the community-based volunteers to use a variety of approaches uniquely tailored to their context and the relationships and spaces they are trying to influence. As a result, we devised a contractual agreement which is longer in time and higher in budget, which has commonly-agreed outcomes but much fewer defined outputs, and many moments for co-design and reflection along the way. We will be documenting the practice and lessons of working under this kind of an agreement throughout the pilot.

It wouldn’t be Twaweza without a strong learning component

Alongside the implementation plans, we also developed rich learning plans. These include internal monitoring and a lot of feedback at the various levels of implementation, as well as an external pre- and post- assessment focusing very much at the community and school level, conducted by an independent party. There are also numerous mechanisms for feedback.

We have developed overarching (initial) hypotheses about what kind of change this approach could potentially lead to, in the future. These are long-term hypotheses and not expected during the initial pilot:

1.1 In the schools receiving the full Public Agency campaign on teacher / pupil presence, there will be a decrease in teacher / pupil absenteeism from school, and an increase in the proportion of teachers / pupils who are in school and also in class (and teaching).
1.2 The district-level authorities and leadership will scrutinize and engage with official as well as independent data on teacher distribution and teacher presence (and pupil presence where relevant), and use the data to make decisions on allocation of teachers, accountability of teachers, and for teacher recognition/motivation.
1.3 National-level authorities will consider changes in how official data on teacher allocation and presence is collected and used; and will accept and engage with independent data on the same.

For this pilot, much of the data collected is qualitative and descriptive. We want to know as much as possible about the process, and we are very modest in our expectation of outcomes. The outcomes we are keenly interested in are focused around two questions.

- First, are we able to apply all the Twaweza trademark tools in this granular, sub-national space, in conjunction with our district partners? This question is about various processes and what they tell us about:
  - Our own capacity to work in this way
  - Our capacity to engage our partners in a more flexible manner
  - The capacity – and interest, and motivation – of our partners to embrace and energize this initiative
  - The capacity – and interest, and motivation – of the volunteers at community level to embrace and energize this initiative
And second, are there early signs of engagement – that is, does it seem that there is energy for citizens (parents, civil society) to engage more pro-actively with authorities (schools, district offices); and is there energy from the authorities side as well?

We have a set of short-term hypotheses, which could be measured in the initial pilot:

1. The communities (local leadership, parents) around the treatment schools will demonstrate an increase in interest and engagement in school management, particularly as related to pupil attendance, teacher accountability and teacher welfare.
2. Teachers and head teachers will positively engage with communities and civil society in verification of teacher (and pupil) presence, for accountability as well as recognition/motivation purposes.
3. District/county level authorities in pilot districts/counties will actively engage with and support collection and use of independent data on teacher (and pupil) presence, tied to accountability as well as teacher welfare.

To capture information on the process-related outcomes, as well as on the short-term hypotheses, each country learning plan has the following core components:

1. Community-level baseline, both through the initiative (implementation), as well as independent research
2. Initial outcome mapping of district-level partners, and feedback on engagement, primarily via our district partners
3. Ongoing monitoring and feedback from community-level activities (e.g. visits to schools and households, community-level meetings, etc.), primarily via volunteers
4. Mid-line “checking in” by independent research party, on the first echoes of the initiative
5. Outcome mapping at national-level and feedback on engagement, by Twaweza, with national-level actors (e.g. Ministry of Education, etc.)
6. Follow-up at community-level through implementation, as well as independent research
7. Several opportunities for in-person meetings and feedback between Twaweza and the district partner (and where possible, volunteers) built into the timeline

Currently, at the end of 2016, we are in the thick of implementing the initial pilot phase in the three countries. This phase lasts through April 2017 (to include the 1st term of the 2017 school year). We envision sifting through experiences, lessons, data and results in May, and tentatively look forward to a revised (and possibly) expanded second phase of the public agency pilot in second half of 2017.