



Via dei Bersaglieri 5c - 40125 Bologna - Italy  
Tel/Fax +39051 221882 - e-mail: cid@cid-bo.it

**SUMMER SCHOOL ON MONITORING AND EVALUATION  
OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMMES AND PUBLIC POLICIES  
POVERTY REDUCTION, SOCIAL POLICY  
AND PUBLIC-SERVICE DELIVERY**

**8 - 13 June 2009**

**Concept**

Recent trends show significant poverty reduction in many countries. Yet, poverty remains a daily reality for many people, especially in rural and remote areas. Social and economic development is still not fully benefiting the poor and the vulnerable, and government interventions fail to properly target groups that are more prone to poverty and social exclusion. More than 60% of the poor population in the world lives without access to basic services such as clean water and sanitation, basic healthcare services, proper primary education, and agricultural extension services.

The reasons for poor service delivery are many and complex, but often, they relate to lack of accountability, transparency and commitment in delivering services for poor and marginalized citizens. In many cases, the lack of implementation and absorptive capacity of government agencies and citizens hamper efficient service delivery. Inadequate targeting of the poor, supply-driven planning, elite capturing of programmes, lack of voice of the poor and their inability to reach the government and service providers, are among the most common reasons.

Often, government services fail to reach the poor, and when services are provided, they rarely reduce poverty. A key challenge for public service delivery is in designing and implementing a system that holds service providers accountable for the services delivered. The 'route' of accountability is often too long and policy makers can rarely be reached by clients, especially poor clients with information, complaints and feedback. Even if the clients are able to reach the policy makers, this does not necessarily lead to improved services because the policy makers cannot ensure that the public service provider (whether public, private or civil society) will deliver the services due to an equally long route of accountability between the policy makers and the service providers.

Mechanisms are needed for delivering services more directly to poor people and for poor people to provide feedback. If implemented strategically, poverty reduction policies can improve access to public services, increase the efficiency, transparency and accountability of government and political processes, as well as empower citizens by enabling them to participate in the decision-making processes of governments—What is needed are strategies and applications for local service delivery that are targeted at improving the livelihood of the poor and vulnerable.

If countries can succeed in strengthening the linkages between policy makers, service providers and poor people and making policy makers and service providers accountable, it will be a way of putting the poor at the centre of public service delivery, and at the same time, giving the poor a voice to tailor services towards the real needs of the communities.

Early approaches to poverty reduction emphasised **structural reforms** (SAPs, PRSPs). These were based on affordable and lean government, macroeconomic management, but have had little impact on poverty reduction and service delivery. PRSPs have actually constrained capacity and service delivery. PSRPs failed to impact positively on service delivery because of little or no direct link to improvements in services. As public services continued to deteriorate or stagnate under the structural PSRPs, there was political and public pressure to focus on improving these services. The key issue was that there were serious limitations for a series of political reasons. The PRSP approach did not address the main issues of implementation of policy and accountability. The emphasis was on policy making only, on the command and control of the State and the Government rather than on policy implementation, including the institutions accountable for it and for the delivery of services.

Subsequent corrections focused on implementation gaps between policy making and putting policy into practice [policy was good but implementation was poor]. Two types of **implementation gaps** can be highlighted:

- 1) **Capacity building and governance** – weak capacity has always been one of the root problems in policy implementation and the poor delivery of public services. Thus, the aim has become improving and expanding public service delivery through capacity building interventions. However, it seems that capacity building-oriented PSRPs have not had any perceptible impact on service delivery (lack of account for service delivery while focusing only on capacity).
- 2) **Service delivery** – based on few principles: a) need to demonstrate early results; b) public demands for transparency and accountability; c) shift to market economies and private sector-led economic growth; d) influence of “new public management”; e) need for PSRPs to support sector-wide approaches; f) pursuit of an integrated systems approach. Public-service delivery approach is result-based evidence-based policy.

Implementation gaps have been reflected in:

- A. Policies and strategies did not meet the priorities of the pro-poor and socially inclusive agenda and governments did not act on the key issue i.e. address the redistributive aspect of providers of equal opportunities for all including poor and marginalized groups.
- B. Services and applications that have a significant impact on local service delivery were not identified.
- C. As a result Importance of capacity building strategies and participatory planning for civil servants, local government and communities in designing and implementing pro-poor services did not materialise.
- D. More significantly there could be no sustainable accountability mechanisms to ensure both comprehensiveness and prevention of ad-hoc failure in the system for making poverty reduction expenditures and polices sustainable and held to transparent account by stakeholders and governments.

The failure of the PRSP agenda viewed as a structural policy-making issue only was partly the result of addressing poverty as a static and income-based issue. In reality, the issue has always been a dynamic one rooted fundamentally in the deficiencies of adequate or effective distribution mechanisms be real incomes or equal access to services. It thus follows that the more appropriate agenda has to be treating the definition of poverty as a constantly changing aggregate as well as a constantly changing composition of its constituent parts. Below are the first base definitions that may illustrate the point.

Definitions of poverty:

- Lack of minimum living standards and nutrients or minimum level of income/consumption – **absolute poverty**
- Income/consumption expenditure level below given threshold varying with aggregate median income – **relative poverty** and **unequal distribution of income and wealth**
- Lack of access to services (clean water, sanitation, health care, education, employment, insurance) independent of income/consumption expenditure – **non-income poverty** and **unequal and un-equitable access to services**.

The proper policy implementation tools should deal with poverty as a dynamic phenomenon, i.e. as a **constantly changing issue**, thus addressing:

- a. the nature scale and composition of poverty
- b. the absence of the appropriate institutional structures for addressing poverty in a dynamic way and
- c. The human and technical capacities for identifying as well as designing both the policies as well as the implementation mechanism needed for responsive and sustainable solutions to the problems.

At the core, poverty reduction policies hinge on public sector reform and government action reform.



Via dei Bersaglieri 5c - 40125 Bologna - Italy  
Tel/Fax +39051 221882 - e-mail: cid@cid-bo.it

## **SUMMER SCHOOL ON MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMMES AND PUBLIC POLICIES POVERTY REDUCTION, SOCIAL POLICY AND PUBLIC-SERVICE DELIVERY**

The Summer School is part of the **University of Bologna International Summer School Programme**. It is organised by the **Centre for International Development** in cooperation with the **University of Bologna Faculty of Political Sciences, the Department of Economics and the Department of Political Science**. The School is also sponsored by the International Office of the **State University of New York (SUNY)** at Albany, NY, as well as the **Center for International Development** at the **SUNY Rockefeller College for Public Affairs and Policy**.

This year's Summer School will be a 6-day intensive course delivered in English, open to applicants of any country and background, giving 5 credits graded by the ECTS system.

This year's Summer School will focus on monitoring and evaluation of poverty reduction policies and the public-service delivery approach. Trainers are both academics and professionals, all outstanding experts in their field. Highly interactive, with extensive use of practical exercises, the course provides an introduction to this increasingly important discipline.

Poverty reduction and social policy have been designed and implemented focusing on control-and-command approach by governments and hinging on structural and public-sector reforms. After considerable failure to deliver services and reduce poverty, emphasis has shifted to capacity building and systems of governance. Yet, service delivery has remained poor. The public-service delivery approach, by emphasising proper targeting, performance indicator tracking and accountability of all levels of government involved, can put effective policy making at the centre-stage of the poverty reduction agenda.

### **Programme of the Course**

## **ISSUES AND APPROACHES**

### **DAY 1**

**[9:00-12:00]**

**Introduction – Prof. Gianfranco Pasquino.** Performance legitimacy and Policy reform as Political processes (in developing countries)

**Prof. Pier Giorgio Ardeni – The problem: the dynamic nature of poverty**

Poverty Reduction, MDGs, and Social Policies: the implementation gap between policy making and implementation, between objectives results, between targets and delivery – Reducing poverty is

not only about raising level of income of the poor (absolute poverty), or raising median income (relative poverty) but also decreasing inequality in income distribution and improving access to services (education, labour, health care) and service delivery

**[14:00-17:00]**

**(TBC) – The solution: an issue of administrative reform**

Public Service Delivery: An approach to policy implementation effectiveness. Approaches to improving Service Delivery and their impact. What is lacking in effective service delivery: prioritization, targets, inter ministerial coordination, regular and excellent M&E systems. Policy design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Policy M&E in political contexts.

## **IMPLEMENTATION PREREQUISITES**

### **DAY 2**

#### **1. CAPACITY BUILDING – AT THE STRUCTURAL/INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL**

**[9:00-12:00]**

**(TBC) – Capacity building for policy implementation: the case of education**

- Context and Definition: Policy implementation can only be effective if capacity is built. The case of education and social inclusion, access to education as way to reduce poverty. Building capacity within institutions responsible for implementation is key to success.
- Tools: Setting processes for improving delivery, setting policy and establishing targets, measuring changes. Data and reporting to drive and inform the process.

**[14:00-17:00]**

**Dr. John N. Pyres – Capacity building for policy implementation: the case of labour and employment policies**

- Context and Definitions: Employment and labour markets are dynamic. Policy should adapt to change in dynamics. The Lisbon Treaty and applications outside EU.
- Tools: Improving Labour Policies. Active labour market policies. Data and intelligence needed to monitor dynamics and inform policies.

### **DAY 3**

#### **2. INTELLIGENCE AND DATA**

**[9:00-12:00]**

**Dr. Antonio Andracchio – Definitions of poverty. Measures and measurement of poverty.**

- The minimum food basket and living standard – absolute poverty
- Consumption expenditure and income and the median-relative threshold – relative poverty and the distribution of income
- Measuring welfare and well-being: income and consumption. Adjusting welfare measures: prices and equivalence scales. Poverty Lines: objective, relative, subjective.
- Poverty indicators - Monetary and non monetary measures – Multi-dimensional measures
- Access to services, entitlements, capabilities – non income and multi-dimensional poverty

**[14:00-17:00]**

**Prof. Pier Giorgio Ardeni**

**– Poverty data: what data/statistics are needed**

- Data sources – household budget surveys (e.g. HBS) – longitudinal and panel surveys (e.g. LSMS) – how to use household surveys to measure different poverty indicators
- Designing survey for poverty measurement

### – Poverty and Inequality: two sides of the same coin

- Distribution of income/consumption expenditure and measures of inequality of distribution – equity, equality, fairness
- Data sources of income/consumption distribution

## DAY 4

### 3. TOOLS TO MONITOR AND ASSESS POLICY IMPACT

[9:00-12:00]

#### Dr. Luigi Cuna – Policy Monitoring and Evaluation

- Concepts and methods. Evaluation methods. Incidence evaluations. Impact evaluations. The archetypal evaluation problem, Randomized and non-randomized evaluations. Evaluation strategy, Incidence evaluation, Impact evaluation.
- Impact and evaluations in policy debate. The issue of causality and attribution. Impact evaluations. Randomized and quasi-experimental experiments. Accountability for results and impact.
- Results-based management. Institutional frameworks and processes to implement an M&E system in a public organization.

[14:00-17:00]

#### (TBC) – Policy Impact Assessment, Targets, and Performance Indicators: Tools of the Public Service Delivery Approach.

Impact Assessment. Performance indicators. M&E for public accountability.

Three elements of performance management model:

- Target - the setting of measurable performance objectives couched in terms of outputs and outcomes - targets are meant to be cascaded down through departments and agencies, with budget allocations tied to outcomes.
- The independent monitoring and reporting of performance,
- Application of consequences for success or failure.

## EVIDENCE-BASED POLICY STRUCTURES NEEDED TO MANAGE POVERTY REDUCTION DYNAMICS AS AN ACCOUNTABLE ACTION.

## DAY 5

#### Dr. John N. Pyres – The Meso-level approach

Meeting the poverty reduction agenda through the new modalities in the social protection and inclusion policies at EU and inter regional levels.

- Social inclusion and protection. Poverty is now being seen as a dynamic
- Country examples – what was done in social inclusion policies
  - Candidate countries and the EU in the enlargement process
  - Balkan countries (not yet candidate countries)

## DAY 6

[9:00-12:00]

#### Prof. Pier Giorgio Ardeni – The macro-level approach

- SAPs and PRSPs – Macroeconomic management and poverty reduction: the structural approach
- PRSPs, Public Administration Reform and the capacity building approach
- Monitoring PRSPs: indicators, sources, frequency, reporting. What has happened in practice, Institutional aspects of PRS monitoring: lessons learned and challenges.

- [Millennium Development Goals](#) – Human development concepts and measures. MDG indicators, Monitoring systems and surveys required
- [The macroeconomics of Poverty reduction strategies](#). Macroeconomic management, sector policies and poverty reduction. What's wrong with PRSPs
- Income distribution and poverty reductions: re-distribution and welfare policies

#### **[14:00-17:00] ROUND TABLE**

#### **CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS**

- Poverty is dynamic – implications for policy
- What institutions, instruments to manage change
- Which agenda and where can we promote it
- The importance of politics and the politics of poverty reduction

#### **TRAINERS**

- [Dr. Antonio Andracchio](#) – CID, Univ. Bologna, Expert in poverty statistics
- [Prof. Pier Giorgio Ardeni](#) – CID, Univ. Bologna, Expert in poverty reduction strategies
- [Dr. Luigi Cuna](#) – IFAD, M&E expert
- [Prof. Gianfranco Pasquino](#) – Univ. Bologna, Former Member of Italian Senate
- [Dr. John Norman Pyres](#) – European Commission

#### **ENROLLEMENT FEE: 1500 Euro**

Fee includes tuition, materials and lunches during training. It does not include room and board or travel expenses. Various affordable lodging arrangements are listed on the CID website along with application information. **A limited number of tuition waivers and scholarships will be available.**

#### **CREDITS: 4 ECTS**

**WHO SHOULD APPLY:** Graduate students, development professionals and civil servants responsible for monitoring and reporting on the quality of social change/development programmes. Applicants need an undergraduate degree and must be proficient in English.