

# JOINT SECTOR REVIEW MATURITY LADDER

November 2018

**Note to the user:**

It is recommended to read through the guidelines for joint sector reviews—*Joint Sector Reviews in the Education Sector—A practical guide for organizing effective JSRs*<sup>1</sup>—as a general introduction before using this tool, specifically Chapter 2 – JSR effectiveness framework

## Maturity ladder

**This two-page matrix sets the JSR within an evolving framework, using short narratives to describe characteristics of different maturity levels of JSRs, from basic to intermediate to mature. Organizers of JSRs can use this intuitive tool as an initial exercise to assess past JSRs against the five dimensions and create a quick and visual overview of the potential for growth and optimized use of JSRs.**

### How and when to use the maturity ladder

The tool is also available on the GPE website for use and adaptation: JSR maturity ladder.

**Purpose and Use:** The tool reflects how country teams might progress from the organization of their first-time or ‘ad-hoc’ JSR, toward a more robust, well-defined, and well-managed JSR. A more mature JSR foresees and responds to changing sector priorities and stakeholder expectations and is used as an instrument to manage technical and capacity risks. It is also fully embedded in the institutional landscape, and collectively supported.

As such, organizers of JSRs can use this intuitive tool as an initial exercise to:

- *Position their JSR* against the five dimensions;
- *Create a quick and visual overview* of the potential for growth and optimized use of JSRs; and
- *Kick off dialogue* around current and potential JSR practices.

**Methodology:** The tool is intended to engage organizers or a wider group of stakeholders in initial dialogue around the JSR, for instance during the preparation of the ToR to set a vision.

It is helpful to use color coding to mark the maturity level that is most resonant within the situation in the specific context for each dimension. Country teams can also mark the level of maturity they are aiming toward, to envision and assess realistic direction for their JSR.

**Timing:** The tool can be used as a taster of the more detailed self-assessment tool (see previous tool), or independently as a shorthand method for assessing organizational maturity and where focus may be needed in the undertaking of JSRs.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/practical-guide-effective-joint-sector-reviews-education-sector>

### JSR MATURITY LADDER

Create a quick visual overview of what characterizes your current JSR practices and how you envision these to evolve over time, based on the maturity characteristics for each JSR dimension. Use one color to mark the box that best captures past/current/likely practices, and another color to mark the desired and feasible level of maturity for the next JSR.

**Note:** The characteristics described for the maturity level of each JSR dimension are indicative only and not mutually exclusive—JSRs do not necessarily evolve linearly, as many factors are at play. Learning can and should happen at all levels. If country teams move along the maturity ladder from one step to the next, they should always be considered as having created a learning environment.

DIMENSIONS OF AN EFFECTIVE JSR	MATURITY LADDER OF EVOLVING JSRS				
	EMERGING		INTERMEDIATE	MATURE	
	INITIAL	DEVELOPING	WELL DEFINED	WELL MANAGED	OPTIMIZED
<b>Inclusive and Participatory</b>	Narrow stakeholder participation in JSR and limited mutual accountability for plan implementation and sector results. Weak trust in JSR process and/or limited agreement on JSR usefulness as part of strengthening of ESP planning, monitoring, and reporting cycle.	Growing stakeholder awareness around necessity of JSR, but limited and reactive engagement of stakeholder groups. Engagement not always effective, with limited stakeholder commitment to JSR priority actions.	Good communication, support services, and funding for broad participation of state and non-state actors in JSR. Expected stakeholder roles well defined and according responsibilities proactively followed. More effective participation and data contributions throughout the review process.	All stakeholder groups represented and proactively participating in JSR. Stakeholders effectively contribute to JSR ToR, gathering evidence base, production of documents, agenda setting, recommendations, etc.	Regular stakeholder updates and communications, and process transparency toward optimizing year-round collaboration on JSR.
<b>Aligned with common policy frameworks</b>	No or partial alignment of JSR to ESP/TEP or sector/subsector strategies. JSR recommendations not systematically followed up to benefit sector reporting, monitoring, and planning cycles. Monitoring efforts entail high transaction costs.	Improvements in joint assessment of education sector performance against ESP/TEP and annual results frameworks, but continued parallel monitoring processes led by development partners and civil society stakeholders. Limited follow-up on JSR recommendations.	JSR largely aligned with ESP/TEP planning and reporting cycle and ESP/TEP annual results frameworks. Explicit linkages with subsector strategies and programming. More systematic attention to documenting and implementing agreed follow-up actions. ESP/TEP regularly reviewed in light of JSR findings.	JSR is principal sector review mechanism to which majority of education stakeholders align. JSR input documents fully aligned with ESP/TEP and its operational documents (e.g., annual or multiyear operational plan and results framework).	Fully integrated JSR serving sector planning, appraisals, and M&E—resulting in mutual accountability and reduced transaction costs. Optimization of JSR data and outcomes across all sector planning, programming, and budgeting elements.

<p><b>Based on Evidence</b></p>	<p>Weak baseline for monitoring. EMIS and M&amp;E data not robust (e.g., inaccurate; outdated; not disaggregated by region, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic level). Low information transparency. Weak financial reporting on government and development partner investments. Lack of reporting from sub-national level, CSOs, NGOs.</p> <p>Poor quality annual report, or no report.</p>	<p>Data still not robust, but broader data contributed by stakeholders (although not all integrated into main JSR documents). Annual implementation report accompanied by financial reporting, complementary studies, etc. However, report quality impinged by data quality and technical capacities. Drafting guidelines developed.</p>	<p>JSR based on verifiable evidence sourced through variety of stakeholders. Information clearly attributed, referenced, unbiased and transparent. JSR documentation quality assured through planning, dedicated capacity development, and peer review.</p>	<p>JSR fed by year-round data collection and analysis. Evidence base regularly updated and aligned with ESP/TEP. Regular availability of good quality JSR documentation (e.g., implementation updates, financial reports, specially commissioned thematic studies).</p>	<p>Metrics and stakeholder feedback on use of data used to drive continuous improvements in data gathering and production of review documents.</p> <p>JSR evidence contributes to strengthened EMIS and M&amp;E capacities by supporting capacity development and flagging urgent deficits in M&amp;E data.</p>
<p><b>Monitoring tool</b></p>	<p>JSR organized on ad-hoc basis. No standardization of processes, resulting in reactive decision making and unpredictability.</p> <p>Weak buy-in to, and accountability for, review process and findings.</p>	<p>JSRs undertaken more regularly. Some parts of JSR process repeatable through standardized ToR.</p> <p>Decision-making sound and work flows improving with some training available, but weak metrics on JSR effectiveness.</p>	<p>JSRs undertaken regularly and gaining momentum. Well-defined ToR with repeatable processes (expected roles and tasks in evidence gathering, implementation report drafting, aide-memoire). Well-defined metrics for measuring JSR process quality and M&amp;E effectiveness.</p>	<p>Well-managed JSR process now part of year-round M&amp;E culture and integrated within a single monitoring system.</p> <p>Metrics and self-assessments exploited to identify inefficiencies, risks, and effectiveness.</p>	<p>JSRs part of a continuous monitoring cycle.</p> <p>JSR metrics analysis and stakeholder feedback drives continuous improvements in JSR processes, ESP/TEP implementation, and M&amp;E systems.</p>
<p><b>Instrument for Change</b></p>	<p>No dedicated government staff and resources assigned to the JSR process.</p> <p>Lack of clarity on stakeholder responsibilities. JSR largely supported through technical support of development partners.</p>	<p>Government leadership identified and dedicated coordination structure engaged with government staff.</p> <p>Clearer roles/responsibilities emerging with some standardization of tasks.</p>	<p>Strategic value of JSR recognized. Drive to fully institutionalize JSR and strengthen capacities.</p> <p>Consistent follow-up throughout year and review of priorities of previous JSR.</p>	<p>JSR fully institutionalized through the LEG; national dialogue structures, thematic working groups, and planning cycle. Strong commitment of government to priority actions and JSR follow-up.</p>	<p>Multi-stakeholder collaboration, information sharing and pooling of experiences optimizes government JSR capacities and ESP/TEP education investments.</p>

## OFFICE LOCATIONS

### Washington

1850 K Street NW  
Suite 625  
Washington, DC 20006  
USA

### Paris

66 Avenue d'Iéna  
75116 Paris  
France

### Brussels

Avenue Marnix 17, 2nd floor  
B-1000, Brussels  
Belgium

## MAILING ADDRESS

### Global Partnership for Education

MSN IS 6-600  
1818 H Street NW  
Washington, DC 20433  
USA

[www.globalpartnership.org](http://www.globalpartnership.org)

