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Some Key Findings

• **Desired school level outcomes**: when coherence in internal (to the school) and external support for meeting expectations and for translating information about performance into everyday practice of teaching and learning

• **Undesirable school level outcomes** in cases of inadequate implementation an ignoring school/teacher capacitates (e.g. to interpret exam results or use educational management or conduct school self-evaluations as part of inspection)

Mechanisms of change:

• Setting expectations
• Providing feedback/consequences
• Capacity development of educators
• Capacity development of stakeholders
• Institutionalisation of norms

• Accountability and three elements are broad and have different meanings in developed versus developing countries: inspection/supervision (shaped differently to fit context of limited resources)

• Relevant elements of context (both in how accountability systems are implemented, and their functioning): (a) level of income, (b) physical and administrative distance between central administration and school, (c) differing urban/rural poor access to educational services

• Lead countries set the debate in different regions: South Africa, South Korea, Chile

Under what conditions do:

• Monitoring systems, including using administrative data systems (e.g. EMIS) as well as more targeted monitoring mechanisms

• Inspection systems

• Assessment systems

improve system efficiency, service delivery and learning outcomes, especially for the poorest and most marginalised in low- and middle-income countries?
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