REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN WORKING GROUP

For Decision/Input

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to seek the decision of the Board of Directors on the draft Global Partnership for Education ("Global Partnership" or "GPE") Strategic Plan found in **Annex 1**. This document will be discussed at the Board Retreat on 6 June 2012 and decisions will be proposed for the meeting of the Board of Directors on 7-8 June 2012. It is recognized that some of the decisions outlined below may be amended after the Retreat and before the meeting of the Board of Directors.

2. RECOMMENDED DECISIONS

The Strategic Plan Working Group proposes that the Board of Directors discuss the following decisions at the Retreat, for its consideration at its meeting on 7-8 June 2012:

BOD/2012/06-XX—Vision, Mission, Strategic Goals and Core Long Term Strategies: The Board of Directors approves the following vision, mission, strategic goals and core long term strategies for the Global Partnership for Education, to be in effect until 2021:

1. **Vision:** A good education for all children, everywhere, so they fulfill their potential and contribute to their societies.

2. **Mission:** To galvanize and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable.

3. **Strategic Goals:**

(a) **Access for All**: All children have access to a safe, adequately equipped place to receive an education.

(b) **Learning for All:** All children master basic literacy and numeracy skills by the early grades.

(c) **Reaching Every Child:** Resources are focused on the most marginalized children and those in fragile and conflict-affected states.

(d) **Building for the Future:** National systems have the capacity and integrity to deliver quality education for all their children.

4. **Core Long Term Strategies:** The Global Partnership will leverage the skills, leadership and resources of it partners to:

- Increase the visibility of education as a key strategy for the health, wealth and stability of nations;
- Support countries to develop and implement good education plans which are sustainable and country-led;
- Strengthen the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of developing country partner government systems;
- Continuously improve through innovation and by promoting best practice;
- Develop and promote harmonized education goals and metrics; and
- Improve development effectiveness.

BOD/2012/06-XX—<u>Objectives of the Global Partnership for Education 2012-2015</u>: The Board of Directors approves the following objectives for the Global Partnership for Education for the period of 2012 to 2015:

1. Fragile and conflict-affected states able to develop and implement their education plans.

2. Girls achieve gender parity in primary completion and transition to secondary in all GPE-endorsed countries.

3. Dramatic increase in the number of children demonstrating mastery of basic literacy skills by Grade 3.

4. Improve teacher effectiveness by attracting the most qualified teachers and supporting them to provide a good education.

5. Expand the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic funding to education in GPE-endorsed countries.

BOD/2012/06-XX—Finalization of the Strategic Plan: The Board of Directors requests:

1. The Strategic Plan Working Group to revise and finalize the draft Strategic Plan, based on input received at the Retreat and meeting of the Board of Directors in June 2012, and present it no later than 1 July 2012 for consideration by the Board of Directors at an audio-conference to be scheduled in late July 2012.

2. The Secretariat to submit to the Board of Directors for its approval, following approval of the Strategic Plan, an implementation plan, budget considerations, risk management plan, and communications strategy for the Strategic Plan.

3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Executive Summary of the Strategic Plan is contained in the draft plan itself in Annex 1.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 At its meeting on 11-12 November 2011, the Board of Directors made the following decision:

> **BOD/2011/11-02 – Strategic Plan for the Global Partnership for Education 2011-2014:** The Board of Directors takes note of "A Strategic Vision for the Global Partnership for Education 2011-2014" (BOD/2011/11—DOC 02), and requests the Chair to form a Working Group of the Board of Directors, working with the Secretariat, to develop a strategic plan and associated implementation plan and budget, for the Global Partnership for 2012-2015 (the "Strategic Plan"). The Board of Directors requests that the Working Group engages with the members of the Global Partnership in its development of the Strategic Plan which it shall present at a retreat to be held immediately prior to the next face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors.

4.2 The Strategic Plan Working Group was formed by the Chair of the Board of Directors and began to operate in February 2012. The terms of reference, including the membership of the Strategic Plan Working Group, which was previously shared after comment by the Board of Directors, are posted on the GPE website[1].

[1] http://www.globalpartnership.org/media/Misc./SPFINAL.pdf

4.3 The Strategic Plan Working Group met four times since February 2012 (one time face-to face and three times by audio-conference). The summaries of each of the meetings were shared with the Board of Directors shortly after the meetings.

4.4 The first task of the Working Group was to design a consultation questionnaire to ensure wide input from the greater partnership. As reported to the Board of Directors, the feedback from the partners was extensive. 78 questionnaires were completed and a summary of the feedback, shared previously with the Board of Directors, is found in **Annex 2**.

4.5 As part of the Strategic Plan, the Working Group also developed a Strategic Framework, which was subject to several iterations following feedback from the Board of Directors. The current version of the Strategic Framework is contained within the draft Strategic Plan on page 9 of Annex 1.

5. PROPOSED PROCESS FOR FINALIZING THE STRATEGIC PLAN

5.1 The Board of Directors is holding a Retreat on 6 June 2012 in Berlin, Germany, immediately before the meeting of the Board of Directors on 7-8 June 2012 where the draft Strategic Plan will be discussed.

5.2 At the time of writing this report (mid-May 2012), the Strategic Plan Working Group is recommending the decisions outlined in Section 2 above. The Strategic Plan Working Group believes that there is a broad consensus within the Board of Directors, following extensive consultation, on the vision, mission, goals and core long term strategies of the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan Working Group is recommending that these be in effect until 2021, which encompasses three 3-year strategic planning cycles of 2012-2015, 2016-2018 and 2019-2021. If agreed, this would commit the Global Partnership to long term goals beyond the Millennium Development Goal target dates of 2015 and would provide the strategic clarity that partners are seeking. The Strategic Plan Working Group is also recommending the five objectives for the period of 2012-2015, upon which there is broad consensus within the Working Group.

5.3 Good feedback was received from developing country partners on the consultation questionnaire, but there was much less feedback from them on the Framework and draft plan. A briefing for interested developing country partners will be organized in Berlin on 5 June 2012, the day before the Retreat.

5.4 The draft Strategic Plan presented in Annex 1 contains a number of new policy areas and foci for the Global Partnership, for which there is not yet enough “buy-in” from the Working

Group or the Board of Directors. Some of these areas are included in the actions lists under the objectives, in the enabling approaches of the Global Partnership for the next three years (2012-2015), and in the indicators that will be used to measure success. These are outlined in the draft Strategic Framework and Plan and will be discussed at the Board Retreat and meeting. The feedback received will be incorporated by the Strategic Plan Working Group into the final documents. Many of these will require further work and consideration by the Board of Directors.

5.5 The Strategic Plan Working Group acknowledges that the terms of reference and the Board decision requested an implementation plan and budget to accompany the Strategic Plan. In addition, the terms of reference referred to a risk management plan. The Working Group noted that these documents would need to be prepared once the Strategic Plan was completed and resolved that they be developed and delivered following the approval of the final Strategic Plan.

5.6 The draft Strategic Plan does not contain an accompanying implementation plan; it will be prepared following consideration by the Board of Directors and finalization of the Strategic Plan. However, the Strategic Plan Working Group has done some preliminary work on some aspects of the implementation plan and can provide some commentary on this at the Retreat on 6 June if requested.

5.7 The draft Strategic Plan contains an accompanying attachment which outlines some very preliminary thinking on budget implications. The purpose of including this draft attachment is to provide the Board of Directors with some very indicative parameters and also provide some reassurance that the budgetary implications of the plan are not excessive.

5.8 In addition, the Working Group recommends to the Board of Directors that a communications strategy be developed with the objective of publishing, launching, disseminating, and promoting the Strategic Plan among the partners, key decision-makers and stakeholders. This has been incorporated into the recommended decision in paragraph 2 above.

6. NEXT STEPS

The Working Group proposes that following discussion at the Board Retreat on 6 June 2012, the decisions be considered by the Board of Directors at its meeting on 7-8 June 2012. The Working Group will continue to work on the Strategic Plan, including the enabling approaches and indicators, following the Board meeting. It will then be delivered to the Board of Directors for its approval by the end of June 2012, likely in an audio-conference to be held by the end of July.

This ambitious timeline is proposed in order to have a final approved document ready for the launching of the United Nations Secretary General's Education Initiative at the United Nations General Assembly meeting in September 2012. The implementation plan, budget considerations, risk management plan, and communications plan will be developed by the Secretariat and sent to the Board of Directors for approval following this process.

ANNEX 1: DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since its inception in 2002, the Global Partnership for Education (the "Global Partnership" or "GPE") has been devoted to getting all children everywhere into school for a good education. It is the only global partnership for education and comprises 50 developing countries; more than 30 bilateral, regional and multilateral agencies and development banks; the private sector and private foundations; the teaching profession; and international and local civil society organizations (CSOs).

The Global Partnership's efforts since 2002 have achieved impressive results, including 19 million more children in school, 300,000 teachers trained, 30,000 more classrooms constructed, 200 million textbooks provided and higher school completion rates for boys and girls.

This Strategic Plan builds on these achievements and sets out the vision, mission, strategic goals and core strategies of the Global Partnership to 2021. The vision is "a good education for all children, everywhere, so they fulfill their potential and contribute to their societies" and the mission is "to galvanize and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable."

The Global Partnership has four Strategic Goals to achieve this vision:

i) all children have access to a safe, adequately equipped place to receive an education;
ii) all children master basic literacy and numeracy skills by the early grades;
iii) resources are focused on the most marginalized children and those in fragile states; and
iv) national systems have the capacity and integrity to deliver quality education for all their children.

The Strategic Plan contains five objectives for the period 2012-2015 which specifically address the major and immediate barriers to achieving the longer term goals. The objectives articulate what the Global Partnership intends to do over the next three years to progress towards its goals and provide a basis for concerted effort in fragile states, on girls' education, early grade reading, education financing and improving teaching.

The following attachments are included in this Strategic Plan:

1. Indicative Budgetary Considerations

2. Implementation Plan

3. Risk Management Plan

4. Glossary

B. FRAMEWORK

The overall framework for the Strategic Plan is contained on the next page.

Draft Framework of the Strategic Plan 2012-2015 and Beyond (vers. 5)

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP for EDUCATION
globalpartnership.org

VISION A good education for all children, everywhere, so they fulfill their potential and contribute to their societies

MISSION To galvanize and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable

2012-21

STRATEGIC GOALS

1	2	3	4
ACCESS FOR ALL *All children have access to a safe, adequately equipped place to receive an education*	**LEARNING FOR ALL** *All children master basic literacy and numeracy skills by the early grades*	**REACHING EVERY CHILD** *Resources are focused on the most marginalized children and those in fragile and conflict-affected states*	**BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE** *National systems have the capacity and integrity to deliver quality education for all their children*

CORE LONG TERM STRATEGIES OF THE PARTNERSHIP

The Global Partnership will leverage the reach, skills, leadership and resources of its partners to:

- Increase the visibility of education as a key strategy for the health, wealth and stability of nations
- Support countries to develop and implement good education plans which are sustainable and country-led

- Strengthen the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of developing country partner government systems
- Continuously improve through innovation and by promoting best practice
- Develop and promote harmonized education goals and metrics
- Improve development effectiveness

OBJECTIVES OF THE PARTNERSHIP 2012 - 2015

2012-15

1. Fragile and conflict-affected states able to develop and implement their education plans	2. Girls achieve gender parity in primary completion and transition to secondary in all GPE-endorsed countries	3. Dramatic increase in the number of children demonstrating mastery of basic literacy skills by Grade 3	4. Improve teacher effectiveness by attracting the most qualified teachers and supporting them to provide a good education	5. Expand the volume, effectiveness and efficiency of external and domestic financing to education in GPE-endorsed countries
• System support to deliver adequate education services at the country and sub-national levels • Increased support to LEGs for better country-level coordination and transitional plan development • GPE endorsement and funding mechanisms to be more flexible and fit for purpose in fragile states	• Work with UNGEI and others on targeted support to countries with elevated gender imbalances • GPE processes reinforce country-level dialogue on increased girls' participation	• Reduce by half the number of children unable to read by Grade 3 in at least 20 countries in 5 years • Support strategies and initiatives for early-grade reading • Prioritize teacher training and professional support for effective approaches to teach reading	• Support improvements in the remuneration and working conditions of teachers • Support the engagement of the teaching profession on standards of practice in GPE-endorsed countries • Increase engagement of teachers in LEGs	• Meet GPE fundraising targets • Improve resource mobilization, communications and advocacy • Advocate for increased external funding and promote sustained or increased domestic funding
Possible Indicators: • *Improvement in donor coordination and operation in GPE fragile states compared to non-fragile states* • *Number of fragile states with GPE-endorsed education plans* • *Core access and learning indicators disaggregated at the Global Partnership level by fragile vs. non-fragile states*	***Possible Indicators:*** • *Gender Parity in transition to lower secondary school* • *Gender Parity in lower secondary school completion rate* • *Gender Parity in transition to upper secondary school* • *Percentage of women in management positions in the education sector*	***Possible Indicators:*** • *The proportion of students who, by Grade 3, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text* • *Percentage of children receiving early childhood education with meaningful content* • *Gender parity in reading*	***Possible Indicators:*** • *Proportion of education plans that adequately address the issue of teacher salaries and working conditions* • *Tracking of actual teacher pay conditions* • *Proportion of countries with agreed and applied teacher practice standards* • *Tracking of "opportunity to learn"*	***Possible Indicators:*** • *Percentage of total government budget that goes to education and to basic education* • *Percentage of resources spent at school level* • *Levels of mobilization of adequate and sustainable external financing for education* • *Progress of developing country partners against their own targets*

ENABLING APPROACHES 2012-2015

The Global Partnership will place a greater priority on basic education in the period 2012-2015 and will ensure:

- Greater engagement in support of local education groups, sector planning and country level processes
- Greater focus on knowledge sharing and lessons learned, including expanding the partnership to foster exchange of evidence based policies
- Strengthen risk management and anti-fraud/corruption standards

- A broader pool of supervising and managing entities
- Streamline processes and procedures
- Strengthen the role of civil society and the private sector in the partnership
- More funding delivered in a way which supports country budgeting processes and builds capacity
- Greater use of information technology for educational improvement
- Greater focus on effectiveness, value for money and results
- Seek out, nurture, evaluate and support scaling-up of innovations

1. INTRODUCTION

The Global Partnership is the only global partnership devoted to getting all children, everywhere, into school for a good education. The Global Partnership is unique, comprising 50 developing countries; more than 30 bilateral, regional and multilateral agencies and development banks; the private sector and private foundations; the teaching profession; and international and local CSOs. Since 2002, the Global Partnership for Education (formerly the Education for All Fast Track Initiative) has fundamentally transformed international cooperation in education in developing countries with impressive achievements in the quality of national education plans in the poorest countries, donor coordination around those plans and the injection of resources to bridge the education funding gap to train teachers, build classrooms, provide books and other education services (amounting to over US$3.5 billion committed to date, as well as approximately six percent annual average increases in domestic financing over the past decade).

The Global Partnership operates at both the country level and the global level. At the country level, the Local Education Group (LEG) forms the foundation of the partnership's governance. It comprises the government of the developing country partner, donors present in the country, multilateral agencies, CSOs, the private sector and private foundations supporting the education sector. At the global level, the Global Partnership is directed by a constituency-based Board of Directors, supported by a professional Secretariat based in Washington, DC.

The work of the Global Partnership is guided by six principles: country ownership, support linked to performance, lower transaction costs, transparency, development results and value-for-money, and mutual accountability.

All members of the Global Partnership have a shared commitment to accelerating progress towards the achievement by 2015 of the Education for All goals of: i) expanding early childhood education; ii) providing free and compulsory basic education for all; iii) promoting learning and life skills for young people and adults; iv) increasing adult literacy; v) achieving gender parity and gender equality; and vi) improving the quality of education.

This document sets out the Global Partnership's vision, mission and goals to 2015 and beyond, and articulates how the partnership will work to achieve its objectives. It provides direction for the whole partnership, and as such it is an inclusive plan, not exclusive or prescriptive. It captures the diversity of the GPE partners while providing a focus for collective effort.

After a general introduction to the importance of education and partnership, the plan is divided into two parts. Part 1 contains the vision, mission, strategic goals and core strategies of the Global Partnership for the longer term, to 2021. This part of the plan provides a longer-term depiction of what the Global Partnership is, what it ultimately seeks to achieve and how it functions at its core.

Part 2 focuses on the period of 2012-2015, outlining five objectives that require specific focus in the short to medium term. These objectives, with indicators to measure progress, are supported by a number of enabling approaches which are a pre-requisite to success and will guide much of the work of the Board of Directors and the Secretariat.

2. THE IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION AND PARTNERSHIP

The numbers of primary school children currently out of school globally is down to 61 million. This is an impressive reduction from close to 110 million in 2000. The developing world and international community have made good progress on improving access to education. However, these figures mask an alarming crisis in education globally. UNICEF estimates that over 50 million children who are enrolled in school do not actually attend school. Even more worryingly, over 50% of children in the poorest countries cannot read anything at all by the end of grade 3. Underlying these stark statistics are significant issues of inequity and marginalization whereby access and learning outcomes are notably worse among the poorer, rural children, with pockets of disadvantage among girls, particularly in terms of access to secondary education.

Over 40% of the world's out-of-school children live in fragile and conflict-affected states (and the percentage is increasing) and reading and other quality indicators remain stubbornly low in these countries.

Much remains to be done. The Global Partnership offers a unique opportunity for coordinated, concerted action.

The Global Partnership is more than a funding body. Its uniqueness lies in its ability to mobilize the efforts of diverse interests to achieve a common goal – the education of children. It does so in two important ways: by mobilizing resources, both domestic and external, and by helping donors and developing countries work together to ensure that education aid is better coordinated and more effective, based on countries' own education strategies.

The Global Partnership model recognizes that developing country partner governments determine a country's national education goals. By joining the Global Partnership, developing country partners also commit to focusing on shared priorities through the Global Partnership.

GPE developing country partners display consistently better outcomes than non-partner countries. The Global Partnership model works. Moreover, developing country partners have for the most part increased their levels of domestic financing over the past decade, by some six percent per annum.

However, the prospects for external financing are more sobering. After some significant increases in donor funding for basic education in the decade to 2010, a renewed commitment, momentum and more predictable financing are required to bridge the gap in funding for education globally. This plan aims to address some of the core challenges still facing efforts to get more children in the poorest countries into school, for longer and for a better education. The power of the Global Partnership underlying the plan can make a very real difference.

PART 1: LONG TERM: 2012-2021

VISION OF THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP

A good education for all children, everywhere, so they fulfill their potential and contribute to their societies

MISSION OF THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP

To galvanize and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable

BOARD ENDORSEMENT OF VISION AND MISSION FOR GPE REQUIRED

STRATEGIC GOALS

The Global Partnership has identified four core strategic goals that will guide the concerted efforts of all of its partners to 2021. The focus of the education community globally over the past 15 years has been to increase the number of children with access to basic education. Much greater consideration needs to be given to education quality, equity, reaching marginalized populations and to building appropriate national education systems. These issues are as vital as

is access to ensure that children receive a good education. Therefore, it is essential that concerted action is also focused on quality, equity and systems.

Each of the four strategic goals will be tracked with specific indicators to measure progress. For the most part, data on these indicators are already available. However, in a couple of instances, specific additional work will be required to obtain data.

GOAL I: Access for All: All children have access to a safe, adequately equipped place to receive an education

Access remains central, with some 61 million children still not enrolled in primary school and tens of millions of children who are enrolled not attending school regularly. However, improved access is not simply about getting more children enrolled. It means reasonable class sizes, in schools that offer a safe environment for both children and teachers, with adequate buildings and equipment.

The core indicators for this goal are:

- gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) in the grade prior to Grade 1;
- primary Completion Rate (PCR);
- pupil-teacher ratio (PTR); and
- rate of out-of-school children.

GOAL II: Learning for All: All children master basic literacy and numeracy skills by the early grades

In order for children to learn, fulfill their potential and contribute positively to their societies as adults, they must be able to read, write and be numerate. The Global Partnership will focus on each of these aspects of a child's education. Other aspects of quality may also be important to the achievement of a country's education plan. The Global Partnership supports a holistic approach to quality, but recognizes that many of its partners are providing strong leadership in other quality areas.

The core indicators for this goal are:

- the proportion of students who, by Grade 3 of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text; and
- the proportion of students who, by Grade 3 of primary schooling, have numerical conceptual understanding and procedural fluency with basic operations.

GOAL III: <u>Reaching Every Child</u>: Resources are focused on the most marginalized children and those in fragile and conflict-affected states

Issues of inequity and marginalization in education cannot be ignored and require targeted action since the Global Partnership cannot achieve its goals if the poorest and most marginalized are not reached. The GPE partners will address inequity by income or wealth, gender, urban-rural, child labor, disability, ethnic/tribal minorities and fragile and conflict-affected states. In the period covered by this Strategic Plan, the Global Partnership will focus primarily on fragile and conflict-affected states and gender inequity to get more children into school for a longer and better education. Effective action on inequity and marginalization necessitates a focus at both the country level and the sub national level in planning, implementation and monitoring.

The core indicators for this goal are the same indicators for Strategic Goals 1 & 2, disaggregated below the country level at least by:

- income or wealth quintile;
- gender; and
- disability.

GOAL IV: <u>Building for the Future</u>: National systems have the capacity and integrity to deliver quality education for all their children

The cornerstone of the Global Partnership is building effective national education systems, with a country-led approach being core to securing sustainable education gains. The effectiveness and quality of an education system can best be measured at the school level in terms of the delivery of quality services to children to enable them to learn. All GPE partners will support effective systems at both the central and school level, and in so doing will demonstrate strong adherence to the principles of development effectiveness.

The core indicators for this goal are as follows:

- quality assurance or benchmarking systems such as SABER or GEQAF, or equivalent, in place and being actively used at regular intervals; and
- education sector is supported according to aid effectiveness principles by GPE partners.

BOARD ENDORSEMENT OF THE FOUR STRATEGIC GOALS REQUIRED

CORE STRATEGIES OF THE PARTNERSHIP

The four strategic goals set out what the Global Partnership seeks to achieve over the long term and how GPE partners can work to progress towards our objectives. The strategies are built on the unique model of the Global Partnership. Aligning existing institutions and partners behind a coherent, shared agenda is the key to success.

The Global Partnership will leverage the reach, skills, leadership and resources of our partners to:

- ***Increase the visibility of education as a key strategy for the health, wealth and stability of nations***

The global dialogue on development must include an acknowledgement of the essential contribution of education to wider development objectives, its enduring impact on countries and their citizens, and the importance of sustained investments to achieve results in all sectors. The GPE partners believe that education is a fundamental right for all children, but is not an end in and of itself. Education is indivisible from all of the other Millennium Development Goals. Investing in education is the single most effective means of reducing poverty. Educating girls and women is the most effective investment for achieving long-term health benefits for a nation. The Global Partnership will be a strong advocate for a good education for all children, with partners demonstrating leadership to ensure education is rightfully placed high on political and development agendas.

- ***Support countries to develop and implement good education plans which are sustainable and country-led***

A central tenet of the Global Partnership is country-led development of education plans and their effective implementation. The GPE model is built around the Local Education Group and its inclusion of all the key actors in the education sector in a country. Education plans will vary from one country to another to respond to their own needs and circumstances, but there are agreed standards that are expected from all GPE partners.

- ***Strengthen the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of developing country partner government systems***

The collective effort of the Global Partnership will be harnessed to strengthen government systems in order that more children will receive a better education, for longer. Quality, effectiveness and efficiency are key. An education system needs to function effectively, deliver the services expected of it and do so in a manner that is efficient in terms of all resources. GPE

partners are committed to working together in all of the poorest countries in order to achieve this.

- ***Continuously improving through innovation and by promoting best practice***

A fundamental responsibility of all members of the Global Partnership is to share information, promote best practice and embrace innovation, including new technologies that deliver improvements. The aim is to help place the right information in the right hands at the right time to enable good planning and implementation of education programs.

- ***Develop and promote harmonized education goals and metrics***

Effective Local Education Groups have common goals agreed with the developing country partner governments. These are normally well-articulated in education plans. It is important that all partners, including donors, multilateral agencies, civil society groups and the private sector participate in the development of the plan so that it reflects common goals at the country level. In terms of monitoring and evaluation, metrics and data, the situation is often not harmonized, with all actors monitoring different things or sometimes the same things differently. The Global Partnership is committed to improving the harmonization of goals and metrics at the country level to reduce the burden on countries and ensure standardized, useful information is available.

- ***Improve development effectiveness***

Since its earliest days, the Global Partnership has strongly adhered to the principles of aid and development effectiveness agreed in Paris and Accra and reinforced in Busan in November 2011. The GPE country-led model works effectively. By joining the Global Partnership, developing countries, donors, international organizations, civil society and the private sector and private foundations commit to development effectiveness.

BOARD ENDORSEMENT OF THE CORE LONG-TERM STRATEGIES REQUIRED

PART 2: PLANNING CYCLE FOR 2012-2015

OBJECTIVES FOR 2012-2015

The Global Partnership has identified five objectives for the period 2012-2015 that are critical to achieving its longer term goals. Given the time-frame of this plan, the objectives, which will be implemented over three years, are more focused and form a subset of the four strategic goals.

BOARD ENDORSEMENT OF THE FIVE OBJECTIVES 2012-2015 REQUIRED

Objective 1: Fragile and conflict-affected states able to develop and implement their education plans

Fragmentation and low capacity have led to a lack of consistency and/or coherence within the education sector in fragile and conflict-affected states. At the most basic level this constrains the ability to deliver the most basic education services to communities, let alone undertake needed reform.

Change will come when school- and district-level actors have the ability to innovate and put the building blocks in place to deliver adequate education services at the country level and/or the sub-national level. This will require that national or sub-national governments develop a supportive framework for financing, information-sharing and capacity development.

While every country context is different, fundamentally the aim is to secure a core sustainable education system that is simple and feasible. To this end the Global Partnership will seek to encourage very basic system improvements, such as teacher salaries being paid, core materials being available and provision of a safe place for teachers to teach and students to learn.

Actions in support of these partnership activities include:

- revise GPE endorsement and funding mechanisms to be more flexible and fit for purpose in fragile states. Currently processes are too cumbersome and inflexible and require significant attention. This will include the introduction of 5-year country program implementation grants;
- expand Supervising and Managing Entity eligibility for program implementation funding and diversify the entities acting in this role. In countries without functional governments it will be necessary to provide funding through other institutions such as major non-governmental organizations;

- increased support to Local Education Groups for better country level coordination and transitional education plan development; and
- in collaboration with the Inter-Agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) and others, help to bridge the divide between emergency response and education development activities with a view to mobilizing additional financing for education activities.

Progress against this objective may be monitored through:

- improvement in donor coordination and operation in GPE developing country partners that are fragile and conflict-affected states compared to non-fragile and conflict-affected states, to be measured by surveys taken during the second half of 2012 (baseline) and the end of 2014;
- the number of fragile states with GPE-endorsed education sector plans; and
- core access and learning indicators disaggregated at the Global Partnership level by fragile vs. non-fragile states.

Objective 2: Girls achieve gender parity in primary completion and transition to secondary in all GPE-endorsed countries

There is growing evidence that the development impact of girls' education is multiplied when girls complete a good-quality secondary education program.

Gender equity strategies have greatest success when they are embedded within a broader context that tackles other categories of marginalization including poverty, child labor and disability.

Greater attention will be paid to learning outcomes for girls. Poor levels of learning are a core trigger for accelerated drop-outs of girls from school. GPE partners will explore the establishment of a gender parity index for reading and literacy, comparable to the gender parity index for access.

In order to address other disincentives for girls attending and remaining in school, the Global Partnership will encourage more attention in education plans and in partner interventions on sanitation and safe schools.

The Global Partnership will work with United Nations Girls' Education Initiative and others on targeted support to countries with elevated gender imbalances at primary completion and will allocate specific funding for activities that address these imbalances.

Greater gender parity in school management and system management is an important symbol of a broader commitment to genuine gender equity in education. The Global Partnership will encourage and promote the inclusion of more qualified women in senior system administration and school principal roles.

Progress against this objective may be monitored through:

- gender parity in transition to lower secondary school;
- gender parity in lower secondary completion rate;
- gender parity in transition to upper secondary; and
- percentage of women in management positions in the education sector.

Objective 3: Dramatic increase in the number of children demonstrating mastery of basic literacy skills by Grade 3

Learning levels are too low, with many children unable to read sufficiently well to achieve basic skills in any subject areas.

Rapid improvement is possible when education systems provide a supportive environment for learning, with core national policies in place around language of instruction, time on task, early grades emphasis, regular monitoring of progress, and local support systems for teachers.

As stated at the Pledging Conference in November 2011, the Global Partnership is committed to an ambitious target: reduce by half the number of children unable to read by Grade 3 in at least 20 countries in 5 years. The Global Partnership has chosen to focus specifically on the early grade reading agenda as the first priority across the array of measures required to address education quality. This is intended to support and complement the excellent work being spearheaded by various GPE partners in other areas of quality.

Coordinated activity is required across the Global Partnership to achieve this. The Global Partnership will work with partners to achieve the reading objective through:

- ensuring there is adequate time devoted to reading in the early grades;
- supporting qualified teachers equipped with the right approaches to teach reading;

- providing appropriate reading materials; and
- promoting mother tongue instruction for reading where appropriate.

Appropriate and regular assessment of reading progress is also crucial. This is not about testing, but about genuine assessments in order to monitor progress and guide policy dialogue. Education plans and the education system need to be geared to make these key success factors happen.

Progress against this objective may be monitored through:

- the proportion of students who, by Grade 3 of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text;
- percentage of children receiving early childhood education with meaningful content; and
- gender parity in reading.

Objective 4: Improve teacher effectiveness by attracting the most qualified teachers and supporting them to provide a good education

Teaching quality and availability constitutes the key barrier to achievement of the Education for All goals.

Recruitment of sufficient teachers with the necessary training will require that the Global Partnership engage with teacher organizations to improve working conditions for teachers, and in support of the growth of teaching as a profession.

This area of focus is new for the Global Partnership and will also depend on coordinated action by the breadth of partners. This will be particularly so for the teaching profession, developing country partner governments and donors. In order to facilitate the achievement of this objective, the Global Partnership will need to engage in the following specific activities:

- increase engagement of the teaching profession in LEGs;
- support education plans that focus on the number of qualified teachers;
- support the engagement of the teaching profession on standards of practice in GPE-endorsed countries; and
- support improvements in the remuneration and working conditions of teachers.

Progress against this objective may be monitored through:

- proportion of education sector plans that adequately address the issue of teacher salaries and working conditions;
- tracking of actual teacher pay conditions;
- proportion of countries with agreed and applied teacher practice standards; and
- tracking of "opportunity to learn."

Objective 5: Expand the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic financing to education in GPE-endorsed countries

Overall external financing for the education sector is too low, and has not moved beyond traditional Official Development Assistance, at a time when these budgets are under increasing pressure from the global financial crisis and other types of investment are perceived to be more innovative or attractive. Domestic financing is often inefficient.

The education sector will attract more external financing when a stronger investment case is made, linking financing and results, and a broader stakeholder group, including the private sector, foundations, and others who benefit from an educated population and a workforce that is more engaged.

Building on a successful replenishment conference in 2011, the Global Partnership will improve resource mobilization, communications and advocacy at both the national and global levels in order to meet its fundraising targets. The Global Partnership will advocate for increased external funding and promote sustained or increased domestic funding. In this context, the Global Partnership will collaborate closely with emerging donors to ensure greater alignment with national education plans. Targets will be set for external and domestic financing across the partnership based on careful analysis of all national education plans. The Global Partnership will pay greater attention to the effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of financing for education in developing country partners.

Progress against this objective may be monitored through:

- percentage of total government budget that goes to education and to basic education;
- percentage of resources spent at school level;[2]

[2](N.B. in the first instance tracking of percentage of GPE Fund resources spent at the school level is all that can be achieved given data paucity.)

- levels of mobilization of adequate and sustainable external financing for education in GPE-endorsed countries; and
- progress of developing country partners against their own financial targets.

ENABLING APPROACHES 2012-2105

The Global Partnership will place a greater priority on basic education in the period 2012-2015. This is an important point of clarification. This does not mean that the Global Partnership will focus its attention exclusively on basic education. Some broader support will be considered, such as finance to upper secondary school in support of girls' education. However, between now and 2015, the Global Partnership will continue to focus on basic education to help meet the Millennium Development Goals. The following approaches will underpin the work of the Global Partnership for the period 2012-2015 in support of our five objectives.

Enabling Approach 1: Greater engagement in support of Local Education Groups, sector planning and country level processes

All GPE partners will work to strengthen the membership and operations of Local Education Groups. Within the Secretariat, the Country Support Team (CST) will be further strengthened with more frequent country engagement. Greater reinforcement of the roles and responsibilities of the different actors at the country level will be required since, while clear in theory, the practice is far more inconsistent.

Enabling Approach 2: Greater focus on knowledge sharing and lessons learned, including expanding the partnership to foster exchange of evidence based policies

Some early work has been undertaken to strengthen knowledge-sharing for the Board of Directors, Local Education Groups and the Secretariat, but more will need to be done. In addition, quality control on determining what is good practice will be required.

Enabling Approach 3: Strengthen risk management and anti-fraud/corruption standards

The Global Partnership has zero tolerance for fraud, corruption and other misuse in the education sector. The establishment of robust approaches to fraud, corruption and other misuse has been essential. There also needs to be full transparency in the use of GPE funds. As part of this strategic plan, the Global Partnership will develop a plan to manage risks, and the Board of Directors will review risks and progress against the risk management plan on a regular basis.

Enabling Approach 4: Expand the pool of Supervising and Managing Entities

The Global Partnership will work to expand the number of bilateral and multilateral agencies taking on Supervising Entity and Managing Entity roles to help ensure a greater diversity in these roles. To date, the World Bank has played this critically important role, acting as the Supervising Entity for the majority of GPE program implementation grants. UNICEF, the United Kingdom Department for International Development, and Netherlands have also taken on the role in a few countries. As discussed under the fragile states objective, GPE Fund rules will be reviewed to expand the eligibility of organizations that can take on these roles, with appropriate fiduciary standards applied. The broadening of eligibility will also apply to the re-designed Global and Regional Activities program which will provide funding for knowledge-based activities that are closely aligned with the objectives of this Strategic Plan.

Enabling Approach 5: Streamline processes and procedures

GPE processes and procedures need to be as efficient and effective as possible, without losing any accountability. Processes also need to be more nimble and fit for purpose, especially when working with fragile and conflict-affected states.

Enabling Approach 6: Strengthen the role of civil society and the private sector in the partnership

The Global Partnership will support greater civil society, teaching profession and private sector and private foundation involvement in LEGs and in policy dialogue at the country level. Across the Global Partnership there will need to be greater and more timely consultation with these actors on education plans, grant applications and GPE processes. The Secretariat will also map the involvement of the private sector and private foundations in education at the country level and develop mechanisms to improve coordination alignment with education plans and innovation with them.

Enabling Approach 7: More funding delivered in a way which supports country budgeting processes and builds capacity

Donor partners and international organizations will endeavor to increase the amount of funding that is on-budget and aligned with country education plans. In non-fragile contexts the proportion of GPE funding allocated to pooled funds or sector budget support will increase from its current level of close to 50 percent.

Enabling Approach 8: Greater use of information technology for educational improvement

GPE partners are already exploring ways in which information technology can be used better for educational improvement. This is an area where close engagement with the private sector will be key. Some of the areas to be addressed include: i) teacher training, in service training and support through information technology and telecommunications; ii) use of mobile telephony to facilitate the payment of salaries and other aspects of education system improvement, e.g. monitoring of teacher attendance; iii) provision of "soft copy" teaching materials; and iv) delivery of curricula through use of information technology.

Enabling Approach 9: Greater focus on effectiveness, value for money and results

The GPE Results Framework applies to the work of the whole Global Partnership, including but not limited to the GPE Fund. The Global Partnership will ensure that there is regular reporting against the Framework, which will incorporate the indicators from this plan. Greater cooperation and coordination will be necessary between the partners involved in data collection and analysis. The Global Partnership needs to be able to report better on the effectiveness of its grant portfolio and a full portfolio review will be conducted to identify what has been achieved for what price and assessing value for money of all grants.

Enabling Approach 10: Seek out, nurture, evaluate and support scaling-up of innovations

The Global Partnership will seek to improve the manner in which successful innovations are evaluated, promulgated and scaled-up where appropriate. All partners commit to cooperating more closely at the country level. The Global Partnership will promote existing (and where necessary create) a new open-source knowledge sharing platform to share information about innovations in education. It is very important that this information be available to the Local Education Groups.

Attachment 1: Indicative Budgetary Considerations

This attachment requires significant further development once the plan is approved and work commences on an implementation plan. It is included at this stage simply as a guide to Board members on possible budgetary implications.

The following budget (in US$) estimates capture very initial thinking on what implementing the Strategic Plan may cost over and above existing resources. The assumptions are split into two: implications for the whole partnership and implications for the Secretariat.

i) Implications for the partnership: Possible costs to be absorbed by partners.

Greater capacity for monitoring education financing	$100,000/annum
CSO post-CSEF program	$10m
Cost of establishing education bond of $500m (based on IFFIm costs)	$1.5m
Cost of taking on the teacher initiatives for the partnership	$2-3m / annum
Background studies in support of the five objectives	$500,000 / annum

ii) Implications for the Secretariat budget

Evaluations of GPE effectiveness in fragile states, 2012 and 2014	$200,000
Larger knowledge sharing platform hosted by Secretariat	$400,000
Greater role for CST in support of fragile states and temporary country presence	$500,000 / annum
Secretariat greater capacity in CSO support	$300,000 / annum
Greater attention to early childhood development issues in learning agenda and access	$500,000 / annum
Cost of taking on the teacher initiatives for the Secretariat	$300,000 / annum
Additional costs involved in 2014 replenishment campaign	$500,000
Value for money portfolio review	$200,000

Attachment 2: Implementation Plan

To be completed once the Strategic Plan is approved.

Attachment 3: Risk Management Plan

To be completed once the Strategic Plan is approved.

Attachment 4: Glossary

The following terms used in the Strategic Plan are defined as follows:

Board of Directors: The constituency-based Board of Directors that operates at the global level and is the supreme governing body of the Global Partnership for Education. The Board of Directors is composed of 19 members and a Chair independent of all partner organizations and is responsible for setting policies and strategies, making funding decisions for the Global Partnership funds and giving direction to the Secretariat.

Developing Country Partner: A developing country partner subscribes to the Global Partnership for Education Compact and thereby commits to achieving the Education for All goals. They do this through the elaboration of an education plan that is generally compliant with the Global Partnership for Education Results Framework and that is embedded in the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper or equivalent. Once the plan is endorsed in-country, the developing country partner joins the partnership.

Development effectiveness: This references the Global Partnership for Education's focus on formulating results-oriented partnerships to strengthen education systems through the prioritization of country-driven processes, strong education plans and donor support to and coordination around education plans.

"Global Partnership" or "partnership": This refers to the collective body of all relevant organizations that subscribe to the Global Partnership for Education Compact, as outlined in the Charter of the Global Partnership for Education. The members work collaboratively to ensure that all children everywhere receive a good education. The partners of the Global Partnership fall into four categories: developing country partners with an endorsed education plan; donors; multilateral agencies; CSOs, the private sector and private foundations. Each partner has particular roles and responsibilities within the Partnership.

"Good" vs. "Quality" Education: The word "good" is used in reference to education rather than "quality" in this Strategic Plan given that it can appeal to a more general audience (i.e. those outside of the education sector) and given that the word "quality" means different things to different people. "Quality", for example, does not necessarily encompass a "relevant" or "equitable" education, although "good" is wide enough to include all aspects of what is deemed to be education that is adequate, appropriate and relevant.

Local Education Group: This is a collaborative forum for policy dialogue, alignment and harmonization of donor support to the education plan. It seeks to ensure all parties are kept fully apprised of progress and challenges in the sector, and it collates and disseminates information on domestic, partner and non-partner funding of the education sector. It is made up of the developing country partner government and local development partners.

Secretariat: The Global Partnership Secretariat provides support to the Chair and the members of the Board of Directors and its committees, working groups and task teams, providing technical and administrative support and serving the interests of the Partnership as a

whole. It also provides guidance to LEGs regarding education plans and GPE funding and other processes.

The following acronyms are also used in the Strategic Plan:

CSO	Civil Society Organization
CST	Country Support Team (within the Secretariat)
ECD	Early Childhood Development
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
GEQAF	General Education Quality Analysis/Diagnosis Framework
GPE	Global Partnership for Education
LEG	Local Education Group
PCR	Primary Completion Rate
PTR	Pupil-Teacher Ratio
SABER	Systems Approach for Better Education Results

ANNEX 2: STRATEGIC PLAN WORKING GROUP CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Set out below is a summary of the key themes and divergences obtained through the Global Partnership for Education Strategic Plan consultation questionnaire. A remarkable total of 75 completed questionnaires and interview summaries were received, which highlights the level of energy across the Global Partnership and also the importance placed on the Strategic Plan itself.

A small team in the Secretariat analysed all of the responses and prepared detailed summaries of the categories of the constituencies of the Board of Directors: i) donor country partners (18 received); ii) developing country partners (13 received); iii) multilateral agencies (12 received); and iv) civil society organizations (i.e., international/northern CSOs, CSOs from developing countries and members of the teaching profession) and private sector/private foundations (30 received, including 14 from developing country partners). Questionnaires were also received from the Board Chair and the Secretariat. This document provides a consolidated summary of responses.

A table outlining the primary areas of agreement across the Partnership and the ways they may be addressed by the Board of Directors is provided at the end of the list of responses to each of the individual questions.

1. STRATEGIC GOALS

a. The Global Partnership was designed to serve as a mechanism to support developing country education plans and the policy priorities within them. The Global Partnership also has policy priorities. How should the Global Partnership advance its policy priorities while it provides support to the priorities of education plans?

There was a universal view that support of national education plans was the core of the GPE model and that country-led processes were key. However, there was also a similarly clear view that there was ***not*** *an inherent contradiction here and the GPE policy priorities should be advocated for and included in national education plans as appropriate. It was seen as an important part of the policy dialogue. There was broad agreement (a large majority) that monitoring of the plans should include monitoring of progress against the GPE policy priorities.*

b. Are the existing strategic goals appropriate? Are there too many? What do you believe should be the strategic goal(s) of the Global Partnership for Education? (No more than three). For each goal, how do we measure success (so we know when it has been achieved)?

While there was a general view that the current goals are appropriate, a clear majority of respondents in all categories highlighted that addressing the out-of school population was central to the Global Partnership. CSOs and developing country partners put a greater emphasis on the importance of teachers and the need for the partnership to provide more focus on their support.

c. What are the challenges and risks to achieving these goals?

There was broad agreement that political and civil instability, lack of political will and also financing were the most important risks. In addition, many respondents noted the lack of sufficient focus on teachers, lack of data, insufficient attention to monitoring, and results. For the developing country partners the fact that much of GPE financing was often not structured as budget support and pooled funding was seen as a major challenge.

d. Does the Global Partnership need a vision or mission statement? If so, based on what you see as the strategic goals, what should it be?

There was a very strong view among a high majority of partners that this is needed. There was a lot of consistency around the idea that it be short and focused on quality education for all (children). There was some confusion between a vision and mission statement, however there was fairly widespread support for a continued commitment to all of the Education for All goals.

e. The Global Partnership is guided by high-level principles (as set out in the Charter). Should these principles be changed or added to? If so, what should those changes be?

There was little support for opening up the principles, with most respondents in all constituency categories and the Secretariat and Chair happy with the current principles in the Charter. That said, a reasonable number of respondents then suggested adding equity and equality as a principle.

2. PARTNERSHIP

a. Should other categories of partners be invited to join the Global Partnership? If so, which categories and how should this be accomplished?

There was strong support for expanding the membership of the partnership by all categories of respondents. Most respondents felt that middle income countries should be welcomed for knowledge exchange (not as funding recipients). The most-cited candidates for membership expansion were members of academia, emerging donors, more members from the private sector, civil society and parents. There was some support for granting observer status at the Board to some categories.

b. How should the Global Partnership accommodate, if at all, the desire of certain partners to prioritize specific policy areas or regions?

The overall response was that there should not be any accommodation of other priorities without broad partnership agreement through the Board of Directors. However, the developing country partners underlined the importance of special attention being given to donor orphans and greater attention being given to teachers (this latter point was a consistent theme throughout all of their responses).

3. POLICY PRIORITIES

The following are some outstanding questions arising from the discussions of the Board of Directors in Copenhagen which require further input under this strategic planning process since agreement was not reached at the time.

a. Besides the three policy priorities listed above, are there other areas GPE funding should specifically target?

The overall view was to include additional policy priorities, with a significant number of comments focussing on out of school populations. All categories of partners believed additional priorities should be added, with access, education sector governance and a greater focus on equity coming through strongly.

b. Should the Global Partnership financing for implementation of education plans be expanded to cover upper secondary education for girls—in general, or only for at-risk and disenfranchised communities?

With the exception of the donor country partners there was widespread support for expansion of financing for upper secondary. The donor country partner's response was mixed. There were concerns raised in all groups that this needed to be looked at carefully in the context of scarce resources.

c. Should the Global Partnership provide funding for implementation directly to non-governmental entities, in particular to reach populations in fragile states?

There was resounding enthusiasm for this change across the partners, with the donor country partners being the most cautious. All groups believed there needed to be appropriate criteria and safeguards. Some respondents thought the eligibility should go beyond simply fragile state contexts. Just about everyone agreed that any funded activity had to be framed within approved education plans and not bypassing the government.

d. Given the need for sustained and predictable support for fragile states, should the Global Partnership provide opportunities for longer term financing for these countries (not limited to 3 years)?

Again, this was resoundingly supported across the partners, with the donor country partners and the private sector the most cautious. Some sort of tranche system with releases based on adequate performance was the most popular approach to this. Caution was expressed around locking in scarce resources.

e. What other changes in the GPE model, if any, are required for the Global Partnership to have greater reach in conflict-affected and fragile states?

All partners, including the Secretariat, agree that this is an area that requires attention. There were numerous recommendations for change, the most oft-cited being: i) the need for greater flexibility in GPE's systems and processes; ii) more flexible funding mechanisms; iii) greater support to the LEGs and development of transitional education plans; iv) exchange of knowledge and best practice; and v) greater technical assistance. The Secretariat will be required to be more active. All of this said, the importance of country-based planning and ownership is still viewed as sacrosanct.

f. What is the best way for the Global Partnership to incentivize a focus on quality and learning outcomes (in addition to access to education)?

There was very broad agreement from across the partners that the following approaches were most important: i) knowledge sharing; ii) greater focus on monitoring, assessment and outcomes; iii) greater focus on teachers (the Chair was particularly passionate about this); iv) working closely with LEGs in plan development and implementation; and v) greater advocacy for quality at the country and global level.

g. Are there any other comments or suggestions on GPE's policy priorities?

Most had no further comments. Of those that did, information and communications technology in education was mentioned most.

4. COUNTRY-LEVEL ENGAGEMENT AND FUNDING

a. Other than funding, what is the added value of the Global Partnership to partner efforts in the education sector in developing countries?

There was virtual unanimity across partners that the core areas of added value were bringing the different actors together to develop sound education plans, sharing knowledge and information, promoting harmonisation and policy dialogue, acting as an honest broker, advocating for education within countries and mobilising resources.

b. Are the roles and responsibilities of the different actors involved in the Global Partnership at the country level sufficiently clear (including as set out in the Charter)? If not, what should be clarified or changed?

Many partners felt that the roles and responsibilities may be clear on paper, but in practice are less so. In some countries things are not working as they should. Many respondents asked for greater simplicity in Secretariat and GPE documentation and policies. It is clear that this is an area that will require greater attention in the coming months.

c. Given what you see as the strategic goals of the Global Partnership, what is the appropriate role for the Global Partnership in supporting partners working at the country-level (in particular, in the Local Education Group)?

There is a general call for greater Secretariat engagement with the LEGs, as a sharer of knowledge, broker, convener and advocate for greater diversity in the LEGs (this last point was raised particularly strongly by CSOs). A notable number of respondents raised the question of having parents represented in LEGs.

d. Is the Global Partnership funding model working efficiently?

Most respondents thought that improvements could be made. Even respondents who thought the model was working efficiently often had suggestions for improvement. However the general view of donor and developing country partners was that it was not working sufficiently efficiently. Areas of concern are around results measurement, disbursement rates, and slow and bureaucratic systems. For the developing country partners, a theme throughout their responses was that project funding was not working and budget/sector support worked better.

e. Is the current eligibility for funding of education plan implementation grants, limited to IDA-eligible countries in Categories i and ii sufficient? Should funding be extended to all IDA-eligible countries? Should funding be extended to middle-income countries with particularly large out of school populations?

There was a split in response to this question. Many of the donor country partners did not support an expansion of funding for implementation to IDA Category iii or to middle income countries. A slight majority of developing country partners supported an expansion, but only to IDA Category iii countries with large out of school populations. Others strongly supported such an expansion. There was recognition that expansion would need to be managed carefully and allocation criteria established.

f. Currently, the Global Partnership only provides funding through multilateral and bilateral agencies represented in the constituencies of the Board of Directors. Should there be greater flexibility in direct recipients of funding, taking into account the possible fiduciary and operational implications of such an approach?

There was broad support for greater flexibility in recipients for funding, with across the board caveats that such funding needs to be based on country-driven processes and that adequate risk management, safeguards and criteria are established.

g. How should the Global Partnership address the issue of ensuring that its funds are additional to and not replacing other kinds of funding, including domestic and, in particular IDA?

The broader issue of avoiding substitution was seen as requiring stronger monitoring of financial flows, using the GPE simulation model, local level advocacy and greater engagement with the LEG from the Secretariat. On the IDA issue the same points were raised as well as some suggestions for specifically addressing it. There was a general view that GPE needed to become more involved in monitoring education financing, providing information and convening the different actors.

h. Should the Global Partnership allow the earmarking of funds for priority areas and regions?

This question was not clearly understood. Those that addressed it as earmarking within the GPE Fund did not support it. However, there was support for earmarking at the country level through education plans. There were some suggestions for establishing a specific fund for innovation or specific pilot activities, including by the Secretariat.

5. RESULTS

a. To what extent are the replenishment outcomes to the end of 2014 adequate for the purposes of this strategic plan or should specific targets be established for 2015? Or should the 2014 targets be extended to 2015? If specific new targets are to be used, what should these targets be?

This was not a popular question with well over 25% leaving it unanswered. It is difficult to capture the trends, but there was some sense that the replenishment financing targets should be increased, while the outcomes targets are very ambitious and adequate. There was strong support for more work on fundraising and resource mobilisation.

b. Partners made substantial commitments at the Pledging Conference in November 2011. What can the Global Partnership do in order to hold all partners to account for their commitments and their delivery against targets?

There was a strong consensus on monitoring pledges and publishing performance against pledges to be made publicly available.

c. In what ways should funding of education plans in developing country partners be contingent on achievement of results?

With perhaps more caution from developing country partners and CSOs, there was general agreement that funding should be contingent on achieving results. Some sort of tranche-based system was the most oft-cited. There was also broad agreement that across the partners that there needed to be a much stronger attention to results and monitoring thereof. There was little consensus on how to do this and who should be responsible for what, indicating that this will require some concerted attention across the partnership and by the Board of Directors.

6. ADVOCACY AND RESOURCE MOBILISATION

a. The current target for raising funds for the GPE Fund is between US$1.75 and US$2.5 billion for the 2011-2014 replenishment period. Should the Global Partnership have greater ambition for fundraising within the replenishment period and beyond? If so, what is a realistic target?

All categories of respondents believed that there should be more ambition, with the exception of the donor country partners who believed the current target was a big stretch. That said, respondents recognised that the current environment is difficult. All groups highlighted the need for greater attention to resource mobilisation.

b. What role should the Global Partnership play in helping to frame the post-2015 agenda for education?

There was a strong view (with a few individual exceptions) across the partnership that GPE should be very involved in the shaping of the post-2105 agenda, acting as a convener, evidence-based advocate, knowledge sharer, participant in global political processes and representative of the whole Global Partnership.

c. What role should the Global Partnership play in advocating for education globally and/or in countries? If there is a greater role for the Global Partnership, what specifically should it do?

According to all partner categories there was a strong role for GPE in advocacy. This should be centred around advocating for education and education quality at both the global and national level, convening different actors, sharing knowledge (a very strong theme throughout all the questionnaires), advocating for greater financing and resources for the sector, collaborating with all members of the partnership in their efforts.

7. SECRETARIAT

a. What should the core roles and functions of the Secretariat be? How should the Secretariat complement the work of each of the partners?

There was broad agreement that the Secretariat facilitates and supports the work of the partnership. Developing country partners asked for more active Secretariat engagement at the country level. Many highlighted the importance of fundraising and knowledge sharing.

b. What is the appropriate separation of roles between the Secretariat, the Board of Directors and partners?

Most felt the current separation of roles was about right.

8. OTHER

a. What lessons can we learn from the experience of the "global funds" in health and other sectors?

The main lessons were around raising money (especially from the private sector), focused communications, country level coordination, flexible funding models, handling fraud and corruption, public-private partnerships, and mobilising a global movement.

b. Does the Global Partnership have a role to play in cooperation and coordination between international organizations?

Yes, it has an important role to play in promoting harmonisation and coordination.

SUMMARY TABLE OF KEY THEMES EMERGING FROM STRATEGIC PLAN CONSULTATION QUESTIONNAIRES

AREA	SUGGESTED ACTIONS	PROPOSED RESPONSE
STRATEGIC GOALS	1. Policy priorities appropriate and should be emphasized in country plans 2. A focus on out-of-school populations should be maintained 3. Need for more funding based on budget support and/or pooled funds 4. Mission and vision statement needed 5. Addition of equity/equality as a principle 6. Hosting review findings to be incorporated	1, 2, 4 and 6: Incorporated into strategic planning process and implementation 3 and 5: Would require policy decisions by the Board. May be included in the forward work agenda for possible Board consideration - Further work on ensuring emphasis on budget support and pooled funding (through recommendation by the FAC) - An amendment to the Charter to add equity/equality as a principle 6: Review of hosting arrangements to be considered at the Board retreat on 6 June
PARTNERSHIP	Expansion of membership supported including possibly middle-income countries, academia, emerging donors, expansion of private sector and CSOs	Would require a decision by the Board. May be included in a forward agenda for the Board, with a paper to be developed to suggest ways of expanding the partnership, what this would mean in practice, the feasibility, and possible incorporation of new partners into the governance structures.
POLICY PRIORITIES	1. Additions to policy priorities should include access of out of school populations, education governance and focus on equity 2. Expansion of funding for implementation to upper secondary education for girls 3. Providing funding directly to NGOs in cases of fragility, provided fiduciary concerns are met 4. Providing longer-term funding to fragile states 5. Greater flexibility and support to fragile states from the Secretariat 6. More knowledge-sharing, monitoring and assessment 7. Greater focus on teachers 8. Advocacy re quality agenda	Aspects of 1 and 7 are being reflected in strategic planning process. Greater focus on teachers can be taken forward in various ways, including through policy dialogue and technical assistance. More substantive assistance would need to be determined through the remainder of the planning process 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7: Would require policy decisions by the Board. May be included in the forward work agenda for possible Board consideration - Implications of expansion of to upper secondary - Implementation issues in fragile states, including flexible approaches, funding to NGOs and resourcing implications - FAC to look at possibility of expanding funding to recipients that are not multilateral or bilateral agencies and a system for promoting fiduciary checks (work has already started on this by the Secretariat and FAC) 6: More knowledge sharing, M&E does not require new policy decisions

AREA	SUGGESTED ACTIONS	PROPOSED RESPONSE
		7, 8: Secretariat already working on this
COUNTRY-LEVEL ENGAGEMENT AND FUNDING	1. Recognition of need to avoid substitution 2. Need for clarification on roles and responsibilities at country-level	1: The Secretariat will need to take a greater role in finance monitoring 2: The Secretariat has already begun to engage more in LEGs, though greater attention is needed on ensuring roles and responsibilities are: i) understood; and ii) implemented
RESULTS	1. The outcome targets are ambitious and adequate 2. More work needed in fundraising and resource mobilization 3. Pledges should be monitored and performance against pledges published 4. While agreement in principle, some caution on basing allocations for education plan implementation grants on results, especially given short implementation timelines 5. Broad agreement that focus on results monitoring needed	3: The Secretariat will be working on monitoring and publishing the status of the Copenhagen pledges - Work required on harmonisation of monitoring and evaluation approaches across partnership - Work has begun by the FAC on incorporating performance (as opposed to results) into the annual review of indicative allocations for education plan implementation grants - FAC is also working on a "top-ups" regime that will be brought to the Board of Directors for decision when ready
ADVOCACY AND RESOURCE MOBILIZATION	1. Fundraising targets are ambitious and should be maintained 2. GPE to ensure pledges are honoured 3. Focus on resource mobilization and broader financing issues for education 4. GPE to be involved in framing the post-2015 agenda	1, 2 and 3: More work required to determine Secretariat engagement in education financing, tracking and broader resource mobilisation for the education sector, with Board oversight 4: A position and advocacy strategy would need to be developed. Proposed as an agenda item for Board consideration in the forward work program.
SECRETARIAT	1. Secretariat's role is to facilitate and support work of greater partnership 2. More Secretariat support to LEGs and in-country processes	1 and 2: To be included in Strategic Plan. Secretariat to consider response strategy and resourcing implications.
OTHER	1. GPE has a role to play in promoting harmonization and coordination amongst partners 2. Greater need to focus on teachers 3. More use of information and communications technology	As above