Results Report 2019



GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP *for* EDUCATION

Disclaimer

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion on the part of the Global Partnership for Education or the World Bank Group concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city, area or its authorities, frontiers or boundaries.

PUBLISHED BY

Office Locations:

Washington D.C.
1850 K Street NW
Suite 625
Washington D.C. 20006

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 D.C. 20433
US

RIGHTS AND PERMISSIONS



This work is available under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 IGO license (CC BY 3.0 IGO) http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/igo.
Under the Creative Commons Attribution license, you are free to copy, distribute, transmit, and adapt this work, including for commercial purposes.

Foreword

I am pleased to present the Global Partnership for Education's *Results Report 2019*. Within these pages you will see the evidence that clear progress is being made. At the same time, far too many children still do not have the opportunity to benefit from a quality education. This report comes at an important moment for the partnership, as we ready ourselves for another strategic planning cycle.

The good news is that school completion rates in the world's most vulnerable countries are improving for both girls and boys. There is some progress in learning outcomes, but the absolute levels and the pace of change remain inexcusably slow. While the data show that the quality of education sector plans has dramatically improved, it is clear that much more attention is needed on implementing and monitoring the plans.

It is good to see the data confirm that our grant support continues to favor countries affected by conflict and fragility and that we spend more on improving learning than on any other category.

This report also shines a light on some exceptional needs that remain unmet: in closing the opportunity gap between rich and poor, urban and rural, and boys and girls, and the equitable deployment of trained teachers. It also shows that even among the world's poorest countries, there is a wide range of difference in education standards. Averages in data can too readily mask important differences that should be driving decision-making and resource allocation.

The number of out-of-school children remains a huge concern, but just as distressing is that millions of children are attending school but not learning. Where learning assessment systems are in place, the results reveal the depth of the learning crisis: Four in 10 primary school graduates lack basic proficiency in reading and math.

Apart from the clarion call for urgency in addressing the learning crisis, the primary message that I take away from this report is the need to pay more attention to the particular circumstances and contexts of individual developing country partners. We need to ensure that our policies and support programs recognize difference and are strong but flexible enough to respond appropriately. What might be a motivating incentive in one country may be an anchor dragging on system reform in another.

We know that there is no more important foundation for achieving better learning outcomes in a country than a quality national education sector plan—one that is based on evidence and analysis of needs. The data in this report demonstrates unequivocally that the quality of education sector plans in the world's most challenging environments is improving year on year, but implementation and monitoring of plans remain a challenge. More and more countries are adopting systematic learning assessments, and the quality of learning assessment systems is improving. Yet, the availability and use of evidence to drive policy decisions and resource allocations is not consistent.

As a partnership committed to accelerating learning outcomes, we need to get better at learning lessons ourselves. This report adds to the arsenal of evidence of progress, but it also identifies where the gaps are widening and where they are not closing fast enough. It complements our efforts to evaluate and improve the Global Partnership for Education's impact, such as the detailed program of ongoing country-level evaluations, which provide real-time evidence of what's working and what's not working, and the recent review of the effectiveness of our partnership at the country level. My hope is that each of us can read the data here and ask not just what the partnership can do better, but how we each as a partner can improve ourselves. That is the essence of the mutual accountability that founds and sustains the Global Partnership for Education.



Alice P. Albright
Chief Executive Officer
Global Partnership for Education

Acknowledgments

The Global Partnership for Education's *Results Report 2019* is a product of the Secretariat staff working together and with other partners to collect, systematize, analyze and make sense of information from across the partnership on an ongoing basis. It would not have been possible without this collaboration and cooperation across the Secretariat and the partnership.

This report was written by the Results and Performance Team of the Global Partnership for Education under the leadership of Jean-Marc Bernard (lead author). Chapter 1 was written by Élisé Wendlassida Miningou and Ramya Vivekanandan, with inputs from Adrien Boucher and Medjy Pierre-Louis. Chapter 2 was written by Meg Ahern with data analysis and visualizations by Sissy Helguero Arandia, and inputs from Sinead Andersen, Stuart Cameron, Jane Davies, Victoria A. Egbetayo, Christin McConnell, Eleni Papakosta, Heather Saunders, Fazle Rabbani, Nilse Ryman and Krystyna Sonnenberg. Chapter 3 was written by Jean-Marc Bernard, Johan Delory and Kyoko Yoshikawa Iwasaki, with inputs from Élisé Wendlassida Miningou and Margaret Irving. Chapter 4 was written by Jean-Marc Bernard, Mafaizath A. Fatoke Dato, Sai Sudha Kanikicharla and Arianne Wessal, with inputs from Anne Guison-Dowdy, Tanvir Muntasim and Janne Kjaersgaard Perrier. Chapter 5 was written by Jean-Marc Bernard, Kyoko Yoshikawa Iwasaki and Yulia Makarova, with inputs from Sinead Andersen, David Glass, Naoko Hosaka, Hadi Khan, Ed Lamot, Élisé Wendlassida Miningou, Karen Schroh, Charles Tapp and Dan Zhang.

We are grateful to Geoff Adlide, Alice Albright, Alexandra Humme, Margarita Focas Licht, Rudraksh Mitra, Charles North, Karen Schroh and Theodore Talbot, who reviewed the report in its entirety and provided many important suggestions. Valuable feedback on individual chapters and sections was also received from Wilson Idahosa Aiwuyor, Sven Baeten, Stuart Cameron, Talia de Chaisemartin, Anne Guison-Dowdy, Margaret Irving, Ed Lamot, Douglas Lehman, Janne Kjaersgaard Perrier, Fazle Rabbani, Lucinda Ramos, Alvine Murielle Tchuathi Sangang, Alexandra Solano, Morten Sigsgaard and Krystyna Sonnenberg.

Luis Crouch, Elizabeth King and Pauline Rose were kind enough to provide generous and incisive insights through external peer review, for which we are enormously thankful.

This report was shaped by the generous and substantive guidance of GPE's Chief Technical Officer, Jo Bourne, and Results and Performance Team lead, Nidhi Khattri. It also benefited from tireless work on data verification, analysis and visualization by Sissy Helguero Arandia, Rudraksh Mitra and Kyoko Yoshikawa Iwasaki, as well as a valuable grant costing analysis by Élisé Wendlassida Miningou. Meg Ahern provided overall editing and revisions. Krystyna Sonnenberg was responsible for the finalization and production of the report, with key contributions by Kyoko Yoshikawa Iwasaki and Tianheng Li.

We would like to thank the designers at Accurat for their impressive work. In addition, we thank Geoff Adlide, Alexandra Humme, Ludovica Pellicioli and Chantal Rigaud for their review of the design of the report, and Jane Sunderland, who copyedited the report. We also wish to acknowledge the support from colleagues at the UNESCO Institute for Statistics for their important inputs and data.

Table of Contents

Foreword 1

Acknowledgments 3

Abbreviations and Acronyms 6

Country Codes 7

Executive Summary 10

Introduction 13

EQUITABLE LEARNING OUTCOMES 17

1

1.1. Assessing the learning crisis in DCPs 20

1.2. Disparities at the heart of the learning crisis 22

1.3. Measuring learning to improve learning 25

1.4. GPE support to improving learning 28

EQUITY, GENDER EQUALITY AND INCLUSION IN ACCESS TO EDUCATION 33

2

2.1. Equity in completion of basic education 36

2.2. Out-of-school children 44

2.3. GPE support for equity in basic education 50

2.4. Early childhood care and education 53

EFFICIENT EDUCATION SYSTEMS 57

3

3.1. Domestic financing for education 60

3.2. Improving efficiency in primary education 62

3.3. The teacher challenge 63

3.4. Data for education systems 70

SECTOR PLANNING, MONITORING AND POLICY DIALOGUE 75

4

4.1. Toward better education plans 78

4.2. Sector monitoring and policy dialogue 83

FINANCING AND PARTNERSHIP 93

5

5.1 GPE grant portfolio 96

5.2. Performance of implementation grants 99

5.3. The persistent challenge of aid effectiveness 105

5.4. Financing: More progress needed 109

5.5. A stronger partnership 111

References 112

Appendices 115

Abbreviations and Acronyms

A4L	Assessment for learning
ASA	Advocacy and social accountability
BELDS	Building Early Learning And Development At Scale
CLE	Country-Level Evaluation
CPIA	Country Policy And Institutional Assessment
CSEF	Civil Society Education Fund
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CY	Calendar year
DEA	Data envelopment analysis
ECCE	Early childhood care and education
ECW	Education Cannot Wait
EGMA	Early Grade Mathematics Assessment
EGRA	Early Grade Reading Assessment
EMIS	Education Management Information System
ESP	Education sector plan
ESPDG	Education sector plan development grant
ESPIG	Education sector program implementation grant
FCACs	Countries affected by fragility and conflict
FY	Fiscal year
GAML	Global Alliance to Monitor Learning
GPE	Global Partnership For Education
GRESP	Gender-responsive education sector plan
HCI	Human Capital Index
HOI	Human Opportunity Index
IEC	Internal efficiency coefficient
IIEP	International Institute For Educational Planning
JSR	Joint sector review
KIX	Knowledge And Innovation Exchange
LAS	Learning assessment system
LEG	Local education group
LLECE	Laboratorio Latinoamericano de Evaluación de la Calidad de la Educación
LSA	Large-scale assessment
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NLA	National learning assessment
ODA	Official development assistance
OECD	Organisation For Economic Co-Operation And Development
OOSC	Out-of-school children
PASEC	Programme D'analyse Des Systèmes Éducatifs De La CONFEMEN
PFM	Public financial management
PIRLS	Progress In International Reading Literacy Study
PISA-D	Program For International Student Assessment For Development
PTTR	Pupil-trained teacher ratio
SACMEQ	Southern And Eastern Africa Consortium For Monitoring Educational Quality
SRGBV	School-related gender-based violence
TEP	Transitional education plan
TIMSS	Trends In International Mathematics And Science Study
TO	Teacher organization
TOSSD	Total official support for sustainable development
UIS	UNESCO Institute For Statistics
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific, And Cultural Organization
UNGEI	United Nations Girls' Education Initiative
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

Country Codes

AFG	Afghanistan
ALB	Albania
BGD	Bangladesh
BEN	Benin
BTN	Bhutan
BFA	Burkina Faso
BDI	Burundi
CPV	Cabo Verde
KHM	Cambodia
CMR	Cameroon
CAF	Central African Republic
TCD	Chad
COM	Comoros
ZAR	Congo, DR
COG	Congo, Rep. of
CIV	Cote d'Ivoire
DJI	Djibouti
DMA	Dominica
ERI	Eritrea
ETH	Ethiopia
FSM	FS Micronesia
GMB	Gambia, The
GEO	Georgia
GHA	Ghana
GRD	Grenada
GIN	Guinea
GNB	Guinea-Bissau
GUY	Guyana
HTI	Haiti
HND	Honduras
KEN	Kenya
KIR	Kiribati
KGZ	Kyrgyz Republic
LAO	Lao PDR
LSO	Lesotho
LBR	Liberia
MDG	Madagascar
MWI	Malawi
MLI	Mali
MHL	Marshall Islands
MRT	Mauritania
MDA	Moldova
MNG	Mongolia
MOZ	Mozambique
MMR	Myanmar
NPL	Nepal
NIC	Nicaragua
NER	Niger
NGA	Nigeria
PCI	Pacific Islands
PAK	Pakistan
PNG	Papua New Guinea
RWA	Rwanda
STP	Sao Tome and Principe
SEN	Senegal
SLE	Sierra Leone
SOM	Somalia
SSD	South Sudan
LCA	St. Lucia
VCT	St. Vincent and Grenadines
SDN	Sudan
TJK	Tajikistan
TZA	Tanzania
TLS	Timor-Leste
TGO	Togo
UGA	Uganda
UZB	Uzbekistan
VUT	Vanuatu
VNM	Vietnam
YEM	Yemen
ZMB	Zambia
ZWE	Zimbabwe

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

IMPACT

GOAL 1
Improved and more equitable learning outcomes

#1
-
Proportion of DCPs with improved learning outcomes.

#2
-
Percentage of children under age 5 developmentally on track.

GOAL 2
Increased equity, gender equality and inclusion

#3
22.2 M
GPE supported 22.2 million children.

#4a
77%
of children completed primary education.

#4b
52%
of children completed lower secondary education.

#5a
67%
of DCPs were at or close to gender parity in primary completion.

#5b
54%
of DCPs were at or close to gender parity in lower secondary completion.

#6
38%
of children enrolled in pre-primary education.

OUTCOME

GOAL 3
Effective and efficient education systems

#10
65%
of DCPs increased their share of education expenditure or maintained it at 20% or above.

#11
-
Equitable allocation of teachers.

#12
30%
of DCPs had fewer than 40 pupils per trained teacher.

#13
-
Repetition and dropout impact on efficiency.

COUNTRY-LEVEL

OBJECTIVE 1
Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation

#16a
100%
of education plans met quality standards.

#16b
84%
of education plans had teaching and learning strategies that met quality standards.

#16c
97%
of education plans had equity strategies that met quality standards.

#16d
94%
of education plans had strategies to improve efficiency that met quality standards.

#17
100%
of DCPs applying for GPE grant published data at national level.

OBJECTIVE 2
Support mutual accountability through inclusive policy dialogue and monitoring

#18
27%
of joint sector reviews met quality standards.

#19
59%
of local education groups included civil society and teacher organizations.

GLOBAL-LEVEL

OBJECTIVE 4
Mobilize more and better financing

#26
11.4 M
contributed to GPE by non-traditional donors.

#27
100%
of donor pledges were fulfilled.

#28
48%
of GPE donors increased or maintained their education funding.

#29
36%
of GPE grants aligned with national systems.

#30
34%
of GPE grants were co-financed or sector pooled.

#31
83%
of country missions addressed domestic financing.

OBJECTIVE 5
Build a stronger partnership

#32
-
reported strengthened clarity of roles.

#33
69
technical products were produced.

#7a
19%
of primary-school-age children were out of school.

#7b
32%
of lower-secondary-school-age children were out of school.

#8a
1.27
Primary-school-age girls were 1.27 times more likely than boys to be out of school.

#8b
1.14
Lower-secondary-school-age girls were 1.14 times more likely than boys to be out of school.

#9
46%
of DCPs improved substantially on the equity index since 2010.

#14
34%
of DCPs reported at least 10 of 12 key education indicators to UIS.

#15
48%
of DCPs had a learning assessment system that met quality standards.

OBJECTIVE 3

Ensure efficient and effective delivery of GPE support

#20
94%
of grants supported EMIS and/or learning assessment systems.

#21
91%
of grants achieved their target for textbook distribution.

#22
90%
of grants achieved their target for teacher training.

#23
89%
of grants achieved their target for classroom construction.

#24a
100%
of grant applications identified variable part targets.

#24b
100%
of grant achieved variable part targets.

#25
89%
of grants were on-track with implementation.

Find the **GPE theory of change** on page 14.

#34
57
advocacy events were undertaken.

#35
100%
of significant audit issues were addressed.

#36
44%
of Secretariat staff time was spent on country-facing functions.

#37
100%
of results and evaluation reports were published.

	Annual milestone met				Annual milestone not met
Indicator performance	N	N	N	N	N
Insufficient data	–	–	–	–	

*See detailed graphics, including trends over recent years and disaggregation by gender and fragility and conflict, for each indicator at the beginning of the chapters.

Executive Summary

When the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) adopted GPE 2020, its strategy for 2016-2020, partners chose to tackle the learning crisis head-on by focusing on education quality and equity. This *Results Report 2019*, the third for the current strategy, shows that GPE is making important headway toward improving learning for all children. More children are entering and completing school across partner countries, and there is encouraging progress in learning.

Partners are working together to build a strong and sustainable foundation for learning, with improvements in sector planning and increased investments in data and learning assessment systems. Going forward, to be transformative these efforts need to be bolstered by consistent and inclusive monitoring of progress, as well as increased and better use of existing national systems.

Inequity is a global challenge that goes beyond our sector and requires significant attention. Education gaps based on wealth and geographic location are still wide but narrowing, while the gap between girls and boys remains steady. This report provides valuable insight into where partners must focus resources to go that extra mile to make sure education systems meet the needs of the most marginalized children and break down the barriers keeping them out of school or not learning. Focusing on those left furthest behind is not just the right thing to do, but also the best way to improve overall learning outcomes and reduce inefficiency.

Structured around the GPE theory of change, this report presents progress and achievements of GPE as measured against the milestones set in the results framework. It should be used as a vital monitoring tool that can foster dialogue on how GPE can continue to learn and improve to deliver on the promise of quality education for all children.

IMPACT LEVEL: LEARNING, ACCESS AND EQUITY

Improved and more equitable learning outcomes are at the heart of GPE's mission. Improvement in learning can be found among most of the developing country partners with data available, but progress needs to accelerate: Absolute levels of learning remain low and there are deep disparities in learning within countries. Countries such as Chad, Mali and Niger register less than 20 percent of students achieving minimum proficiency levels in both reading and mathematics by the end of primary education. However, other developing country partners have more than 80 percent of students achieving minimum proficiency level in mathematics or in reading by the end of primary education (for instance, Albania, Tanzania and Vietnam).

The most effective way to improve overall outcomes is to focus on those who are particularly disadvantaged, and there are sizable disparities by wealth and location, with only about two-thirds as many children from the poorest families attaining minimum proficiency levels in math or reading by the end of primary school as did children from the richest families. Gender parity in learning outcomes exhibit significant variance from country to country, with girls or boys scoring higher in math or reading or both. In addition, too many schools are not imparting the basics. Across 10 countries, 45 percent of the schools were underperforming, with less than 20 percent of their students achieving minimum proficiency level. In Chad and Niger, more than 80 percent of schools are underperforming on learning outcomes, compared with only 1 percent in Burundi.

Strong learning assessment systems can enable a country to use data to develop strategies to improve not only overall learning but also equity in learning. There has been steady progress in improving learning assessment systems: Forty-eight percent of learning assessment systems met quality standards in 2018, up from 40 percent in 2015. Continued efforts should yield further improvement in the future; 88 percent of all GPE implementation grants active in June 2018 included support for learning assessment activities.

Ensuring that more children, especially the most marginalized, can attend school and complete their education is one of GPE's key priorities. Completion rates continued an

upward trend, with more children completing primary (77 percent) and lower secondary (52 percent). Niger has made substantial progress on primary completion rates in recent years, as have Cote d'Ivoire and Djibouti, while Sao Tome and Principe and Tanzania have lost ground. In lower secondary completion, Burundi, the Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR) and Timor-Leste have made significant progress, while Tanzania has seen some decline. The proportion of girls completing both primary and lower secondary also surpassed milestones, as did the proportion of children in countries affected by fragility and conflict (FCACs) completing lower secondary. In addition, pre-primary enrollments continued to rise, reaching 38 percent overall in 2018.

While access to education is improving on average, inequity is the challenge of our time. The poorest children are only 28 percent as likely to complete lower secondary education as the richest, and children in rural areas about half as likely as urban children. The degree of disparity varies by country: In Zimbabwe, 76 percent of the poorest rural girls complete lower secondary school compared with 98 percent of the richest urban girls, whereas in Mozambique, that ratio is 5 percent compared with 82 percent. However, equity index data show that these gaps based on wealth and rural versus urban location are steadily narrowing.

The same cannot be said for girls: While more girls are attending and completing school, the average gap between girls and boys across the partnership remains steady. Though there are some countries where boys are less likely than girls to complete school, these cases are not as common nor, generally, as dramatic. And where girls are disadvantaged in completing primary school, the disadvantage generally increases in lower secondary school. Likewise, girls in FCACs are especially disadvantaged at the lower secondary level. However, there is progress at the country level, in that more developing country partners are approaching gender parity in completion, meeting the milestone for the primary level. Working toward gender equality in and through education remains a key priority for GPE and there are signs of important foundations being set: Ninety-seven percent of education plans have a strategy to respond to marginalized groups that meets quality standards. From the implementation grants active as of June 2018, US$60 million was allocated to activities specifically focused on promoting gender equality.

Inclusive and equitable quality education requires improvement and equity in both access and learning, so that all children have an equal chance to go to school and learn. This entails removing barriers through both targeted and system-level approaches. With partners, GPE supports capacity building in gender-responsive sector analysis and planning, with 13 more country delegations trained in 2018, and is supporting similar approaches to inclusive education for children with disabilities. Active implementation grant allocations to equity and learning as of June 2018 totaled US$582 million and US$373 million, respectively.

OUTCOME LEVEL: EFFICIENT EDUCATION SYSTEMS

The efficient use of resources is critical to deliver on equity and learning strategic goals. Data from 25 countries suggest that on average 37 percent of all education spending covered the costs of repetition and dropout. The proportion of developing country partners with fewer than 40 pupils per trained teacher increased from 24 percent in 2017 to 30 percent in 2018, but many countries, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa and FCACs, are struggling to provide enough trained teachers, and the allocation of teachers is deeply uneven, contributing to the disparities in learning outcomes. Among the developing country partners with a pupil-trained teacher ratio (PTTR) higher than 40 in the 2018 data set, more worsened their PTTR than improved it. Cote d'Ivoire was one of the few countries that significantly improved their PTTR over two years prior, from 50.1 to 42.5: The government trained 24,000 pre-service teachers and 16,797 in-service teachers between 2012 and 2017 with the support of the project co-funded by GPE and the World Bank. All of GPE's implementation grants active as of June 2018 included support to teacher development, and 350,000 teachers were trained with GPE financial support during fiscal year 2018.

The ability to collect, report and use data on key indicators is crucial to monitoring and improving education at the country level. While not enough developing country partners currently report sufficient data on global indicators to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, coverage is slowly improving, and the overall trend is positive. GPE prioritizes data strengthening in its grants and through international engagement, which will contribute to further improvements. Ninety-four percent of implementation grants now support education management and information systems and/or learning assessment systems, up from 38 percent in 2015.

Increased domestic financing is key to the sustainability of quality education systems. The volume of domestic expenditures for education increased by US$2.1 billion between 2015 and 2017. In 2017, almost half (46 percent) of developing country partners dedicated 20 percent or more of their public spending for education and a further 19 percent increased their public spending for education. However, the share of domestic financing for education declined in FCACs.

COUNTRY- AND GLOBAL-LEVEL OBJECTIVES: SECTOR PLANNING AND MONITORING, FINANCING AND PARTNERSHIP

Providing technical and financial support to education sector planning and implementation has always been the core of GPE's business. The quality of education plans improved significantly, with 100 percent of plans meeting quality standards

in 2018, compared with 58 percent in 2015. Sector planning is also more inclusive, as local education groups have increasing representation from civil society and teacher organizations. Country-level evaluations show that GPE processes and support have contributed to this improvement.

Despite meeting the quality standards, one-third of the education sector plans, mostly in FCACs, are rated as "not achievable," meaning that they do not include sufficient analysis of the financial constraints and implementation challenges to overcome. In addition, national monitoring of the implementation of sector plans remains weak. Fewer than half of developing country partners organized a joint sector review in 2018, and the overall quality of joint sector reviews is low with only 27 percent meeting quality standards in 2018, down from 29 percent in 2015. Country-level evaluations also found weaknesses around plan implementation and monitoring.

The central opportunity before GPE now is to extend its success in sector planning to strengthen the monitoring and implementation of plans. A recent review of country-level roles and responsibilities within the partnership is building a stronger bridge from sector planning to implementation, and expanding support for the implementation and monitoring of plans. GPE's leverage in bringing partners together around a plan, and enhancing coordination to improve implementation, can also be further strengthened through increased harmonization and alignment of its implementation grants. Two-thirds of GPE's implementation grants still use stand-alone modalities that are weakly aligned to national systems. Improved approaches to grant modalities factoring in a system's capacity, such as making greater use of pooled funding mechanisms, by GPE grant agents could significantly enhance effectiveness of GPE support to education plan implementation, and expand their potential for system strengthening. With 37 countries and states expected to apply for new funding between April 2019 and August 2020, GPE has an unprecedented window of opportunity to improve its approaches to the way financial support is provided to developing country partners.

Overall external support for GPE is improving. In 2018, donors contributed US$638 million to GPE—the highest level of annual contribution since its inception—because of the success of the GPE Financing Conference held in Dakar in February 2018. Donor pledges to GPE for 2018-2020 increased by more than US$1 billion over the previous three-year-period amount.

GPE continues to have a strong equity lens in how it allocates financing to countries. Between July 2017 and June 2018 (fiscal year 2018), more than half of total implementation grant funding was disbursed in countries affected by fragility and conflict. Almost three-fourths of total implementation grant funding was disbursed to Sub-Saharan Africa, the region home to 54 percent of the world's out-of-school children of primary school age. Fifty-nine percent of implementation grant funding was disbursed to low-income countries. Grant activities related to learning were allocated 40 percent of the total grant funding; activities related to equity (Strategic Goal 2), 26 percent; and activities related to systems (Strategic Goal 3), 29 percent.

The particular challenges faced by FCACs appear multiple times across this report. They have more children out of school, and disparities in completion based on wealth, location and gender are larger on average than they are in non-FCACs. FCACs struggle to provide sufficient trained teachers, as only 12 percent of them have fewer than 40 pupils per trained teacher. Because of competing priorities, domestic financing is especially an issue in FCACs, as only 53 percent dedicated 20 percent or more of their public spending for education or increased their education expenditures in 2017. However, some FCACs are improving quickly in a number of areas and outperform non-FCACs in others, such as the inclusiveness of local education groups.

Introduction

The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) is a multi-stakeholder partnership and fund dedicated to improving education in the world's poorest countries, and those with the most children out of school. Founded in 2002, the partnership is designed to harness the power of collaboration among developing countries, donor countries, civil society, foundations, the private sector and youth (represented through civil society organizations) to support inclusive and quality education for all.

The partnership is now implementing GPE 2020, its strategic plan for the 2016-2020 period that outlines an ambitious course of action to achieve three strategic goals:

- **Strategic Goal 1**: Improved and more equitable student learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning
- **Strategic Goal 2**: Increased equity, gender equality and inclusion for all in a full cycle of quality education, targeting the poorest and most marginalized, including by gender, disability, ethnicity and conflict or fragility
- **Strategic Goal 3**: Effective and efficient education systems delivering equitable, quality educational services for all

These efforts are aligned with and support Sustainable Development Goal 4, the world's commitment to inclusive and equitable quality education for all.

This is the third results report for GPE 2020. It presents progress and achievements of the partnership as measured against the milestones set for 2017-2018 in its results framework. It also notes where improvements are needed and highlights the key actions the partnership is taking to contribute to the realization of its three strategic goals. This report is thus a monitoring tool to inform the partnership about progress and challenges and to facilitate decision-making about course direction changes as needed. It is not intended to evaluate GPE's impact—that role is performed by a portfolio of evaluations, as planned in the monitoring and evaluation strategy. However, when available, the report mobilizes the results of these evaluations to complement its findings and inform its message to the partnership. The ambition of this report is also to foster dialogue on key education and operational issues across the partnership, so that GPE can continue to learn and improve.

GPE'S THEORY OF CHANGE AND RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Developed in 2015 to guide GPE 2020, GPE's theory of change articulates the pathway to achieve the first goal: improved and more equitable student learning outcomes. The theory of change posits that a strengthened national education system (Goal 3) is a prerequisite to achieving improved learning outcomes (Goal 1) and improving equity, gender equality and inclusion (Goal 2). Strengthened, effective and efficient national education systems, in turn, are supported through quality education sector plan implementation, mutual accountability and inclusive policy dialogue, and efficient delivery of GPE financing, which comprise GPE's country-level objectives.

At the global level, GPE's objectives are to (1) mobilize more and better financing, and (2) build a stronger partnership. Activities underpinning the global objectives form the bedrock of the partnership for a strong interlocking of finance, knowledge and coordinated actions of diverse stakeholders in support of GPE 2020. The theory of change is accompanied by a results framework, which encompasses a set of 37 indicators for GPE's goals and objectives. Each indicator is associated with a set of milestones to track the partnership's progress between 2015 and 2020 (see Appendix A). Data for these indicators are collected from the developing country partners and from international databases such as the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, as well as from the GPE's Secretariat.

GOALS

IMPACT

1. IMPROVED AND MORE EQUITABLE LEARNING OUTCOMES

Improved and more equitable learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning

2. INCREASED EQUITY, GENDER EQUALITY AND INCLUSION

Increased equity, gender equality and inclusion for all in a full cycle of quality education, targeting the poorest and most marginalized, including by gender, disability, ethnicity and conflict or fragility.

OUTCOME

3. EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT EDUCATION SYSTEMS

Effective and efficient education systems delivering equitable, quality educational services for all.

THEORY OF CHANGE

OBJECTIVES

COUNTRY-LEVEL OBJECTIVES

1. STRENGTHEN EDUCATION SECTOR PLANNING

Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation

2. SUPPORT MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring

3. ENSURE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE DELIVERY OF GPE SUPPORT

GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning

GLOBAL-LEVEL OBJECTIVES

4. MOBILIZE MORE AND BETTER FINANCING

5. BUILD A STRONGER PARTNERSHIP

STRUCTURE OF THE 2019 RESULTS REPORT

The five chapters in this report are organized according to the theory of change. The first three chapters are dedicated to each of the three strategic goals: learning, equity and systems, respectively. Chapter 4 is dedicated to Strategic Objectives 1 and 2, on strengthening education sector planning and policy implementation, and mutual accountability. Finally, Chapter 5 reports on Strategic Objectives 3, 4 and 5: GPE grants, mobilizing more and better financing for education, and building a stronger partnership. The presentation of the indicators does not follow a strict order to facilitate some important connections between different aspects of the theory of change. For example, Indicator 15 on learning assessment systems would normally be categorized under Strategic Goal 3, but because it is an important element of measuring learning, it is discussed in Chapter 1.

UNDERSTANDING THE RESULTS PRESENTED

It is useful to understand the results presented within the context of how GPE 2020 and its theory of change work, and the data available.

- Most of the outcome and impact data available to GPE on the strategic goals, mobilized through the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, household surveys and learning assessment programs, are at least two years old, owing to the time needed for data collection, cleaning, analysis and publication. As such, some 2018 data reflects results in 2016, which in turn reflects actions taken prior to 2016. However, these data provide critical information about the education outcome trends across developing partners, and the key challenges education sectors are facing. The lower levels of the theory of change, characterized by five strategic objectives, specify how the strategic goals are supported through the operational and advocacy work of GPE. Data on these objectives are generally collected by the Secretariat and are more recent, from the last calendar year or fiscal year. These also are areas where, in most cases, decisions made by the partnership can translate rapidly in its operational work and show progress in implementation during the time frame of GPE 2020.

- GPE adopted a new funding model in 2014 and started implementing it progressively in 2015. By December 2018, 28 implementation grants (three in 2015, five in 2016, five in 2017 and 15 in 2018) had been awarded under the funding model adopted by the GPE Board in May 2014. The majority of GPE developing country partners are expected to apply for an implementation grant in the next 18 months.

A third grade student reads aloud during a GPE-supported National Learning Assessment in Khartoum, Sudan. As part of this early Early Grades Reading Assessment (EGRA) he has to identify letters and read out loud. His teacher also takes the same assessment.

Credit: GPE/Kelley Lynch



CHAPTER

1

Equitable Learning Outcomes

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

IMPACT

GOAL 1

Improved and more equitable learning outcomes

#1

Proportion **DCPs with improved learning outcomes**.

-

*20 countries with data available.


OUTCOME

GOAL 3

Effective and efficient education systems

#15

48% of DCPs had a learning assessment system.



*29 countries had a learning assessment system that met the quality standards.



An increasing number of DCPs are participating in cross-national (regional and international) learning assessments.


COUNTRY-LEVEL

OBJECTIVE 3

Effective and efficient GPE financing

#20

94% of grants **supported EMIS/LAS**.



*88% of active implementation grants in fiscal year 2018 invested in activities related to learning assessments.



KEY FINDINGS

> Despite some encouraging progress in improving learning outcomes, **too many schools are not imparting the basics**. Almost half of students leaving primary school have not learned basic math, and more than a third are struggling with reading.

> **The quality of learning assessment systems is improving**: Nearly half now meet quality standards, compared with 40 percent in 2015.

> **Ninety-four percent of grants now support learning assessment** and/or other education data systems, a dramatic increase over the past two years.

> Forty percent of active implementation grant funds as of June 2018 were allocated to **activities specifically for improving learning, amounting to almost US$600 million.**

CHAPTER

1

Equitable Learning Outcomes

In alignment with Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4, improved and more equitable learning outcomes are at the core of the GPE 2020 strategic plan (Strategic Goal 1).[1] There is mounting evidence that developing countries are facing a learning crisis and that this crisis has a strong equity dimension:[2] Across countries, underserved populations are the most likely to achieve the lowest learning outcomes.

This chapter gives an overview of the findings to date on GPE's results framework Indicator 1, which captures the proportion of developing country partners (DCPs) showing improvements in learning outcomes. It then highlights the most recent information available on learning outcomes in DCPs and presents analysis that underscores the importance of data for addressing learning. Finally, the chapter presents the progress countries are making in establishing learning assessment systems and how GPE funds support learning and strengthening of learning assessment systems.

1.1. Assessing the learning crisis in DCPs

IMPROVED LEARNING OUTCOMES IN DCPS Indicator 1

GPE tracks learning outcomes trends using available international, regional and national learning assessments. Indicator 1 of GPE's results framework captures the proportion of partner countries showing improvements in learning outcomes in basic education over the period of the Strategic Plan 2016-2020 (GPE 2020).[3] Thirteen out of 20 DCPs (65 percent) with data showed improvement in learning for the baseline, which covers improvements between 2000-2010 and 2011-2015.[4]

The 2018 milestone measures improvements between 2011-2015 and 2016-2017. Currently, comparable learning assessment data are available for only three countries for the 2018 milestone: Georgia, Nepal and Rwanda.[5] Learning improved in Georgia and Rwanda, but not in Nepal. By 2020, GPE expects to report on Indicator 1 from 26 countries.

ASSESSING LEARNING IN DCPS

If data available to date are considered, between 2000 and 2018 learning outcomes improved in 70 percent of DCPs (16 out of 23), including four out of six countries affected by fragility and conflict (FCACs).[6]

This result must be situated in the broader context of low levels of learning.[7] On average in DCPs with data available through 2016 (see Figure 1.1),[8] less than 50 percent of early-grade students achieve minimum proficiency levels in reading and mathematics. A higher proportion of students achieve


1. For more details on Strategic Goal 1 of GPE 2020, see: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2020-strategic-plan.
2. UNESCO, *Teaching and Learning: Achieving Quality for All*, EFA Monitoring Report, 2013-2014; Education Commission, *The Learning Generation*; World Bank, *World Development Report 2018*; GPE, *Results Report 2018* (Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2018), https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/results-report-2018.
3. For details on any indicator methodology, replace X with the number of the indicator in the following URL address: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/methodology-sheet-gpe-result-indicator-X.
4. Albania, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Honduras, Kyrgyz Republic, Lesotho, Malawi, Moldova, Nicaragua, Tanzania and Yemen.
5. Another country, Cote d'Ivoire, had new learning data but it was not comparable with its previous assessment data. Five other countries - Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Honduras and Lao PDR were expected to have learning assessment data to report this year, but no data was available at the time of this analysis.
6. Albania, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Georgia, Ghana, Honduras, The Gambia, Lesotho, Malawi, Moldova, Nicaragua, Rwanda, Tanzania and Zimbabwe.
7. More than 387 million children of primary school age around the world are not learning the basics in reading and mathematics, and two-thirds of the children who are not learning are in school (UIS, *More Than One-Half of Children and Adolescents Are Not Learning Worldwide, September 2017*).
8. Thirty DCPs have some data available on SDG 4.1.1.

minimum proficiency levels in reading (63.3 percent) and in mathematics (53.4 percent) for the end of primary education[9], although the overall performance remains low. In comparison, the proportion of students in low- and middle-income countries meeting minimum proficiency levels in reading and mathematics at the end of primary education is slightly higher: 68 percent and 60 percent, respectively. However, proficiency levels are different across assessments, so the comparability is limited.

FIGURE 1.1.

LEARNING ACROSS DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTNERS VARIES.

Proportion of primary education students meeting minimum proficiency levels in reading and mathematics at the end of primary education



Source
GPE Secretariat compilations based on UIS (most recent data available between 2005 and 2015) and GPE results framework Indicator 1.

Note
Of the 23 countries with some data available on improvements in learning outcomes, only 13 also had data on the proportion of children completing primary school having achieved minimum proficiency levels in reading and mathematics.
Data used for this figure come from a variety of assessments, and are not necessarily mutually comparable.

9. GPE calculations based on data from UIS on SDG 4.1.1.

These data predate GPE 2020, and the 2019 round of regional and international assessments linking together regional assessments (Latin American Laboratory for Assessment of the Quality of Education [LLECE] and Programme d'Analyse des Systèmes Éducatifs de la CONFEMEN [PASEC]) to Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science (TIMSS) should provide a more accurate picture of the situation and more current information on the status of learning in DCPs.

The extent of the learning crisis varies across countries. In nine out of 30 DCPs with data, more than half of all students have not achieved minimum proficiency levels in reading and mathematics by the end of primary education (Figure 1.1). Among these DCPs, countries such as Chad, Mali and Niger register less than 20 percent of students achieving minimum proficiency levels in both reading and mathematics by the end of primary education. However, other DCPs have more than 80 percent of students achieving minimum proficiency level in mathematics or reading by the end of primary education (for instance, Albania, Tanzania and Vietnam). The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) 2018 SDG 4 Data Digest shows that while learning is improving in some of the highest performing DCPs, it is decreasing in some of the lowest performing ones, indicating that challenges regarding learning are particularly worrisome in certain DCPs.[10] This also underscores the potential of knowledge exchange among DCPs regarding good practices for improving learning.[11]

1.2. Disparities at the heart of the learning crisis

MAJOR LEARNING DISPARITIES IN DCPS

There is increasing evidence that poor and marginalized populations are disadvantaged with regards to learning outcomes.[12] In most developing countries, disparities are so deep that any major improvement in learning outcomes will require focusing on those who are not learning at all.[13] In DCPs, these disparities are related to socioeconomic status (in favor of students from the wealthiest households) and location (in favor of students in urban areas) (Figure 1.2). Because in most DCPs the poorest share of the population is more likely to live in rural areas, the disparity in learning between the rich and the poor is strongly correlated with the disparity in learning between urban and rural students.[14]

Although the average across DCPs would suggest gender parity in learning outcomes overall, country-level data show that girls or boys are still disadvantaged in many DCPs. In reading, girls outperformed boys in 10 out of the 18 countries with data available, while they outperformed boys in eight out of these 18 countries in mathematics. Girls are disadvantaged in mathematics in countries such as Chad, Cote d'Ivoire and Niger, while boys are disadvantaged in mathematics in countries like Burundi, Malawi and Zambia (see Appendix D). The gender parity index in reading and mathematics varies significantly across countries.

On average, by the end of primary education 73.9 percent of children from the richest 20 percent households achieved the minimum proficiency level in reading for that level, compared with 47.8 percent for the poorest 20 percent (See Appendix E). Cameroon, Niger, and the Republic of Congo are among the countries with the highest disparities with respect to socioeconomic status and location. In Niger, on average, less than 8 percent of all students at the end of primary school achieve the minimum proficiency level in reading.[15] For the children coming from the poorest 20 percent households, only 2 percent are achieving minimum reading proficiency levels at the end of primary education.

SIGNIFICANT DISPARITIES AMONG SCHOOLS

A substantial share of the disparities in learning outcomes originates from differences in learning achievement among schools. For example, across the 10 countries that participated in PASEC 2014, 45 percent of the overall disparity among students in learning outcomes is explained by the variations in the performance of the schools they attend.[16] It is around two times higher than what is observed in developed countries.[17] School performance has a significant impact on learning out-

10. For instance, learning outcomes are relatively low and decreasing in Zambia and Mozambique (see *SDG 4 Data Digest*, Appendix Figure 1.2).
11. In 2018, GPE developed the Knowledge and Innovation Exchange, a new funding mechanism designed to promote knowledge sharing among DCPs within the partnership.
12. Disparities in learning outcomes in developing countries should be addressed by focusing on the bottom of the pyramid (poor and marginalized communities) according to D. Wagner, S. Wolf and R. Boruch, *Learning at the Bottom of the Pyramid: Science, Measurement, and Policy in Low-Income Countries*.
13. L. Crouch and M. Gustafsson, "Worldwide Inequality and Poverty in Cognitive Results: Cross-Sectional Evidence and Time-Based Trends."
14. Correlation between the socioeconomic and rural/urban parity indices: R^2=0.94.
15. See Appendix E.
16. S. Bashir et al., *Facing Forward: Schooling for Learning in Africa*, used the same data and found similar results. They note that the between-school variance is larger in Francophone Africa than in southern and East Africa.
17. M. Martin et al., "Effective Schools in Reading, Mathematics and Science at the Fourth Grade," show that the share of overall learning heterogeneity that is related to schools in fourth grade varies from 22 percent in reading to 26 percent in mathematics and 32 percent in science in PIRLS 2011 and TIMSS 2011. Bashir et *al., Facing Forward: Schooling for Learning in Africa*, show that low- and middle-income countries experience greater between-school disparity (also called academic segregation) than do high-income countries.

BOX 1.1.

LEARNING OUTCOMES AND THE HUMAN CAPITAL INDEX IN DCPS

Strengthening learning is particularly important for improved human capital in DCPs. The average Human Capital Index (HCI) provided by the World Bank for DCPs illustrates that the expected productivity of a child born today as a future worker is only 41 percent of what it would be with full health and a full cycle of quality education to age 18.[a] The figure below shows that among the three dimensions of the HCI, the education component registers the lowest in DCPs. In other terms, the expected productivity of workers is low in DCPs mainly because of low achievements in learning-adjusted school years per child. This demonstrates that improving access to quality education is critical to foster to human capital development, productivity and economic development in DCPs.



Source: GPE compilation based on data from the World Bank Human Capital Project.

Note: The education component of the HCI includes two indicators: the learning score and the expected years of schooling. The survival component includes the probability of survival to age 5; the health component includes two indicators: the fraction of the children under 5 not stunted and the fraction of the 15-year-olds who survive to age 60.


DCPs' achievements in learning need to improve significantly to reach the benchmark of full learning as defined by the HCI.[b] The average learning score in DCPs (371) as measured by the harmonized test score is not only below the average of the low- and middle-income countries (401) but far from the benchmark of 625 defined as full productivity in relation to learning.

a. World Bank, *World Development Report 2019*. For more information on the HCI, see the Human Capital Project website: http://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/human-capital.
b. The education component of the HCI, the expected years of learning-adjusted school, combines the information on the quantity of education a child can expect to obtain by age 18 with a measure of quality: how much children learn in school based on countries' relative performance on international student achievement tests. Full learning corresponds to the result of the country with the highest average learning assessment score (benchmark of 625).

FIGURE 1.2.

MAJOR LEARNING DISPARITIES ARE LINKED TO SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND LOCATION.

Proportion of students achieving the minimum proficiency level in reading and mathematics at the end of primary education: average parity indices



Source

GPE compilation for 18 countries based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (most recent data points available between 2005 and 2015, grade 6). The learning assessments on which this analysis is based include PASEC 2014 and SACMEQ 2007 (cross-national assessments), and national assessments.

Note

There is perfect parity when the parity index equals 1. A gender parity index higher or lower than 1 shows that girls or boys are respectively advantaged. A location parity index higher or lower than 1 shows that students in rural or in urban areas are respectively advantaged. A socioeconomic status parity index higher or lower than 1 shows that students from the poorest or the richest households are respectively advantaged.

BOX 1.2.

LEARNING IS FACING SYSTEMIC CHALLENGES

There is a strong correlation between achievement in reading and in mathematics at the national level. This relationship starts in early grades and becomes stronger by the end of primary education, with 77 percent of achievement in mathematics being correlated with achievement in reading.[a] Data show that DCPs with low achievement in reading are more likely to also perform poorly in mathematics.

Learning disparities begin in early grades and remain throughout primary education. There is a very strong correlation between the rural/urban parity index for learning in early grades (grade 2 or 3) and at the end of primary education (grade 6).[b] In other words, countries with huge disparities in early grades are rarely able to make up their lost ground later on.

a. While some studies demonstrate that learning mathematics does not necessarily require reading skills, a vast majority of research findings show that reading is key to learning mathematics (G. Fite, "Reading and Math: What Is the Connection?"; H. Korpershoek, H. Kuyper, and G. van der Werf, "The Relation between Students' Math and Reading Ability and Their Mathematics, Physics, and Chemistry Examination Grades in Secondary Education").

b. R^2=0.87; GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (most recent data points available between 2005 and 2015, grade 6).

comes. Across the 10 countries with PASEC data, 45 percent of the schools were underperforming with fewer than 20 percent of their students achieving minimum proficiency level, while in other schools the majority of students achieved minimum proficiency levels (see Appendix F). The degree of variance between schools differs across countries. For example, in Chad and Niger more than 80 percent of schools are underperforming, while this figure is only 1 percent in Burundi.

The vast majority (88.7 percent) of the underperforming schools are located in rural areas, and a majority (53.1 percent) of the students in these underperforming schools come from the poorest 40 percent households.

BOX 1.3.

GPE SUPPORT TO LEARNING IN CHAD AND NIGER

The 2014 PASEC results show that Chad and Niger are facing extremely low learning outcomes combined with high levels of disparity in learning outcomes with respect to gender, location and socioeconomic status. For 2018-2021, Chad is receiving a US$28 million GPE grant. More than 50 percent of this grant allocation is devoted to learning and activities: textbook provision (23.6 percent), teacher management (21.5 percent), learning assessment systems (4 percent) and teacher training (3.2 percent).

In Niger, the 2018 report of the Niger education system (RESEN) shows that nearly 90 percent of primary schools are in rural areas and seriously lack basic school facilities (school infrastructure, toilets, electricity, clean water, and so on). School resources are inadequately distributed, and teachers' competency is a huge challenge. GPE's current grant in Niger (US$84.2 million) aims to strengthen the availability of school facilities (40 percent of the grant allocation) and to provide teacher training, learning materials and strengthen learning assessment systems (23 percent of the grant allocation).

Both countries are participating in the 2019 PASEC regional assessment, which will provide information on the evolution of learning outcomes over time.

Source: Niger 2018 RESEN and GPE Secretariat.

The data clearly show that the learning crisis disproportionally affects poor and rural children, with too many attending primary schools that cannot teach them to read a single word. Evidence demonstrates that when countries focus on the students with the lowest learning achievements, they make more substantial progress in improving learning overall.[18]

The results of this section suggest that a first step in improving learning outcomes is to identify particular areas and schools that are falling behind. Unfortunately, few DCPs have the data they need to make these kinds of analyses to inform their learning policies.

1.3. Measuring learning to improve learning

Indicator 15

Improving the measurement of learning is a priority for GPE. Measuring learning requires the administration of learning assessments that provide the necessary data, and such learning assessments cannot take place in a coherent and sustainable manner without the existence of sound learning assessment systems.

GPE's results framework Indicator 15 examines the proportion of DCPs with a learning assessment system within the basic education cycle that meets quality standards. The indicator looks at examinations and large-scale assessments (both national and international), and uses a composite index to guide the classification of the overall system into the categories "established," "under development," "nascent," or "no information" (see Appendix H for specifics). Additional work is ongoing for assessing the quality of classroom-based assessment (see Box 1.5). An assessment system meets the quality standards when it is classified as "established."

The 2018 data show that progress has been made: Twenty-nine out of 61 countries (48 percent) met the quality standards,[19] which is five more countries than the baseline,[20] raising the proportion of DCPs within that category by 8 percentage points. Progress is even more marked in FCACs with an increase of 11 percentage points (Figure 1.3). An additional eight learning assessment systems met the quality standards in 2018 (Cameroon, Chad, Guinea, Haiti, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Togo and Vietnam). In some cases, the progress is attributable to engagement in cross-national assessment for the first time

18. L. Crouch and M. Gustafsson, "Worldwide Inequality and Poverty in Cognitive Results: Cross-Sectional Evidence and Time-Based Trends." See also L. Crouch and C. Rolleston, "Raising the Floor on Learning Levels: Equitable Improvement Starts with the Tail."
19. The 2018 data benefited from supplementary information gathered from country responses through two regional assessment networks that are receiving support from GPE through the Assessment for Learning (A4L) initiative (NEQMAP in the Asia-Pacific and TALENT in Sub-Saharan Africa). A total of 27 DCPs (11 from the Asia-Pacific region, 16 from Sub-Saharan Africa) responded.
20. It is important to note that the original baseline data values have been revised because of the better availability of online information, which was not available at the time of the baseline data collection. This newly available information revised our 2015 baseline to be eight points higher than previously calculated (the original was 32 percent), and in fact higher than the 2018 milestone.

BOX 1.4.

STRENGTHENING SCHOOL EFFICIENCY TO IMPROVE PARITY IN LEARNING OUTCOMES

Even though resources are important for learning, at the school level more resources don't always translate to better learning outcomes.[a] The same quantity of resources allocated to different schools yields different results in terms of learning. The capacity of schools to use their resources efficiently is an important part of reducing disparities in learning outcomes between schools.

To assess the efficiency with which school resources are translated into learning outcomes, an efficiency analysis was performed applying the data envelopment analysis (DEA) methodology on PASEC 2014 data.[b] It took into account teachers (salary level, education level), textbooks (proportion of students with reading and mathematics textbooks), infrastructure (PASEC infrastructure quality index) and pedagogical resources (PASEC pedagogical resources index), and assessed the capacity of schools to translate these resources into learning outcomes, comparing the most efficient schools with the others.

The efficiency analysis shows that learning outcomes may have been about 25 percent higher if all schools were as efficient as the most efficient schools in the PASEC countries, in terms of the results they were able to get with the resources they had. While efficiency drivers may vary depending on the country's specific contexts, findings show that location (rural/urban), school type (public/private), student absenteeism, involvement of the community in school management, teaching time and teaching environment play a role in school efficiency.

This analysis suggests targeted and diversified policies to promote parity in learning outcomes, including prioritizing improvement in the efficiency with which resources are used in less efficient schools. Increasing school resources in low-performing schools with high efficiency levels could be another effective way to improve learning outcomes.[c]

Source: E. W. Miningou, J.-M. Bernard and M. Pierre-Louis, "Improving Learning Outcomes in Francophone Africa."

a. For instance, PASEC schools with the greatest allocation of pedagogical resources are not necessarily those with the highest levels of achievement in reading. In addition, the literature shows a weak correlation between some types of resources and learning outcomes (S. Fehrler, K. Michaelowa and A. Wechtler, "The Effectiveness of Inputs in Primary Education"; H.-A. Dang, L. Sarr and N. Asadullah, "School Access, Resources, and Learning Outcomes: Evidence from a Non-formal School Program in Bangladesh").
b. Given a selected set of input and output variables, DEA estimates a frontier of best practices. It is a relative measure. The most efficient schools are on the frontier and the efficiency of the other schools is evaluated by measuring the distance to this empirical frontier, and a score between 0 and 1 is given to each school. The higher the efficiency score, the closest is the distance to the frontier and the more efficient is the school. A total of six inputs and two outputs have been included in the analysis.
c. The DEA results show that returns to scale are increasing in these schools. An increase in the school resources would lead to a higher than proportional increase in learning outcomes.

(for example, Guinea), while in others it reflects the first implementation of a national large-scale assessment (for example, Haiti). It is also encouraging to note progress in Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Guyana, Madagascar and Sierra Leone. While their learning assessment systems do not meet the quality standards yet, they have progressed from the category "nascent" to the category "under development." However, three countries whose learning assessment systems met the quality standard at the baseline no longer did so in 2018 (Lao PDR, Lesotho and Tanzania).[21] See Appendix I for country-level details on progress since the baseline.

While general challenges in the establishment and maintenance of quality learning assessment systems are by now generally well known to include a host of technical, financial and political barriers, when unpacking the Indicator 15 data further to examine why countries do not meet the quality standards that the indicator assesses, some interesting patterns emerge. Large-scale assessments (LSAs) appear to be a major challenge for 24 countries. For 11 of them, information was not available, and the other 13 countries did not meet all of the six quality standards for these assessments, including six countries that did not conduct an LSA within the 2015-2018 time frame, two that conducted an LSA only once,

21. Results for Lesotho and Tanzania are linked to their participation in the regional assessment program Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ), which has not had a round of evaluations recently.

BOX 1.5.


STRENGTHENING THE FOCUS ON LEARNING ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS IN GPE'S OPERATIONAL WORK

Until now, the quality assurance process for education sector program implementation grants (ESPIGs) has considered the funding model requirement met if the country had at least one comparable large-scale learning assessment over time. However, the comprehensive and systemic vision underpinning Indicator 15 can also be applied to assess if the requirement is met in a more system-oriented manner. For this purpose, the GPE Secretariat has developed a tool that is built largely from the Indicator 15 definition and methodology. It considers issues of system quality in relation to both large-scale assessments and public examinations (as for Indicator 15), but it goes further by examining classroom assessment as well. A pilot is planned to assess the use of this tool for both evaluation of the funding model requirement and Indicator 15 data collection in the future. This could contribute to strengthening dialogue about learning assessment system at the country level.

and three that have no permanent agency responsible for large-scale assessments. There appears to be a particular challenge in conducting LSAs regularly and ensuring comparability over time, while participating in international LSAs is also hampered by the lack of a permanent agency, institution or office to conduct these assessments in some cases. From this, it appears that countries need support in conducting LSAs in a sustainable manner rather than as ad hoc exercises. Forty-eight out of GPE's current 67 DCPs (72 percent) participated in or administered LSAs during the 2016-2019 period. An increasing number of DCPs are participating in cross-national (regional and international) learning assessments (34 DCPs in the 2018-2020 period versus 25 in 2013-2017) (see Appendix J details). This is because two new cross-national assessments have occurred or will occur for the first time in the 2018-2020 period (PISA for Development or PISA-D and the Southeast Asia Primary Learning Metric or SEA-PLM) and some DCPs will be participating for the first time in the next round of some of these assessments, notably in TIMSS and PASEC. For Bhutan, Cambodia (Box 1.6), the Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Mali, Myanmar and Pakistan, these engagements mark their first participation in the full international version of a cross-national learning assessment.[22]

FIGURE 1.3.

LEARNING ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS ARE GETTING STRONGER ACROSS THE PARTNERSHIP.
Proportion of DCPs with a learning assessment system within the basic education cycle that meets quality standards



Source
GPE Secretariat.

22. The Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea, Madagascar and Mali have participated in a *diagnostic* or *thematic* PASEC evaluation in the past, but 2019 will mark their first time participating in the full international PASEC. Cambodia and Lao PDR, as members of CONFEMEN, have also undertaken diagnostic PASEC evaluations in the past.

BOX 1.6.

CAMBODIA: A STORY OF PROGRESS

Cambodia provides an interesting example of a country that has made remarkable progress, both in engagement in different types of learning assessments and in anchoring the learning assessment system within the education system more broadly. From an ad hoc administration of national learning assessments beginning in 2007, the country has moved to the regular administration of these assessments, which test students in Khmer, mathematics and physics in grades 3, 6, 8 and 11. The country is also participating in both PISA-D (in 2017-2018) and SEA-PLM (in 2019-2020). In addition, Cambodia administers examinations in grades 9 and 12 and different types of school- and classroom-based assessments, in addition to Early Grade Reading Assessments and Early Grade Mathematics Assessments. Beyond this, the country has established a well-organized and well-functioning directorate—the Education Quality Assurance Department (EQAD)—within the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports and has committed to actively building the capacity of this structure and its officials. EQAD and the country's engagement in the different assessments noted above have strong political support at the highest levels, and the results of the national assessment have informed a number of policies, such as the improvement of incentives for marginalized students, scholarships and other support for marginalized children and allocation of more budgetary resources to rural schools.

1.4. GPE support to improving learning


GPE's focus on learning is evident across the different levels of its theory of change and is reflected in its operational model. First, the analysis of the quality of education sector plans has a dedicated focus on learning (see Indicator 16b in Chapter 4). Second, one of the three areas of the variable tranche of the funding model is dedicated to learning in alignment with the education sector plan, meaning that countries must show results in the learning area to receive their full funding allocations. Other aspects of system efficiency contribute directly to learning, including teacher training and teacher deployment (see Chapter 3). In this section, we review the overall funding dedicated to learning activities in GPE implementation grants, and then we do a deep dive on the support dedicated to learning assessment.

GPE'S STRONG FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO LEARNING OVERALL

For the 34 implementation grants active as of June 2018, US$581.8 million in funding was allocated to activities designed primarily to improve learning (see Chapter 5). This is the single largest investment area of GPE funding, representing 40.5 percent of all GPE implementation grant allocations as of June 2018. The funding is split among five categories of learning activities (Funding Focus: Learning). Learning assessment systems benefit from allocations totaling US$39 million.

FUNDING FOCUS: LEARNING

GPE FUNDING TO IMPROVE LEARNING, 2018



INCREASING GPE SUPPORT TO THE MEASUREMENT OF LEARNING Indicator 20

GPE's implementation grants provide support to various dimensions of learning assessment systems (LAS), as well as education management information systems (EMIS). Indicator 20 of the GPE results framework examines the proportion of grants supporting EMIS and/or LAS. Indicator 20 data show significant progress from 2016 to 2018, with the 2018 and even 2020 milestones overwhelmingly surpassed (Figure 1.4).[23] The results are even more dramatic in FCACs, where in 2018 all of the implementation grants from GPE were supporting EMIS and/or LAS (Figure 1.4).

GPE's strategic interest in learning outcomes was operationalized in its 2014 funding model's requirement that countries wishing to access implementation grants must have either a system in place to monitor learning outcomes or a costed plan to develop one. Furthermore, in 2017 the GPE Board decided that GPE funding should be used to close any financing gaps for such data plans.[24] The rapid progress on this indicator has been incentivized by GPE's own strategic orientation as well as the increasing interest on the part of countries in these questions.

Looking further into the 34 implementation grants active at the end of fiscal year 2018, 88 percent of them invested in activities related to learning assessment. These grants support multiple aspects, including national assessments and participation in cross-national assessments, classroom assessment, examinations, and participation in Early Grade Reading Assessments (EGRAs) and Early Grade Mathematics Assessments (EGMAs).[25] For example, in Bangladesh the grant has supported the development and implementation of classroom-based assessment and national assessment, while in the Democratic Republic of Congo the funding has enabled the establishment of an independent agency in charge of national assessments.

In 2017, GPE launched the Assessment for Learning (A4L) initiative. A4L provides support at global and regional levels, which, in concert with the funding model requirement and its operationalization through the sector planning process, ensures that GPE's support to measuring learning is a coherent package that contributes to improved national learning assessment systems across DCPs. A4L has supported the development of a toolkit to support diagnostics of learning assessment systems to inform strategies to strengthen these systems.[26] It is being piloted in three DCPs—Ethiopia, Mauritania and Vietnam—after which it will be finalized and disseminated. A4L also supports regional assessment networks in the Asia-Pacific region (NEQMAP) and in Sub-Saharan Africa (TALENT) focusing on capacity development, research and knowledge sharing among countries of these two regions. These networks have been instrumental in collecting the information for Indicator 15. To date, A4L has supported the organization of four regional capacity development workshops on technical aspects of learning assessment,[27] such as contextual data and reporting and dissemination of results. Through A4L support, the two networks have also undertaken research (on topics such as assessment of transversal competencies, the use and impact of learning assessments and so on) and knowledge sharing (for example, webinars, newsletters and a knowledge portal). Finally, A4L contributes to the exploration of broader measurements of learning, through a landscape review of the measurement of 21st-century skills and the piloting of tools for assessing these skills.[28]


A4L will dovetail with GPE's new Knowledge and Innovation Exchange, which is being launched in 2019 with an aim of strengthening national education systems by engaging DCPs and other partners in knowledge generation, innovation and capacity strengthening on a range of technical topics, including learning assessment systems.

23. Milestones were based on initial data for baseline that were much lower, but not comprehensive and not reliable.
24. See the Board decision at: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/board-decisions-march-2017.
25. The EGRA measures students' progress toward literacy; the EGMA measures students' progress toward numeracy.
26. The toolkit is known as the Analysis of National Learning Assessment Systems (ANLAS) and is being developed in partnership with the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER), along with CONFEMEN/PASEC.
27. Each of these workshops has generally had about 50 participants from around 20 countries.
28. The landscape review, to be published in 2019, aims to inform future reflection on GPE's part on supporting the promotion of 21st-century skills in its work. The tool development work, focused on classroom assessment, is being led by the Brookings Institution in six countries, three in the Asia-Pacific region (Cambodia, Mongolia and Nepal) and three in Sub-Saharan Africa (Democratic Republic of Congo, The Gambia and Zambia).

FIGURE 1.4.

GRANT SUPPORT TO DATA SYSTEMS IS INCREASING.

Proportion of grants supporting EMIS/LAS



Source
GPE Secretariat.

BOX 1.7.

GLOBAL ALLIANCE TO MONITOR LEARNING

GPE supports the global dialogue around the learning- and skills-related targets and indicators of SDG 4. This engagement has been primarily channeled through the Global Alliance to Monitor Learning (GAML), which is a platform to support national strategies for measuring learning and to enable international reporting against the learning- and skills-related indicators of SDG 4. Led by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, which serves as its secretariat, GAML brings together a range of stakeholders focused on improving learning assessments globally. The GPE Secretariat serves on the GAML Strategic Planning Committee as well as several of its task forces (including the one for SDG 4.1.1) and will soon be initiating a new task force focused on capacity development.

ADDRESSING THE LEARNING CRISIS

The lack of new data makes it difficult to report on progress about learning outcomes. However, there are some encouraging signs and reasons for hope. First, in the 23 countries with data comparable over time, a majority of DCPs (70 percent) have seen some progress in learning outcomes over time. Of course, much more progress is needed as almost half the students are not learning the basics by the end of primary education, but it is an indication that progress is not only possible but also happening in many countries. Thus, the question becomes not only how to improve learning, but also how to accelerate learning improvement. This is a key priority for GPE, as more than 40 percent of its active implementation grant funding, almost US$600 million, was allocated to learning activities as of June 2018.

This chapter has highlighted the disparities in learning outcomes that impede overall progress on learning, and the importance of having a systems approach to improving learning. Across the 10 countries with PASEC data, 45 percent of the overall disparity among students in learning outcomes is explained by the variations in the performance of the schools they attend. In particular, disparities among schools, where some do not impart the basics, suggest a key emphasis for learning policies in certain contexts.

To inform such policies, learning data at all levels of the education system must be available and acted upon. The lack of learning data has been a major constraint for learning policies, but there is some good news in that domain. The availability of data is increasing significantly, with more learning assessments happening, and learning assessment systems are improving. Forty-eight percent of learning assessment systems now meet quality standards, above the 2018 milestone, and up from 40 percent in 2015. The proportion of GPE grants supporting learning assessment and other data systems has increased significantly over the past three years, from 83 percent in 2016 to 94 percent 2018, with the 2018 milestones surpassed, and 88 percent supporting learning assessment systems specifically.

A grade five student hands her answer to a math problem to the teacher at Phonsivilay Primary School, Meun District, Lao PDR.

Credit: GPE/Kelley Lynch



CHAPTER

2

Equity, Gender Equality and Inclusion in Access to Education

RESULTS AT A GLANCE

IMPACT

GOAL 1

Improved and more equitable learning outcomes

#2

Percentage of children **under age 5 developmentally on track**.

-


*13 countries with data available.

GOAL 2

Increased equity, gender equality, and inclusion


#3

GPE supported **22.2 million children**.




#4a

76.7% of children **completed primary education**.




#4b

51.6% of children **completed lower secondary education**.




#5a

67% of DCPs were at or close to **gender parity** in primary completion



#5b


54% of DCPs were at or close to **gender parity** in lower secondary completion



	Baseline	Annual milestone met	Annual milestone not met
Overall	○	●	●
FCACs	□	■	■
Female	◇	◆	◆


#6

37.9% of pre-primary-age children **enrolled in pre-primary education**.




#7a

19.4% of primary-school-age children were out of school.




#7b

31.8% of lower-secondary-school-age children were out of school.




#8a

Primary-school-age girls were **1.27 times more likely** than boys **to be out of school**.




#8b

Lower-secondary-school-age girls were **1.14 times more likely** than boys **to be out of school**.



#9

46% of DCPs improved substantially on the **equity index since 2010**.



KEY FINDINGS

› **Completion rates are improving**, with an estimated 4.9 million more children completing primary school and 2.6 million more completing lower secondary over the previous year. **In countries affected by fragility and conflict, the primary completion rate is still lagging but showing progress.**

› **Parity between girls and boys completing school is improving but still elusive at the lower secondary level**. The proportion of developing country partners nearing equal numbers of girls and boys completing rose to more than two-thirds for primary, and to well over half for lower secondary.

› **While large disparities persist between the richest and poorest and between urban and rural children, these disparities are narrowing.** For example, in countries affected by fragility and conflict, 42 rural children completed lower secondary school for every 100 urban children in 2018, compared with 39 in 2017.

› **Too many children are still out of school**. One in 5 young children are out of primary school, and that has not changed this year. Nearly 1 in 3 children are out of lower secondary school, but that number fell by more than 3 percent in the last year.

› GPE grants supported an estimated 22.2 million students: 20.2 million in primary school and 2 million in lower secondary. **GPE surpassed its goal for support to countries affected by fragility and conflict by more than 45 percent**, reflecting GPE's commitment to prioritizing these countries.

› GPE implementation grants active as of June 2018 allocated **over US$372.8 million to activities specifically promoting equity, gender equality and inclusion**.

CHAPTER

2

Equity, Gender Equality and Inclusion in Access to Education

Increased equity, gender equality and inclusion in access to education are fundamental to the Global Partnership for Education's mission and comprise Strategic Goal 2. Seventy-one percent of the world's 62.2 million out-of-school children of primary school age, and 59 percent of the 60.7 million of lower secondary school age, are in developing country partners as of 2016.[1] Children from the poorest households, from rural areas, and from countries affected by fragility and conflict are still more likely to be left behind, as are girls in many countries. Marginalization based on socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity, language, religion, disability and location are drivers of education inequality. This chapter focuses on progress and challenges in equitable access to school with special attention to gender and countries affected by fragility and conflict.[2] Progress on completion of primary and lower secondary school, as well as reducing out-of-school rates, provides the main lenses for these equity analyses, and access to early childhood care and education is also examined.[3] The chapter discusses GPE support for equity in basic education as well, including for children with disabilities.

2.1. Equity in completion of basic education

COMPLETION RATES Indicator 4


Good progress has been made on primary and lower secondary completion rates (Indicator 4), with nearly all indicators above their milestones, indicating that the proportion of children reaching the end of primary and lower secondary education is increasing significantly (Figures 2.1a and 2.1b).[4] Progress is below the milestone for primary education in FCACs.

As Figure 2.2 shows, apart from Djibouti, all of the countries below the 2018 milestones for completion rates are in Sub-Saharan Africa, indicating a need to redouble efforts to support DCPs in that region to get more children into school and reduce dropout. Rates are especially low in the Central African Republic, Chad, Malawi, Mozambique and Niger. At the same time, Niger has made substantial progress on primary completion rates in recent years, as have Djibouti and Cote d'Ivoire, while Tanzania and Sao Tome and Principe have lost ground.[5] In lower secondary completion, Timor-Leste, Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR) and Burundi have made significant progress, while Tanzania has seen some decline.[6] Overall, of the 19 DCPs with data below the milestone for primary


1. GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org.
2. GPE understands equity to include broader aims concerning access and completion of school for all children, in addition to the equal distribution of access, resources and outcomes. Not only are children who are denied a full cycle of quality education more likely to be from disadvantaged groups, but this denial is itself a form of marginalization. For this reason, GPE endeavors to ensure that more children are given educational opportunities, and that these opportunities are equally available to all.
3. Data for the milestones 2018 are generally coming from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) and cover the school year 2015-2016, so there is a two-year lag.
4. For details on any indicator methodology, replace X with the number of the indicator in the following link: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/methodology-sheet-gpe-result-indicator-X.
5. Not included in the primary completion count are Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Somalia and South Sudan, which had no data in the 2013-2016 range.
6. Not included in the lower secondary completion count are Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Somalia and South Sudan, which had no data in the 2013-2016 range.

FIGURE 2.1.

A: PRIMARY COMPLETION RATES ARE INCREASING, BUT SLOWLY IN FCACS.
Proportion of children who complete primary education



B: LOWER SECONDARY COMPLETION RATES ARE INCREASING FOR ALL CHILDREN.
Proportion of children who complete lower secondary education



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (2018).

completion, seven improved by more than 1 percentage point, and six regressed by more than 1 percentage point, since the 2015 baseline.[7] Of the 20 DCPs with data below the milestone for lower secondary completion, seven improved by more than 1 percentage point, and three regressed by more than 1 percentage point, since the 2015 baseline.[8]

While, on average, girls are still disadvantaged in primary and lower secondary completion (Figures 2.1a and 2.1b), both completion rates are improving for girls at almost exactly the same rate as they are for boys. This means that while girls are not being left behind in the improvements in completion rates, the gender gap is not narrowing. Girls in FCACs are especially disadvantaged in lower secondary completion: at 41.2 percent, they fall well below both the average for all children in FCACs and the average for girls overall for 2018 (compare to Figure 2.1b).[9]

GENDER PARITY IN COMPLETION RATES Indicator 5


Another way to measure progress toward gender equality is through a gender parity index, which shows how girls are doing compared with boys on a given indicator, such as completion rates. Indicator 5 counts the number of countries with gender parity indexes for completion rates that come within about 10 percent of the accepted range for gender parity.[10]


7. GPE compilation based on UIS data for 2018 compared with baseline (2015) reporting years. Within this group, four DCPs' primary completion rates stayed within 1 percentage point of their baseline values, and two did not have baseline data for comparison.
8. GPE compilation based on UIS data for 2018 compared with baseline (2015) reporting years. Within this group, six DCPs' primary completion rates stayed within 1 percentage point of their baseline values, and four did not have baseline data for comparison.
9. GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (2018).
10. A gender parity index divides girls' results by boys' results to get a ratio, so the closer to 1, the more even the results are across girls and boys. Indicator 5 uses the threshold of 0.877-1.123, which represents coming within about 10 percent of the accepted range for gender parity of 0.97-1.03. Counting the number of countries within this wider range provides more useful information about progress toward parity across the partnership.

FIGURE 2.2.

COUNTRY-LEVEL PROGRESS IS VARIED ON PRIMARY AND LOWER SECONDARY COMPLETION RATES.

Primary and lower secondary completion rates for individual DCPs






Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (2016-2012 last data point available). The origins are the 2018 milestones (x axis: 76.0%, y axis: 50.3%).

Note
The lack of data from Nigeria and Bangladesh, two of GPE's most populous developing country partners, alters averages. Country codes can be found on page 7.

FIGURE 2.3.


A: GENDER PARITY IN PRIMARY COMPLETION MEETS MILESTONES.

Proportion of GPE DCPs within set thresholds for gender parity index of completion rates for primary education



B: GENDER PARITY IN LOWER SECONDARY COMPLETION INCREASES MORE STEADILY IN FCACS.

Proportion of GPE DCPs within set thresholds for gender parity index of completion rates for lower secondary education



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, www.uis.unesco.org

Note
Baseline data points have been excluded to adjust projections.

The proportion of DCPs near gender parity on completion met the 2018 milestone in primary education, but it has stagnated since 2016 in FCACs (Figure 2.3a). Conversely, the pace of progress in FCACs regarding gender parity in lower secondary completion appears to outperform that of other DCPs (Figure 2.3b), largely because gains for girls in non-FCACs are more likely to result in a slight advantage for girls than they are in FCACs.[11]


Looking at gender parity in completion rates for individual DCPs (Figure 2.4), two salient patterns emerge: First, a country's gender parity index in primary completion tends to stay relatively consistent into lower secondary, except that cases of girls' disadvantage tend to become more pronounced—dramatically so in countries like the Democratic Republic of Congo and Burundi. Second, while underperformance of boys does


11. This may be due in part to a phenomenon in which stronger education systems may correlate with higher girls' completion rates: More non-FCACs are getting girls completing lower secondary school to the point where girls outnumber boys by more than 1.12 to 1. See Psaki, McCarthy, and Mensch, "Measuring Gender Equality in Education: Lessons from Trends in 43 Countries"; UNESCO, *Gender Review: Creating Sustainable Futures for All*, Global Education Monitoring Report, 2016.

FIGURE 2.4.

COUNTRY-LEVEL PROGRESS IS VARIED ON GENDER PARITY OF COMPLETION.

Gender parity indices of completion rates in primary and lower secondary for individual DCPs





Non-FCACs FCACs

Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (2016-2012 last data point available).
The marked thresholds (0.88-1.12) indicate coming within about 10% of gender parity.

Note
Not pictured: Lesotho (1.22, 1.45 for primary and lower secondary, respectively), and Chad (0.64, 0.42, likewise).
Country codes can be found on page 7.

exist in a few countries, it is neither as common nor, generally, as severe as the cases of girls' disadvantage. While a number of DCPs are close to meeting the gender parity milestone, others are a significant cause for concern, especially the Central African Republic, Chad, Guinea and Lesotho, which are outside the boundaries of the chart in Figure 2.4.

THE EQUITY INDEX: LOWER SECONDARY COMPLETION RATES BY GENDER, LOCATION AND WEALTH Indicator 9


Indicator 9 of the GPE results framework tracks the performance of DCPs on the equity index each year and takes note of how many have improved at least 10 percent since 2010. The equity index provides a measure of equity in lower secondary completion rates in 59 DCPs with available data, by averaging the three parity indexes: girls to boys, rural to urban, and the poorest 20 percent of households to the richest 20 percent.[12] In combining these three measures, the equity index provides a snapshot of how level the playing field may or may not be for all children within a given country to receive a full cycle of basic education.

The equity index across DCPs has continued to increase steadily, and a number of DCPs have surpassed the 2018 milestone (Figure 2.5a). Progress in FCACs matched or slightly outperformed that of non-FCACs on all three of the component indexes, while the values remain lower on all for FCACs (Figure 2.5b).

While the overall rate of progress is positive, the equity index also illustrates how dramatic the current disparities still are: In FCACs, for example, children from the richest 20 percent of households are five times more likely to complete lower secondary school than children from the poorest 20 percent. The data echo a finding of the recent country-level evaluations, describing "evidence of improvements across countries, but also of persistent inequities based on learners' gender, income level and geographic location" with regard to access to basic education.[13]

FIGURE 2.5

A: THE EQUITY INDEX SHOWS STEADY IMPROVEMENT.
Proportion of GPE DCPs with an equity index that has increased at least 10 percent since 2010




Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, www.uis.unesco.org, and the WIDE database www.education-inequalities.org.

12. Each component of the equity index always divides the rates of the more disadvantaged group by those of the advantaged group: In the relatively few countries where more girls complete lower secondary school than do boys, for example, boys' rates are divided by girls'. This way, unlike with traditional gender parity indexes used elsewhere in this chapter, the parity index never exceeds 1. No GPE DCP has any record of the poorest children with higher lower secondary completion rates than the wealthiest, and no DCP has reported higher rates for rural children since 2006. (Only Albania, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan had reported slightly higher rates for rural children in 2005, 2005, and 2006, respectively.) GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org, and the WIDE database, https://www.education-inequalities.org.
13. Universalia, *GPE Country-level Evaluations – Synthesis Report: Financial Year 2018*, 84.

FIGURE 2.5

B: COMPONENT PARITY INDICES SHOW CONTINUED IMPROVEMENTS.

Parity indices across GPE DCPs with regard to gender, location and wealth



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org, and the WIDE database, https://www.education-inequalities.org.

These disparities become even more substantial in combination, and in the majority of countries, rural girls from the poorest households are the furthest behind. Yet the degree of disparity can vary significantly from one country to the next. Figure 2.6 illustrates the variance in disparity between the primary completion rates of girls depending on their wealth and location in DCPs, highlighting the differences especially in the middle of the graph, with countries like Nicaragua and Honduras showing higher degrees of parity, and countries like Cameroon and Mozambique with particularly strong disparities.


As more marginalized children are denied access or forced to drop out, it is the more socioeconomically advantaged children who end up capturing the bulk of public education expenditures—paradoxically—as they are able to remain in school.[14] This pattern is especially pronounced in low-income countries, where 46 percent of public resources go the top 10 percent most educated students, who tend to be the wealthiest as well—as opposed to 26 percent of resources in lower-middle income countries, and 13 percent in upper-middle-income and high-income countries.[15] This is one of the many reasons why efficiency, equity and efficacy are intertwined when it comes to strong education systems, and why GPE pursues these goals jointly in its support for system-strengthening.

14. Based on data from IIEP-Pôle de Dakar, 2000-2017.
15. UNICEF, *The Investment Case for Education and Equity*; Ilie and Rose, "Is Equal Access to Higher Education in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa Achievable by 2030?"

FIGURE 2.6.

DEGREES OF DISADVANTAGE VARY ACROSS COUNTRIES.

Primary completion rates for urban girls from the richest quintile versus rural girls from the poorest quintile



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://uis.unesco.org (latest available years as indicated).

Note
Country codes can be found on page 7.

2.2. Out-of-school children


OUT-OF-SCHOOL RATES Indicator 7

Indicator 7 tracks the proportion of (a) children of primary school age and (b) children of lower secondary school age that are out of school using out-of-school rates.[16] Despite progress, the 2018 milestones, for all groups—girls, children in FCACs, and children overall—were not met (Figure 2.7a and 2.7b).


Across GPE developing country partners, on average, more girls than boys are still out of primary and lower secondary school, and girls' out-of-school rates for lower secondary have stagnated over the past three years. This means that girls are falling farther behind boys in access to lower secondary education. Likewise, progress on lower secondary out-of-school rates in FCACs is erratic, and DCPs in the lower left quadrant of Figure 2.8 are especially facing challenges.

FIGURE 2.7

A: PROGRESS IS SLOW ON PRIMARY OUT-OF-SCHOOL RATES.
Out-of-school rate for children of primary school age



B: THERE IS PROGRESS FOR BOYS IN LOWER SECONDARY OUT-OF-SCHOOL RATES.
Out-of-school rate for children of lower secondary school age




Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org.

16. Out-of-school rates track the number of primary-school-age children who are not in school, as a proportion of all primary-school-age children; the same applies for lower secondary.

In relation to progress since the baseline, Cote d'Ivoire has made dramatic progress in primary out-of-school rates, and Burkina Faso, Pakistan, and The Gambia have improved substantially as well, while Timor-Leste has significantly more children out of primary school. As for lower secondary out-of-school rates, Timor-Leste has in fact made substantial improvements, as has the Kyrgyz Republic, while Honduras and Mauritania have more children out of lower secondary school. Overall, of the 14 DCPs with data not meeting the 2018 milestone for primary out-of-school rates, six have improved by more than 1 percentage point and three have deteriorated by more than 1 percentage point since the 2015 baseline.[17] Of the nine DCPs with data not meeting the 2018 milestone for lower secondary out-of-school rates, two have improved by more than 1 percentage point and three have deteriorated by more than 1 percentage point since the 2015 baseline.[18] Data are especially scarce for lower secondary, and countries such as Afghanistan, the Central African Republic, Chad and Somalia have not published recent rates, but they may still be facing challenges.

FIGURE 2.8.

COUNTRY-LEVEL PROGRESS IS VARIED ON OUT-OF-SCHOOL RATES.
Primary and lower secondary out-of-school rates for individual DCPs



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (2016-2012 last data point available)

Note
The origins on the graph are GPE's 2018 milestones for primary and lower secondary out-of-school rates (x axis origin: 18.3%, y axis origin: 31.3%).
Country codes can be found on page 7.

17. GPE compilation based on UIS data for 2018 compared with baseline (2015) reporting years. Within this group, three DCPs have kept within 1 percentage point of their baseline primary out-of-school rates, and two did not have baseline data for comparison.
18. GPE compilation based on UIS data for 2018 compared with baseline (2015) reporting years. Within this group, four DCPs did not have baseline data for comparison.

One of the key reasons why performance is poorer on out-of-school rates than on completion rates, discussed above, is that the out-of-school rates include children who are in school but older than the official age range for their school level (that is, primary age or lower secondary age). When a child's education is delayed or disrupted, the ripple effects may be seen in out-of-school rates for a decade or more to come. As a consequence, bringing down out-of-school rates requires not only getting more children into school and reducing dropout, but also dealing with entrenched problems of over-age enrollment.[19]

Supporting countries in implementing strategies to get more children into school, and completing their education, is one of GPE's core priorities. For example, the South Sudan General Education Strategic Plan (2017-2021) prioritizes providing education to out-of-school children. In December 2018, the GPE Board approved a grant to support a program in South Sudan that would bring more than 330,000 out-of-school children into the education system. In Eritrea, the GPE-supported program targeted areas where most of the out-of-school children live. In 2018, the program provided 3,428,668 textbooks and teacher's guides, trained 1,550 teachers from minority groups for deployment to underserved areas, and trained another 478 teachers in mother-tongue instruction to expand access to education for these children.

GENDER PARITY IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL CHILDREN

Indicator 8

Indicator 8 tracks the average of all gender parity indexes of out-of-school-rates across the partnership. The data for 2018 show that girls' disadvantage persists more significantly than expected for milestones at both the primary and lower secondary levels, both overall and in FCACs (see Appendix K). However, since taking an average of these indexes allows high values (showing girls' disadvantage) to cancel out low ones (showing boys' disadvantage), it can mask disparities, and a clearer picture is revealed by looking at the country-level values (see Appendix K). Substantial gender disparities[20] with regards to out-of-school children (outside the 0.877-1.123 nearing-parity threshold) persist in 81 percent of DCPs with data available at the primary level and 71 percent at the lower secondary level.[21] As with completion rates, girls' disadvantage is both more common and more dramatic.[22] GPE is well positioned to address this issue, as 73 percent of the girls who are out of primary school worldwide, and 63 percent of those out of lower secondary, are in GPE DCPs.[23]

However, the countries with the highest gender disparities for Indicator 8 are often not the ones with the highest overall out-of-school rates—in fact, they tend to have more of their children in school overall.[24] But gender parity indexes can point us to the fact that, for example, while a girl has roughly a 49 percent chance of being out of lower secondary school in both Sudan and Ethiopia, she is 130 percent more likely to be out of school than a boy her age in Sudan, but only 10 percent more likely than a boy in Ethiopia. When analyzed alongside overall rates, gender parity indexes provide an important aspect of the larger picture of equity.

19. Children may be enrolled in school at later ages due to a wide variety of factors, whether economic (parents must save for the cost of schooling, and/or depend on their school-age children to care for younger siblings or livestock), institutional (children must wait for a place in overcrowded schools) or environmental (parents fear for their small children's safety walking to school, or crisis-driven displacement disrupts access to education). In addition, malnutrition is one reason why a school-age child might seem much younger and not ready for school. With thanks to Elizabeth King for the latter point, see Glewwe and Jacoby, "An Economic Analysis of Delayed Primary School Enrollment in a Low-Income Country: The Role of Early Childhood Nutrition."
20. GPE is committed to a broad and comprehensive vision of gender equality in education. While factors such as data availability drive a focus on gender parity in access and completion, the Secretariat is seeking more comprehensive and system-level indicators of gender equality, in addition to Indicator 16c, on equity in sector planning. The Secretariat is actively reviewing the results framework for the next strategic plan and is looking to invest in the development of a tool for measuring the gender-responsiveness of education systems.
21. Results are for 47 DCPs with data available for gender parity in out-of-school rates for primary, and 38 DCPs with such data available for lower secondary. GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (2016-2012 last data point available). GPE does not have an official target threshold for gender parity indexes of out-of-school rates; the one employed for Indicator 5, regarding gender parity index of completion rates, simply provides a frame of reference here.
22. Notably, recent out-of-school rates for both primary and lower secondary levels are only available for 38 GPE developing country partners; the rates are not available for many DCPS, including some of the most populous, such as Nigeria. Moreover, lack of data availability can, in general terms, tend to correlate with higher out-of-school rates and/or greater girls' disadvantage, as appears to be the case in states such as Somalia. Available data may not show the full picture, and this underscores the urgency of improving data collection and reporting to drive equity outcomes.
23. GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (2018).
24. This is often simply because large ratios are easier to get from smaller numbers than larger ones – for example, in Albania, 3.52 percent of girls are out of lower secondary school versus 0.63 percent of boys, resulting in a gender parity index of 5.60.

IN FOCUS
GENDER EQUALITY IN BASIC EDUCATION

On average across the partnership, girls are still disadvantaged with regard to access and completion at both the primary and lower secondary levels (see Figures 2.1 and 2.6). Here, more attention at both levels is especially needed in countries like Chad, the Central African Republic, Guinea, Mali and Niger,[25] and for girls in lower secondary in particular in countries like the Democratic Republic of Congo and Togo. For learning outcomes, as detailed in Chapter 1, whether girls' or boys' performance is stronger in a given subject can vary greatly from one country to the next, underscoring that disparities are driven by factors within the education system, in the context of local sociocultural factors, and are not intrinsic (see Appendix D). Thus, these disparities also point to the need for gender-responsive approaches to ensure that all children have an equal opportunity to learn.

The GPE funding model helps to reinforce support to gender equality in education, in part through requiring and monitoring whether education sector plans (ESPs)/transitional education plans have strategies to respond to marginalized groups that meets quality standards, as discussed in Chapter 4. For example, Benin's ESP uses evidence to clearly identify the causes of girls' disadvantage, and has a strategy, to which its action plan is aligned, to address some of these causes, with well-defined outcomes, outputs and indicators.[26]

Many DCPs are now implementing ESPs, with GPE support, that address barriers to girls' education, particularly in lower secondary. According to a recent stocktake conducted by the GPE Secretariat (Box 2.1), these include demand-side activities such as awareness-raising campaigns, scholarships and other incentive measures for girls, as some of the countries with the most disadvantaged girls (Niger, Nigeria, Mauritania, Somalia-Puntland and Somalia-Somaliland) have recently implemented.[27] Supply-side activities to create gender-responsive schools and systems include the recruitment of female teachers, gender mainstreaming in teacher training, gender-sensitive curricula, textbooks, and teaching and training materials, as well as the construction of private latrines and water access points to facilitate menstrual hygiene management, and measures to prevent gender-based violence. From the active implementation grants as of June 2018, US$60.2 million was allocated to activities focused on promoting gender equality specifically.

At the global level, GPE is taking action on a variety of fronts, primarily through the implementation of the Gender Equality Strategy 2016-2020 (Box 2.1). In the realm of advocacy, GPE is working with partners to build political support for girls' education and gender equality. For example, the Secretariat is working to ensure that girls' education is a key theme at the landmark Women Deliver global conference in June 2019, and engaging with the African Union Child Marriage campaign and Gender is My Agenda Campaign to provide an education perspective. GPE is a member of the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI) working group on school-related gender-based violence, and is working with the Safe to Learn campaign to end violence in schools. GPE's Board chair is a member of the Commonwealth Platform for Girls' Education, a group of champions of girls' education, and GPE's CEO is a member of the G-7 Gender Equality Advisory Council, a group of gender equality experts advising the G-7 on key issues for girls and women, including education. GPE is also working to engage political champions for education and gender equality at the level of the African Union—including continued outreach to the Organization of African First Ladies for Development (OAFLAD)—and pursuing strategic partnerships with civil society organizations and youth at the global and regional levels to raise political will for, and commitments to, gender equality and girls' education.

25. In these countries, the situation for girls is especially challenging: They face both low completion rates (as well as high out-of-school rates) and large gender disparities in favor of boys. GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org.
26. GPE Secretariat.
27. GPE, *Portfolio Review 2018* (Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2018), https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/2018-annual-portfolio-review.

BOX 2.1.

PROGRESS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENDER EQUALITY STRATEGY 2016-2020

The Board of Directors adopted the Gender Equality Strategy 2016-2020 to put GPE's *Gender Equality Policy* into practice, in alignment with GPE 2020, to advance inclusive and equitable quality education for all girls and boys. Implementation continues apace, with 2018 involving mainstreaming gender-responsiveness into GPE's operational frameworks, involving all Secretariat teams, and a comprehensive stocktake of gender equality activities in ESPs. In addition, the Secretariat has recently created a girls' education advocacy strategy, setting out how it will work with partners to secure political and financial support for girls' education, and position investments in girls' education and gender equality as critical to achieving all the Sustainable Development Goals, in alignment with GPE 2020.

GPE also partnered with UNGEI and others to deliver two more capacity development workshops based on their jointly developed *Guidance for Developing Gender-Responsive Education Sector Plans* (GRESP) in 2018, for a total of 13 country delegations from West and Central Africa and from East and southern Africa, and two more workshops are planned for the remainder of 2019. In these workshops, delegates review their own ESPs, carry out a gender analysis of their own education context, and, at the end, create an action plan to guide follow-up work that will make their ESP plan more gender-responsive. GRESP receives support from the Children's Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF), which has provided one of GPE's first sources of targeted funding to improve girls' lower secondary education completion rates in Sub-Saharan Africa.

More details can be found in the annual reports on implementation of the GPE *Gender Equality Strategy*, the latest of which will be published to GPE's website in the summer of 2019.

IN FOCUS
BASIC EDUCATION IN COUNTRIES AFFECTED BY FRAGILITY AND CONFLICT

Half of all the world's children of primary- and lower-secondary-school age live in the 51 countries affected by fragility and conflict—a very sobering reality.[28] Of these children, 41 percent live in the 32 FCACs that are GPE developing country partners. On average, children are still less likely to complete basic education in FCACs, and much more likely to be out of school. The need to ensure consistent access to quality education for these children is urgent—and a key priority for GPE. As of February 2019, 48 percent of GPE developing country partners are FCAC.

The disruption and delay that conflict and fragility can cause to a child's education may be one reason why progress is so much slower on lower secondary out-of-school rates than it is on lower secondary completion rates. At the same time, primary completion rates are also increasing more slowly than lower secondary completion rates, making universal primary education a distant goal for many FCACs. This is not only an injustice for the children who are excluded from primary education, and a constraint on the growth of lower secondary completion rates in the future: It represents a risk of fueling instability in these countries, as education has been shown to reduce the risk of armed conflict and build resilience.[29]

FCACs especially facing challenges in getting more children into school and completing basic education include the Central African Republic, Chad, Eritrea, Liberia, Mali and South Sudan—and the latter four have seen deteriorating rates in recent years.[30] Cases of backward movement are causes for concern, and imply a need for greater support to help meet the challenges present. FCACs such as Afghanistan, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, and Somalia do not appear on most lists and charts in this chapter because of the lack of recent data availability, but their progress—as well as data issues—deserve attention as well.

28. It is 49.7 percent, according to GPE calculations based on world and FCAC population data for 2016 from the United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, *World Population Prospects: The 2017 Revision*, DVD edition. For primary (age 6 to 11); lower secondary (age 12 to 14) details, see https://population.un.org/wpp/Publications/Files/WPP2017_Methodology.pdf. GPE's categorization of FCACs takes into account determinations from the World Bank and UNESCO; see Appendix C for more details on the categorizations.
29. UNESCO (2011). *The hidden crisis: armed conflict and education*. EFA Global Monitoring Report, UNESCO.
30. Based on the latest available data within the period (2012-2016) for primary and lower secondary completion rates; and comparisons between the latest available data within the periods (2008-2011) and (2013-2016) for primary completion rates, and primary and lower secondary out-of-school rates. GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org.

GPE weights its funding allocations toward countries affected by fragility and conflict so that they get more support from the outset:[31] As of June 2018, 65 percent of all active implementation grant allocations were for FCACs. GPE's accelerated funding mechanism allows DCPs to access up to 20 percent of their maximum allocation in case of emergency education needs.[32] GPE grants can be also restructured to meet urgent emergency needs, and deployed for direct service provision to ensure schools remain open, under the Operational Framework for Effective Support in Fragile and Conflict-affected States. This framework was amended in December 2018 to adopt operating principles for GPE engagement in complex emergencies, with emphases on alignment, complementarity and, above all, ensuring the protection of children's rights.[33] GPE also provides financial and technical support to help countries emerging from crisis establish a transitional education plan, which sets up a coordinated approach by identifying priority actions in the medium term to maintain progress toward key educational goals, and linking development and humanitarian actors.

GPE promotes the inclusion of refugees and displaced children in education sector plans and works with partners to meet the needs of these populations (see Box 2.2 for one such partnership). For example, in Uganda, the Secretariat supported dialogue between the education ministry, the local education group, and Education Cannot Wait to develop a long-term plan for refugee education.[34] And in September 2018, the Board approved a request for US$8.3 million from the government of Bangladesh for the schooling of Rohingya refugees and children in surrounding communities in Bangladesh, helping almost 80,000 children to get an education, most of whom had never been enrolled in school. GPE has a Memorandum of Understanding with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) that has been facilitating closer collaboration at country and global levels.

BOX 2.2.

THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION AND EDUCATION CANNOT WAIT

The Global Partnership for Education is engaging with Education Cannot Wait (ECW) to ensure quality education for children affected by conflict and crisis. ECW was established at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit by humanitarian and development aid actors to help position education as a priority on the humanitarian agenda, promote a more collaborative approach and foster additional funding for crisis-affected children and youth. ECW has so far invested in 19 crisis-affected countries; 13 are GPE member countries (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Nepal, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Somalia, Uganda and Yemen) and three are GPE-eligible (Indonesia, West Bank and Gaza, Syria).

The secretariats of GPE and ECW are discussing the development of protocols to systematically connect to optimize opportunities for coordinated, interlinked support that helps bridge the gap between emergency and longer-term education provision. Fulfilling the education rights of children in conflict and crisis requires the flexibility to act quickly and to link first response to predictable medium-term response, as provided by ECW. It also requires strategic and sustained efforts to ensure children and youth affected by emergencies have access to government-operated, formal education systems so their education is certified for access to higher levels of education, which GPE support promotes.

31. GPE, *GPE Funding Model: A Results-Based Approach for the Education Sector* (Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2015), https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-funding-model.
32. GPE, *Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations* (Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2015), https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-accelerated-support-emergency-and-early-recovery-situations.
33. Additional emphases include the humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, as well as preserving and supporting the functionality of the system; for the full principles, see Annex 2 of the GPE Board paper BOD/2018/12 DOC 05, "Operating Principles in Complex Emergencies: Report from the Grants and Performance Committee": https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/operating-principles-complex-emergencies-report-gpc-december-2018.
34. GPE, "Uganda: A New Education Response Plan to Ensure Quality Education for Refugees," GPE Media Coverage, News & Media, Global Partnership for Education, September 17, 2018, https://www.globalpartnership.org/news-and-media/news/uganda-new-education-response-plan-ensure-quality-education-refugee.

2.3. GPE support for equity in basic education

Indicator 3

GPE's institutional commitment to equity starts with its membership criteria and allocation formula for developing countries, which are based on economic needs, political fragility and high proportions of out-of-school children. GPE's support is focused on basic education, meaning primary and lower secondary levels, which is vital for driving equity outcomes. GPE further promotes equity through grant-making and technical assistance for education sector planning, and its results-based funding model requires that countries demonstrate results for equity to receive their full allocation of funds.

Indicator 3 provides a rough equivalence of the number of additional children enrolled in basic education as a result of the disbursements of GPE grants in a particular year.[35] By 2018, the grants disbursed by GPE amounted to the annual cost of supporting 22.2 million students: 20.2 million in primary school and 2 million in lower secondary, including 10.6 million girls.[36] The milestone for countries affected by fragility and conflict was surpassed by over 45 percent, reflecting GPE's commitment to prioritizing these countries.

GRANT ALLOCATIONS FOR EQUITY


Among the 34 implementation grants active as of June 2018 (for more details, see Chapter 5), US$372.8 million in GPE funding supported activities to improve equity, ranging across seven categories (Funding Focus: Equity).

Education facilities are the largest expenditure for equity. They are key to expanding access to school especially for children in underserved areas: Of the total facility allocations, 81.6 percent were in countries affected by fragility and conflict. This category also includes water, sanitation and hygiene facilities, which are likewise critical for equitable access.

FIGURE 2.9.

GPE HAS SUPPORTED MORE THAN 22 MILLION CHILDREN SINCE 2015.

Cumulative number of equivalent children supported for a year of basic education (primary and lower secondary) by GPE, in millions




Source
GPE Secretariat.

35. Note that this indicator is not intended as a formal count; it is only a proxy for the actual number of children reached by GPE. Specifically, depending on how a given GPE grant is used by a country and the nature of country-level projects implemented, its impact may affect more or less children than estimated by the indicator.
36. Girls make up less than half of the estimated children supported because these estimates are based on the children being served by the education systems across DCPs, and girls are still on average less likely to have access to education, so they are less likely to be beneficiaries.

FUNDING FOCUS: EQUITY

GPE FUNDING SUPPORT TO IMPROVE EQUITY, 2018



Note
The grant allocation is among the 34 implementation grants active as of June 2018.

a. This involves activities focused on promoting gender equality in a very clear and specific way, such as awareness campaigns, resources for menstrual hygiene management, gender-responsive education, and so on. Activities (such as scholarships) that mention girls as part of a broader group of beneficiaries are additional to this category.

b. This category focuses primarily on non-formal education systems and interventions for refugees and displaced children; other activities that expand access to get more children into school, such as building schools and recruiting teachers, are counted in other categories.

GPE SUPPORT FOR INCLUSIVE EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

Expanding support for the inclusion of children with disabilities in quality education is an important part of GPE's strategic goals. In low- and lower-middle-income countries, around 40 percent of children with disabilities are out of school at primary level and 55 percent at lower secondary level.[37] Moreover, the disability gaps for primary and lower secondary completion, literacy rates, and ever enrolling in school continue to widen, according to a study funded by GPE.[38]

In February 2018, GPE published the results of a Secretariat stocktake on disability and inclusive education in DCP education sector plans and GPE grants.[39] The stocktake found that across 51 DCPs with active implementation grants over the 2015-2018 period, 24 education sector plans included strategies to improve education access for children with disabilities, 19 were starting to include disability and inclusive education strategies in sector planning, and eight did not mention children with disabilities at all.

Sector plans in Cambodia, Ghana, the Kyrgyz Republic and Nepal, for example, have included strategies to increase enrollments by improving school access with the construction of ramps, as well as by developing minimum standards of construction; addressing staffing requirements, teacher training and data collection; increasing community awareness; and

37. Mizunoya, Mitra, and Yamasaki, «Towards Inclusive Education: The Impact of Disability on School Attendance in Developing Countries."
38. C. Male and Q. Wodon, "Disability Gaps in Educational Attainment and Literacy," *The Price of Exclusion: Disability and Education* series, Global Partnership for Education, Washington, DC, 2017, https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/disability-gaps-educational-attainment-and-literacy.
39. GPE, "Disability and Inclusive Education: A Stocktake of Education Sector Plans and GPE-Funded Grants," Working paper 3, Global Partnership for Education, Washington, DC, 2018, https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/disability-and-inclusive-education-stocktake-education-sector-plans-and-gpe-funded-grants.

BOX 2.3.

GPE GLOBAL AND REGIONAL ACTIVITIES GRANTS FOR OUT-OF-SCHOOL CHILDREN AND EQUITY

The Global and Regional Activities (GRA) program and grants have complemented country-level support and grant financing from GPE. Five grants under this program focused on out-of-school children and equity. Two of them concluded in prior years: **Out-of-school children: Closing the data gap** (UIS, September 2013-July 2016), which focused on data dissemination and use, and **Significant reduction in out-of-school children** (UNICEF, August 2013-December 2015), which funded the Out-of-School Children Initiative, a joint UIS and UNICEF initiative that has supported more than 90 countries to develop profiles of out-of-school children not captured by routine education management data, and support policy dialogue to address the education needs of these children.

The other three grants concluded in fiscal year 2018:


- **Addressing the out-of-school children data and policy gaps** (World Bank, March 2014-August 2017) resulted in the production of a series of influential global studies on child marriage, the changing wealth of nations, the cost of gender inequality, disability gaps in education and the cost of not educating girls.
- **Disability/health and education in support of learning for all** (World Bank, August 2014-June 2018) strengthened collaboration between ministries of health and education and improved the capacity for joint planning and implementation of integrated school health and nutrition programs in Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana and Senegal. It increased awareness, capacity and the operational and technical resources to include school health and nutrition in education sector plans.
- **Addressing school-related gender-based violence** (SRGBV) (UNICEF, March 2014-December 2017) gave rise to the End Gender Violence in Schools (EGVS) initiative, through which four participating countries (Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Togo and Zambia) used evidence-based policies and strategies to reduce SRGBV.

A list of outputs from these grants can be accessed at: https://www.globalpartnership.org/funding/gra.

FIGURE 2.10.

PRE-PRIMARY GROSS ENROLLMENT RATIOS CONTINUE TO INCREASE OVERALL.

Proportion of children of pre-primary school age enrolled in pre-primary education



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org.

initiating cross-sectoral interventions in health and education. And among 34 implementation grants active in June 2018, US$2.7 million was allocated to activities that specifically target children with disabilities and special needs.

To support broader and more robust integration of inclusive education into sector plans, GPE, in partnership with the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), International Institute for Educational Planning–UNESCO (IIEP-UNESCO), and the World Bank, is supporting the development and testing of technical methodological guidelines for conducting detailed education sector analysis with a focus on inclusive education for children with disabilities. The draft guidelines were piloted in Ghana in 2017, and this focus will be part of the forthcoming third volume in the series of Education Sector Analysis Methodological Guidelines. The Secretariat also participated in a technical roundtable co-convened by IIEP-UNESCO and UNICEF in July 2018 to develop a conceptual framework for an IIEP training offer on disability-inclusive education sector planning, which builds on the gender-responsive education sector planning model.[40]

Addressing the challenge of insufficient data on disability at national and global levels is a key priority for GPE and partners. GPE is working with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) to improve the collection of comparable education data disaggregated by disability in national administrative systems.[41] This will be an important step toward being able to monitor whether educational outcomes are improving for children with disabilities internationally.

2.4. Early childhood care and education

Indicators 2 and 6

Access to quality early childhood care and education (ECCE)[42] has a powerful impact on a child's future, through the rest of their education and beyond. It has been shown to reduce repetition and dropout in primary school, and improve the quality and equity of learning outcomes, and it is even associated with improved health and increased income in adulthood.[43] ECCE is one of the most important, and most economical, investments a country can make to improve outcomes for children, as ample evidence demonstrates.[44]

Indicator 6 of the GPE results framework tracks progress on access to pre-primary education through the pre-primary gross enrollment ratio.[45] While the jump in 2017 was mainly due to data revisions from the UIS, the fact that enrollment ratios have increased further overall and for girls is good news (Figure 2.10). All 2018 milestones were met for indicator 6.

Attention to additional equity issues in ECCE is warranted, given that in low-income countries, the poorest children are eight times less likely to attend ECCE programs. Moreover, fewer than 50 percent of pre-primary teachers have received training, compared with 74 percent of teachers at the primary level, highlighting for ECCE the importance of not only access but quality.[46] In recent consultations conducted by the Secretariat, a large majority of DCPs named financing as a top bottleneck to accelerating equitable access to quality ECCE, and they expressed interest in information on the various ECCE models used in other countries. The two biggest data and planning priorities mentioned were support to data generation on ECCE access and quality and financing options analysis in ECCE.

40. IIEP-UNESCO (International Institute for Educational Planning–UNESCO), "Technical Round Table: Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities."
41. This collaboration includes a draft paper, "The Use of UIS Data and Education Management Information Systems for Constructing Indicators to Monitor Inclusive Education," to be finalized by the end of June 2019. It updates and extends the review of EMIS questionnaires in the 2016 UNICEF *Guide for Including Disability in Education Management Information Systems* (http://training.unicef.org/disability/emergencies/downloads/UNICEF_guide-for-including-disability-in-education-management-information-systems.pdf). It has recommendations on how to incorporate functional questions based on the Washington Group question sets as well as questions on accessible infrastructure into EMIS, building on the recommended questions listed in the UNICEF publication. It also has a brief annex suggesting how GPE and UIS could work together to improve the availability in DCPs of internationally comparable disability-disaggregated Sustainable Development Goal 4 indicators.
42. "Early childhood care and education" is a term adopted from the Dakar Framework for Action and refers to a broad range of programs and services intended to promote healthy child development, covering children from birth to the transition to primary school. ECCE includes support for learning, stimulation, health, nutrition, water, sanitation and hygiene, and protection. It includes pre-primary schooling and other forms of formal and informal early learning programs.
43. Aboud and Yousafzai, "Global Health and Development in Early Childhood"; Gertler et al., "Labor Market Returns to an Early Childhood Stimulation Intervention in Jamaica"; Rao et al., *Early Childhood Development and Cognitive Development in Developing Countries: A Rigorous Literature Review*.
44. Alderman, ed., *No Small Matter: The Impact of Poverty, Shocks, and Human Capital Investments in Early Childhood Development*; Daelmans et al., "Early Childhood Development: The Foundation of Sustainable Development."
45. The pre-primary gross enrollment ratio of a country measures the number of children enrolled in pre-primary education, as a percentage of the number of children of pre-primary school age living in that country.
46. UNICEF, "A World Ready to Learn: Prioritizing Quality Early Childhood Education."

From 2004 to 2017, 6 percent of GPE implementation grant disbursements were allocated to early childhood education, amounting to US$267.5 million. In Guyana, for example, a GPE-funded project targeted remote and poor-performing regions of the country and showed positive impacts in student achievement through training teachers, training parents and conducting a mass media campaign. In addition to mainstreaming support to pre-primary education and other aspects of ECCE into its support to education sector planning and grants, GPE has undertaken several targeted funding programs to support this vital subsector:

- Through the GRA program, GPE funded the Pacific Early Age Readiness and Learning (PEARL) project to pursue evidence-based policy orientation in ECCE and introduce a monitoring system to track child development. Led by the World Bank, the project collected child development data from more than 6,600 children in Tonga and 1,500 children in Tuvalu, among other countries, to inform ECCE policy road maps.

- Through the Better Early Learning and Development at Scale (BELDS) initiative, GPE has provided US$1.3 million in financing to UNICEF to develop better diagnostic tools to support systems and planning on the quality of ECCE services. This will involve piloting relevant tools in four partner countries accompanied by tailored in-country capacity development activities and several peer learning exchanges/events related to ECCE planning and implementation in 2019,[47] as well as developing case studies and a global toolkit for the benefit of other developing country partners.

- Through its new Knowledge and Innovation Exchange (KIX) program, GPE will make an initial investment of US$5 million from its core fund, seeking to match this support with contributions from others to make catalytic investments to harness successful knowledge and innovation in ECCE policy planning and implementation across the partnership.

For the first time since the baseline, new data are available for Indicator 2, the percentage of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being. However, data comparability poses a challenge for drawing meaningful conclusions from this indicator. The baseline sample, based on data from 2011-2014, was made up of 22 DCPs with data, among which 66 percent of children under 5 were on track. The new sample contains 13 DCPs, of which only three were in the baseline sample, precluding meaningful comparison. Within that group, 61 percent of children under 5 were on track, but this cannot be considered a decrease over time, as the numbers come from two different groups of countries. This underscores the need for greater and more consistent data availability to be able to track and improve outcomes for children.

TOWARD EQUITY, GENDER EQUALITY AND INCLUSION IN EDUCATION

Progress on equity is encouraging: More children are completing primary and lower secondary education—76.7 percent and 51.6 percent, respectively—with GPE developing country partners meeting the 2018 milestones on both indicators. The equity index continues to show steady improvement in the proportion of rural to urban and poorest to wealthiest children, and girls to boys, completing lower secondary education, with 46 percent of DCPs having improved at least 10 percent on this front since 2010. And to the extent that pre-primary enrollment in DCPs is expanding—it is now at 37.9 percent—it is laying a foundation for improved and more equitable learning outcomes, and reduced repetition and dropout, in the years ahead. However, progress is slower on reducing out-of-school rates, missing the milestones at 19.4 percent and 31.8 percent for primary and lower secondary levels, respectively, and large proportions of children are still excluded from education in many GPE DCPs, especially FCACs.

Vast disparities still persist, most of all for the poorest children, who are only 28 percent as likely as wealthy children to complete lower secondary school. Children in rural areas are also greatly disadvantaged, with 49 percent of the lower secondary completion rates as children in urban areas, and girls in many countries are left behind as well. Important work still needs to be done to reduce all forms of disadvantage through sensitive and targeted policies that consider how these factors of exclusion tend to work in combination, and to promote equality in and through education.

Equally important are equitable approaches to education sector planning and implementation across the board, including support to more equitable allocation of teachers and data systems that make identifying and addressing the most disadvantaged children possible, as the next chapters will discuss. Continuing the momentum of key efforts such as gender-responsive education sector planning and support for early learning will be critical to facing the challenges ahead. With sustained focus, the partnership has the opportunity to deliver on strategic goal of increased equity, gender equality and inclusion for all in a full cycle of quality education.

47. The BELDS partner countries are Ghana, the Kyrgyz Republic, Lesotho and Sao Tome and Principe.

Alpha Bah, head of the EMIS and ICT units at the Ministry of Basic and Secondary Education in The Gambia, presents at an April 2019 meeting of the Education Data Solutions Roundtable.

Credit: GPE/Chantal Rigaud



CHAPTER

3

Efficient Education Systems

RESULTS AT A GLANCE


OUTCOME

GOAL 3

Effective and efficient education systems

#10

65% of DCPs increased their share of education expenditure or maintained it at 20% or above.



#11


Equitable allocation of teachers

-

Only six countries had recent data after 2015.

#12

30% of DCPs had less than 40 pupils per trained teacher



#13


Repetition and dropout impact on efficiency

-

Only six countries had recent data after 2015.

#14

34% of DCPs reported at least **10 of 12 key education indicators** to UIS.




COUNTRY-LEVEL

OBJECTIVE 1

Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation

#17

100% of DCPs applying for GPE grant published data at national level.



	Baseline	Milestone	Annual milestone met	Annual milestone not met
Overall	○	◌	● ● ●	●
FCACs	□	⬚	■ ■ ■	■
Insufficient data			- - -	


GLOBAL-LEVEL

OBJECTIVE 4

Mobilize more and better financing

#31

83% of country missions addressed domestic financing.



KEY FINDINGS

› **Developing country partners are investing more in education**, spending an additional US$2.1 billion between 2015 and 2017.

› **In terms of share of national budget, commitment to education remains stable compared to 2015**. In 2017, nearly two-thirds of developing country partners dedicated 20 percent or more of their public spending to education or increased their education expenditures toward it. Among countries affected by fragility and conflict, 54 percent did so.

› **Inefficiency remains a significant problem**. Across 25 countries, more than a third of all education spending covers the costs of repetition and dropout.

› **Despite progress, the lack of trained teachers remains a challenge**, and the majority of developing country partners still have more than 40 students per trained teacher. Almost all of these developing country partners are in Sub-Saharan Africa, and half of them are affected by fragility and conflict.

› **Data reporting is improving, but too slowly**. More than a third of developing country partners now report sufficient key education indicators to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Of the countries that fall short, almost half are close to achieving this.

› As of June 2018, 29 percent of active implementation grant funds were **allocated specifically to strengthen systems, totaling US$413.6 million; another US$237 million went to teacher development and teacher management**.

CHAPTER

3

Efficient education systems

To be effective, education systems must be reliably well financed and make efficient use of resources and have strong cores—such as sufficient trained teachers and engaged data systems. Improving domestic financing for education has been an area of focus for the Global Partnership for Education since its inception, and it was introduced as a requirement in the GPE funding model in 2014.[1] While more domestic resources are needed in many contexts, it is also essential to ensure that these resources are used efficiently to achieve maximum impact. Significant efficiency gains in education systems[2] will be essential for developing country partners (DCPs) to accelerate progress around learning and equity as needed to meet GPE's strategic goals and Sustainable Development Goal 4. This chapter analyzes the progress toward effective and efficient education systems (Strategic Goal 3), and it outlines the challenges with respect to teacher training and data systems.

3.1. Domestic financing for education

DOMESTIC FINANCING EFFORT FOR EDUCATION REMAINS STABLE Indicator 10

Indicator 10 mirrors part of the funding model requirement, tracking the proportion of developing country partners spending at least 20 percent of their national budget on education, or increasing their spending for education toward that goal.[3] The availability of new data in 2018 on domestic spending for previous years prompted a revision of the baseline and 2016 data as required per the indicator methodology.[4] As a result, the baseline and 2016 results are significantly lower than previously estimated, which makes current milestones even more ambitious (Figures 3.1).

In 2017, almost two-thirds of DCPs with data dedicated 20 percent or more of their public spending for education or increased their public spending for education, and almost half (46 percent) dedicated 20 percent or more of their public spending for education.[5] The situation is more challenging in FCACs, with a decrease between 2015 and 2017.

In 2017, 16 DCPs spent less than 20 percent of their government budget for education and experienced an overall downward trend in comparison to the baseline: six non-FCACs (Albania, Benin, Guinea, Lesotho, Tanzania (Zanzibar) and Malawi) and 10 FCACs (Haiti, Nepal, Niger, Pakistan (Sindh), Rwanda, Sierra-Leone, South Sudan, Timor-Leste, Togo and Uganda). Four of these countries, Nepal, Lesotho, Malawi and Rwanda, received GPE implementation grants after the introduction of GPE's funding requirement on domestic financing. Thus, it is still too early to assess whether the increased focus on domestic financing triggered by the requirement of the funding model has a positive effect.


Where Haiti and Nepal are concerned, additional evidence shows that caution must be exerted: The drops in the share of their spending for education may not reflect a decrease in

1. "When submitting an application for a Program Implementation Grant, the Government must specifically confirm its commitment to finance the ESP or TESP. In countries where 20 percent or more of domestic resources are allocated to education, the Global Partnership seeks commitment to at least maintain current levels; while for countries where current levels are lower than 20 percent, the Global Partnership seeks Government commitment to increase the domestic share of resources to education progressively towards 20 percent" (GPE Board paper BOD/2014/05 DOC 03, "Report of the Country Grants and Performance Committee Part 1," https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/operational-framework-requirements-and-incentives-funding-model).
2. Bashir et al., *Facing Forward: Schooling for Learning in Africa*.
3. Excluding debt service.
4. For details on any indicator methodology, replace X with the number of the indicator in the following URL address: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/methodology-sheet-gpe-result-indicator-X. When actual data is not available, estimates are calculated using past execution rates. The methodology requires that when actual data become available they replace previous estimations.
5. Excluding debt service.

FIGURE 3.1.

DOMESTIC FINANCING COMMITMENT FOR EDUCATION HAS REMAINED STABLE IN DCPS SINCE 2015.

Proportion of DCPs with education spending as a share of government budget above 20 percent or increasing



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org.

Note
The data covers 46 countries and federal entities, including 19 FCACs. Data for each year were updated using most recent documentation. Data published as part of the Results Report 2018 have been updated and revised accordingly, as has the baseline. However, 2017 data were only collected in 2018, and 2018 data were not yet available at the time of this report.

domestic financing. In Haiti, the decrease derives from varying data sources over time.[6] In Nepal, the country is facing not a worsening domestic financing situation, but rather an upsurge in post-earthquake recovery funds for other sectors.[7] These two examples show that interpreting the evolution of education's share of a country's public spending is complex and requires additional contextual information.

According to UIS and World Bank data, the overall volume of public expenditure on education increased in DCPs by 1.58 percent on average annually from 2015 to 2017,[8] amounting to an additional US$2.1 billion. Despite the school-age population growth (1.09 percent on average annually), the average public expenditure per school-age child increased by 0.5 percentage point during the same period. The public education spending per child is US$100 on average in DCPs, but it can vary significantly across countries, from US$13 in the Democratic Republic of Congo (a low-income country) to US$380 in Albania (a middle-income country).[9]

6. Before 2015-2016, budget reporting was primarily based on the World Bank Group's BOOST documents for Haiti. From 2015-2016 onward, budget documents from the Haitian government became the main source, yet with some differences in the budget perimeter.
7. After the earthquake in Nepal in 2015, recovery funds allocated to the education sector were proportionally less than others: Education was allocated an estimated US$397 million (6 percent of the total recovery need), whereas the housing sector, for example, received an estimated US$3,278 million (49 percent of the total need), according to the 2015 Post Disaster Need Assessment. This caused a declining ratio of education spending to total public spending, from 20.1 percent in 2015 (fiscal year 2017) down to 17 percent in 2017 (fiscal year 2019), while the dollar amount for education increased.
8. GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org, and World Bank data.
9. See also *Facing Forward: Schooling for Learning in Africa*, by Bashir et al.

BOX 3.1.

DETERMINANTS OF EDUCATION BUDGET INCREASE

Overall, the most decisive factor in budget negotiations appears to be the endorsement of the highest-ranking political actors. GPE Secretariat interviews suggest that the education budget is more likely to be increased or given priority over other sectors when the head of state officially endorses the education sector plan and/or affirms education as a priority. For example, in Liberia, in spite of the austere budget environment, the president and the government identified education as a priority sector. Thus, in 2016/17, while other sectors were subject to budget cuts, the education budget remained approximately stable, and projections suggest a progressive increase until 2020. The country-level evaluations point out, "Reasons for difficulties in eliciting additional funding for education from the respective Ministry of Finance are in most cases political rather than technical in nature."

Source: Universalia, *GPE Country-level Evaluations – Synthesis Report: Financial Year 2018.*

INCREASED SUPPORT TO DIALOGUE ON DOMESTIC FINANCING Indicator 31

GPE is committed to addressing domestic education financing in DCPs through country-level dialogue with education stakeholders. Indicator 31 measures the proportion of the Secretariat's missions that address domestic education financing in DCPs, and the milestones have been surpassed each year (see Figures 3.2).

SECRETARIAT MISSIONS RELATED TO DOMESTIC FINANCING

In 2018, the Secretariat undertook 82 missions in 48 DCPs (44 in FCACs), including 68 addressing domestic financing issues. The proportion of missions addressing domestic financing was higher (85 percent) in countries previously stated as underperforming in light of Indicator 10.

While the level of financing is certainly critical for the education sector, it is not a good predictor of education results when considered in isolation. For instance, research findings indicate that there is low correlation between government spending and the performance of the education system.[10] Indeed, with similar levels of government expenditure per child, some DCPs have achieved universal primary education, while others remain far from this target. This means that in addition to increasing education expenditure, more must be done to ensure that these resources will effectively improve education outcomes—in particular, learning.

3.2. Improving efficiency in primary education

Indicator 13

GPE tracks efficiency in primary education through measuring the impact of repetition and dropout on the resources dedicated to the primary education cycle (Indicator 13). The internal efficiency coefficient (IEC)[11] allows estimation of the proportion of the resources that are used for repetition and dropout, which inform the inefficiencies of the system. The indicator calculates the proportion of countries that have an IEC higher or equal to 70 percent, meaning that 30 percent or less of their resources are used for repetition and dropout. However, the lack of data is an impediment to a comprehensive assessment across DCPs. Data since 2010 for Indicator 13 are only available for 25 DCPs, and only six have data for the period 2015-2018, so there are not enough updates to enable reporting against the milestone for this indicator.[12] But across the 25 DCPs with available data, the IEC at the primary level sits at 63 percent (59 percent for the 17 FCACs with data). This means that 37 percent of all education spending was used to cover the costs of repetition and dropout in these countries.

To get a better sense for the efficiency of education systems across DCPs, the ratio between completion rate and the gross enrollment ratio for primary education in DCPs is an interesting proxy for internal efficiency that can shed light on more countries.[13] For instance, a country with a ratio of 0.5 could theoretically double its primary completion rate if the resources were used efficiently. If the ratio is close to 1, it means that the country is efficient in its use of resources. With this approach, it is possible to mobilize data from 58 DCPs.


10. Pritchett and Filmer, "What Education Production Functions Really Show: A Positive Theory of Education Expenditures."
11. The UIS defines the IEC as the "Ideal (optimal) number of pupil-years required (i.e. in the absence of repetition and dropout) to produce a number of graduates from a given school-cohort for a cycle or level of education expressed as a percentage of the actual number of pupil-years spent to produce the same number of graduates."
12. In addition, the size of the data set is so small and fluctuating—19 countries for the baseline (2010-2015) and 25 in 2018 (2010-2018—it is challenging to monitor progress over time as initially intended for Indicator 13.
13. Luis A. Crouch is a critical contributor for this approach.

The average of this internal efficiency ratio in DCPs is 0.76, indicating that there is room for improvement on efficiency (Figure 3.3). However, the results vary across countries. On one hand, 13 countries appear to have a very efficient primary education cycle with a ratio equal or above 0.9.[14] On the other hand, 10 countries face significant efficiency issues with a ratio below 0.6.[15] These countries are only getting half of the results on primary education completion, or even less in the Central African Republic and Chad, for the enrollment levels they have. All of the countries with low efficiency as measured by internal efficiency ratio combine issues of both dropout and repetition (see Appendix L).

FIGURE 3.2.

MORE MISSIONS ADDRESS DOMESTIC FINANCING.

Proportion of missions to all DCPs addressing domestic financing issues



Source
GPE Secretariat.

3.3. The teacher challenge


Teachers are the single most important resource of any education system. Teachers are at the heart of the learning process and the most important school-based factor for improving learning.[16] As teacher salaries generally constitute 70-90 percent of the national education budget, the uneven distribution of teachers results in inequity, inefficient utilization of some teachers and, in turn, inefficiencies in public education expenditure.[17] Thus the GPE results framework monitors adequate allocation of teachers (Indicator 11) and the availability of trained teachers (Indicator 12).

14. Albania, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Kenya, Kiribati, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Vietnam.
15. Burundi, the Central African Republic, Chad, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sierra Leone and Uganda.
16. Snilstveit et al., *Interventions for Improving Learning Outcomes and Access to Education in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review*; Béteille and Evans, *Successful Teachers, Successful Students: Recruiting and Supporting Society's Most Crucial Profession*.
17. NORRAG and Global Partnership for Education, "Teacher Allocation in Key National Policy Documents of GPE DCPs"; Pôle de Dakar, *Universal Primary Education in Africa: The Teacher Challenge*; Mulkeen, *Teachers in Anglophone Africa: Issues in Teacher Supply, Training, and Management*.

FIGURE 3.3.

THERE IS ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT ON EFFICIENCY.

Completion rate versus gross enrollment ratio for primary education in DCPs



Source

GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database) as of October 2018. Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org

TEACHER ALLOCATION Indicator 11

The number of students in a school should be the major determining factor for the number of teachers to be deployed to a school. The GPE results framework assesses the extent to which the number of teachers allocated to schools is based on the number of students in those schools. Specifically, Indicator 11 tracks the proportion of countries with R^2 above 80 percent,[18] meaning that 80 percent of their teacher allocation is explained by the number of students in the schools.

Despite the importance of the issue, only 26 DCPs have any data since 2010 available for Indicator 11, and only six have recent data; therefore, it is not possible to report against the milestone on this indicator.[19] But of these 26 DCPs, 20 have an R^2 below 80 percent, indicating that a significant proportion of teacher allocation has not been based on the number of students (Figure 3.4). In Kenya, for example, some primary schools with 400 learners have as few as four teachers, while others with similar enrollments have as many as 16 teachers.[20] Countries like these could realize significant efficiency and equity gains if they were to distribute their teachers more equitably across schools.

In many countries, teacher allocation in rural areas represents a big challenge.[21] Teachers are often reluctant to work in remote areas because of harder working and living conditions, distance to public services (such as hospitals) and fewer opportunities for professional development.[22] Context-based analyses of the population density and distribution within a country are required at the country level to better understand disparities across schools, and inform strategies to improve teacher allocation in rural areas. This echoes the findings of chapter 1 regarding underperforming schools in rural areas.

Beyond the rural challenge, there are inherent issues in teacher allocation systems more broadly. Lack of clear rules, criteria and processes, and/or failure to enforce them, leave room for inequities and inefficiencies in teacher allocation.[23] Examples like Senegal's success with the teacher management system Mirador, which has improved teacher utilization and streamlined teacher management practices, show that significant progress is possible in this area.[24]

Among the 34 active implementation grants at the end of fiscal year 2018,[25] 19 financed teacher management and support, which includes activities that aim to recruit, deploy and/or motivate teachers. These activities amount to US$86 million, or 6 percent of the total allocated for the 34 grants.

DCPs are adopting a variety of policy measures to tackle disparity in teacher allocation (Box 3.2). Five countries so far (Chad, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, and Mozambique) have set equitable teacher allocation as one of their variable tranche strategies for their implementation grants, and most of them intend to deploy trained teachers to disadvantaged areas.[26] Mozambique has already partially achieved the target by reducing the number of districts with a pupil-teacher ratio above the country's threshold from 17 to 10.[27]


18. The coefficient of determination, the R^2, is used to show the percentage of the variation of the number of teachers allocated to the schools that is explained by the number of students enrolled in the schools. If the number of teachers allocated to schools was only based on the number of students, the R^2 would be equal to 100 percent. Because of geographical variations in population density, it is almost impossible to reach 100 percent, but high-performing and relatively homogenous countries can easily reach 80-90 percent.
19. As of January 2019. All 26 countries are from Sub-Saharan Africa. Only six are from the 2015-2018 period; the other 20 are from the baseline period (2010-2014). To compute this indicator value, education sector analyses and the Pole de Dakar database were consulted.
20. Kenya, Ministry of Education, "Kenya Education Sector Analysis."
21. NORRAG and Global Partnership for Education, "Teacher Allocation in Key National Policy Documents of GPE DCPs"; UNESCO, *Teaching and Learning: Achieving Quality for All; Pôle de Dakar, Universal Primary Education in Africa: The Teacher Challenge*.
22. Mulkeen, "Teachers for Rural Schools: A Challenge for Africa."
23. IIEP–Pôle de Dakar, Teacher Allocation and Utilization in Africa, 2016; NORRAG and Global Partnership for Education, "Teacher Allocation in Key National Policy Documents of GPE DCPs"; World Bank, *World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise*.
24. Senegal, "Document de présentation du programme d'appui au développement de l'éducation au Sénégal: PADES 2019–2023," Dakar, 2018.
25. July 2017 through June 2018.
26. As of the end of fiscal year 2018.
27. GPE, *Portfolio Review 2018* (Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2018), https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/2018-annual-portfolio-review, 116. The original target was the decrease from 12 to 8, whereas the actual achievement was from 17 to 10, owing to the increase in the baseline from 12 to 17 because of the administrative re-mapping.

FIGURE 3.4.

TEACHER ALLOCATION IS OFTEN INEFFICIENT AND INEQUITABLE.

Coefficient of determination characterizing the relationship between teacher allocation and enrollment levels by school (latest data 2010-2018)





Source
UNESCO Pole de Dakar and education sector analyses (2010-2018) compiled by GPE Secretariat.

BOX 3.2.

PREVALENT POLICY MEASURES TO IMPROVE TEACHER ALLOCATION INCLUDED IN EDUCATION SECTOR PLANS

The GPE Secretariat and Network for International Policies and Cooperation in Education and Training (NORRAG) conducted an analysis of 19 education sector plans (15 from Sub-Saharan Africa and four from Asia) and identified the most commonly used policy measures (in order of frequency):

- Targeted deployment of teachers in disadvantaged areas, and/or of certain characteristics (for example, female teachers, teachers with ethnic minorities language skill, and so on)
- Use of various incentives to attract and retain teachers in underserved areas
- Improvement of teacher allocation management system
- Improvement in data collection on teacher deployment
- Change in transfer policy
- Devolving the teacher recruitment to the local level

Source: GPE compilation based on data available in NORRAG and GPE.

THE NEED FOR TRAINED TEACHERS Indicator 12

Indicator 12 of the results framework tracks the proportion of DCPs with an average of fewer than 40 students per trained teacher in primary schools.[28]

The proportion of DCPs with a PTTR below 40 increased from 24 percent (12 out of 49) in 2017 to 30 percent (13 out of 43) in 2018, mainly because of a smaller group of countries with data, which is slightly below the overall milestone (Figure 3.5).[29] For FCACs, however, there are only two DCPs out of 17 in the data set (12 percent) with a PTTR below 40, missing the milestone for the second consecutive year. This points to a major and persistent challenge for FCACs in addressing the lack of trained teachers.

As of the 2018 data set, all 30 DCPs with PTTRs above 40 are in Sub-Saharan Africa except Cambodia and Pakistan. The challenge that low-income countries face in recruiting and retaining trained teachers to keep up with the influx of students related to the demographic growth is also evident, as the PTTR was below 40 in only 13 percent (3 out of 24) of low-income countries, while it was below 40 in half (9 out of 18) of lower-middle-income countries.

Among the DCPs with PTTRs higher than 40, more DCPs worsened their PTTR than improved it (Figure 3.6).[30] Cote d'Ivoire was one of the few countries that significantly improved their PTTR over two years prior, from 50.1 to 42.5: The government trained 24,000 pre-service teachers and 16,797 in-service teachers between 2012 and 2017 with the support of the project co-funded by GPE and World Bank.[31]

Among the countries with PTTRs that worsened between 2014 and 2016, considerable deterioration was observed in Liberia (47 to 64.8), Eritrea (60.1 to 70.9) and Madagascar (250.4 to 273.0). GPE-financed education sector analyses for these countries highlight intertwined challenges around teacher recruitment, development and retention in these DCPs. For example, in Liberia, the size of the teaching force almost doubled in the past eight years, but half of the teacher workforce does not have the minimum qualification required to teach at the grade they are

28. The indicator uses the pupil-trained teacher ratio (PTTR) at the primary level provided by the UIS. PTTR is the average number of pupils per a teacher who has received the minimum organized teacher training (pre-service or in-service) required for teaching at the relevant level according to the relevant national policy or law.
29. The results framework reports PTTR from two years prior to the reporting year because of the usual time lag of publishing data at UIS. For example, for the 2018 reporting year, 2016 PTTR data is reported. If 2016 data is not available on the UIS database, the latest available data point between 2011 and 2015 is reported. This practice has been in place since the 2016 reporting year.
30. To be consistent with publicly available country-level data on the UIS database, PTTR is not imputed for countries in this paragraph and the following two paragraphs. As a result, for some countries, the PTTR is different from the data used to compute the indicator value for the results framework.
31. World Bank, "Implementation Completion and Results Report TF–12500 on a Grant in the Amount of US$41.4 Million to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire for an Emergency Basic Education Support Project - GPEF Grant (P119328)."

BOX 3.3.


CLASSIFICATION FRAMEWORK FOR TEACHER TRAINING AND QUALIFICATIONS

The pupil-trained teacher ratio (PTTR) at the primary level provided by the UIS is based on country-specific standards for what it means to be a trained teacher, which may compromise comparability across countries. The UIS, with support from GPE, has launched a global initiative to develop an international classification framework to address the comparability issue. Every country has its own definition for a "trained" and "qualified" teacher. In some countries, these definitions have evolved over time and not always been clear to all actors. This makes it difficult to monitor, compare and use information on teachers. To address this challenge, the UIS with support from GPE has launched a global initiative to develop a simple classification framework for teacher training and qualifications. This initiative was presented at the multi-partner policy dialogue of the UNESCO Teacher Task Force in 2018, and participants recommended that efforts be intensified to develop robust definitions and classifications of qualified teachers to ensure effective and comprehensive monitoring of Sustainable Development Goal 4c.

FIGURE 3.5.

PROGRESS ON TRAINED TEACHERS IS SLOW.

Proportion of DCPs with PTTR below 40



Source
GPE Secretariat.

Note
The latest available data from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics database, 2011-2016, is used for the 2018 reporting period.

assigned.[32] Furthermore, the distribution of qualified teachers greatly varies across counties, with PTTRs ranging from 34 to 90. In light of this situation, the GPE grant is supporting in-service training for unqualified primary teachers in disadvantaged areas to acquire certification to teach at the primary level.[33]

There are notable outliers observed in this group. For example, the PTTR in Sao Tome and Principe was 103.4 in 2016 and 60 percent of primary school teachers are unqualified. The country is still suffering from a rupture in pre-service teacher training system, where there was no pre-service teacher training school in the country for more than 10 years from 1996 until a new one was created in 2007/2008.[34] A GPE-funded project

32. Liberia, Ministry of Education, "Liberia Education Sector Analysis."
33. World Bank, "Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of US$11.07 Million to the Republic of Liberia for a Liberia: Getting to Best in Education Project."
34. World Bank, "Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of SDR 0.6 Million (US$0.9 Million Equivalent) and a Global Partnership For Education Trust Fund Grant in the Amount of US$1.1 Million to the Democratic Republic of São Tomé and Príncipe for the Quality Education for All Project (Phase II) November 25, 2013."

FIGURE 3.6.

MOST DCPS WITH HIGH RATIOS OF PUPILS TO TRAINED TEACHERS ARE SEEING FURTHER DETERIORATION.

Movement in PTTRs (primary education) among DCPs between 2014 and 2016



Source
GPE compilation based on UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org.

Notes
Numbers below the squares indicate PTTR in 2014 (or 2013, if data is not available for 2014) and 2016 (or 2015, if data is not available for 2016). This figure includes countries that have these two data points available on the UIS database as of November 2018. Note that figures may be different from the ones used to compute the indicator value for the GPE results framework, as the latter used estimates for countries with no PTTR available on the UIS database to compute the 2014 value (that are used for 2016 Results Framework value), and the latest available PTTR in the 2016-2011 range to compute 2016 values (that are used for 2018 Results Framework value). FCAC denomination in this figure is based on list of FCACs for FY2016.

provided a 150-hour training program to 372 primary school teachers in 2016-2017,[35] which will be scaled up to a training that counts toward teacher certification to all 515 unqualified primary teachers currently in the system.[36]

The results presented in this section emphasize the teacher challenge that many DCPs face, particularly low-income countries and countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. The trained teacher gap is immense and requires ambitious and strategic teacher policies and consistent domestic financing prioritization. Of the 17 thematic areas funded through GPE implementation grants, teacher development is the third-highest funded area. All 34 GPE active grants at the end of fiscal year 2018 included support to teacher development. The US$151 million allocation accounts for 10.5 percent of total grant support. In total, 347,073 teachers were trained with GPE financial support during fiscal year 2018.


3.4. Data for education systems Indicators 14 and 17

Accurate, comprehensive and timely data are the cornerstone of good policy formulation and effective education sector plan implementation. GPE's funding model provides powerful incentives and support for DCPs to produce and use data.[37] Indicator 14 of the results framework looks at whether a country reports data on at least 10 out of 12 key education indicators to the UIS.[38]

FIGURE 3.7.

PROGRESS ON DATA REPORTING IS SLOW BUT IMPROVING.

Proportion of DCPs reporting at least 10 out of 12 key education indicators to the UIS



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org.

35. World Bank, "Implementation Status and Results Report Sao Tome and Principe – Quality Education for All Project (P146877), June 2017, Seq No: 7, ISR28123."
36. World Bank, "Implementation Status and Results Report Sao Tome and Principe – Quality Education for All Project (P146877), December 2018, Seq No: 10, ISR35510." Note that this training is funded by World Bank.
37. A country applying for a GPE implementation grant must have "critical data and evidence for planning, budgeting, managing, monitoring and accountability, or alternatively, a strategy to develop capacity to produce and effectively use critical data." If the country does not have the capacity to publish data at the national level, the funding model requires a time-bound plan to develop or strengthen the education management information system to produce reliable data. In addition, in 2017 the GPE Board decided that if there is a funding gap for that plan, the GPE grant should be used to fill it.
38. For more information, see the "Methodology Sheet for Indicator 14": https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/methodology-sheet-gpe-result-indicator-14. Note that GPE uses UIS data from 2015-2016 to generate 2018 values for the results framework because of the standard two-year lag in data publication on the online UIS database.

Data reporting by DCPs to the UIS improved in 2018 over the previous year.[39] Five DCPs (Burundi, Cameroon, The Gambia, Mauritania and Rwanda) did not meet the benchmark last year but met it this year. FCACs, in particular, have shown a remarkable increase of more than 10 percentage points (Figure 3.7). However, 40 out of 61 DCPs in total still did not meet the criteria, and the indicator missed the milestone for the second consecutive year. At the time the data was collected (2016), only two countries had gone through the GPE funding model process, so the effects of the data requirement of the funding model cannot yet reliably be assessed.

Of the 40 DCPs reporting fewer than 10 indicators, almost half (19) reported eight or nine indicators, suggesting that they are very close to meeting the criteria. A majority of the DCPs that did not report the expenditure for primary education as a percentage of total education expenditure (9 out of 14 DCPs) reported public expenditure on education, suggesting that the challenge for them is to report the proportion spent on primary education, which is not always provided by the finance ministry. Similarly, almost half of the DCPs that did not report the percentage of trained teachers in lower secondary education (6 out of 13) reported the percentage of trained teachers in primary education, suggesting that they have the capacity to disaggregate trained and untrained teachers. The challenge for these DCPs may be disaggregating lower and upper secondary, because in some countries teachers work in both cycles. In addition, it appears that nonreporting for certain indicators is related to technical issues not directly reflecting capacity of national data system.

Eleven DCPs reported less than four indicators as of 2018, including four DCPs (Guinea-Bissau, Somalia, Zambia and Zimbabwe) with no data published by the UIS. Three of these countries (Guinea-Bissau, Zambia and Zimbabwe) with no UIS data do have statistical reports available online;[40] thus, the challenge was not in collecting data from schools or compiling them: Either the data was not reported to the UIS, or the UIS did not publish it for technical reasons.

Among these 11 DCPs, six (Chad, Comoros, Nigeria, Somalia,[41] Zambia[42] and Zimbabwe) are supported by GPE's grants on the establishment or management of education management information systems (EMIS), which is expected to contribute to better collection and reporting of data. In Somalia, GPE is supporting the operationalization of EMIS at the state level to make data available in a timely manner, to be used for decision-making at all levels.[43]

As of the end of fiscal year 2018, 85 percent of active implementation grants (29 out of 34) provided support to develop and strengthen EMIS and sustain data collection and reporting systems.[44] The estimated amount to be spent to strengthen EMIS in the DCPs totals US$37.7 million.

While Indicator 14 captures the availability of key education data in DCPs, Indicator 17 tracks the existence of sound strategies to fill the data gaps in DCPs that apply for implementation grants and do not report key data to the UIS. Of the 14 DCPs that benefited from new implementation grants in fiscal year 2018, seven did not report key education data to the UIS. In three of these seven DCPs (Cambodia, Comoros and Zanzibar) relevant data were collected and used at the country level.[45] The remaining four DCPs (Chad, Guinea-Bissau, Somalia-Puntland and Somalia-Somaliland) developed strategies to address their data gaps. In other words, all DCPs that were recipients of a new implementation grant in fiscal year 2018 met the Indicator 17 criteria, leading to successful achievement of the 100 percent milestone set for 2018.

GPE supports data production and use through the program implementation grants as well as through its global programs (Box 3.4).

39. The indicator values for 2015 and 2016 used UIS mid-year data release (June-July), while 2017 and 2018 values are based on the end-of-year data release (October-November), which raised comparability issues. The peak in 2016 is also related to an exceptional data collection exercise for financing data (GPE 2018a).
40. These statistical reports include five to seven key education indicators being monitored by the results framework Indicator 14.
41. GPE implementation grants for Puntland and Somaliland are supporting EMIS. EMIS at the federal level is supported by other partners.
42. GPE contributes to a sector-pooled fund that supports EMIS.
43. Somalia-Somaliland, Ministry of Education and Science, "Global Partnership for Education Program 2018-2021"; Somalia-Puntland, Ministry of Education and Higher Education, "Global Partnership for Education Programme Document, 2017-2020."
44. In FCACs, 86 percent (19 out of 22) of implementation grants support EMIS.
45. These three countries were removed from the Indicator 17 data set per the indicator's methodology.

BOX 3.4.

GPE GLOBAL EFFORTS TO IMPROVE DATA AVAILABILITY

- **Education Data Solutions Roundtable:** In 2018, the partnership launched the Education Data Solutions Roundtable. This initiative aims to leverage expertise of various stakeholders, including developing country governments, the private sector, foundations, donor governments, multilateral and regional partners and civil society organizations to improve the availability and use of accurate and timely education data at the country and global levels. Through roundtable discussions, key challenge areas have been identified and solutions will be developed based on members' visits to countries and discussions with in-country stakeholders.
- **International conference on EMIS:** In April 2018, the Secretariat organized an international conference on EMIS with UNESCO, which allowed more than 50 ministry of education staff hailing from 20 developing countries to engage around key lessons learned and challenges faced in developing and improving their administrative data systems. Through discussion in the conference, developing country participants identified areas where international support can be most useful in their contexts.
- **Data Must Speak:** GPE supported UNICEF's Data Must Speak initiative as a part of its Global and Regional Activities grants.[a] This initiative, which involves country-level activities in four GPE DCPs, aims to make education data user-friendly and accessible for decision-makers and communities so that they can make informed decisions, prioritize resources and support the schools that need them most.[b] In-country partners supported the inclusion of exam data in EMIS and alignment of two databases to identify low- and high-performing schools, which enabled inspectorates to prioritize schools and tailor their pedagogical support to them.[c]
- **Knowledge and Innovation Exchange:** In 2019, GPE will launch its Knowledge and Innovation Exchange initiative with a window dedicated to "strengthening data systems," which will focus on improving both data collection and use.

a. GPE funded UNICEF to conduct Data Must Speak from 2014 to 2017. Focus countries included Madagascar, Nepal, Togo and Zambia. The project is ongoing, implementing its Phase II which is co-funded by UNICEF and Hewlett Foundation that will last till 2020.
b. Data Must Speak: https://www.unicef.org/education/data-must-speak.
c. GPE annual GRA Portfolio Status Report as of June 30, 2018.

TOWARD MORE DOMESTIC RESOURCES, BETTER USED

The commitment of DCP budgets to education has remained relatively high since 2015, but below ambitious GPE milestones. Overall, the volume of public expenditure for education from 2015 to 2017 in DCPs increased by an additional US$2.1 billion, but the proportion of countries allocating 20 percent or more, or increasing the share, of public expenditures for education remains below GPE's 2018 milestone, particularly in countries affected by conflict and fragility.

Evidence also suggests that high repetition and dropout rates may be taking a serious toll on efficiency in many DCPs, along with the uneven allocation of teachers. The PTTR remains a serious challenge, with 70 percent of DCPs with data available with more than 40 students per trained teacher: most of them low-income countries, in Sub-Saharan Africa, and almost half are FCACs. It points to the challenge of providing sufficient trained teachers in contexts with limited resources. All 34 GPE active grants at the end of fiscal year 2018 included support to teacher development. The US$151 million allocation accounts for 10.5 percent of total grant support. In total, 347,073 teachers were trained with GPE financial support during fiscal year 2018.

Finally, while progress has been slow on the proportion of DCPs reporting at least 10 out of 12 key education indicators to UIS, with only 34 percent meeting the 10 out of 12 threshold, the fact that an additional 19 countries reported eight or nine indicators is encouraging. GPE has prioritized data through its funding model, grants and international engagement, and these efforts should contribute to increase the availability of data in the coming years, helping to inform country-level strategies on equity and learning, as well as the monitoring of Global Goals.

A student reads from her textbook at School #181
in the Ridaki District of Tajikistan.

Credit: GPE/Carine Durand



CHAPTER

4

Sector Planning, Monitoring and Policy Dialogue

RESULTS AT A GLANCE


COUNTRY-LEVEL

OBJECTIVE 1

Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation

#16a


100% of education plans met quality standards.



*ESPs rated as "achievable" increased from 25% in 2014/15 to 68% in 2016/17/18.


#16b

84% of education plans had **teaching and learning strategies** that met quality standards.




#16c

97% of education plans had **equity strategies** that met quality standards.



#16d

94% of education plans had **strategies to improve efficiency** that met quality standards.




OBJECTIVE 2

Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring

#18

27% of joint sector reviews met quality standards.




*Less than half of DCPs conducted JSRs in 2018.

*JSRs are increasingly evidence-based, used as monitoring tools and policy-making instruments.

#19

Civil society and teachers were represented in **59% of local education groups**.



*CSOs are represented in 89%of LEGs, and teacher organizations are represented in 59% of LEGs.

	Baseline	Annual milestone met	Annual milestone not met
Overall	○	●	●
FCACs	□	■	■
ESPs	△	▲	▲
TEPs	☆	★	★

KEY FINDINGS

> **All education sector plans now meet quality standards**, up from 58percent in 2015.

> **Two-thirds of the education sector plans are rated as "achievable."** Those rated "not achievable" tend to make overly optimistic financial assumptions.

> **Local coordination mechanisms are more inclusive**, with increased participation of civil society organizations and teacher organizations. Six out of 10 local education groups involve teacher organizations.

> **Monitoring of the implementation of sector plans is poor**. Fewer than half of developing country partners organized a joint sector review in 2018, and just over a quarter of these met quality standards in 2018.

> From 2012 through December 2018, GPE has provided **US$26.8 million to developing country partners as education sector plan development grants**.

CHAPTER

4

Sector planning, monitoring and policy dialogue

The Global Partnership for Education has strengthening sector planning and policy implementation at the heart of its GPE 2020 strategic plan and operational model. This chapter examines the progress on GPE's two country-level objectives: strengthened sector planning and policy implementation, and mutual accountability (Strategic Objectives 1 and 2). GPE promotes ownership among country-level stakeholders by promoting a participatory approach to planning. Overall, GPE confirmed strong progress on country-level objectives, but it also identified clear challenges for the implementation and monitoring of education plans. This chapter offers a detailed view of which aspects of GPE's country-level objectives are working well, and which areas need more attention from the partnership.

4.1. Toward better education plans

Because education plans are central to GPE's theory of change, GPE continues to support developing country partners (DCPs) in the development of quality education sector analysis and plans through its education sector plan development grants (ESPDGs), which provide both technical and financial support. Since the inception of the ESPDG in 2012 through December 2018, GPE has granted US$26.8 million to DCPs to support their planning process.

OVERALL IMPROVEMENT OF THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION PLANS Indicator 16a

GPE's results framework monitors progress on the overall quality of education sector plans (Indicator 16a),[1] as measured by GPE's education sector plan (ESP) and transitional education plan (TEP) quality standards.[2] An ESP must meet at least five out of seven quality standards (Box 4.1) to meet the benchmark for a quality ESP,[3] while a TEP, employed by countries affected by fragility or conflict, must meet at least three out of five quality standards to meet the benchmark for a quality TEP.[4] The measurement provided by the indicator is a proxy of ESP/TEP credibility, and as such it is useful to indicate the direction of travel for the quality of plans in the partnership.

GPE has continued to see consistent improvement in the proportion of education plans meeting overall quality standards. The data show a strong increase from 58 percent of plans meeting quality standards at the 2015 baseline to 100 percent at the 2018 milestone (Figure 4.1).[5] A closer examination of the trend of improvements in the quality of sector plans shows that only 56 percent of the 16 ESPs from 2014 and 2015 met quality standards compared to 100 percent of the 28 ESPs from 2016, 2017 and 2018. Two out of three TEPs in the 2014-2015 baseline and all four TEPs in the 2016-2018 group have met the benchmark for quality.[6] This evolution came about in the context of GPE efforts through the plan preparation and appraisal guidelines developed with UNESCO's International Institute for Educational Planning, the new quality assurance process, the support with ESPDG and the GPE funding model requirement about the quality of the plan.

1. For details on any indicator methodology, replace X with the number of the indicator in the following link: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/methodology-sheet-gpe-result-indicator-X.
2. GPE's ESP and TEP quality standards are based on the Secretariat and UNESCO-International Institute for Educational Planning plan preparation guidelines.
3. GPE ESP quality standards mirror the seven key characteristics for ESP plan preparation as outlined in the GPE-IIEP *Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Preparation* (https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-education-sector-plan-preparation).
4. GPE TEP quality standards are based on the characteristics of a quality TEP as outlined in the *Guidelines for Transitional Education Plan Preparation* (https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-transitional-education-plan-preparation).
5. Baseline data from 2014 and 2015 comprises 19 ESPs and TEPs; 2018 milestone data from 2016, 2017 and 2018 comprises 32 ESPs and TEPs. See Appendix M for a summary of ESPs and TEPs by year and the number of quality standards met.
6. No specific analyses were done on TEPs because of their limited number. There were only three TEPs at baseline and four at the 2018 milestone.


BOX 4.1.

QUALITY STANDARDS FOR AN EDUCATION SECTOR PLAN

1. Guided by an overall vision: The plan, for instance through a mission statement, indicates overall direction.
2. Strategic: It identifies the strategies for achieving the vision.
3. Holistic: It covers all subsectors (early childhood education, primary, secondary and higher education), and should also include non-formal education as well as adult literacy.
4. Evidence-based: It starts from an education sector analysis providing data and assessments that form the information base on which strategies and programs are developed.
5. Achievable: It is based on an analysis of the current trends and thoughtful hypotheses for overcoming financial, technical and political constraints to effective implementation.
6. Sensitive to the context: It includes an analysis of the vulnerabilities specific to a country.
7. Attentive to disparities: It includes disaggregated data for gender, children with disabilities and/or geographic disparities.

FIGURE 4.1.

OVERALL QUALITY OF PLANS IS SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVING.
Proportion of ESPs and TEPs meeting quality standards




Source
GPE Secretariat.

Further analysis of the progress of ESPs against each of the seven quality standards shows that significant improvements have been made across these standards (Figure 4.2). However, the "achievable" quality standard is lagging behind despite the 2018 milestone data showing a sizable gain (68 percent of ESPs meeting the standard, up from 25 percent). In total in 2016, 2017 and 2018, nine ESPs were assessed as not "achievable,"[7] and seven of these nine were from countries affected by fragility and conflict (FCACs). This result suggests a need for a greater focus on implementation challenges, especially in FCACs.

FIGURE 4.2.

ESPS HAVE MADE SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT ACROSS THE SEVEN QUALITY STANDARDS.

Proportion of ESPs meeting each quality standard, 2014/2015 vs. 2016/2017/2018



Source
GPE Secretariat.

Note
The baseline 2014/2015 includes 16 ESPs, while the sample of 2016/2017/2018 includes 28 ESPs.

UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEM OF PLANS' ACHIEVABILITY

The quality standard "achievable" reviews the extent to which the sector plan reflects key considerations for its implementation as related to the financial framework, the implementation capacity, the monitoring tools and the action plan.

Additional analyses show that most ESPs are not "achievable" because of issues around the funding gap estimate. The quality standard assesses whether the estimation of the size of the gap is based on realistic assumptions for national resources.[8] From 2016 to 2018, seven of the nine ESPs rated not "achievable" had a funding gap estimate that was not based on realistic assumptions.

In addition, three ESPs not rated "achievable" either did not have a sound financial framework or a sound monitoring plan.[9] More importantly, an ESP can miss multiple criteria for meeting the quality standard "achievable." In 2014/2015, the ESPs that did not meet the criterion on the funding gap also did not meet the criteria on the financial framework or the simulation model.

7. Countries that did not meet this standard from the 2016/2017/2018 sample include Bhutan, Cote d'Ivoire, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Lesotho, Liberia, Myanmar, Somalia Federal and Zimbabwe.
8. According to the ESP methodology, "In order for the gap to be calculated realistically two conditions must be met: (i) the assumptions on the GDP growth must be realistic (trends presented by the plan are reasonable and aligned with IMF projections), (ii) the assumptions on the growth in the share of public expenditure/GDP allocated to education or education expenditure as a % of total government expenditure must be realistic."
9. According to the ESP methodology, a sound financial framework should include: (i) domestic resources for the education sector, (ii) domestic resources allocated to specific ESP programs, (iii) capital and recurrent expenditures, and (iv) financial gap. According to the ESP methodology, a sound monitoring plan should include corresponding outcomes for the strategies as well as outputs. It should also include a description of the monitoring mechanism at the national and decentralized levels.

BOX 4.2.

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF ESPS: THE ROLE OF APPRAISAL

The independent appraisal provides a unique opportunity to support countries in strengthening the quality of their education plans prior to their finalization and endorsement. Overall, the strengthened appraisal process has contributed to improvements in the quality of appraisal reports and the quality of ESPs and TEPs.


DRAFT ESP/TEP > INDEPENDENT APPRAISAL > FINALIZATION OF ESP / TEP

The independent appraisal of the sector plan at the country level is an opportunity to capture potential issues that could pose challenges to its implementation. At appraisal, 10 out of 18 ESPs appraised in 2017 and 2018 met the benchmark of five out of seven quality standards. At the final stage, all 18 ESPs met the benchmark.

The number of ESPs meeting the quality standard "achievable" has increased the most in comparison to other standards from the appraisal stage to endorsement of the plan, even though "achievable" remains the most challenging standard to meet (see figure below). This result might signal that the independent appraisal mechanism could help mitigate risks to the implementation of the sector plan by capturing potential issues early in the development process. However, the timing of the appraisal is key to contribute effectively to the improvement of the sector plans. The evaluation of GPE's support to sector plan development points to the issue of timing of appraisal in certain countries,[a] which could undermine its purpose of improving the quality of education plans.

a. Universalia, *Evaluation of the GPE's Support to Sector Plan Development.*

NUMBER OF ESPS MEETING EACH QUALITY STANDARD AT THE APPRAISAL STAGE AND AFTER FINALIZATION IN 2017/2018



Source
GPE Secretariat.

Note
The sample includes 18 ESPs appraised in 2017 and 2018: Afghanistan, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Eritrea, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Madagascar, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia-Puntland, Somalia-Somaliland, Sudan and Zanzibar. This sample is different from the samples of ESPs considered in the previous analysis because a plan might usually not be appraised and finalized in the same calendar year.

Additional analysis of the nine ESPs assessed not achievable in 2016/2017/2018 shows that problems with the funding gap estimate could stem from the following elements: an underestimation of costs (2 out of 9), an overestimation of resources (4 out of 9) and/or a lack of realism of the underlying assumptions of the financial framework (2 out of 9). Discrepancy between the action plan and the financial framework was also a major issue. Concretely, the problems with the funding gap estimate, the financial framework and the action plans imply that it is not clear how some activities will be financed and implemented. These issues are directly linked to a well-known major challenge of education planning: prioritization. For instance, according to the country-level evaluations, prioritization was a clear issue in Burkina Faso and Kenya.

The synthesis of GPE country-level evaluations raises the following strategic questions for GPE:[10] "Can a sector plan truly be considered 'credible' if it does not fully meet the quality criterion of being 'achievable'? Should all ESP quality criteria continue to carry equal weight?" Does the GPE quality assurance review process for ESPs pay sufficient attention to ensuring that sector plans are appropriate and realistic in relation to the country's existing implementation capacity? The findings from the evaluation about the weakness of the plan implementation suggest that in assessing the quality of a plan, the "achievable" standard should carry more weight. The evaluators also suggest providing more support to the development of action plans. The Effective Partnership Review initiated by the GPE Board is looking into these questions and beyond (Box 4.3).

BOX 4.3.

EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIP REVIEW

Multiple assessments and evaluations have drawn similar conclusions about the Global Partnership for Education's country-level model: In theory it is sound, but in practice there are inconsistencies in how it is applied and great variation in its effectiveness and efficiency.

The ongoing Effective Partnership Review seeks to address that issue. It began by taking stock of the state of the partnership through extensive consultations in the first half of 2018. This led to a Board-approved action plan to address inconsistencies and inefficiencies, with a particular focus on the roles, responsibilities, accountabilities, authorities and resources of key roles in the partnership. In December 2018, the Board requested exploration of different options for adjustments to the country model, based on four agreed principles:

- A focus on country-level mutual accountability
- Reinforcing national government ownership, political will and capacity
- Rebalancing the country-level model to ensure GPE grants and processes support the development and effective implementation of high-quality, well-financed, government-owned education sector plans
- Achieving a reduction in GPE country-level processes and transaction costs while maintaining robust mechanisms for ensuring quality and managing risk

The next steps include efforts in four key areas. The first seeks to strengthen country-level partnership and policy dialogue. Proposals for how to build on existing good practice and promote country-owned partnership agreements and ways to measure effectiveness are being considered. A second area of work addresses evidence from the development and monitoring of education sector plans. This considers how to strengthen government ownership of sector plans and how to place greater emphasis on implementation. Finally, the partnership is considering how to better streamline and clarify grant application and implementation processes to reduce transaction costs and ensure clarity of responsibilities and accountabilities from country level through to the governance mechanisms of GPE.

10. Universalia, *GPE Country-level Evaluations – Synthesis Report: Financial Year 2018* (Quebec: Universalia, 2019), https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/synthesis-report-gpe-country-level-evaluations-february-2019.

STRONGER STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING, EQUITY AND EFFICIENCY Indicators 16b-d

In addition to monitoring the overall quality of education sector plans, GPE tracks the quality of their strategies related to GPE 2020's three strategic goals: teaching and learning (Indicator 16b), equity (Indicator 16c) and efficiency (Indicator 16d). The indicators look at the proportion of plans in each thematic area that have a strategy that meets quality standards (Box 4.4).[11]

As with education sector plans overall, tremendous progress has been made in the three thematic areas (Figure 4.3). On average, the proportion of strategies from the 28 plans meeting quality standards has increased by 37 percentage points from the 2015 baseline. However, the rate of progress varies across the different thematic areas. While equity strategies surpass the 2018 milestone, and efficiency strategies are almost at the milestone, teaching and learning strategies are significantly behind. Further analyses (see Appendix N) show that this result is due mainly to the fact that teaching and learning strategies are less likely to meet the quality standards regarding implementability, measurability and evidence base than other quality standards. This is a source of concern in light of the learning crisis discussed in Chapter 1.

BOX 4.4.

QUALITY STANDARDS TO ASSESS PLAN STRATEGIES

1. Evidence-based: Includes identification of the underlying causes of the challenge.
2. Relevant: Addresses the underlying causes of the challenge.
3. Coherent: Aligns the action plan to the strategies.
4. Measurable: Includes indicators with targets.
5. Implementable: Identifies cost, funding source, responsible entity and time frames for operationalization.

Across all three types of strategies, the quality standard "implementable" shows a downward trend, from 79 percent at the 2015 baseline to 63 percent in 2018, again highlighting the need to focus more on implementation and its monitoring.

Other elements beyond what is assessed by Indicator 16 are required to support effective implementation of education sector plans. An inclusive and participatory process is key both at the plan preparation stage and the plan implementation stage, which is why GPE emphasizes the role of local coordination mechanisms (known as local education groups). Regular monitoring of plan implementation to facilitate adjustments is also critical, and effective joint sector reviews can play an important role in this.

4.2. Sector monitoring and policy dialogue

IMPROVEMENT NEEDED IN THE FREQUENCY AND QUALITY OF JOINT SECTOR REVIEWS Indicator 18

A joint sector review (JSR) is a government-led process bringing different stakeholders together to engage in dialogue, review status, and monitor expenditure, progress, and performance in the implementation of national education sector plans or countries' sector implementation frameworks. Effective JSRs take a critical look at past achievements as well as bottlenecks in plan implementation and propose forward-looking remedial actions. The process usually consolidates evidence on sector progress in the run-up to a JSR gathering.[12] When used as intended, JSRs can be a key tool for driving improvements in the implementation of education plans. However, only 30 to 40 percent of developing country partners organize JSRs every year, and among those that are held, the quality is often lacking.


Indicator 18 of GPE's results framework monitors the proportion of JSRs meeting at least three out of five quality standards (Box 4.5). In 2018, 26 out of 61 countries (43 percent) provided data on JSRs, suggesting that fewer than half of GPE's developing country partners conducted JSRs in the period under review.

11. These need to meet at least four out of a possible total of five standards for ESPs, and at least four out of a possible total of five standards for TEPs.
12. GPE, *Joint Sector Reviews in the Education Sector: A Practical Guide for Organizing Effective JSRs* (Washington, DC: GPE, 2018), https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/practical-guide-effective-joint-sector-reviews-education-sector.

FIGURE 4.3.

OVERALL QUALITY OF STRATEGIES IN TEACHING AND LEARNING, EQUITY AND EFFICIENCY SHOWS IMPROVEMENT.

Proportion of strategies in teaching and learning, equity and efficiency meeting quality standards



Source
GPE Secretariat.

Note
Overall baseline values for Indicators 16b-d have been updated from 58 percent, 68 percent and 53 percent, respectively, to correct earlier technical errors.

JSR data from the last three years have shown that there is a consistent shortfall in the performance of JSRs in relation to the milestones set for the indicator. Results have fluctuated from the baseline year (2015) with no clear signs of improvement from year to year. With only 27 percent (7 out of 26) of the JSRs meeting the quality standards, the 2018 milestone was missed by a wide margin. The situation is a bit better in FCACs, with five (Cameroon, Liberia, Mozambique, Niger and Togo) out of 13 countries (38 percent) meeting three or more quality standards in 2018, reflecting some improvement from the baseline of 25 percent. Overall, nine countries (Burkina Faso, Ghana, Guinea, Cambodia, Mali, Mozambique, Nepal, Rwanda and Togo) have had a JSR all four years since the baseline (2015-2018), with one of them, Nepal, consistently meeting at least three quality standards.

These results raise serious questions about the monitoring of the implementation of education sector plans. It echoes the results of the *GPE Country-Level Evaluations – Synthesis Report*, which concludes: "*joint sector reviews tend to focus on high-level objectives rather than on the specifics of ESP implementation and vary considerably in the extent to which they result in actionable, targeted recommendations that are used to improve sector plan implementation.*"[13] Significant efforts are still required to achieve the planned target of having 90 percent of the JSRs meet at least three out of five quality standards by 2020.

Further analysis of the performance of JSRs against each of the five quality standards shows that evolution is volatile from year to year. Improvements have been made from baseline to 2018 across three quality standards, relating to JSR being evidence-based, a monitoring tool and a policymaking instrument (see Figure 4.5). However, the "policymaking instrument" standard results are fairly low, with only 38 percent of the JSRs meeting this standard. Here again, it is consistent with the

13. Universalia, *GPE Country-level Evaluations – Synthesis Report.*

BOX 4.5.

QUALITY STANDARDS FOR JOINT SECTOR REVIEWS

1. Participatory and inclusive: Includes effective and transparent participation from all education sector stakeholders.
2. Evidence-based: Is informed by evidence including reliable education and financial data.
3. Comprehensive: Addresses all the subsectors (early childhood, primary, secondary, technical and vocational education and training [TVET], and higher education) as well as non-formal education and adult literacy.
4. Monitorable: Monitors sector performance and key indicators to help better identify ESP/TEP implementation issues and achievements.
5. Policymaking instrument: Recommendations from the JSR effectively feed into addressing weaknesses in the ESP/TEP implementation.

country-level evaluations report's conclusion that JSRs' "effect on influencing ongoing ESP implementation was in most cases undetectable."

The "participatory and inclusive" standard has scored consistently poorly since 2015.[14] However, closer examination of stakeholder categories attending JSRs shows improvements on all variables used to measure this standard, echoing progress observed for local education groups (see following section), except representation of parents' associations. Low representation on this consistently causes this standard to be unmet, and thus does not reflect the other progress made. However, there is a systematic and a high level of inclusion of both national and international civil society organizations (CSOs): INGOs were confirmed present in 85 percent of JSRs, and local CSOs were confirmed present in 88 percent of JSRs, in 2018.[15] In addition, there has been an increase in the confirmed attendance of teacher organizations in JSRs from 49 percent in 2015 to 65 percent in 2018.[16]

The country-level evaluations observed that "in most countries, no one systematically monitored overall ESP implementation progress" and the evaluations present ESP implementation as a "fragmented and emergent process." In conclusion, though the JSR assessment (Indicator 18) serves as a proxy to understand how JSRs are contributing to more aligned and comprehensive sector monitoring, the data over the last four years has shown that the JSRs are organized in a relative limited number of countries, and when organized they are often not used to their full potential for responsive operational planning to help ensure that plan implementation remains on track and is adjusted as necessary based on lessons from the review.

MORE INCLUSIVE LOCAL EDUCATION GROUPS Indicator 19

Existing local coordination mechanisms for the education sector, also called local education groups (LEGs), play a key role in GPE work at the country level.[17] LEGs are critical to promote inclusive and participatory process at the plan preparation stage and the plan implementation stage, in particular for sector monitoring. LEGs seek to broaden the participation and diversity of stakeholders working in education. They are government-led and should ideally include representation from all development partners (multilateral and bilateral), CSOs, teacher organizations (TOs), national and international NGOs, CSO coalitions, community groups, indigenous groups, parent-teacher organizations and the private sector. To facilitate measuring progress against this objective, the GPE results framework tracks the inclusion of CSOs and TOs in LEGs

14. This quality standard assesses how inclusive (who is represented) and participatory (effective engagement) the JSR was in bringing together a broad set of stakeholders in joint sector monitoring efforts.
15. Source: GPE Secretariat. Of the 26 JSRs in the 2018 data set, 22 reported INGO participation and four did not specify; 23 reported local CSO participation, one reported no local CSO participation, and two did not specify. The nature of this assessment makes it hard to gauge the nature of CSO participation and understand whether the proceedings of the JSR gave them enough opportunities to bring their views to the table and broaden the dialogue.
16. Source: GPE Secretariat. Of the 26 JSRs in the 2018 data set, 17 reported TO participation, 3 reported no local TO participation, five did not specify, and in one this was not applicable. Of the 35 JSRs in the 2015 data set, 17 reported TO participation, four reported no local TO participation, and 14 did not specify.
17. GPE works through existing mechanisms and does not require specific mechanisms.


(Indicator 19). The proportion of countries and federal states with both CSO and TO representation on their LEGs increased from 44 percent in 2016 (the baseline)[18] to 59 percent in 2018. In Ethiopia, for instance, thanks to the GPE process, CSO inclusion was addressed during the grant application.

Representation of both CSOs and TOs has performed above the set milestones for both 2017 and 2018. The trend for representation in FCACs has consistently showed high performance much beyond the milestones set. Combined representation on LEGs in FCACs has risen from 55 percent (2016) to 65 percent (2018) (Figure 4.6). This is especially significant in FCAC con-

FIGURE 4.4.

JOINT SECTOR REVIEWS FALL SHORT OF MILESTONES SET FOR MEETING QUALITY STANDARDS.

Proportion of joint sector reviews meeting quality standards




Source
GPE Secretariat.

18. Data was not collected prior to 2016 because the methodology was developed and approved in 2015 as part of the results framework.

FIGURE 4.5.

JOINT SECTOR REVIEWS SHOW LACK OF IMPROVEMENT.

Proportion of joint sector reviews meeting quality standards, 2015-2018 (%)



Source
GPE Secretariat.

BOX 4.6.

COUNTRY-LEVEL EVALUATIONS: KEY FINDINGS ON SECTOR DIALOGUE AND SECTOR MONITORING

- During the respective review periods, sector dialogue improved in most of the countries reviewed by summative country-level evaluations (CLEs) and is showing promising foundations in most prospective CLE countries. However, sustaining inclusive dialogue beyond the sector planning phase and using this dialogue to ensure partner harmonization and inform ESP implementation remain common areas for improvement.
- Systematic monitoring of ESP implementation faces challenges owing to weaknesses in monitoring tools and mechanisms and/or their application.
- Across countries, joint sector reviews tend to focus on high-level objectives rather than on the specifics of ESP implementation and vary considerably in the extent to which they result in actionable, targeted recommendations that are used to improve sector plan implementation.
- GPE has made notable contributions to establishing and/or strengthening country mechanisms and processes for sector dialogue and monitoring. GPE support has had limited effect, however, on ensuring that sector dialogue and monitoring lead to mutual accountability for sector progress.
- While CLE findings on GPE support to sector dialogue and monitoring were largely positive, evaluations in three countries raised questions about the extent to which GPE country-level processes (especially around the grant agents' role) consistently reflect and promote the principle of mutual accountability.

Source: Universalia, *GPE Country-level Evaluations – Synthesis Report*.

BOX 4.7.

THE JOINT SECTOR REVIEW IN BURKINA FASO

The JSR plays a key role in monitoring the implementation of the Strategic Basic Education Program (PDSEB) 2012-2021 and in enacting mutual accountability between the National Education and Literacy Ministry and its development partners.

The Burkinabe JSR combines essential features that characterize a well-organized JSR process: It is based on clear terms of reference; participation is inclusive of teacher unions, civil society organizations and the Ministry of Economy and Finance. The government produces an annual progress report, which applies the PDSEB results framework. The JSR also takes stock of the progress made on the recommendations from the previous JSR and produces actionable, targeted recommendations that are used to inform operational adjustments and improve plan implementation. Finally, it enjoys buy-in from high-level decision makers, including the minister of education and heads of development partners, who sign off on the JSR aide-memoire confirming their respective commitments, explicitly expressed through performance indicators.

Both the preparation and follow-up to the JSR are anchored in broader sector dialogue mechanisms throughout the year. PDSEB thematic working groups meet regularly and are responsible for thematic reporting for the JSR. Additionally, the partnership framework group (the LEG) draws on this work and, as stated in the independent country evaluation, has increased its relevance as a consultative body that informs government decision-making.

texts, where more inclusion can compensate for the lack of routine or systematic data collection by bringing to the table a broader set of perspectives and information, or additional data gathered in different ways. Overall, the level of participation of teacher organizations is much lower than CSOs, respectively 59 percent and 89 percent, and requires more attention from the partnership (Figure 4.7).

Though there have been strides to increase participation, meaningful engagement cannot be deduced from this data. The findings of the country-level evaluations indicate that "Non-government stakeholders, in particular civil society organizations (CSOs), are represented on all reviewed LEGs, but the degree of their involvement varies and is strongly dependent on the willingness of the respective DCP government to engage these actors."[19] Additional work will be done to bring more specific analyses of the type of CSO representation (INGO, NGO and coalitions) on LEGs, to better understand the nature of representation in developing country partners.

GPE also provides both technical and financial support to better understand and enhance factors that contribute toward the more effective functioning of LEGs, including the guidance note "Guiding Principles for Building Effective LEGs: Framing Issues and Solution" and a working paper, "What Can LEGs Learn from Effective Coordination and Partnership Mechanism." These publications, expected to be published in 2019, are the first products in a planned series of guidance notes and tools to support LEGs in GPE developing country partners. In addition, the ongoing Effective Partnership Review is considering what other measures or adjustments could be adopted to help strengthen LEG effectiveness and mutual accountability at the country level. Finally, GPE has provided financial support through the Civil Society Education Fund (Box 4.8), and will launch a new funding mechanism, Advocacy and Social Accountability (ASA) funding, in 2019.

PIVOTING TOWARD IMPLEMENTATION

The results presented in this chapter from the analyses of the results framework indicators are consistent with those of the country-level evaluations, as well as those of the Effective Partnership Review, and they point to a need for the partnership to focus its attention on improving the implementation of education plans. The weakness around the achievability of the plans at the initial stage is an upstream signal of the challenges ahead for implementing education sector plans successfully.

In strengthening its focus on plan implementation and monitoring, GPE can build on its experience and results in supporting sector planning, which the country-level evaluations confirm as a strong suit for the partnership, as "GPE, through both grant(-related) and non-financial types of support, has made notable contributions to countries developing systematic and comprehensive sector plans and doing so in (largely) inclusive and participatory ways."[20] In that regard, the Effective Partnership Review is exploring and discussing ways to build a stronger bridge from sector planning to implementation, and bolster the support GPE offers to the implementation and monitoring of plans. The limited progress in the number and the quality of JSRs illustrates the weakness of sector monitoring and, to a certain extent, plan implementation. Country-level evaluations identified these as areas of notable weakness in both country processes and the efficacy of technical support. Through the variable part of the GPE funding model and an increased focus on JSRs, GPE has shifted its attention to sector monitoring and education plan implementation. However, the current results indicate that a more significant pivot in that direction will be essential to deliver on the promises of GPE 2020 and beyond. The Board's adoption in December 2018 of the principle of rebalancing the country-level model to support the development and effective implementation of high-quality, well-financed, government-owned education sector plans is propelling action in this regard, and a proposal on how to strengthen the partnership's response to these challenges is under development for Board review in June 2019.


In the next chapter, evidence suggests additional opportunities to increase the impact of GPE support in grant-making and implementation through greater alignment to national systems. This means that, as successful as GPE has been in support to sector plan development, that success can be amplified powerfully in the implementation phase through some strategic shifts.

19. Universalia, *GPE Country-level Evaluations – Synthesis Report*, 27.
20. Universalia, *GPE Country-level Evaluations – Synthesis Report*, 13.

FIGURE 4.6.

LOCAL EDUCATION GROUPS ARE BECOMING MORE INCLUSIVE.

Proportion of LEGs with civil society organizations and teacher organizations represented




Source
GPE Secretariat.

FIGURE 4.7.

CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATION AND TEACHER ORGANIZATION REPRESENTATION IN LEGS IS GROWING.

Proportion of LEGs with civil society organizations or teacher organizations represented



Proportion of LEGs with teacher organizations represented (%)
Proportion of LEGs with civil society organizations represented (%)
[Number of LEGs in the sample]

Source: GPE Secretariat.

BOX 4.8.

LESSONS FROM CIVIL SOCIETY ENGAGEMENT IN LEGS

GPE has been funding national civil society education coalitions through the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) since 2009. A learning brief from the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) identified six key lessons and good practice examples from the experience of participating in LEGs:

1. LEGs don't always exist, and they are not always open to civil society, but doors can be opened through positive engagement. Owing to persistent effort in engaging stakeholders, including, at times, communication facilitated by the GPE Secretariat, the number of CSEF national education coalitions recognized in LEGs rose from 29 to 46—or in 86 percent of countries in which CSEF operates.

2. LEGs are more inclusive when they follow good practice guidelines and have strong national leadership. GCE identified good practices that include having written and official agreements or memorandums of understanding mandating CSO participation. Stemming from this, a document that institutionalized the relationship between civil society and the Ministry of National Education in Burkina Faso was developed, for example.

3. A policy focus or niche can be key to building civil society credibility in LEGs. For instance, VCEFA, the coalition in Vietnam, has contributed to improving policies on early childhood care and quality education for disabled groups.

4. The voice of civil society in LEGs must be broad and strong. To ensure representation of voices of the most marginalized, it is important that coalitions be connected to the communities in which they live. In countries with federal governments like Pakistan and Nigeria, the national coalitions focus on engagement with decision-making structures of the LEGs at the state and provincial levels.

5. Engage with good evidence, to build credibility in LEGs. CSOs have been actively working to bring and build an evidence base from communities to contribute robust data to policy discussions. Through its annual monitoring mechanism and flagship research, Education Watch, Campaign for Popular Education in Bangladesh carries out systematic research, surveys and studies to assess the progress of Education for All in Bangladesh and makes recommendations to the national policy and sector planning processes.

6. Effective participation in LEGs can help create a virtuous cycle of civil society engagement. Through CSEF support, national education coalitions have had an impact on strengthening civil society participation in LEGs. More governments and international organizations in several countries are seeing national coalitions as key educational stakeholders as a result.

Source: GCE, "A View from the Civil Society Education Fund's Engagement in Local Education Sector Planning Groups."

Kadida N'Diaye with her second grade students at the Ecole Madina III in Niamey, Niger. Ms. N'Diaye's school is piloting a local-language curriculum, which she says, "makes teaching much easier."

Credit: GPE/Kelley Lynch



CHAPTER

5

Financing and Partnership

RESULTS AT A GLANCE


COUNTRY-LEVEL

OBJECTIVE 3

Effective and efficient GPE financing


#21

GPE grants achieved **91% of their target for textbook distribution**.




#22

GPE grants achieved **90% of their target for teacher training**.




#23

GPE grants achieved **89% of their target for classroom construction**.




#24a

100% of GPE grant applications identified variable part targets.




#24b

100% of GPE grants achieved variable part targets.



#25

89% of grants were on track.




GLOBAL-LEVEL

OBJECTIVE 4

Mobilize more and better financing


#26

Non-traditional donors contributed **11.4 million** to GPE.




#27

100% of donor pledges were fulfilled.




#28

48% of GPE donors increased or maintained their **education funding**.




#29

36% of GPE grants aligned with **national systems**.



#30

34% of GPE grants were co-financed or sector pooled.



GLOBAL-LEVEL

OBJECTIVE 5

Build a stronger partnership


#32

Proportion of **DCPs and other partners** reporting strengthened clarity of roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities in GPE country processes.

-


#33

69 technical products were produced.




#34

57 advocacy events were undertaken.




#35

100% of significant audit issues were addressed.




#36

44% of Secretariat staff time was spent on country-facing functions.



#37

100% of results and evaluation reports were published.



	Baseline	Annual milestone met	Annual milestone not met
Overall	○	● ●	●
FCACs	□	■ ■	■
Insufficient data		- -	

KEY FINDINGS

› **More than US$5 billion has been allocated to developing country partners through GPE implementation grants since 2002**, and more than half (51 percent) of implementation grant funding was disbursed to countries affected by fragility and conflict in fiscal year 2018.

› **Nearly three-quarters of GPE implementation grant funding goes to Sub-Saharan Africa**, and grant allocations emphasize **learning** and **primary education**.

› **Donor funding to GPE is expanding**. In 2018, donors contributed US$638 million to GPE, the highest level of annual paid-in contribution since its inception.

› **Donor pledges to GPE for 2018-2020 increased by more than US$1 billion** over the previous three-year period.

› While all GPE grants are aligned to national sector plans, **two-thirds use stand-alone mechanisms that are poorly aligned with national systems**.

CHAPTER

5

Financing and partnership

Mobilizing more and better financing for education is a key strategic objective of GPE 2020, as is building a stronger partnership. According to the International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity, an additional US$44 billion each year would need to be mobilized from international financing to fill the gap for all low- and middle-income countries to achieve universal pre-primary, primary and secondary education.[1] However, more financing is not the only challenge: External financing should be allocated to the countries with the greatest education need, and used to support those interventions directly associated with learning for all children. This chapter presents an overview of the GPE grant portfolio,[2] using the most recent data to examine where GPE funding goes, and the performance of GPE grants. It also discusses challenges in the alignment of grants to education systems and wider efforts to advocate for more and better financing for education.

5.1 GPE grant portfolio

OVERVIEW OF GPE GRANTS

GPE employs a variety of instruments to address complex challenges in education in DCPs. The largest share of GPE funding is spent at the country level, where three types of grants operate alongside the life cycle of education sector plans (Figure 5.1; see Appendix R). There are also three categories of global and cross-national grants that support strategic investments in civil society organizations and thematic work in GPE priority areas (Appendix R). Two new categories of global and cross-national grants, Knowledge and Innovation Exchange (KIX) and Advocacy and Social Accountability (ASA),[3] will start in the latter half of 2019.

In 2017, GPE launched the GPE Multiplier, which uses GPE's implementation grant funding to mobilize new and additional external finance for education sector plan implementation.[4] For each US$1 in Multiplier funding from GPE, partners need to mobilize at least US$3 in external funding to help implement nationally owned education sector plans. By the end of 2018, 12 expressions of interest from countries had been approved for a total of US$101 million in Multiplier funding, which is expected to leverage US$446 million of external cofinancing (see Figure 5.2).

IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS: TRENDS IN VOLUME AND PRIORITIES

The education sector program implementation grant is the largest grant in the GPE grant portfolio. Since GPE's inception in 2002, the cumulative amount allocated to implementation grants surpassed US$5 billion in 2018 (Figure 5.3). The annual disbursements increased to US$494 million in fiscal year 2018 from US$421 million in fiscal year 2017, getting closer to its peak of US$503 million recorded in fiscal year 2015.


GPE uses a needs-based allocation formula to determine grant allocation.[5] Between July 2017 and June 2018 (fiscal year 2018), more than half of total implementation grant funding was disbursed in countries affected by fragility and conflict (FCACs).[6] Almost three-fourths of total implementation grant disbursement was allocated to Sub-Saharan Africa, the region

1. Education Commission, *The Learning Generation: Investing in Education for a Changing World*.
2. For more information, see the *GPE Portfolio Review 2018*: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/2018-annual-portfolio-review.
3. For more information, see the webpages https://www.globalpartnership.org/advocacy-and-social-accountability and https://www.globalpartnership.org/focus-areas/knowledge-and-innovation-exchange.
4. For a more detailed description of the GPE Multiplier, see the GPE *Portfolio Review 2018* (https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/2018-annual-portfolio-review), pages 13-14 and Appendix 1E.
5. For more information, see the GPE Board paper BOD/2017/03 DOC 04, "Eligibility, Allocation, and Proportionality: Recommendations from the Strategic Financing Working Group": https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/eligibility-allocation-and-proportionality-recommendations-strategic-financing-working-group.
6. Please see Appendix S.

FIGURE 5.1.

THE GPE GRANT PORTFOLIO IS VARIED.

Grant types and cumulative allocated amounts from inception to December 2018




Source
GPE Secretariat.


Note
Allocated amount is cumulative from GPE's inception in 2002 to December 2018. The amount allocated to education sector program implementation grants includes the amount allocated to the GPE Multiplier.

FIGURE 5.2.

GPE MULTIPLIER LEVERAGES ADDITIONAL COFINANCING.

Cumulative Multiplier allocations and reported cofinancing through December 2018






Source
GPE Secretariat.

FIGURE 5.3.

GPE IMPLEMENTATION GRANT-MAKING CONTINUES TO GROW.

Cumulative amount and number of implementation grants by calendar year



Source
GPE Secretariat.

home to 54 percent of world out-of-school children of primary school age.[7] Fifty-nine percent of implementation grant funding was disbursed to low-income countries (Figure 5.4).

STRONG FOCUS ON LEARNING

GPE's 34 active program implementation grants at the end of fiscal year 2018 had a strong focus on learning, GPE's Strategic Goal 1. Grant activities related to learning were allocated 40.5 percent of the total grant funding, activities related to equity (Strategic Goal 2) were allocated 25.9 percent, and activities related to systems (Strategic Goal 3) were allocated 28.8 percent (see figure 5.5. for more details).[8]

IMPLEMENTATION GRANT ALLOCATIONS BY EDUCATION LEVELS


GPE reported its financial contributions by education levels to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) for the first time in November 2018,[9] and the allocations of 131 implementation grants approved between 2004 and 2017 appear in figure 5.6.: On the whole, these allocation levels have remained largely stable across this time period. GPE is also involved with OECD in a new initiative aiming to create a comprehensive database to track aid flows to Sustainable Development Goal targets (total official support for sustainable development) and will participate in the pilot of this database.

7. According to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics online database (retrieved in January 2019).
8. While there is a coding system that allows determining which implementation grants support which of the GPE 2020 thematic areas, there is no information on the amount allocated to each. The costing exercise undertaken by the Secretariat aimed to fill this gap by associating dollar figures with the GPE 2020 thematic areas for each implementation grant active at the end of fiscal year 2018. In cases where a grant was not specific enough (for example, combining curriculum and teacher training), estimates were done.

FIGURE 5.4.

GPE IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS PRIORITIZE RECIPIENTS IN GREATEST NEED.

Implementation grant disbursement by FCAC category, region and income category, fiscal year 2018



Source
GPE Secretariat.

Note
SSA: Sub-Saharan Africa, EAP: East Asia and Pacific, ECA: Europe and Cenral Asia, MENA: Middle East and North Africa, SA: South Asia

5.2. Performance of implementation grants

GPE GRANTS DELIVER ON TEXTBOOKS, TEACHER TRAINING AND CLASSROOMS Indicators 21-23

The GPE results framework tracks progress on textbook provision (Indicator 21),[10] teachers trained (Indicator 22), and building and renovation of classrooms (Indicator 23) in GPE implementation grants. In fiscal year 2018, all three indicators surpassed their GPE 2020 milestones for the overall portfolio (figure 5.7.).[11] All three also show positive trends since the 2015 baseline, with somewhat irregular progress for textbooks and teachers trained.[12] During fiscal year 2018, 24.7 million textbooks were distributed, 347,073 teachers were trained and 3,588 classrooms were built or rehabilitated thanks to GPE implementation grants.[13]


Although on average for the overall and FCAC portfolio these indicators demonstrated strong performance and the milestones, this performance varies widely across the grants. During fiscal year 2018, five grants achieved less than 75 percent of their annual targets for textbook provision (Indicator 21), as did eight grants for teachers trained (Indicator 22) and nine grants for building and renovation of classrooms (Indicator 23), respectively. This underscores the need to examine closely the implementation performance of grants and the drivers of delays (see box 5.1.).

9. GPE is working to improve financial reporting and tracking. It has recently put in place a solution that will allow the partnership to report to the OECD without running the risk of double-counting the contributions of GPE donors and grant agents who are already reporting. In consultation with some GPE grant agents, it was agreed that GPE financial flows would be included in a new database especially designed for trust and pooled funds. In June 2018, this proposal was approved by the OECD Development Assistance Committee Working Party on Development Finance Statistics (WP Stat).
10. For details on any indicator methodology, replace X with the number of the indicator in the following URL address: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/methodology-sheet-gpe-result-indicator-X.
11. Thirty-six implementation grants with planned components for these indicators, including for grants in FCACs (22 grants).
12. For all indicators in fiscal year 2017, some countries significantly overachieved planned targets. Reasons for this overachievement included ministry's effective negotiation with printing vendors for textbooks, underestimation of targets, a favorable change in exchange rate, additional funds from other organizations and rolled-over activities because of underachievement in fiscal year 2016.
13. Exactly 24,716,001 textbooks were distributed.

FIGURE 5.5.

GRANT ALLOCATIONS FOLLOW THE GPE 2020 STRATEGIC GOALS.

Implementation grant allocations by activity, out of US$1.438 billion total active at end of fiscal year 2018 in 34 grants




Source
GPE Secretariat.

FIGURE 5.6.

GPE IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS FOCUS ON PRIMARY EDUCATION.

Implementation grant allocations by education level, 2004-2017




Source
Source: GPE Secretariat.

Note
"Level unspecified" refers to allocations that cannot be attributed to a specific level but support general system-level investments such as teacher management or EMIS.

FIGURE 5.7.

DELIVERY OF TEXTBOOKS, TEACHER TRAINING AND CLASSROOMS WAS SUCCESSFUL.

Respective proportions of textbooks purchased and distributed, teachers trained, and classrooms built or rehabilitated through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants



Source
GPE Secretariat.


OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION OF GPE GRANTS IS SATISFACTORY Indicator 25

The GPE results framework tracks the overall status of implementation of the grants (Indicator 25). Grants that are expected to achieve all of their major outputs, or most of their outputs with moderate shortcomings, are classified as "on track." Significant progress was made in fiscal year 2018, with 89.3 percent (25 out of 28) of the grants on track, above the 2018 milestone (Figure 5.8).[14]

For FCACs, 15 out of 16 grants (94 percent) were on track, a notable result in very challenging contexts. Only one FCAC grant (Yemen) was rated as delayed, mainly because of the ongoing conflict.

FIGURE 5.8.

ON-TRACK IMPLEMENTATION GRANTS EXCEED MILESTONES.
Proportion of GPE implementation grants rated as "on track" in implementation



Source
GPE, Portfolio Review 2018, 32.

RESULTS-BASED FUNDING (Indicator 24)

The GPE results framework tracks progress on the GPE results-based funding model by calculating Indicator 24: (a) the proportion of GPE implementation grant applications that identified targets for performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning, and (b) the proportion of grants that achieved a high proportion of their performance targets in these areas.[15]

The results-based funding model is still relatively new and requires more time for a robust assessment of its variable part. During fiscal year 2018, there were six implementation grant applications (Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Liberia and Madagascar), including three FCACs, to consider for indicator 24a.[16] All six grants identified equity, efficiency and learning performance indicators to be tracked in relation to GPE financing. This is above the 2018 milestones for this indicator (95 percent target for overall and 90 percent target for FCACs) but should be interpreted cautiously as it is based on a very small number of grants.

14. However, it should be noted that the number of active grants in fiscal year 2018 was significantly smaller compared to previous years: 28 active grants with available ratings in fiscal year 2018 compared to 48 last year and 58 in fiscal year 2014. For more details, see the *Portfolio Review 2018*: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/2018-annual-portfolio-review.
15. The GPE funding model splits the requirements-based implementation grant into a fixed part (no more than 70 percent of funding) and an incentives-based variable part, which incorporates the results-based financing concept but raises it to a sector level (no less than 30 percent of funding). For more details, see the factsheet *GPE Funding Model: A Results-Based Approach for the Education Sector*: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-funding-model; and *the Guidance Note on GPE Variable Part Financing:* https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidance-note-gpe-variable-part-financing.
16. Eight applications were not accounted for the adoption rate for the following reasons: Small Island Developing States (allocation of less than US$2 million each) do not contain any "variable" component owing to the small size of the allocation; for implementation grants of less than US$5 million, an ex ante approach for the variable part of the funding model applies where the variable allocation is not linked to actual attainment of results.

BOX 5.1.

WHAT CAUSES IMPLEMENTATION DELAYS?

The Secretariat conducted an analysis of 43 implementation grants that were slightly behind or delayed in fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018 to understand the reasons for implementation delays.[a] The analysis showed that the majority of delays are related to operational challenges (57.9 percent), such as procurement and program management issues, followed by unforeseen changes and external circumstances (24.8 percent) and activity preparation (12 percent).

According to an analysis of the implementation completion reports from the last three years,[b] challenges in implementation due to program design issues can be prevented with a clearly defined scope, and targets of the program and activities that are achievable during the project time frame, given country contexts, such as the security situation, government capacity, and availability of contractors. Likewise, challenges related to activity preparation can be circumvented by negotiating agreements and arrangements between development partners, implementation agencies and other providers at the project preparation stage; and by investing more time and resources in thorough assessments of needs and capacity at the project appraisal stage.[c]

a. The analysis is based on 43 implementation grants representing all grants that were rated as "slightly behind" or "delayed" in fiscal year 2018 and/or in fiscal year 2017. For more details, see the *Portfolio Review 2018*: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/2018-annual-portfolio-review.
b. These reports were only available for the grants implemented by the World Bank.
c. Examples of needs and capacity assessment include conducting a site selection for construction activities at the project preparation stage, complete with the necessary government approvals and compliance standards; assessments of school needs and infrastructure management capacity of the implementation agency.

BOX 5.2.

EQUITY DIMENSION IN THE VARIABLE PART OF NEPAL

One of the performance indicators of Nepal's variable part funding from GPE aimed to operationalize Nepal's Equity Strategy, particularly for out-of-school children (OOSC). Three milestones were associated with disbursements from the GPE variable part. The first milestone of the performance indicator was the development of an equity index. The subsequent milestone was then to design and implement interventions to reduce OOSC. The ultimate outcome expected was a 20 percent reduction of OOSC in targeted districts.

The index was developed by the Ministry of Education with support from UNICEF Headquarters, South Asia Regional Office and Nepal Country Office (through the Data Must Speak Initiative), the World Bank and GPE. It uses the disparity-based formula known as the Human Opportunity Index (HOI) and draws on both household and school-based census capturing data on gender, geography, socioeconomic status, ethnicity and caste, and disability. The data are analyzed and converted into an equity score by district, which helps to create a picture of the intensity of inequity across the country and allows for evidence-based planning to allocate additional budget for targeted interventions in the most disadvantaged districts.

Nepal's Equity Index was launched in 2017. In the first period of the program implementation (2016-2017), targeted interventions in the five most disadvantaged districts (according to the Equity Index) led to an 18.2 percent reduction of OOSC in these districts. In the next period (2017-2018), the interventions are expected to lead to a 20 percent reduction of OOSC in the 10 most disadvantaged districts. Independent verification is ongoing to evaluate results for this period. Although the Equity Index remains quite new, it is hoped that its success in the 10 disadvantaged districts can be gradually replicated to improve school attendance and learning among children all over the country.

With respect to Indicator 24b (the proportion of grants that achieved a high proportion of their performance targets in these areas), five active implementation grants had variable part achievements accompanied by disbursement for the reporting period of November 2017-October 2018:[17] Mozambique, Rwanda, Nepal (see Box 5.2), Malawi, and Ethiopia. For example, Rwanda conducted a national sample-based assessment of learning outcomes and used its results to inform teaching and learning; Ethiopia doubled the school grants allocation for educating children with special needs; and Mozambique had 1,453 more primary school directors participate in director training. Four grants met all their targets, and one grant missed one equity target out of four targets.[18] This indicator has surpassed the 2018 milestone. Further analyses will be possible in the future as more grants report against variable part achievements.

5.3. The persistent challenge of aid effectiveness

SOME PROGRESS IN ALIGNMENT FOR GPE GRANTS

Indicator 29


Alignment is a core element of aid effectiveness,[19] defined by the OECD as when "donors base their support on partner countries' national development strategies, institutions and procedures."[20] It helps avoid high transaction costs for countries and strengthens their systems' capacity. GPE measures the alignment of its grants along 10 dimensions.

In 2018, the percentage of overall GPE grants aligned with national systems was the highest on record (see Figure 5.9). The improvement was due to the closure of 10 non-aligned grants in fiscal year 2017 and the start of four aligned grants out of nine new grants in fiscal year 2018. However, the indicator remains below the 2018 milestone. Grants are systematically aligned with education sector plans, but there is limited use of national financial management, accounting and audit systems.

FIGURE 5.9.

GRANT ALIGNMENT IS LOW, BUT SHOWS SOME IMPROVEMENT.

Proportion of GPE grants aligned to national systems



Source
GPE Secretariat.

17. In line with the internal cutoff date of results report data collection (November 15).
18. Countries may choose to set more than one target per strategic goal, which is why some have more than three in total.
19. Alignment is one of the five core principles of the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action.
20. OECD definition: http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/aideffectivenessglossary.htm.


Indicator 29 considers 10 dimensions of alignment (Figure 5.10), and a grant must fulfill at least seven of the dimensions to be assessed as aligned. The main challenge lies in achieving deeper alignment with public financial management (PFM) systems. This is captured by the five bottom dimensions in Figure 5.10, which represent the lowest levels of alignment. These require a stronger commitment to alignment combined with the appropriate capacity support and risk management strategies. More traditional approaches to aid favor the use of project or donor-specific procedures to avoid the risks associated with the use of national systems, thus undermining their capacity to strengthen these systems. It is indeed difficult to build national systems while bypassing them.

However, analyses in the *Results Report 2018* and *Portfolio Review 2018* show that even when a system's capacity is relatively strong, its use may be still limited.[21] In fiscal year 2018, 13 out of 36 non-aligned grants were in countries with systems of comparable capacity to those of countries with aligned grants. In short, if the choice of alignment were only based on system capacity, as a risk-averse approach would suggest, then 52 percent of GPE implementation grants would be aligned. It indicates that other considerations or incentives are driving choices on alignment.

FIGURE 5.10.

NON-ALIGNED GRANTS REMAIN A CHALLENGE.

Proportion of non-aligned grants meeting each dimension in fiscal year 2018



Source
GPE Annual Portfolio Review 2018

This means that there is significant room for improvement—and thereby, significant opportunity for the partnership to deepen its commitment to systems-strengthening—but it will require identifying the factors at stake in a given context and engaging early in the grant development process and choice of financing modality before choosing the grant agent. This normative support to the country-level process and dialogue is already part of the GPE model, and it has been reinforced through the implementation of the alignment road map.[22] However, without more effective levers to promote greater alignment in the GPE operating model, progress will largely dependent on external factors such as contextual factors or grant agents' preferred modalities.

21. These analyses used the World Bank's Country Policy and Institutional Assessment scores as the measure of system capacity.
22. For instance, 10 "opportunity countries" identified in 2017 for potential movement toward aligned modalities are benefiting from additional support from the Secretariat.


DECREASE IN COFINANCING Indicator 30

The Global Partnership for Education monitors the extent to which its grants are associated with cofinancing from other partners seeking better donor harmonization (Indicator 30).

The majority of implementation grants (66 percent) use standalone project modalities,[23] meaning that the partnership continues to use relatively fragmented aid implementation mechanisms. Moreover, the proportion of GPE grants that are either cofinanced or deployed as pooled funding has been decreasing (Figure 5.11). The significant increased mobilization of cofinancing through the GPE Multiplier discussed in the first section of this chapter should contribute to rapid improvements with this indicator.

FIGURE 5.11.

COFINANCING CONTINUES TO DECREASE.
Proportion of GPE grants using cofinanced project or sector pooled funding mechanisms



Source
GPE Secretariat.

THE OPPORTUNITY OF GREATER ALIGNMENT AND HARMONIZATION

Though progress anticipated with the GPE Multiplier should lead to increased cofinancing through project modalities, it will not necessarily improve alignment to national systems, as illustrated by Figure 5.12. Currently, cofinanced projects are not more aligned than standalone projects—pooled funding mechanisms and budget support, of course, are very much so, but these are the least used modalities for GPE grants, representing only 16 percent of them (9 out of 56). There are no incentives associated with the Multiplier that could lead to a significant increase of pooled funding mechanisms or budget support.


In summary, like most development actors, the majority of GPE implementation grants continue to use relatively fragmented (stand-alone) aid implementation mechanisms that are weakly aligned with national systems. This detracts from GPE's own effectiveness and impact: First, because the majority of the implementation modalities used by the partnership are not conducive of optimal support to the capacity development of national systems, impairing the long-term improvement of these systems. Second, the successful implementation of education sector plans is compromised by aid fragmentation as pointed out by recent GPE country-level evaluations (see Box 5.3).[24]

23. Projects with the GPE grant as the only source of funding.
24. Universalia's *GPE Country-Level Evaluations – Synthesis Report: Financial Year 2018* states: "In most of the 15 reviewed countries, international financing for the education sector has been channeled through project modalities either as stand-alone or co-financed projects, except for Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Nepal where a pooled fund was in place. This likely contributed to fragmented ESP implementation and limited mutual accountability for sector results."

FIGURE 5.12.

ALIGNMENT VARIES GREATLY BY MODALITY.

Grant alignment by modality, fiscal year 2018



Source
GPE Secretariat.

More pooled funding mechanisms and budget support, and increased alignment with national systems, notably public financial management systems, would increase GPE's ability to contribute to education sector plan implementation and system strengthening. By working to put effective levers in place to promote alignment and harmonization, the partnership can better deliver on the GPE 2020 objective of more and better financing, and, more fundamentally, its strategic goal of effective and efficient education systems delivering equitable, quality educational services for all.

BOX 5.3.

EDUCATION SECTOR PLAN IMPLEMENTATION: BY AND LARGE, A FRAGMENTED, EMERGENT PROCESS

Most summative country-level evaluations found that instead of constituting the execution of a relatively linear road map, ESP implementation tended to derive somewhat organically from achievements made under multiple subprojects/initiatives led by different actors (within the ministry of education and various development partners). Often, assigning responsibilities to development partners appeared to focus on ensuring that a particular development partner would be ableto fund a particular subsector, while the "how" and "what" of subsequent interventions were largely left to the development partner. Overall, ESP implementation thus tended to emerge as the product of many stand-alone projects that were only loosely connected, if at all, with each other. This made it difficult for ministries of education to retain oversight and keep track of overall ESP implementation—especially in contexts where ongoing sector dialogue and/or monitoring were not consistently focused on reflecting on change under the lens of plan implementation.

Source: Universalia, *GPE Country-level Evaluations - Synthesis Report*, 54.

5.4. Financing: More progress needed


Indicators 26-28

In 2018, donors contributed US$638 million to GPE, a record high since its inception (see Appendices O, W and X), as a result of the momentum created at the GPE Financing Conference in February 2018 (Box 5.4). At the conference, donors renewed their commitment to more and better financing of education and pledged US$2.3 billion for 2018-2020, a US$1 billion increase compared with the previous three years, and an additional US$250 million was mobilized between then and the end of 2018. Nontraditional donors made pledges,[25] too, including the United Arab Emirates, the first Arab and Middle Eastern donor with a US$100 million commitment, and Senegal, the first African donor, with a US$2 million commitment. Increased contributions from nontraditional donors to GPE are reflected in the progress of Indicator 26, which measures their cumulative contributions paid into the GPE fund (Figure 5.13). In fiscal year 2018, all GPE donors fulfilled their commitments, and Indicator 27 on the proportion of donor pledges fulfilled remained at 100 percent for the fourth consecutive year. These developments are very positive, yet there is still more external financing needed for the education sector, and for GPE to reach its target of US$3.1 billion and deliver on GPE 2020 and beyond.

FIGURE 5.13.

NONTRADITIONAL DONORS ARE ON THE RISE.

Cumulative contributions from nontraditional donors (US$ millions)



Source
GPE Secretariat.

The share of education in total official development assistance (ODA) has been decreasing over the past decade, dropping from 8.6 percent in 2008 to 7.0 percent in 2017 (see Appendix Q). During this period, the dollar amount of education ODA increased, at an annual growth rate of 2.7 percent, but not at the pace of overall ODA, which grew at 4.9 percent annually, nor at the pace of health (8.0 percent) or energy (8.6 percent)[26].


GPE results framework Indicator 28, which measures the proportion of GPE donors who increased or maintained the dollar amount of their total education ODA in comparison with its base year (2014), did not meet the milestone for 2018 (52 percent) (Figure 5.14). This is despite the increase in overall funding from GPE donors to education from 2014 to 2017, which was driven by the three biggest donors (Germany, the United States and the European Union) contributing more than 50 percent of all funding to education from GPE donors in 2017. More than half (11 out of 21)[27] of GPE donors decreased their ODA to education compared with 2014, though two of them (Denmark and Ireland) increased it compared with 2016. Increased and targeted advocacy efforts to further boost the momentum toward education in the global community are needed (Appendix P).

25. Nontraditional donors comprise novel types of donors, which include bilateral donors who are not members of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), the private sector, private foundations, and high net worth individuals and first-time traditional donors defined as DAC donors that have not donated to GPE as of the base year of 2012. See the GPE methodology sheet for Indicator 26: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/methodology-sheet-gpe-result-indicator-26.
26. General budget support is not included to compute annual growth rate.
27. Australia, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, the Republic of Korea, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Arab Emirates, and the United Kingdom.

FIGURE 5.14.

MORE GPE DONORS ARE DECREASING EDUCATION ODA.

Proportion of GPE donors increasing or maintaining education ODA



Source
GPE Secretariat.

BOX 5.4.

GPE'S ADVOCACY EFFORTS: INCREASING POLITICAL MOMENTUM FOR EDUCATION

The Global Partnership for Education has worked with partners to galvanize more political and financial support to education globally, regionally and nationally. Through working with governments, civil society and young people, the partnership has mobilized public and political support for building stronger education systems. GPE's financing campaign brought together new and established advocates for education, and their influence has helped to raise education even further up the global political agenda.

These advocacy efforts contributed to gradually increasing global political support to education. In July 2017, the G-20 highlighted the importance of education in the Hamburg Leaders' Declaration.[a] In September 2017, Secretary-General António Guterres prioritized education and called on world leaders to do the same at his first UN General Assembly.[b] In January 2018, at the African Union Summit, education financing was a focus of leaders' attention for the first time.[c] In February 2018, at the GPE Financing Conference in Dakar, Senegal, heads of government and ministers made momentous pledges to fund education. In June 2018, G-7 leaders made historic commitments to girls' education in crisis through the Charlevoix Declaration.[d]

a. G20, "Leaders' Declaration: Shaping an Interconnected World."
b. UNICEF, "World Leaders Commit to Tackling Global Education Crisis that Is Holding Back Millions of Children and Threatening Progress and Stability."
c. GPE, "Financing Africa's Future: Unlocking Development Potentials through Education."
d. The Charlevoix G7 Summit Communique, https://g7.gc.ca/en/official-documents/charlevoix-g7-summit-communique/.

5.5. A stronger partnership Indicators 33-37

In fiscal year 2018, the partnership strengthened its role in knowledge production and education advocacy and increased its organizational efficiency and effectiveness. All the indicators under Strategic Objective 5 on stronger partnership met the milestone in fiscal year 2018.[28]

GPE is increasing its effort in developing the evidence base to improve DCPs' education systems and advocating for a strengthened global commitment for education. Indicator 33 on the cumulative number of knowledge products developed and disseminated, by the Secretariat, in collaboration with partners or with GPE funding, has already exceeded the target for 2020, totaling 69 products by the end of fiscal year 2018.[29] Notably, GPE funds supported the development of nine knowledge products on school health, providing global education and health community with practical resources to improve their interventions in this area. Indicator 34 on the cumulative number of advocacy events exceeded the milestone for 2018 and 2019 as well. The partnership conducted 31 education events in fiscal year 2018, almost tripling its volume from the last fiscal year. These advocacy efforts contributed to increased global political momentum for education (Box 5.4).

GPE is also strengthening fiduciary oversight and country support. In fiscal year 2018, 22 significant issues were identified through audit reviews and were addressed satisfactorily, keeping the indicator value at 100 percent for Indicator 35. Indicator 36 on the proportion of Secretariat staff time spent on country-facing functions met the milestone for fiscal year 2018, too, increasing its share from 28 percent at baseline (fiscal year 2015) to 44.3 percent. To strengthen mutual accountability and to improve the work of the partnership, GPE is actively engaged in monitoring and evaluation in line with the monitoring and evaluation strategy adopted in 2015. It delivered all planned evaluation reports in fiscal year 2018,[30] meeting the fiscal year 2018 milestone for Indicator 37 (proportion of results and evaluation reports published against set targets).

TOWARD MORE AND BETTER SUPPORT TO EDUCATION SYSTEMS

In 2018, donors contributed US$638 million to GPE—the highest level of contribution since its inception—as a result of the success of the GPE Financing Conference held in Dakar in February 2018. However, the broader status of ODA for education is mixed with the continuous decrease of its share in overall ODA despite an increase of the dollar amount dedicated to education. More than half of GPE donors decreased their ODA to education from 2014 to 2017, highlighting the need of all donors in the partnership to join in reaffirming their commitment to robust financing of the education sector as a key investment.

GPE cumulative support to education in developing countries passed the US$5 billion mark in 2018. This support continues to have a strong equity lens, with more than half of the funding dedicated to FCACs and 59 percent to low-income countries. The overall implementation of the grants appears satisfactory, with almost 90 percent on track.

The main challenge for GPE in terms of implementation is aid effectiveness. The majority of GPE implementation grants, like those of many other development actors, continue to use stand-alone aid implementation mechanisms that are weakly aligned with national systems and contribute to fragmented education plan implementation process. More aligned and harmonized modalities would significantly increase GPE's ability to contribute to successful education sector plan implementation and system strengthening. This evolution could also help to channel more funding in support of education plan implementation. With 37 countries and states slated to apply for new funding between April 2019 and August 2020, and an additional four to be determined, GPE has an unprecedented window of opportunity to move toward more and better financing for education systems in DCPs.

28. However, data collection for Indicator 32 (proportion of DCPs and other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities in DCP processes) was postponed this year because of the ongoing follow-up process of Effective Partnership Review. The indicator value may be gauged more accurately when the follow-up process is fully conducted.
29. GPE supported development of 36 knowledge products, including 25 technical reports, six guidelines, two working papers, one policy brief, one video interview and one infographic.
30. The *GPE Results Report 2018* is available at: https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/results-report-2018. Country-level evaluation reports are available at: https://www.globalpartnership.org/data-and-results/country-level-evaluation.

References

Aboud, F. E., and A. K. Yousafzai. "Global Health and Development in Early Childhood." *Annual Review of Psychology 66* (2015): 433-57.

Alderman, H., ed. *No Small Matter: The Impact of Poverty, Shocks, and Human Capital Investments in Early Childhood Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2011.

Bashir, S., M. Lockheed, E. Ninan, and J.-P. Tan. *Facing Forward: Schooling for Learning in Africa*. Africa Development Forum series. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2019.

Béteille, T., and D. K. Evans. *Successful Teachers, Successful Students: Recruiting and Supporting Society's Most Crucial Profession*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2019.

Crouch, L., and M. Gustaffson. "Worldwide Inequality and Poverty in Cognitive Results: Cross-sectional Evidence and Time-based Trends." Working paper 18/019, RISE (Research on Improving Systems of Education), Oxford, United Kingdom, 2018. https://www.riseprogramme.org/publications/rise-working-paper-18019-worldwide-inequality-and-poverty-cognitive-results-cross.

Crouch, L., and C. Rolleston. "Raising the Floor on Learning Levels: Equitable Improvement Starts with the Tail." Insights note, RISE (Research on Improving Systems of Education), Oxford, United Kingdom, 2017. https://www.riseprogramme.org/publications/raising-floor-learning-levels-equitable-improvement-starts-tail.

Daelmans, B., G. L. Darmstadt, J. Lombardi, M. M. Black, P. R. Britto, S. Lye, T. Dua, Z. A. Bhutta, and L. M. Richter. "Early Childhood Development: The Foundation of Sustainable Development." The Lancet 389, no. 10064 (2017): 9-11.

Dang, H.-A., L. Sarr, and N. Asadullah. "School Access, Resources, and Learning Outcomes: Evidence from a Non-formal School Program in Bangladesh." Discussion paper 5659, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn, Germany, 2011.

Education Commission. *The Learning Generation: Investing in Education for a Changing World*. New York: International Commission on Financing Global Education Opportunity, 2016. http://report.educationcommission.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/Learning_Generation_Exec_Summary.pdf.

Fehrler, S., K. Michaelowa, and A. Wechtler. "The Effectiveness of Inputs in Primary Education: Insights from Recent Student Surveys for Sub-Saharan Africa." *Journal of Development Studies 45, no. 9* (2009): 1545-78.

Fite, G. "Reading and Math: What Is the Connection? A Short Review of the Literature." *Kansas Science Teacher 14* (2002): 7-11.

G-20. "Leaders' Declaration: Shaping an Interconnected World." G-20 Germany 2017, Hamburg, July 7-8, 2017. https://www.g20germany.de/Content/EN/_Anlagen/G20/G20-leaders-declaration_nn=2186554.html.

GCE (Global Campaign for Education). *A View from the Civil Society Education Fund's Engagement in Local Education Sector Planning Groups*. Washington, DC: Global Campaign for Education, 2018. https://www.campaignforeducation.org/en/2018/01/19/civil-society-education-fund/.

Gertler, P., J. Heckman, R. Pinto, A. Zanolini, C. Vermeersch, S. Walker, S. M. Chang, and S. Grantham-McGregor. "Labor Market Returns to an Early Childhood Stimulation Intervention in Jamaica." Science 344, no. 6187 (2014): 998-1001.

Glewwe, P., and H. G. Jacoby. "An Economic Analysis of Delayed Primary School Enrollment in a Low-Income Country: The Role of Early Childhood Nutrition." *Review of Economics and Statistics 1*, no. 77 (1995): 156-69.

GPE-IIEP (Global Partnership for Education and International Institute for Educational Planning). *Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Preparation*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, and Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, 2015. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-education-sector-plan-preparation.

———. *Guidelines for Transitional Education Plan Preparation*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, and Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, 2016. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-transitional-education-plan-preparation.

GPE (Global Partnership for Education). "Disability and Inclusive Education: A Stocktake of Education Sector Plans and GPE-Funded Grants." Working paper 3, Global Partnership for Education, Washington, DC, 2018.

———. "Eligibility, Allocation, and Proportionality: Recommendations from the Strategic Financing Working Group." Board paper BOD/2017/03 DOC 04, Meeting of the Board of Directors, March 1, 2017, Washington, DC. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/eligibility-allocation-and-proportionality-recommendations-strategic-financing-working-group.

———. "Financing Africa's Future: Unlocking Development Potentials through Education." Press release, January 27, 2018. https://www.globalpartnership.org/news-and-media/news/financing-africas-future-unlocking-development-potentials-through-education.

———. *Gender Equality Strategy 2016-2020*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2016. http://www.globalpartnership.org/sites/default/files/2016-06-gpe-gender-equality-policy-strategy.pdf.

———. *GPE Funding Model: A Results-Based Approach for the Education Sector*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2015. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-funding-model.

———. *Guidance Note on GPE Variable Part Financing*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2019. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidance-note-gpe-variable-part-financing.

———. *Guidelines for Accelerated Support in Emergency and Early Recovery Situations*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2015. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-accelerated-support-emergency-and-early-recovery-situations.

———. *Joint Sector Reviews in the Education Sector: A Practical Guide for Organizing Effective JSRs*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2018. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/practical-guide-effective-joint-sector-reviews-education-sector.

———. "Operating Principles in Complex Emergencies: Report from the Grants and Performance Committee." Board paper BOD/2018/12 DOC 05, Meeting of the Board of Directors, December 6-7, 2018, Dublin, Ireland. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/operating-principles-complex-emergencies-report-gpc-december-2018.

———. *Portfolio Review 2018*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2018. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/2018-annual-portfolio-review.

———. "Report of the Country Grants and Performance Committee Part 1: Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the Funding Model of the Global Partnership for Education and Results-Based Financing Pilot." Board paper BOD/2014/05 DOC 03, Meeting of the Board of Directors, May 28, 2014, Washington, DC. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/operational-framework-requirements-and-incentives-funding-model.

———. *Results Report 2018*. Washington, DC: Global Partnership for Education, 2018. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/results-report-2018.

———. "Uganda: A New Education Response Plan to Ensure Quality Education for Refugees." GPE Media Coverage, News & Media, Global Partnership for Education, September 17, 2018. https://www.globalpartnership.org/news-and-media/news/uganda-new-education-response-plan-ensure-quality-education-refugees.

IIEP–Pôle de Dakar (International Institute for Educational Planning–International Institute for Educational Planning–Pôle de Dakar). "Teacher Allocation and Utilization in Africa." Working paper, Pôle de Dakar, Dakar, 2016. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000259340.

IIEP-UNESCO (International Institute for Educational Planning–UNESCO). "Technical Round Table: Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities." *Latest News* (blog), June 18, 2018. http://www.iiep.unesco.org/en/technical-round-table-inclusive-education-children-disabilities-4523.

———. *Universal Primary Education in Africa: The Teacher Challenge*. Dakar: UNESCO-BREDA, 2009.

Ilie, S., and P. Rose. "Is Equal Access to Higher Education in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa Achievable by 2030?" *Higher Education* 72, no. 4 (2016): 435-55.

Kenya, Ministry of Education. "Kenya Education Sector Analysis." Nairobi, 2018.

Korpershoek, H., H. Kuyper, and G. van der Werf. "The Relation between Students' Math and Reading Ability and Their Mathematics, Physics, and Chemistry Examination Grades in Secondary Education." *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education 13*, no. 5 (2015): 1013-37.

Liberia, Ministry of Education. "Liberia Education Sector Analysis." Monrovia, 2017.

Male, C., and Q. Wodon. "Disability Gaps in Educational Attainment and Literacy." *The Price of Exclusion: Disability and Education series*. Global Partnership for Education, Washington, DC, 2017. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/disability-gaps-educational-attainment-and-literacy.

Martin, M. O., P. Foy, I. V. Mullis, and L. M. O'Dwyer. "Effective Schools in Reading, Mathematics, and Science at the Fourth Grade." *In TIMSS and PIRLS 2011 Relationships Report*, edited by M. O. Martin and I. V. Mullis, 109-78. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College, 2013.

Miningou, E. W., J.-M. Bernard, and M. Pierre-Louis. "Improving Learning Outcomes in Francophone Africa: More Resources or Improved Efficiency?" Working paper 19-01, Groupe de Recherche en Économie et Développement International, Université de Sherbrooke, Quebec, Canada, 2019.

Mizunoya, S., S. Mitra, and I. Yamasaki. "Towards Inclusive Education: The Impact of Disability on School Attendance in Developing Countries." Working paper 2016-03, Office of Research–Innocenti, UNICEF, Florence, 2016.

Mulkeen, A. "Teachers for Rural Schools: A Challenge for Africa." Paper presented at the Association for the Development of Education in Africa's Biennale on Education in Africa, Libreville, Gabon, March 27-31, 2006.

Mulkeen, A. *Teachers in Anglophone Africa: Issues in Teacher Supply, Training, and Management*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2010.

NORRAG (Network for International Policies and Cooperation in Education and Training) and Global Partnership for Education. "Teacher Allocation in Key National Policy Documents of GPE DCPs." NORRAG-GPE working paper (forthcoming).

Pritchett, L., and D. Filmer. "What Education Production Functions Really Show: A Positive Theory of Education Expenditures." *Economics of Education Review 18*, no. 2 (April 1999): 223-39.

Psaki, S. R., K. J. McCarthy, and B. S. Mensch. "Measuring Gender Equality in Education: Lessons from Trends in 43 Countries." *Population and Development Review 44*, no. 1 (March 2018): 117-42.

Rao, R., J. Sun, J. M. S. Wong, B. S. Weekes, P. Ip, S. Shaeffer, M. Young, M. Bray, E. Chen, and D. Lee. *Early Childhood Development and Cognitive Development in Developing Countries: A Rigorous Literature Review*. London: Department for International Development, 2014.

Senegal. "Document de presentation du programme d'appui au développement de l'éducation au Sénégal: PADES 2019–2023." Dakar, 2018.

Snilstveit, B., J. Stevenson, D. Phillips, M. Vojtkova, E. Gallagher, T. Schmidt, H. Jobse, M. Geelen, M. G. Pastorello, and J. Eyers. *Interventions for Improving Learning Outcomes and Access to Education in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review*. 3ie Systematic Review 24. London: International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie), 2015.

Somalia-Puntland, Ministry of Education and Higher Education. "Global Partnership for Education Programme Document, 2017-2020." Garoowe, 2017.

Somalia-Somaliland, Ministry of Education and Science. "Global Partnership for Education Program 2018-2021." Hargeisa, 2017.

UIS (UNESCO Institute for Statistics). *More Than One-Half of Children and Adolescents Are Not Learning Worldwide*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2017. http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/fs46-more-than-half-children-not-learning-en-2017.pdf.

———. *SDG 4 Data Digest 2018: Data to Nurture Learning*. New York: UNESCO, 2018. http://uis.unesco.org/en/news/launch-sdg-4-data-digest-data-nurture-learning.

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization). *Gender Review: Creating Sustainable Futures for All*. Global Education Monitoring Report, 2016. Paris: UNESCO, 2016.

———. *Teaching and Learning: Achieving Quality for All*. EFA Global Monitoring Report, 2013-2014. Paris: UNESCO, 2014.

UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund). *A World Ready to Learn: Prioritizing Quality Early Childhood Education*. New York: UNICEF, 2019. https://www.unicef.org/reports/a-world-ready-to-learn-2019.

———. *The Investment Case for Education and Equity*. Paris: UNICEF, 2015.

———. "World Leaders Commit to Tackling Global Education Crisis That Is Holding Back Millions of Children and Threatening Progress and Stability." Press release, September 20, 2017. https://www.unicef.org/press-releases/world-leaders-commit-tackling-global-education-crisis-holding-back-millions-children.

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. *World Population Prospects: The 2017 Revision*. DVD Edition. New York: United Nations, 2017.

———. "World Population Prospects: The 2017 Revision, Methodology of the United Nations Population Estimates and Projections." Working paper ESA/P/WP.250, United Nations, New York, 2017. https://population.un.org/wpp/Publications/Files/WPP2017_Methodology.pdf.

Universalia. *Evaluation of the GPE's Support to Sector Plan Development*. Quebec: Universalia, 2019.

———. *GPE Country-level Evaluations – Synthesis Report: Financial Year 2018*. Quebec: Universalia, 2019. https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/synthesis-report-gpe-country-level-evaluations-february-2019.

Wagner, D. A., S. Wolf, and R. F. Boruch, eds. *Learning at the Bottom of the Pyramid*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, 2018. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265581.

World Bank. "Implementation Completion and Results Report TF–12500 on a Grant in the Amount of US$41.4 Million to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire for an Emergency Basic Education Support Project - GPEF Grant (P119328)." World Bank, Washington, DC, 2018.

———. "Implementation Status and Results Report Sao Tome and Principe – Quality Education for All Project (P146877), June 2017, Seq No: 7, ISR28123." World Bank, Washington, DC, 2017.

———. "Implementation Status and Results Report Sao Tome and Principe – Quality Education for All Project (P146877), December 2018, Seq No: 10, ISR35510." World Bank, Washington, DC, 2018.

———. "Project Appraisal Document on a Proposed Grant in the Amount of SDR 0.6 Million (US$0.9 Million Equivalent) and a Global Partnership for Education Trust Fund Grant in the Amount of US$1.1 Million to the Democratic Republic of São Tomé and Príncipe for the Quality Education for All Project (Phase II) November 25, 2013." World Bank, Washington, DC, 2013.

———. *World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realize Education's Promise*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2018.

———. *World Development Report 2019: The Changing Nature of Work*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2019.

Appendices

Appendix A

GPE RESULTS REPORT INDICATORS

IMPACT

Strategic Goal 1: Improved and more equitable student learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
1. Proportion of developing country partners (DCPs) showing improvement on learning outcomes (basic education)	UNICEF, others[1]	Every other year	Overall:[2]	65%	n/a[3]	n/a	68% **n/a**[4]	n/a	70%
			FCAC:[5]	50%	n/a	n/a	65% **n/a**	n/a	75%
			Baseline time frame = CY2000-2015 N = 20 DCPs (4 FCACs) with assessment data available						
2. Percentage of children under five (5) years of age who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning, and psychosocial well-being[6]	UNICEF	Every other year	Overall:	66%	n/a	n/a	70% **n/a**	n/a	74%
			FCAC:	62%	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	-
			Female:	68%	n/a	n/a	71% **n/a**	n/a	75%
			Baseline timeframe = CY2011-2014 N = 22 DCPs						

Strategic Goal 2: Increased equity, gender equality and inclusion for all in a full cycle of quality education, targeting the poorest and most marginalized, including by gender, disability, ethnicity and conflict or fragility

3. Cumulative number of equivalent children supported for a year of basic education (primary and lower secondary) by GPE	UIS and GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	7.2 million	11.3 million **13.2 million**	17.3 million **18.5 million**	22.3 million **22.2 million**	n/a	n/a
			FCAC:	5.6 million	7.2 million **10.4 million**	9.5 million **14 million**	11.4 million **16.6 million**	n/a	n/a
			Female:	3.4 million	5.4 million **6.3 million**	8.3 million **8.8 million**	10.7 million **10.6 million**	n/a	n/a
			Baseline time frame = CY2015 N = 49 DCPs (24 FCACs)						

1. Including international, regional and national assessments.
2. Throughout this table, the "Overall" fields display data for all developing country partners for which data are available.
3. Throughout this table, "n/a" stands for "not applicable."
4. Throughout this table, values in bold represent actual values.
5. Country affected by fragility and conflict.
6. "Children under five years of age" refers to children between 36 and 59 months of age.

Strategic Goal 2: Increased equity, gender equality and inclusion for all in a full cycle of quality education, targeting the poorest and most marginalized, including by gender, disability, ethnicity and conflict or fragility

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
4. Proportion of children who complete: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	UIS	Yearly (two-year time lag)	**(a) Primary education**						
			Overall:	72.5%	73.7% **73.2%**	74.8% **76.1%**	76.0% **76.7%**	77.1%	78.3%
			FCAC:	68.1%	69.3% **68.5%**	70.6% **68.3%**	71.9% **69.8%**	73.3%	74.6%
			Female:	70.1%	71.1% **70.8%**	72.3% **73.9%**	73.5% **74.5%**	74.7%	75.9%
			(b) Lower secondary education						
			Overall:	47.9%	48.6% **49.5%**	49.5% **50.2%**	50.3% **51.6%**	51.2%	52.1%
			FCAC:	41.1%	41.9% **42.7%**	42.7% **42.8%**	43.6% **45.5%**	44.5%	45.4%
			Female:	45.7%	46.9% **47.0%**	48.1% **47.9%**	49.3% **49.6%**	50.6%	51.8%
			Baseline time frame = CY2013 N = 61 DCPs (28 FCACs)						
5. Proportion of GPE DCPs within set thresholds for gender parity index of completion rates for: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	UIS	Yearly (two-year time lag)	**(a) Primary education**						
			Overall:	62%	64% **64%**	65% **66%**	66% **67%**	68%	69%
			FCAC:	54%	54% **57%**	55% **57%**	57% **57%**	59%	61%
			(b) Lower secondary education						
			Overall:	49%	52% **54%**	56% **51%**	59% **54%**	62%	66%
			FCAC:	36%	32% **34%**	38% **39%**	43% **43%**	48%	54%
			Baseline time frame = CY2013 N = 61 DCPs (28 FCACs)						
6. Pre-primary gross enrollment ratio	UIS	Yearly (two-year time lag)	Overall:	28.2%	29.0% **28.1%**	29.8% **37.2%**	30.6% **37.9%**	31.4%	32.2%
			FCAC:	22.6%	23.3% **22.1%**	24.0% **35.5%**	24.6% **35.1%**	25.3%	26.0%
			Female:	27.5%	28.3% **27.5%**	29.1% **36.7%**	29.9% **37.3%**	30.8%	31.6%
			Baseline time frame = CY2013 N = 61 DCPs (28 FCACs)						

Strategic Goal 2: Increased equity, gender equality and inclusion for all in a full cycle of quality education, targeting the poorest and most marginalized, including by gender, disability, ethnicity and conflict or fragility

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
7. Out-of-school rate for: (a) children of primary school age; (b) children of lower secondary school age	UIS	Yearly [two-year time lag]	**(a) Primary education**						
			Overall:	20.3%	19.6% **19.8%**	19.0% **19.4%**	18.3% **19.4%**	17.7%	17.0%
			FCAC:	25.8%	25.0% **25.0%**	24.2% **25.9%**	23.4% **23.7%**	22.5%	21.7%
			Female:	22.7%	21.9% **22.3%**	21.1% **22.0%**	20.2% **21.7%**	19.4%	18.6%
			(b) Lower secondary education						
			Overall:	33.4%	32.7% **32.4%**	32.0% **32.9%**	31.3% **31.8%**	30.6%	29.9%
			FCAC:	38.4%	37.2% **36.6%**	36.0% **40.8%**	34.8% **37.6%**	33.6%	32.4%
			Female:	35.3%	34.3% **34.2%**	33.3% **34.1%**	32.2% **33.9%**	31.2%	30.2%
			Baseline time frame = CY2013 N = 61 DCPs (28 FCACs)						
8. Gender parity index of out-of-school rate for: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	UIS	Yearly [two-year time lag]	**(a) Primary education**						
			Overall:	1.27	1.26 **1.28**	1.25 **1.30**	1.24 **1.27**	1.23	1.22
			FCAC:	1.34	1.33 **1.37**	1.32 **1.40**	1.31 **1.40**	1.30	1.29
			(b) Lower secondary education						
			Overall:	1.12	1.10 **1.11**	1.09 **1.08**	1.07 **1.14**	1.05	1.04
			FCAC:	1.19	1.17 **1.19**	1.15 **1.14**	1.14 **1.16**	1.12	1.10
			Baseline time frame = CY2013 N = 61 DCPs (28 FCACs)						
9. Equity index	UNICEF	Yearly	Overall:	32%	24% **37%**	36% **42%**	38% **46%**	40%	42%
			FCAC:	33%	15% **37%**	37% **41%**	39% **48%**	41%	43%
			Baseline time frame = CY2010-2014 N = 59 DCPs (27 FCACs)						

OUTCOME

Strategic Goal 3: Effective and efficient education systems delivering equitable, quality educational services for all

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
10. Proportion of DCPs that have (a) increased their public expenditure on education; or (b) maintained sector spending at 20% or above	DCPs / GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	78% (a - 24%; b - 53%)	76% **79%**	83% **65%**	85%	88%	90%
			FCAC:	77% (a - 32%; b - 45%)	74% **63%**	81% **53%**	82%	84%	86%
			Baseline time frame = CY2015 N = 49 DCPs (22 FCACs)						
11. Equitable allocation of teachers, as measured by the relationship (R^2) between the number of teachers and the number of pupils per school in each DCP	DCPs / GPE Secretariat	Every other year	Overall:	29%	n/a	n/a	38% **n/a**	n/a	48%
			FCAC:	18%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Baseline time frame = CY2010-2014 N = 21 DCPs (11 FCACs)						
12. Proportion of DCPs with pupil-trained teacher ratio below threshold (<40) at the primary level	UIS	Yearly (two-year time lag)	Overall:	25%	27% **29%**	29% **24%**	31% **30%**	33%	35%
			FCAC:	13%	13% **13%**	17% **15%**	17% **12%**	21%	21%
			Baseline time frame = CY2013 N = 55 DCPs (24 FCACs)						
13. Repetition and dropout impact on efficiency, as measured by the internal efficiency coefficient at the primary level in each DCP	DCPs / GPE Secretariat	Every two years	Overall:	26%	n/a	n/a	32% **n/a**	n/a	42%
			FCAC:	17%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25%
			Baseline time frame = CY2010-2014 N = 19 DCPs (12 FCACs)						
14. Proportion of DCPs reporting at least 10 of 12 key international education indicators to UIS (including key outcomes, service delivery and financing indicators as identified by GPE)	UIS	Yearly (two-year time lag)	Overall:	30%	30% **43%**	38% **30%**	43% **34%**	54%	66%
			FCAC:	32%	32% **39%**	39% **21%**	43% **32%**	46%	54%
			Baseline time frame = CY2012-2013 N = 61 DCPs (28 FCACs)						
15. Proportion of DCPs with a learning assessment system within the basic education cycle that meets quality standards	UIS, UNESCO, World Bank, DCPs	Every other year	Overall:	32%	n/a	n/a	38% **48%**	n/a	47%
			FCAC:	21%	n/a	n/a	29% **36%**	n/a	36%
			Baseline time frame = CY2011-2015 N = 60 DCPs (28 FCACs)						

COUNTRY-LEVEL

Strategic Objective 1: Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
(a): Support evidence-based, nationally owned sector plans focused on equity, efficiency and learning									
16a. Proportion of endorsed (a) education sector plans (ESP) or (b) transitional education plans (TEP) meeting quality standards	GPE Secretariat	Every two years	Overall:	58% of ESPs/ TEPs met at least the minimum number of quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **100%**	n/a	100%
			ESPs:	56% of ESPs met at least 5 quality standards out of 7	n/a	n/a	95% **100%**	n/a	100%
			TEPs:	67% of TEPs met at least 3 quality standards out of 5	n/a	n/a	95% **100%**	n/a	100%
			Baseline time frame = CY2014-2015 N = 19 sector plans (16 ESPs and 3 TEPs)						
16b. Proportion of ESPs/TEPs that have a teaching and learning strategy meeting quality standards	GPE Secretariat	Every two years	Overall:	58% of ESPs/ TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **84%**	n/a	100%
			ESPs:	50% of ESPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **82%**	n/a	100%
			TEPs:	100% of TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **100%**	n/a	100%
			Baseline time frame = CY2014-2015 N = 19 sector plans (16 ESPs and 3 TEPs)						
16c. Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to respond to marginalized groups that meets quality standards (including gender, disability and other context-relevant dimensions)	GPE Secretariat	Every two years	Overall:	68% of ESPs/ TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **97%**	n/a	100%
			ESPs:	63% of ESPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **100%**	n/a	100%
			TEPs:	100% of TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **75%**	n/a	100%
			Baseline time frame = CY2014-2015 N = 19 sector plans (16 ESPs and 3 TEPs)						
16d. Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to improve efficiency that meets quality standards	GPE Secretariat	Every two years	Overall:	53% of ESPs/ TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **94%**	n/a	100%
			ESPs:	50% of ESPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **93%**	n/a	100%
			TEPs:	67% of TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95% **100%**	n/a	100%
			Baseline time frame = CY2014-2015 N = 19 sector plans (16 ESPs and 3 TEPs)						
(b): Enhance sector plan implementation through knowledge and good practice exchange, capacity development and improved monitoring and evaluation, particularly in the areas of teaching and learning and equity and inclusion									
17. Proportion of DCPs or states with a data strategy that meets quality standards	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	n/a		100% **100%**	100% **n/a**	100% **100%**	100%	100%
			Baseline time frame = FY2015 N = 1 ESPIG application identified with data gaps to inform key indicators.						

Strategic Objective 2: Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
(a): Promote inclusive and evidence-based sector policy dialogue and sector monitoring, through government-led local education groups and the joint sector review process, with participation from civil society, teacher organizations, the private sector and all development partners									
18. Proportion of joint sector reviews (JSRs) meeting quality standards	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	29% of JSRs met at least 3 quality standards out a total of 5	41% **45%**	53% **32%**	66% **27%**	78%	90%
			FCAC:	25% of JSRs met at least 3 quality standards out of a total of 5	38% **36%**	51% **18%**	64% **38%**	77%	90%
			Baseline time frame = CY2015 N = 35 JSRs (20 in FCACs)						
(b): Strengthen the capacity of civil society and teacher organizations to engage in evidence-based policy dialogue and sector monitoring on equity and learning, leveraging social accountability to enhance the delivery of results									
19. Proportion of LEGs with (a) civil society and (b) teacher representation	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	44% (a – 77%; b – 48%)	n/a	48% **53%**	52% **59% (a. 89%; b. 59%)**	55%	59%
			FCAC:	55% (a – 77%; b – 58%)	n/a	59% **61%**	63% **65% (a. 91%; b. 65%)**	66%	70%
			Baseline time frame = FY2016 N = 61 LEGs (28 in FCACs)						
Strategic Objective 3: GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning									
(a): GPE financing is used to improve national monitoring of outcomes, including learning									
20. Proportion of grants supporting EMIS/learning assessment systems	GPE Secretariat, grant agents	Yearly	Overall:	38%	n/a **46%**	n/a **92%**	50% **94%**	n/a	60%
			FCAC:	34%	n/a **38%**	n/a **96%**	43% **100%**	n/a	51%
			Baseline time frame = FY2015 N = 53 active ESPIGs at the end of FY2015 (29 in FCACs)						
(b): GPE financing is used to improve teaching and learning in national education systems									
21. Proportion of textbooks purchased and distributed through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants	GPE Secretariat, grant agents	Yearly	Overall:	74%	n/a	78% **114%**	82% **91%**	86%	90%
			FCAC:	71%	n/a	76% **118%**	81% **106%**	85%	90%
			Baseline time frame = FY2016 N=13 ESPIGs (9 in FCACs)						
22. Proportion of teachers trained through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants	GPE Secretariat, grant agents	Yearly	Overall:	86%	n/a	87% **98%**	88% **90%**	89%	90%
			FCAC:	83%	n/a	85% **90%**	87% **91%**	88%	90%
			Baseline time frame = FY2016 N=30 ESPIGs (17 in FCACs)						

Strategic Objective 3: GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
(c): GPE financing is used to improve equity and access in national education systems									
23. Proportion of classrooms built or rehabilitated through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants	GPE Secretariat, grant agents	Yearly	Overall:	65%	n/a	69% 76%	73% 89%	76%	80%
			FCAC:	71%	n/a	73% 71%	76% 85%	78%	80%
			Baseline timeframe = FY2016 N=25 ESPIGs (17 in FCACs)						
(d): The GPE funding model is implemented effectively, leading to the achievement of country- selected targets for equity, efficiency, and learning									
24. Proportion of GPE program grant applications approved from 2015 onward: (a) identifying targets in funding model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning; (b) achieving targets in funding model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	(a) n/a (b) n/a[7]	(a) 95% (b) 90% **(a) 100% (b) 100%**	(a) 95% (b) 90% **(a) 100% (b) 100%**	(a) 95% (b) 90% **(a) 100% (b) 100%**	(a) 95% (b) 90%	(a) 95% (b) 90%
			FCAC:	(a) n/a (b) n/a	(a) 90% (b) 90% **(a) 100% (b) n/a**	(a) 90% (b) 90% **(a) 100% (b) n/a**	(a) 90% (b) 90% **(a) 100% (b) 100%**	(a) 90% (b) 90%	(a) 90% (b) 90%
			Baseline time frame = FY2015 N = (a) 3 ESPIG applications; (b) 0 active ESPIGs with such performance indicators due for assessment in FY2015						
(e): GPE financing is assessed based on whether implementation is on track									
25. Proportion of GPE program grants assessed as on-track with implementation	GPE Secretariat, grant agents	Yearly	Overall:	80%	n/a	82% **79%**	83% **89%%**	84%	85%
			FCAC:	77%	n/a	79% **85%**	80% **94%**	82%	83%
			Baseline time frame = FY2016 N = 54 active ESPIGs at the end of FY2016 (29 in FCACs)						

7. Performance data are not available for fiscal year 2015, as there are no ESPIG applications that identified equity, efficiency and learning indicators that are up for assessment of target attainment in FY2015.

GLOBAL-LEVEL

Strategic Objective 4: Mobilize more and better financing

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline	Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
(a): Encourage increased, sustainable and better coordinated international financing for education by diversifying and increasing GPE's international donor base and sources of financing								
26. Funding to GPE from non-traditional donors (private sector and those who are first-time donors to GPE)	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	US$5.0 million Baseline time frame = FY2015	6.4 million USD **6.4 million USD**	8.5 million USD **10 million USD**	11.3 million USD **11.4 million USD**	n/a	n/a
27. Percentage of donor pledges fulfilled	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	100% of pledges fulfilled Baseline time frame = FY2015	100% **100%**	100% **100%**	100% **100%**	100%	100%
28. Proportion of GPE donors that have (a) increased their funding for education; or (b) maintained their funding	OECD/DAC	Yearly	48% (a – 38%; b – 10%) Baseline time frame = CY2010-2014 N = 21 donors	n/a	50% **62%**	52% **48%**	54%	56%
(b): Advocate for improved alignment and harmonization of funding from the partnership and its international partners around nationally owned education sector plans and country systems								
29. Proportion of GPE grants aligned to national systems	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall: 34% of ESPIGs meet at least 7 elements of alignment out of a total of 10 FCAC: 27% of ESPIGs meet at least 7 elements of alignment out of a total of 10 Baseline time frame = FY2015 N = 68 active ESPIGs at any point during FY2015 (37 in FCACs)	Overall: 37% **31%** FCAC: 29% **26%**	Overall: 41% **28%** FCAC: 31% **24%**	Overall: 44% **36%** FCAC: 34% **24%**	47% 37%	51% 38%
30. Proportion of GPE grants using (a) cofinanced project or (b) sector-pooled funding mechanisms	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall: 40% of ESPIGs are co-financed or sector pooled (a – 26%; b – 13%) FCAC: 32% of ESPIGs in FCAC are cofinanced or sector-pooled (a – 22%; b – 11%) Baseline time frame = FY2015 N = 68 active ESPIGs at any point during FY2015 (37 in FCACs)	Overall: 34% **39%** FCAC: 35% **35%**	Overall: 48% **37%** FCAC: 38% **31%**	Overall: 52% **34%** FCAC: 40% **27%**	56% 44%	60% 45%
(c): Support increased, efficient, and equitable domestic financing for education through cross-national advocacy, mutual accountability, and support for transparent monitoring and reporting								
31. Proportion of country missions addressing domestic financing issues	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall: 47% FCAC: 62% Baseline time frame = FY2015 N = 57 missions (34 to FCACs)	Overall: 51% **70%** FCAC: 65% **81%**	Overall: 54% **70%** FCAC: 65% **76%**	Overall: 58% **83%** FCAC: 65% **86%**	61% 65%	65% 65%

Strategic Objective 5: Build a stronger partnership

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline	Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
(a): Promote and coordinate consistent country-level roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities among governments, development partners, grant agents, civil society, teacher's organizations, and the private sector through local education groups and a strengthened operational model								
32. Proportion of (a) DCPs and (b) other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities in GPE country processes	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	**All respondents**					
			DCPs: n/a	n/a	65% **65%**	70% **n/a**	75%	80%
			Other partners: n/a	n/a	65% **63%**	70% **n/a**	75%	80%
			Respondents in FCACs					
			DCPs: n/a	n/a	65% **58%**	70% **n/a**	75%	80%
			Other partners: n/a	n/a	65% **55%**	70% **n/a**	75%	80%
			Baseline time frame = FY2016 N = 70 respondents in 28 DCPs (40 in 16 FCACs)					
(b): Use global and cross-national knowledge and good practice exchange effectively to bring about improved education policies and systems, especially in the areas of equity and learning								
33. Number of policy, technical and/or other knowledge products developed and disseminated with funding or support from GPE	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	4	6[8] **13**	21 **36**	37 **69**	50	64
			Baseline time frame = FY2015					
(c): Expand the partnership's convening and advocacy role, working with partners to strengthen global commitment and financing for education								
34. Number of advocacy events undertaken with partners and other external stakeholders to support the achievement of GPE's strategic goals and objectives	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	11	n/a	26 **26**	38 **57**	51	65
			Baseline time frame = FY2016					
(d): Improve GPE's organizational efficiency and effectiveness, creating stronger systems for quality assurance, risk management, country support and fiduciary oversight								
35. Proportion of significant issues identified through audit reviews satisfactorily addressed	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	100%	n/a	100% **100%**	100% **100%**	100%	100%
			Baseline time frame = FY2016 N = 12 audit reports					
36. Proportion of GPE Secretariat staff time spent on country-facing functions	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	28%	32% **42%**	36% **41%**	40% **44%**	45%	50%
			Baseline time frame = FY2015 N = 2,254.74 total workweeks					
(e): Invest in monitoring and evaluation to establish evidence of GPE results, strengthen mutual accountability and improve the work of the partnership								
37. Proportion of results reports and evaluation reports published against set targets	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	100%	n/a	n/a	100% **100%**	100%	100%
			Baseline time frame = FY2015 N = 1 results report and 1 evaluation report					

8. The target for fiscal year 2016 was set by the organization indicators, which, by definition, do not include knowledge products (KPs) developed by partners through GPE funding (GRA KPs).

Appendix B

TECHNICAL NOTES ON INDICATOR DATA

- **1. Baselines:** The year 2015 is the overall baseline year for the results framework, which will report on the achievement of the goals and objectives of GPE's strategic plan GPE 2020, covering the period 2016 to 2020. In some cases, due to data availability, the baseline was set at 2016. Ten indicators had revised baseline values published in the 2015/16 Results Report because of improved availability of data: 1, 9, 10, 20–23, 25, 30 and 37; Indicator 35 was also updated from "in process" to 100%.

- **2. Milestones and targets:** For each indicator, 2020 end targets and milestones in intervening years were developed to assess whether GPE is on track to reach them.

- **3. Periodicity:** In accordance with the nature of the data underpinning each indicator, source data can be based on the calendar year or on the Secretariat's fiscal year (July to June).

- **4. Data sources:** Data sources vary; the results framework uses data from UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS), UNICEF and other partners, in addition to data generated by the Secretariat.

- **5. Units of analysis:** Indicators have different units of analysis—for example, children, developing country partners, grants, donors, technical reports, and so on.

- **6. Sample:** If the unit of analysis is a developing country partner, the sample consists of those countries that were developing country partners at baseline, in 2015 (that is, 61 countries). If the unit of analysis is a grant (Indicators 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29 and 30), all active grants in the reference fiscal year are included in the sample.

- **7. Reporting cycle:** While some indicators are reported on every year, others are reported on only once every other year.

- **8. Tolerance:** In the case of UIS-based, impact-level indicators that are reported in percentages, a 1 percentage point "tolerance" is applied to assessing achievement of milestones and targets (see note 10 below). Therefore, if GPE achievement is within 1 percentage point of its milestone or target, this will be considered to have been met within tolerance.

- **9. Disaggregation:** Depending on the nature of the indicator, different types of disaggregation are applied. Typically, where the unit of analysis is a developing country partner, data are disaggregated by FCAC. Where the unit of analysis is children, data are disaggregated by gender.

- **10. FCACs:** Though GPE revises the list of FCACs every year, the list from 2016 is used for the disaggregation of indicators, as the baseline and milestones and target set for 2020 are based on the FCAC list from 2016. However, the list of FCACs from 2018 is used for the disaggregation of grant-level indicators (Indicators 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29 and 30), to be consistent with other GPE publications (for example, the portfolio review).

- **11. Core indicators:** Within the GPE results framework, a subset of 12 "core indicators" highlights the key results the partnership aims to achieve. These core indicators display a vertical line to the left of the indicator in the results framework data tables presented in Appendix A.

- **12. Achievement:** There are three categories for overall results for each indicator: fully met, met with tolerance, and not met. Indicator milestones are reflected as partially met if milestones for one educational level (for example, primary) were achieved, but they were not for the other educational level (for example, lower secondary). They are reflected as met if the overall milestone is met, even though the milestone for disaggregated group(s) (that is, FCAC and/or gender) is not met.

- **13. Updated data:** New data are available for some results framework indicators. When they are based on internally produced data, the revised numbers for 2016 and 2017 reporting years have been used in the figures and main texts in this report. Indicators 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12 and 14 of the results framework use data sourced from the UIS. As new data become available, imputation methodologies are revised and population data are updated, the UIS revises indicator values. This includes revising data for past years. For instance, the value the UIS reports in 2016 for the primary completion rate in developing country partners in 2015 can differ from the value it reports in 2017, when more reliable data for 2015 become available. However, to avoid frequent revisions in baselines, milestones and targets, GPE will not revise data for any indicators going backward in its results framework (with the exception of the baselines noted in note 1 above), and the originally reported numbers from the UIS have been used in the figures and main text in this report with that exception only.

- **14. Methodological notes:** Methodological notes for each indicator are available on the GPE website at http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/results-framework-methodology.

Appendix C

GPE DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTNERS AS OF MARCH 2019

Low-income countries: Afghanistan; Benin; Burkina Faso; Burundi; Central African Republic; Chad; Comoros; Congo, Dem. Rep.; Eritrea; Ethiopia; The Gambia; Guinea; Guinea-Bissau; Haiti; Liberia; Madagascar; Malawi; Mali; Mozambique; Nepal; Niger; Rwanda; Senegal; Sierra Leone; Somalia; South Sudan; Tanzania; Tajikistan; Togo; Uganda; Yemen; Zimbabwe

Small island and landlocked developing states: Bhutan; Cabo Verde; Dominica; Grenada; Guyana; Lesotho; Sao Tome and Principe; St. Lucia; St. Vincent and the Grenadines

Lower-middle-income countries: Bangladesh; Cambodia; Cameroon; Congo, Rep. of; Cote d'Ivoire; Djibouti; Ghana; Honduras; Kenya; Kyrgyz Republic; Lao PDR; Mauritania; Moldova; Mongolia; Myanmar; Nicaragua; Nigeria; Pakistan; Papua New Guinea; Sudan; Timor-Leste; Uzbekistan; Vietnam; Zambia

Upper-middle-income countries (countries no longer eligible for GPE funding): Albania; Georgia.

Countries eligible to join GPE

Low-income countries: Syria

Small island and landlocked developing states: Eswatini; Kiribati; Maldives; Marshall Islands; FS Micronesia; Samoa; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Tuvalu; Vanuatu

Lower-middle-income countries: Armenia; Bolivia; Egypt, Arab Rep.; El Salvador; Guatemala; India; Indonesia; Morocco; Philippines; Sri Lanka; Tunisia; Ukraine; West Bank and Gaza

FCACs included in the 2016 and 2017 results report samples

A country is included if it is listed in either World Bank's Harmonized List of Fragile Situations or UNESCO's list of conflict-affected countries. The former is the list of IDA-eligible countries with (i) a harmonized CPIA country rating of 3.2 or less, and/or (ii) the presence of UN and/or regional peace-keeping or political/peace-building mission during the last three years (World Bank [2017] Information Note: The World Bank Group's Harmonized List of Fragile Situations, p. 3). The latter is a list of countries with 1,000 or more battle-related deaths (including fatalities among civilians and military actors) over the preceding 10-year period and/or more than 200 battle-related deaths in any one year over the preceding three-year period according to the Uppsala Conflict Data Program Battle- Related Deaths Dataset (UNESCO [2017] Global Education Monitoring Report, p. 427). The list for 2018 is based on World Bank's list for FY2018 and UNESCO's Global Education Monitoring Report 2017. The list for 2016 is based on World Bank's list for FY2016 and UNESCO's Global Education Monitoring Report 2015.

Table C.1.
FY2016 GPE FCAC DCPs

Afghanistan
Burundi
Central African Republic
Chad
Comoros
Cote d'Ivoire
Democratic Republic of Congo
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Guinea-Bissau
Haiti
Liberia
Madagascar
Mali
Nepal
Nigeria
Pakistan
Rwanda
Sierra Leone
Somalia
South Sudan
Sudan
Gambia, The
Timor-Leste
Togo
Uganda
Yemen
Zimbabwe

Note: Out of the 61 DCPs of results framework. Applicable for Indicators 1 through 17 inclusive, and Indicator 31.

Table C.2.
FY2018 GPE FCAC DCPs

Afghanistan
Burundi
Cameroon
Central African Republic
Chad
Comoros
Cote d'Ivoire
Democratic Republic of Congo
Djibouti
Eritrea
Ethiopia
Guinea-Bissau
Haiti
Liberia
Mali
Mozambique
Niger
Nigeria
Pakistan
Papua New Guinea
Republic of Congo
Rwanda
Sierra Leone
Somalia
South Sudan
Sudan
Gambia, The
Togo
Uganda
Yemen
Zimbabwe


Note: Out of the 61 DCPs of results framework. Applicable for Indicators 18 through 25 inclusive, 29 and 30.

Appendix D


MINIMUM PROFICIENCY LEVEL IN READING AND MATHEMATICS AT THE END OF OR DURING PRIMARY EDUCATION: GENDER PARITY INDEXES BY COUNTRY

FIGURE D.1.

A: PROPORTION OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING THE MINIMUM PROFICIENCY LEVEL.
Gender parity index reading



B: PROPORTION OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING THE MINIMUM PROFICIENCY LEVEL.
Gender parity index mathematics



Boys disadvantaged
Girls disadvantaged

Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org. Most recent data points available between 2005 and 2015, grade 6.


Appendix E


MINIMUM PROFICIENCY LEVEL IN READING AT THE END OF PRIMARY EDUCATION

FIGURE E.1.

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING THE MINIMUM PROFICIENCY LEVEL IN READING AT THE END OF PRIMARY EDUCATION.

By socioeconomic status





Light-gray-shaded areas represent proportion of students from the richest 20% households and the poorest 20% households achieving the minimum proficiency level in reading at the end of primary education

Source

GPE compilation based on UIS. Most recent data points available between 2005 and 2015, grade 6.


Note


These represent the 10 countries with the highest levels of inequality in terms of socioeconomic status.

FIGURE E.2.

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS ACHIEVING THE MINIMUM PROFICIENCY LEVEL IN READING AT THE END OF PRIMARY EDUCATION.

By location





Light-gray-shaded areas represent proportion of students in rural and urban areas achieving the minimum proficiency level in reading at the end of primary education

Source

GPE compilation based on UIS. Most recent data points available between 2005 and 2015, grade 6.

Note


These represent the 10 countries with the highest levels of inequality in terms of location.

Appendix F

THE CHALLENGE OF UNDER-PERFORMING SCHOOLS

FIGURE F.1.

PROPORTION OF HIGH AND UNDER-PERFORMING SCHOOLS.
PASEC 2014



- Lowest performing schools (less than 20% of the students achieving minimum proficiency level in math or reading)
- Highest performing schools (more than 80% of the students achieving minimum proficiency level in math or reading)


Source
GPE compilation based on PASEC 2014, grade 6.

Note
PASEC: Programme d'Analyse des Systèmes Éducatifs de la CONFEMEN, a cross-national learning assessment focused on francophone countries.

Appendix G

PROPORTION OF THE OVERALL DISPARITY IN LEARNING OUTCOMES THAT IS EXPLAINED BY DISPARITIES BETWEEN SCHOOLS

FIGURE G.1.



Source
GPE compilation based on PASEC 2014 and SACMEQ 2007, grade 6.

Note
This figure shows the percentage of variance attributable to schools versus students. The variance captures the overall disparity in learning outcomes. A statistical method (ANOVA) is applied to decompose the overall variance into two components: a component associated with differences in students' characteristics and a component associated with differences in the schools. Bernard estimated the intraclass correlation coefficient for five PASEC countries using previous learning assessment data and aggregating the mathematics and reading scores: Burkina Faso (1996), 0.4; Cote d'Ivoire (1996), 0.4; Senegal (1996), 0.2; Chad (2004), 0.5; Cameroon (2005), 0.4, in "La fonction de production éducative revisitée dans le cadre de l'Education Pour Tous en Afrique subsaharienne: des limites théoriques et méthodologiques aux apports à la politique éducative." Overall, it can be stated that Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) stagnated or increased in the five PASEC countries with two data points. In other terms, heterogeneity between schools seems to have stagnated in some countries and increased in other countries.

Appendix H

QUALITY STANDARDS FOR LEARNING ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS

The definition of a learning assessment system that meets quality standards examines large-scale assessments (including national, regional and international assessments as relevant) and public examinations. The construct is based on the World Bank's Systems Approach for Better Education Results (SABER) Student Assessment framework but is further contextualized for the realities of developing country partners (DCPs). The following aspects of these assessments are considered:

- Whether they have been carried out at regular frequency with all eligible students.
- Whether a permanent agency/institution/office is responsible for conducting the assessments.
- Whether the assessments are based on official learning standards or curriculum.
- Whether there are publicly available technical documents on the assessments.
- Whether the results are disseminated within a reasonable time frame.
- Whether assessment data are used to monitor learning outcomes.

Using these criteria to analyze the different assessments in use in DCPs, the indicator assigns a composite index to each country, which allows for classification of the overall system as "established," "under development" or "nascent." An assessment system meets the quality standards when it is classified as "established."

- "Established" countries are those that meet all of the above criteria in relation to both a large-scale assessment (either national or regional/international) and public examination.
- "Under development" countries, on the other hand, meet all of the above criteria in relation to either a large-scale assessment or a public examination, but not both.
- "Nascent" countries meet the criteria neither for a large-scale assessment nor a public examination.

Appendix I

RECENT MOVEMENT OF DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTNERS ACROSS LEARNING ASSESSMENT SYSTEMS CLASSIFICATIONS

Countries that moved from "under development" to "established	Countries that moved from 'nascent' to 'under development'	"Under development" countries that made no progress or that moved from "established" to "under development"	"Nascent" or "no information" countries that made no progress or that moved from "under development" to "nascent"
Cameroon	Afghanistan	Burundi	Central African Republic
Chad	Congo, Dem. Rep.	Ethiopia	Comoros
Guinea ("nascent" to "established")	Guyana	Georgia	Djibouti
Haiti	Madagascar	Lao PDR	Eritrea
Malawi	Sierra Leone	Lesotho	Guinea Bissau
Papua New Guinea		Mali	Kyrgyz Republic
Togo ("nascent" to "established")		Mauritania	Liberia
Vietnam		Nicaragua	Moldova
		Nigeria	Sao Tome and Principe
		Tanzania	Somalia
			South Sudan
			Sudan
			Tajikistan
			Timor-Leste
			Uzbekistan
			Yemen

Note: GPE compilation based on latest data available within each period being compared: 2011-2015 and 2015-2018.

Appendix J

PARTICIPATION OF DEVELOPING PARTNER COUNTRIES IN CROSS-NATIONAL ASSESSMENTS

Assessment	Point A (2013-2016)		Point B (2018-2020)	
LLECE	2013	Honduras Nicaragua	2019	Honduras Nicaragua
PASEC	2014	Benin Burkina Faso Burundi Cameroon Chad Congo, Rep. of Cote d'Ivoire Niger Senegal Togo	2019	Benin Burkina Faso Burundi Cameroon Chad Congo, Rep. of Congo, Dem. Rep. Cote d'Ivoire Guinea Madagascar Mali Niger Senegal Togo
PILNA*	2015	Papua New Guinea	2018	Papua New Guinea
PIRLS	2016	Georgia	2021	Georgia
PISA	2015	Albania Georgia Moldova Vietnam	2018	Albania Georgia Moldova Vietnam
PISA-D	N/A		2018	Bhutan Cambodia Honduras Senegal Zambia
SACMEQ/ SEACMEQ**	2013	Kenya (2016) Lesotho Malawi Mozambique Tanzania Uganda Zambia Zimbabwe	2019	Kenya Lesotho Malawi Mozambique Tanzania Uganda Zambia Zimbabwe
SEA-PLM	N/A		2019	Cambodia Lao PDR Myanmar Vietnam
TIMSS	2015	Georgia	2019	Albania – Gr 4 only Georgia Pakistan - Gr 4 only

*PILNA regional data is publicly available. National reports and data sets are released to each participating country's ministry/department of education, with public reporting of results left to each country, if they choose to do so.
**While SACMEQ IV was administered in 2013, the international report has not been published to date, implying that data are not publicly available. SACMEQ (also known as SEACMEQ) V is to be conducted in 2019. The list of countries participating in SACMEQ/SEACMEQ 2019 was shared in a presentation during a UNESCO Dakar-TALENT workshop held in 2018, but it is not available online at the time of publication.


Appendix K

GENDER PARITY IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL RATES, COUNTRY-LEVEL DATA

FIGURE K.1.

GENDER DISPARITIES PERSIST IN OUT-OF-SCHOOL RATES.

Gender parity indexes for out-of-school rates, primary and lower secondary



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org (2016-2012 last data point available).


Note
Country codes can be found on page 7.

Appendix L

REPETITION AND DROPOUTS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTNERS

FIGURE L.1.

DROPOUT AND REPETITION RATES OF DEVELOPING COUNTRY PARTNERS WITH AVAILABLE DATA FOR THE PRIMARY SUB-SECTOR



Source
GPE compilation based on data of the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (database), Montreal, http://www.uis.unesco.org. Last dropout and repetition rates since 2012 from 40 GPE countries.

Note
Because UIS data on repetition and dropout are scarcer than for GER and PCR, nine countries—including three among the 10 lowest performers (Central African Republic, Malawi, and Mozambique)—could not be represented in the graph. Country codes can be found on page 7.

Appendix M

EDUCATION SECTOR PLANS (ESPS) AND TRANSITIONAL EDUCATION PLANS (TEPS) MEETING GPE QUALITY STANDARDS

Table M.1. ESPs meeting GPE quality standards, 2014-2015

Country / subnational entity	No. of quality standards met out of 7*	GPE benchmark: Met or Not met
Bangladesh	6	Met
Cambodia	4	Not met
Congo, Rep. of	6	Met
Guyana	5	Met
Haiti	4	Not met
Kenya	5	Met
Mozambique	7	Met
Nigeria-Jigawa	5	Met
Nigeria-Kaduna	5	Met
Nigeria-Kano	3	Not met
Nigeria-Katsina	4	Not met
Nigeria-Sokoto	3	Not met
Pakistan-Balochistan	4	Not met
Pakistan-Sindh	4	Not met
Rwanda	5	Met
Togo	7	Met

* An ESP must meet 5 out of 7 quality standards to meet GPEs benchmark.

Table M.2. TEPs meeting GPE quality standards, 2014-2015

Country	No. of quality standards met out of 5**	GPE benchmark: Met or Not met
Central African Republic	3	Met
Guinea	4	Met
Mali	1	Not met

** A TEP must meet 3 out of 5 quality standards to meet GPEs benchmark.

Table M.3. ESPs meeting GPE quality standards, 2016-2018

Country / subnational entity	No. of quality standards met out of 7*	GPE benchmark: Met or Not met
Afghanistan	5	Met
Benin	7	Met
Bhutan	6	Met
Burkina Faso	7	Met
Cambodia	6	Met
Cabo Verde	7	Met
Cote d'Ivoire	6	Met
Congo, Dem. Rep.	7	Met
Eritrea	5	Met
Ethiopia	5	Met
Gambia, The	6	Met
Ghana	7	Met
Guinea-Bissau	6	Met
Lesotho	6	Met
Liberia	6	Met
Madagascar	7	Met
Myanmar	5	Met
Nepal	7	Met
Papua New Guinea	6	Met
Rwanda	7	Met
Senegal	7	Met
Sierra Leone	7	Met
Somalia-Federal	6	Met
Somalia-Puntland	7	Met
Somalia-Somaliland	7	Met
Sudan	6	Met
Tanzania-Zanzibar	7	Met
Zimbabwe	5	Met

* An ESP must meet 5 out of 7 quality standards to meet GPEs benchmark.

Table M.4. TEPs meeting GPE quality standards, 2016-2018

Country	No. of quality standards met out of 5**	GPE benchmark: Met or Not met
Burundi	5	Met
Chad	5	Met
Comoros	5	Met
South Sudan	5	Met

** A TEP must meet 3 out of 5 quality standards to meet GPEs benchmark.

Appendix N

PROPORTION OF ESPS AND TEPS MEETING EACH QUALITY STANDARD FOR THEMATIC STRATEGIES, 2014-2015 AND 2016-2018

FIGURE N.1.

INDICATOR 16B: STRATEGY FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING




FIGURE N.2.

INDICATOR 16C: STRATEGY TO RESPOND TO MARGINALIZED GROUPS





FIGURE N.3.

INDICATOR 16D: STRATEGY FOR IMPROVED EFFICIENCY



Baseline (2014-2015)
2016-2018

Source
GPE Secretariat.


Note
Baseline 2014-2015, N = 19; CY2018 (2016-2018), N = 32.

Appendix O

DONORS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO GPE FROM 2004 TO 2018

FIGURE 0.1.

DONORS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO GPE AND NUMBER OF DONORS, 2004-2018 (US$ MILLIONS).



Source
GPE Secretariat.

Note
The number of donors for each year include only the ones who made a contribution in that year

Appendix P

ADVOCACY EVENTS IN FISCAL YEAR 2018


	Name of event	Date
1	Educate All, Shape the Future high-level reception (margins of G-20)	July 6, 2017
2	Global Citizen G-20 concert	July 6, 2017
3	FAWE Girls' Education Conference	August 23-25, 2017
4	GPE reception: Education Will Shape the Future	September 19, 2017
5	Financing the Future: Education 2030	September 20, 2017
6	Global Citizen Festival	September 23, 2017
7	Global Teachers' Forum 2017	October 7-8, 2017
8	ANCEFA Regional Forum	October 30-November 2, 2017
9	Webinar with RESULTS advocates	November 11, 2017
10	Gender is My Agenda Campaign (GIMAC) Pre-Summit Consultative Meeting on Gender Mainstreaming in the African Union	January 20-21, 2018
11	Education Commission's Live Forum with Julia Gillard	January 24, 2018
12	Financing Africa's Future: Unlocking Potentials Through Education	January 27, 2018
13	Accountability in Education: The Role of Citizens in Accelerating Learning for All	March 6, 2018
14	GPE Financing Conference and events	February 1-2, 2018
15	Global Education and Skills Forum	March 16-18, 2018
16	Comparative International Education Society Conference (8 panels)	March 24-29, 2018
17	GCE Roundtable - Accountability for SDG 4	April 11, 2018
18	EMIS Conference	April 11-13, 2018
19	Data Solutions Roundtable	April 12-13, 2018
20	G-20 Working Group on Education meeting/presentation	April 12-14, 2018
21	CHOGM Gender Forum	April 16-17,2018
22	Securing the Foundation for Human Capital: A Global Priority	April 18, 2018
23	Facebook live conversation with Julia Gillard and Mark Dybul	April 19, 2018
24	Pan-African Youth Conference	April 23-24, 2018
25	PACE 2018	April 25-27, 2018
26	GCE Twitter chat with Alice Albright	April 26, 2018
27	Regional Conference on Civil Society's Role in Financing Education 2030 (ACEA)	May 1-3, 2018
28	UNPGA Youth Dialogue	May 30, 2018
29	Advancing Gender Equality in and through Education: The Way Forward (EU Dev Days)	June 5, 2018
30	11th Session of the Conference of States Parties to the CRPD - panel "Leverage Investment through Partnerships"	June 12, 2018
31	2nd Girls Not Brides Global Meeting	June 25-27, 2018

Appendix Q

EDUCATION OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

FIGURE Q.1.

EDUCATION ODA AND SHARE OF EDUCATION IN TOTAL ODA, 2008-2017



Source
OECD-DAC Creditor Reporting System.

Note
Gross disbursement. Constant prices include adjustments to allow for inflation rate changes in provider countries as well as changes in exchange rates between the provider currency and the US dollar over the same period (see http://www.oecd.org/development/stats/idsonline.htm).
Education ODA includes 20% of General Budget Support.
GPE donors number 21 bilateral and multilateral donors and foundations that financially contribute to GPE.
Non-GPE donors are the official donors reporting to OECD that are not GPE donors.
ODA = official development assistance.

Appendix R

GPE GRANTS BY TYPE AND AMOUNT

Table R.1. Grant amount allocated, FY2018

Type	Number of grants	Amount allocated (US$, millions)	Amount share (%)
Education sector plan development grant (ESPDG)	42	14.3	0.59%
Program development grant (PDG)	25	5.5	0.23%
Education sector program implementation grant (ESPIG)	66	2,397.2	99.18%
Total	**133**	**2,417.0**	**100%**

Source: GPE (2018) Portfolio Review 2018

Table R.2. Cumulative allocation and disbursement by grant per fiscal year, inception to June 2018

Type	Number	Amount allocated (US$, millions)	Amount share (%)	Disbursed (US$, millions)
Country-level grants				
Education sector plan development grant (ESPDG)	85	23.6	0.5%	17.0
Program development grant (PDG)	61	12.3	0.2%	8.3
Education sector program implementation grant (ESPIG)*	146	4,829.4	97.7%	4,122.0
Global and cross-national grants				
Global and Regional Activities grant	15	29.7	0.6%	29.7
Civil Society Education Fund II	2	48.3	1.0%	40.5
Total	**309**	**4,943.3**	**100%**	**4,217.4****

* Cumulative disbursement amount for ESPIG up to June 2018 is higher than in the Portfolio Review, which indicated that it was US$4,120 million (pp. 9 and 10), because the figure in this table includes updated disbursement data for Somaliland's accelerated funding.
**While the rounded figures in this table would suggest a slightly higher total, this figure is accurate, as the sum of non-rounded amounts.

Table R.3. Cumulative allocation and disbursement by grant per calendar year, inception to December 2018

Type	Number	Amount allocated (US$, millions)	Amount share (%)	Disbursed (US$, millions)
Country-level grants				
Education sector plan development grant (ESPDG)	92	26.8	0.5%	23.8
Program development grant (PDG)	71	14.1	0.3%	12.4
Education sector program implementation grant (ESPIG)	154	5,107.4	97.7%	4,267.1
Global and cross-national grants				
Global and Regional Activities grant	15	29.7	0.6%	29.7
Civil Society Education Fund II	2	48.3	0.9%	40.5
Total	**334**	**5,226.2***	**100%**	**4,373.5**

* While the rounded figures in this table would suggest a slightly higher total, this figure is accurate, as the sum of non-rounded amounts.

Appendix S

ESPIG CUMULATIVE DISBURSEMENTS TO FCACS AND NON-FCACS

Table S.1. Cumulative disbursement, FY2018

	Cumulative disbursement, as of June 2018 (US$, millions)	Cumulative disbursement, as of June 2018 (%)
Non-FCAC	2,104.8	51.1%
FCAC	2,017.2	48.9%
Total	**4,122.0**	**100.0%**

Table S.2. Cumulative disbursement, CY2018

	Cumulative disbursement, as of December 2018 (US$, millions)	Cumulative disbursement, as of December 2018 (%)
Non-FCAC	2,162.5	50.8%
FCAC	2,104.6	49.2%
Total	**4,267.1**	**100%**

Appendix T

ESPIG CUMULATIVE DISBURSEMENTS BY REGION

Table T.1. Cumulative disbursement by region, FY2018

Region	Cumulative disbursement, as of June 2018 (US$, millions)	Cumulative disbursement, as of June 2018 (%)
East Asia and Pacific	290.5	7.0%
Europe and Central Asia	130.5	3.2%
Latin America and the Caribbean	121.9	3.0%
Middle East and North Africa	97.6	2.4%
South Asia	393.3	9.5%
Sub-Saharan Africa	3,088.1	74.9%
Total	**4,122.0***	**100.0%**

* While the rounded figures in this table would suggest a slightly lower total, this figure is accurate, as the sum of non-rounded amounts.

Table T.2. Cumulative disbursement by region, CY2018

Region	Cumulative disbursement, as of December 2018 (US$, millions)	Cumulative disbursement, as of December 2018 (%)
East Asia and Pacific	291.6	6.8%
Europe and Central Asia	130.8	3.1%
Latin America and the Caribbean	122.7	2.9%
Middle East and North Africa	102.6	2.4%
South Asia	409.4	9.6%
Sub-Saharan Africa	3,210.0	75.2%
Total	**4,267.1**	**100.0%**

Appendix U

GPE DISBURSEMENTS BY COUNTRY, AS OF JUNE 2018

FIGURE U.1.

CUMULATIVE DISBURSEMENTS, FY2018 (US$, MILLIONS)





FIGURE U.2.

DISBURSEMENTS IN FY2018 (US$, MILLIONS)



Appendix V

GPE DISBURSEMENTS BY COUNTRY, AS OF DECEMBER 2018

FIGURE V.1.

CUMULATIVE DISBURSEMENTS, CY2018 (US$, MILLIONS)





FIGURE V.2.

DISBURSEMENTS IN CY2018 (US$, MILLION)



Appendix W

FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION

FIGURE W.1.

DONORS' CUMULATIVE CONTRIBUTION, 2004-JUNE 2018 (US$, MILLIONS)





FIGURE W.2.

DONORS' CONTRIBUTION, FY2018 (US$, MILLIONS)



Appendix X

FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION

FIGURE X.1.

DONORS' CUMULATIVE CONTRIBUTION, 2004-DECEMBER 2018 (US$, MILLIONS)





FIGURE X.2.

DONORS' CONTRIBUTION, CY2018 (US$, MILLIONS)





OFFICE LOCATIONS

1850 K Street N.W.
Suite 625
Washington D.C., 20006
USA

Avenue Marnix 17
2nd Floor
1000 Brussels
Belgium

MAILING ADDRESS

Global Partnership for Education
MSN IS6-600
1818 H Street NW
Washington D.C., 20433
USA

www.globalpartnership.org

FACEBOOK globalpartnership
TWITTER gpforeducation