GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP *for* EDUCATION

Results Tracking: Lessons

Luis Crouch, Secretariat

For Information and Input


Tracking of indicators in the Results Framework

- Many of key outcome indicators are already tracked (UNESCO data)
- For many indicators, extra effort in Results Framework is not large
- Some quality indicators are new
- All require improvement in reporting, usage, or crafting

The indicators in yellow are already generally available…

Results Framework: Key Performance Indicators		
Goal level		
Literacy rate in GPE endorsed countries improved - Youth (15-24 years) literacy rate		
Outcome level		
Number of children (girls and boys) receiving good quality primary education, and transitioning to lower and upper secondary	1.	Gross Enrolment Ratio in the grade prior to Grade 1
	2.	Primary Gross Intake Rate (GIR)
	3.	% of GPE countries that achieved Gender Parity in Gross Intake Rate
	4.	Rate of out-of-school children
	5.	Primary Completion Rate (PCR)
	6.	% of GPE countries that achieved Gender Parity in primary completion
	7.	Transition rate from primary to lower secondary education
	8.	% of GPE countries that achieved Gender Parity in transition from primary to secondary
	9.	Lower Secondary Completion Rate
	10.	% of GPE countries that achieved Gender Parity in lower secondary
	11.	The proportion of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text.
	12.	The proportion of students who, by the end of the primary or basic education cycle, are able to read and demonstrate understanding, as defined by the national curriculum or agreed-upon by national experts.

Global Partnership endorsed vs non endorsed countries



All is Not Perfect

1. Less than perfect data
2. Data show that progress is not perfect

Example:

- Repetition rate drops much faster in Global Partnership countries—reason unclear, could be by fiat?
- So, how believable are the data?
- And, what other problems does it create?
- LEGs with support of partners such as UIS ought to discuss

Tracking at the Local Level

- Joint Sector Reviews: key country-level process
- Uses many of the same indicators as Results Framework
- Developing countries use similar indicators
- Global Partnership Secretariat tracks Joint Sector Reviews
  - Not always undertaken, or not even in quality
  - Degree of commitment/authority to ensure they take place, and to standardize

Implications of use thus far:

- For key outcomes and processes, tracking already exists
  - UNESCO Institute of Statistics data
  - Joint Sector Reviews
- So: it has been done, but needs to improve
- What needs to improve or be formalized?
- Integration, standardization, and better local-global interaction

For Future: Increase formality of Monitoring and Evaluation Framework

- Integration:
  - Results Framework, Accountability Matrix, Impact Evaluation
- Standardization:
  - Increase the % of countries reporting on all indicators
- Local-global interaction:
  - Merging the global and local: use same indicators in Joint Sector Reviews as used for tracking globally
  - If values differ: use local values for planning
  - Support data collection and analysis to sort out differences

Requirements

- Commitment
  - Technicalities not hard: requires commitment to standardize and report
- Resources
  - Coordinating Agencies, Supervising Entities, and Secretariat need to commit resources (like other global funds/partnerships)
- Use of Accountability Matrix
  - To increase commitment to report
  - Note C Tapp's presentation next



GLOBAL
PARTNERSHIP
for EDUCATION

visit our website at:
www.globalpartnership.org