REPORT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN WORKING GROUP: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

For Input

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to present the recommendations of the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) on the Implementation Plan for the Global Partnership for Education ("Global Partnership" or "GPE") Strategic Plan 2012-2015. The Implementation Plan can be found in Annex 1. The proposed decision language is included below. The purpose of the audio-conference call is to solicit feedback on the SPWG's recommendations before presenting the final plan at the Board's face-to-face meeting on 20-22 May 2013 in Brussels, Belgium.

2. PROPOSED DECISION

The SPWG proposes that the Board of Directors consider the approval of the following decision at its face-to-face meeting in May 2013:

> **BOD/2013/05-XX – Approval of the Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015:** The Board of Directors:
>
> i. approves the implementation plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015 contained in Annex 1 of BOD/2013/05 DOC XX (the "Implementation Plan"), including the indicators to measure progress and impact of the plan;
>
> ii. reiterates its request in decision BOD/2012/11-02 urging all partners to commit to contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan and indicate support for particular deliverables where possible;
>
> iii. requests the Secretariat to report to the Board of Directors on an annual basis, starting with the first face-to-face meeting of 2014, on progress on the implementation of the Implementation Plan; and
>
> iv. commends the Strategic Plan Working Group for its work on developing the Strategic Plan and Implementation Plan and decides that the SPWG shall cease to be operational.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The Strategic Plan 2012-2015 was approved by the Board of Directors at its audio-conference meeting in July 2012. At that time, the Board of Directors requested that the SPWG continue to work on an implementation plan. At its face-to-face meeting in November 2012 in Paris, the Board of Directors discussed the progress of the SPWG on developing an implementation plan and approved the following decision:

> **BOD/2012/11-02—Finalization of the Strategic Plan Implementation Plan:**
>
> The Board of Directors:
>
> a. notes the work to date of the Strategic Plan Working Group on developing an implementation plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015;
>
> b. requests the Strategic Plan Working Group, working with the Secretariat, to:
>
> i. continue its consultation of GPE partners to contribute to the development of the implementation plan; and
>
> ii. finalize the implementation plan, including possible amendments to the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy and the Secretariat budget, and deliver it to the Board of Directors as soon as possible but no later than 28 February 2013, for consideration by the Board of Directors at an audio-conference to be scheduled;
>
> c. urges all partners to commit to contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan and indicate support for particular deliverables where possible; and
>
> d. requests the Secretariat to deliver to the Board of Directors, no later than the next face-to-face Board meeting in 2013, a risk management framework for review by the Board of Directors.

3.2 Following the meeting in Paris, the SPWG decided, as part of its consultation process, to establish five Thematic Groups to address each of the five Strategic Objectives in the Strategic Plan, namely:

- Education in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States
- Girls' Education
- Learning, especially in the early grades
- Teachers and Teaching
- Education Financing

The Thematic Groups would conduct a short-term consultation with a wide variety of GPE partners in order to develop recommendations on outcomes, activities, roles and responsibilities and a timeframe for implementation. Each Thematic Group was co-led by one developing country partner and one donor, civil society, or multilateral partner. The co-leads for each group included:

Education in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States	Afghanistan, Save the Children
Girls' Education	UNGEI/UNICEF, Ethiopia
Learning	The Gambia, USAID
Teachers	Education International, Senegal
Education Financing	Lao PDR, Australia

Terms of reference for the five Thematic Groups were developed in December 2012. A copy of the terms of reference is in Attachment 1 to Annex 1. The Thematic Groups began their consultations in early January 2013.

3.3 Reporting templates, background information and some support was provided to each Thematic Group by the Secretariat. In addition, Secretariat staff participated in the work of each Thematic Group. In parallel to the work of the Thematic Groups, the Technical Group on Indicators worked to finalize its revised priority and costing analysis of the Strategic Plan indicators, and the Secretariat developed a report on issues that would not be addressed by each of the five Thematic Groups, characterized as "Strengthening the Partnership."

3.4 The Thematic Group reports, the report on indicators and the "Strengthening the Partnership" report were discussed at a face-to-face meeting in London on 18-19 February 2013. The result of those discussions is contained in the final Implementation Plan in Annex 1.

3.5 The SPWG was impressed by the engagement in the five Thematic Groups from all constituencies across the partnership and the dynamic and constructive debate. The Implementation Plan captures the most critical outcomes and actions identified by the five groups, though considerable more work will need to be done through various communities of practice that will ideally evolve from the groups. Moreover, the Secretariat work plan is being revised to take account of greater alignment with the Implementation Plan, based on the outputs of the five groups. The SPWG members believe that there is significant dynamism and goodwill in the partnership and a strong commitment to advancing the Strategic Plan agenda. Continuing efforts will need to be made to promote strong participation from developing country partners. This is an issue that requires further attention.

4. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

4.1 The Implementation Plan presented in Annex 1 was developed through extensive consultation and collaboration with a large number and variety of actors in the partnership. The plan lays out a series of outcomes and actions that will be important for successfully achieving the five strategic objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan by 2015. Although the SPWG recognizes that it was not able to capture the breadth of possible actions the partnership could take over the next few years, the actions that are included in the Implementation Plan will allow the partnership to demonstrate solid progress in the areas of its five strategic objectives. The SPWG has adopted an "opt-in" approach that will allow GPE partners to take the lead on, or participate in, particular outcomes and actions that are most aligned with their own organizational priorities. At the same time, having one central plan provides a mechanism to ensure that the actions listed in the Implementation Plan are being addressed and progress is made in each objective in a timely and satisfactory manner.

4.2 At the face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors in Brussels in May 2013, the Implementation Plan presented will include a section on monitoring progress of implementation, with suggested process indicators and also a section on cost implications for the Secretariat. It is still premature to make changes to the existing Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy until November 2013 when final recommendations will be put to the Board of Directors on new indicators.

5. NEXT STEPS

5.1 Following the Board audio-conference call on 3 April 2013, Board members will be requested to provide written feedback on the Implementation Plan by mid-April 2013. Based on the input provided, the implementation plan will be revised by the Secretariat, in consultation with the co-Chairs of the SPWG.

5.2 A final version of the Implementation Plan will be delivered to the Board of Directors as part of the documentation for the face-to-face meeting of the Board of Directors on 20-22 May 2013 in Brussels.

ANNEX 1

Global Partnership for Education
Implementation Plan for the Strategic Plan 2012-2015

A. INTRODUCTION

The Global Partnership for Education (the "Global Partnership" or "GPE") Strategic Plan covers the period from 2012 to the end of 2015. Approved in July 2012 by the Board of Directors (the "Board"), it defines the partnership's vision as "A good quality education for all children, everywhere, so they fulfill their potential and contribute to their societies" and partnership's mission as "To galvanize and coordinate a global effort to deliver a good quality education to all girls and boys, prioritizing the poorest and most vulnerable."

The Strategic Plan outlines four long-term Strategic Goals, namely:

- Access for all: All children have access to a safe, adequately equipped space to receive an education with a skilled teacher
- Learning for all: All children master basic literacy and numeracy skills by the early grades
- Reaching every child: Resources are focused on the most marginalized children and those in fragile and conflict-affected states
- Building for the future: National systems have the capacity and integrity to deliver, support and assess quality education for all

Within the context of these four longer-term Strategic Goals, the Strategic Plan highlights five Objectives to be achieved by 2015. This Implementation Plan is focused on these five objectives, which are:

- Fragile and conflict-affected states able to develop and implement their education plans
- All girls in GPE-endorsed countries successfully complete primary school and go to secondary school in a safe, supportive learning environment
- Dramatic increase in the number of children learning and demonstrating mastery of basic literacy and numeracy skills by Grade 3
- Improve teacher effectiveness by training, recruiting and retaining teachers and supporting them to provide a good quality education
- Expand the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic funding and support to education in GPE-endorsed countries

The Global Partnership is a voluntary coalition built around a common vision and mission. The Implementation Plan aims to make greater cooperation and partnership more feasible, in order to help remove some of the obstacles to the collective achievement of the Strategic Goals and Objectives outlined in the Strategic Plan. It is expected that partners will support the Plan as a whole and choose to "opt in" to key areas of interest. This will also be a key indicator of the success and value-added of the Global Partnership and will be monitored closely by the Secretariat, with annual reporting to the Board.

Developed through a wide consultation process by the members of the partnership themselves, this Implementation Plan outlines the core outcomes and actions required to make significant progress against the five Objectives (Section B). It is not a plan simply for the Secretariat, but for the broader partnership, and it requires collective action to succeed. The Implementation Plan also tackles four areas of critical importance in strengthening the workings of the partnership (Section C), namely:

- Greater capacity for the Local Education Groups (LEGs)
- Greater focus on the value-added of the partnership
- Improved knowledge sharing across the partnership
- Greater focus on innovation by the partnership

This Implementation Plan also includes an approach to developing more comprehensive indicators (Section D) to monitor and validate the outcomes of the Strategic Plan. The use of this comprehensive framework marks a major step forward for the education sector as a whole.

The Global Partnership is grounded in a country-led approach, based on the Paris Declaration and other development effectiveness principles. The Strategic Objectives contained in the Strategic Plan were developed through a highly consultative, consensus-driven approach involving all actors in the partnership. However, the way in which the Strategic Objectives are addressed in specific countries will be led and determined by countries themselves. The partnership as a whole will assess its collective impact against these Strategic Objectives.

The development of national education sector plans ("ESPs") and GPE program implementation grant applications is a country-led process, in accordance with the guiding principles laid out in the GPE Charter.[1] All partners at the country level are expected to take the Strategic Goals and Objectives into consideration, but the decisions over what should or should not be included in ESPs or GPE grant applications rest firmly at the country level.

Due to active partner engagement in the development of the Implementation Plan, there is a reasonable prospect of rapid progress and success in achieving the Objectives. Partners will opt-in voluntarily to different aspects of implementation, in part due to their respective organizational/national missions and objectives and in part due to their commitment to the Global Partnership. Some partners have already demonstrated real leadership in making progress in the areas of the five Strategic Objectives. Other partners are encouraged to support this leadership and indeed, take on leadership roles themselves. The Secretariat is tasked with supporting the implementation of the Strategic Plan and organizing itself accordingly.

Section E of the Implementation Plan outlines how it will be monitored and the process indicators that will be used to track progress, while Section F outlines cost implications to the Secretariat.

[1] The Charter for the Global Partnership for Education can be found at: https://www.globalpartnership.org/media/docs/publications/Charter_of_GPE_English.pdf

B. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND ACTIONS

The core of the Implementation Plan lays out the process for achieving the five Strategic Objectives of the Strategic Plan. This section sets out the list of outcomes, actions, key actors and timeframes for each Strategic Objective. Each list has been developed by large thematic working groups and thus represents the collective wisdom of the partnership. More detailed actions for some partners have been developed, including the Secretariat, in support of each Strategic Objective, though such detail is not required in this document. Some of these more detailed actions will be taken forward by a number of partners and through communities of practice that have or will be established to support various aspects of the Implementation Plan.

This section is not intended to act as a complete "work plan" for the Secretariat or any other partner. Rather, the outcomes and actions outlined below represent a framework of the core activities that are essential to meeting the Strategic Objectives and will require collective action by the partnership as a whole.

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

Outcome	Next Steps	Suggested Key actors	Actions and Timeframe
1.1 More effective GPE support of fragile and conflict-affected states (FCAS)	Develop and agree on an Operational Framework for FCAS	• Secretariat • Board working group on guidelines for fragile states • Other interested partners (e.g. INEE, Education Cluster)	• By May 2013 Board meeting • Begin applying the framework to GPE processes from second quarter of 2013 • Collect data on effectiveness of the framework and revise, as appropriate in first or second quarter 2015
	Establish new eligibility criteria for Managing Entities ("MEs")	• Secretariat • Board approval • Financial Advisory Committee (FAC)	• FAC to develop process and criteria following Board approval of assessment guidelines • Board to approve criteria November 2013
	Once ME criteria are established, work to increase the number of active MEs and Supervising Entities ("SEs")	• Secretariat • Trustee • Developing country partners • Other partners	• Secretariat and other partners to communicate with LEGs regarding new eligible MEs (TBC) • Work with newly eligible MEs to establish Transfer Agreements under an agreed timeline
	Create a ME and SE Community of Practice ("COP") in fragile contexts, where both active and prospective MEs and SEs can share information, experiences and practices	• Secretariat • Leadership by ME/SE with interest/ experience in FCAS	• Identification of prospective members of COP by third quarter 2013 • COP actively engaging and sharing knowledge and experiences by first quarter 2014 • COP to share update regarding its utility to Board (TBC)

	Define the criteria and process for a mid-term transition of management of GPE-funded programs from MEs to Government and Local institutions	• Secretariat • Board working group on guidelines for fragile states • Other interested partners	• Criteria developed end of third quarter of 2013 • Process recommendations developed by fourth quarter of 2013 • Criteria and process recommendations used in at least one developing country partner context by fourth quarter 2015
	Greater and more consistent engagement from the Secretariat for FCAS	• Secretariat	• Clear terms of reference for focal point engagement including in fragile states set and shared with developing country partners • Resource implications for the Secretariat assessed in April 2013 and new staffing in place by June 2013 • Assessment of impact through GPE impact evaluation by fourth quarter 2015
1.2 Greater alignment of funding and policy dialogue in support of education planning and implementation in FCAS	Operationalize, review and assess the provision of up to 20 percent of indicative allocation amounts to fragile and conflict-affected states on an urgent basis, with benchmarks developed to monitor implementation	• Secretariat • Board • FAC • Education Cluster	• Operationalization by end 2013 • Review ongoing, with an initial evaluation report by first quarter 2015
	Countries develop transitional ESPs, when applicable and appropriate	• Secretariat (Country Support Team) • All partners represented in relevant LEGs • ME and SE partners	• Initial guidance provided to developing country partners by Secretariat as appropriate, including through publication and dissemination of transitional ESP guidelines by third quarter 2013 • Support for implementation (ongoing)
	Countries work to develop full education sector plans during the implementation of the transitional plans	• Secretariat, donor and multilateral partners to provide support • LEGs	• Ongoing through transitional education sector process and Program Implementation Grants
	Undertake research designed to identify how Education Cluster and associated humanitarian actors can work more effectively with development actors	• Education Cluster • Secretariat • Other interested partners	• Begin in 2013 • Include identification of improved systems, procedures and aid architecture at the national, regional and local levels in analysis • Complete research and analysis by fourth quarter 2014

			• Share findings with all partners by first quarter 2015 • Convene a space to discuss how to operationalize relevant findings in second quarter 2015
	Strengthen Education Cluster-LEG collaboration at country level through the implementation of appropriate findings identified through the research process outlined in the previous activity	• Education Cluster • LEG	• Begin operationalizing relevant findings in at least one country by December 2015
	Engage in ongoing efforts to identify and agree on conflict analysis and resilience tools to support the development of conflict-sensitive ESPs and transitional ESPs	• Secretariat • INEE • UNICEF • Other partners	• Ongoing throughout Strategic Plan period
	Integrate the INEE Minimum Standards and other tools including conflict analysis and resilience, as appropriate, into the development of transitional education sector plans	• Secretariat • INEE • LEGs	• Conduct trainings and communications with LEGs on the application of the Minimum Standards and other tools, as applicable (ongoing) • Provide technical support to LEGs on the application of the Standards, as appropriate (ongoing) • Monitor uptake in new ESPs/transitional ESPs to measure success
1.3 Mobilize more money for education in FCAS	Mobilize increased external financing for fragile and conflict-affected states, with an additional US$500 million in bilateral and other funding beyond current commitments and pledges (not including contributions from the GPE Fund)	• Secretariat • Partners	• By fourth quarter of 2015
	Analyze country-level pooled funding mechanisms in FCAS, focusing in particular on:	• Secretariat • Working group of interested partners	• Working group formed by third quarter 2013 • Analysis and recommendations produced by fourth quarter 2014

	• whether they contribute to increasing overall funding • their effectiveness for delivering services in FCAS		
	Overall proportion of humanitarian assistance to education doubles from 2% in 2012, to at least 4% in 2015	• Education Cannot Wait Group • GPE Chair • Secretariat • Partners	• Establishment of intermediary targets for an increase in proportion of humanitarian assistance to education by second quarter 2013 • Convening of a semi-annual progress meeting of the participants of the UN General Assembly 2012 Education Cannot Wait meeting • Biannual publication of results of progress to target • Ongoing advocacy and profile raising

Objective 2: All girls in GPE-endorsed countries successfully complete primary school and go to secondary school in a safe, supportive learning environment

Outcome	Next Steps	Key actors	Actions and Timeframe
2.1 Government-developed gender-responsive ESPs with implementation monitored, preferably through the Joint Sector Reviews ("JSRs")	Adjust the GPE Guidelines for ESP Development and Appraisal and other GPE mechanisms as needed to promote gender-responsive planning	• Secretariat • UN Girls Education Initiative ("UNGEI") • UNESCO International Institute for Education Planning ("IIEP") • Developing country partners	• GPE approach/ priority related to girls communicated to countries and LEGs by third quarter 2013, including reference to role of UNGEI and other partners • Guidelines revised by fourth quarter2013 • Supporting documents revised and others developed by first quarter 2014 • Conduct a desk review of ESPs/ transitional ESPs to assess how far gender is prioritized and effectively monitored
	Engage in ongoing efforts to identify and agree on gender analysis and planning tools	• Secretariat • UNGEI • UNICEF • UNESCO • Other partners	• Gender analysis tool developed by fourth quarter 2013 • Additional planning tools identified through 2014 • Tools piloted in 2014 with an evaluation of the pilots in 2015 • Ongoing collaboration with other partners on advances in gender analysis and planning throughout Strategic Plan period
	Support LEGs to undertake gender analysis to inform ESP development	• Secretariat • UNGEI • UNESCO • LEGs	• GPE Girls' Education package developed and provided to countries and LEGs from first quarter 2014
	Promote the integration of gender analysis in the development, implementation and monitoring of the ESPs through knowledge-sharing and the exchange of good practice at national and regional levels	• Secretariat • UNICEF • UNGEI • Pôle de Dakar/ UNESCO	• See actions included in C.3 • Two regional workshops on planning for improved gender equality in education held in 2014
2.2 Greater focus on countries with significant and persistent gender disparities	Work with UNGEI and other partners to foster the exchange of effective approaches to address persistent gender disparities in education	• Secretariat • UNGEI • Other partners	• GPE mechanism for identifying countries with persistent gender disparities in place by third quarter 2013 • Analysis of GPE country experience and good practices by fourth quarter 2013

	Explore potential for developing and financing accelerated plans for girls' education within ESPs	• Secretariat	• Concept note developed in third quarter 2013 • Information session or request for decision proposed to Board in first quarter 2014
2.3 Schools provide safe and supportive learning environments, especially for girls	Promote the collection of evidence by governments and civil society organizations and the adoption of strategies to reduce violence against girls	• Secretariat • UNICEF • UNGEI • Education International • Developing country partners • Other partners	• Following decision by Board • Map current inclusion of strategies to reduce violence against girls in all ESPs by third quarter of 2013
	Promote more adequate sanitation, female teachers and other safeguards to ensure girls remain in school	• Secretariat • Board • Other partners • LEGs	• Following decision by Board • See timeline actions for 2.4 below
	Collaborate with other partners on the development of quality standards on safe and supportive learning environments for girls, including with reference to standards related to school based violence	• Secretariat • UNICEF • UNGEI • UNESCO • Other partners	• Quality standards available by first quarter 2014 • Ensure consistency with relevant Strategic Plan indicators to be agreed by the Board (timeline according to Indicators work plan)
2.4 GPE partners track enrolment, progression and learning of primary and lower secondary school girls (preferably disaggregated by age, grade, location and socio-economic status)	Disaggregation of results, including learning outcomes, by gender	• Secretariat • LEGs • Developing country partners	• Guidance on tracking girls' enrolment and progress developed in first quarter 2014 • Current practices followed in developing country partners in tracking girls' enrolment and progression identified by fourth quarter 2013 • Support provided throughout Strategic Plan period • Integrate gender perspectives in learning improvement and learning assessment in Learning Matrix Task Force and other efforts led by Strategic Objective 3

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

Outcome	Next Steps	Suggested Key actors	Actions and Timeframe
3.1 Early literacy, numeracy and early childhood care and education addressed as important education issues at the global level	Promote early literacy and numeracy outcomes, including Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE), in the broader education and development agendas	• Secretariat • Brookings Institution • UNESCO • UNICEF • Other partners	• March 2013-inputs to Dakar Meeting • Develop an advocacy approach, including possibly convening an event at the 2013 UN General Assembly • Learning Metrics Task Force outcomes in third quarter 2013
3.2 Countries, donors and education sector plans (ESPs) provide greater attention to early literacy and numeracy and use evidence-based strategies for program design	Increase ECCE services: • Identify effective and scalable programs that focus on emergent literacy, numeracy and social development • Support advocacy efforts for increased funding • Include ECCE in education sector plans	• Secretariat • UNICEF • UNESCO • Donors • LEGs • Other partners	• Ongoing
	Improve country-level work on early literacy and numeracy through: • supporting country-level planning to improve early grade literacy and numeracy outcomes by: • identifying learning champions in developing country partners that mobilize support for and action on early literacy and numeracy • implementing Results-Based Financing pilot on improving learning outcomes and use methodology widely	• Secretariat • Developing country partners • LEGs • Donors	• Ongoing • Secretariat and others provide technical support, beginning the first round of GPE program implementation grant applications in 2014 • Results-based funding pilot running by fourth quarter 2013

	if successful		
	Develop capacity to monitor and measure learning outcomes through: • improving metrics for primary grade literacy and numeracy measurement • supporting strong and regular JSRs that take into account measuring literacy and numeracy progress against targets	• Secretariat • Donors and UN agencies focused on literacy and numeracy • Multilaterals	• Start immediately • Establish metrics by 2015
3.3 Developing country and other GPE partners have access to emerging evidence on best practices for early-grade literacy and numeracy	Continued building of early-grade literacy and numeracy COPs including: • supporting a global community of practice • supporting a global knowledge management platform • continued Global and Regional Activities program support for early literacy and numeracy • supporting research and evaluation to identify best practice • follow-up to All Children Reading workshops • follow-up to numeracy workshop	Secretariat Relevant partners including AusAID, DfID and USAID Community of Practice	• Initial follow up to All Children Reading workshops in second quarter 2013 • 1-2 Africa regional follow-up meetings in third quarter 2013 and 1 Asia follow-up meeting in third quarter 2013 • Regional numeracy workshops in 2013-2014 • Secretariat visits during ESP preparations (ongoing) • Communication and agreement with SEs on GPE priorities and goals • Establish and share an online evidence repository by early 2014

Objective 4: Improve teacher effectiveness by training, recruiting and retaining teachers and supporting them to provide a good quality education

Outcome	Next Steps	Suggested Key actors	Actions and Timeframe
4.1 Improved effectiveness of teaching/ teachers at the primary and secondary levels	Strengthen the evidence base on teacher effectiveness to inform ESPs	• Secretariat • UNESCO • EFA Teacher Taskforce • UNESCO Institute for Statistics • UNESCO IIEP	• Conduct a review of the EFA Teacher Task Force teacher policy database and analyze how it is applied to inform decision-making by fourth quarter 2013 • Identify gaps in the research (using the database and stocktaking research, and UNESCO's eAtlas on Teachers) and commission research to fill these gaps, as necessary by fourth quarter of 2013 • Encourage the use of the database as a tool to inform decision-making at the country level, including: utilization by LEGs and governments in developing ESPs by first quarter 2014 • Encourage a systematic focus on the measurement of teacher effectiveness at the country level with consistent tracking of progress during JSRs • JSR reporting on teacher effectiveness feeds back into Teacher Task Force database • Explore ways to converge with the existing work on School Report Cards and other global databases on teacher policies such as SABER and QEDAF • Explore dissemination of findings through a dedicated website and the launching of publications/ reports in relevant regional and global conferences

	Promote innovative approaches to support, assess and strengthen teacher effectiveness	• Secretariat • UNESCO • EFA Teacher Task Force • Education International • World Bank • OECD • Pan-African Teaching Council	• Organize a roundtable prior to the African Union ministerial on teacher development (PACTED3) with a group of teacher organization representatives and ministers of education on ways to support teacher effectiveness in June 2013 • Target a prominent role for the partnership in the next Teacher Task Force global policy forum • Envisage potential regional roundtables on teacher effectiveness followed up with national dialogue activities • Global and Regional Activities financing to fund innovative teacher effectiveness project, beginning immediately
4.2 Improved employment terms and conditions for teachers	Promote dialogue between government and teacher representatives	• Secretariat • Education International • Other partners • LEGs • International Labour Organisation (ILO) • UNESCO • Committee of Experts on the Application of Recommendations concerning Teachers ("CEART")	• Ensure that teacher representatives are included in the LEGs • Ensure that teacher representatives are involved in Joint Sector Review processes • Operationalize UN standards for conditions of services for teachers, including from the ILO Handbook of Good Human Resource Practices in the Teaching Profession • Facilitate the reporting of the status of teaching conditions to the CEART
	Assess how ESPs address the recruitment/ deployment of female teachers and teachers for rural areas	• Secretariat • LEGs • EFA Teacher Task Force • UNGEI • UNICEF	• Analysis of ESPs by second quarter 2014 • Results disseminated by fourth quarter 2014 • Provide guidance on approaches to growing, keeping and deploying female teachers and teachers in rural areas, and provide guidance on keeping them safe

4.3 Greater engagement of teacher organizations in education sector planning	Conduct situational analysis of participation of teacher representatives in LEGs	• Secretariat	• Initial analysis completed by third quarter 2013 • Results posted on GPE website by fourth quarter 2013 • Using analysis above, identify gaps in the participation of teacher representatives in the LEGs and provide recommendations for solving these gaps
	Build the capacity of teacher organizations to contribute effectively to the development of ESPs, based on analysis conducted above	• Secretariat • UNESCO • Education International • Other partners	• Training on GPE processes and operations conducted regularly, with adequate participation from teacher organizations • Provide ongoing training and capacity-building for teacher organizations on education sector planning • Explore innovative or alternative funding sources for strengthening or scaling up capacity-building and training opportunities, including through the Civil Society Education Fund and Global and Regional Activities program

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

Outcome	Deliverables	Suggested Key actors	Actions and Timeframe
5.1 More effective, efficient and equitable education financing	Provide guidance and support for effective, efficient and equitable financing in the preparation of ESPs	• Secretariat • FAC • Board	• Proposal on revised guidance/ support prepared for Board approval by November 2013 • Explore the possibility of developing a framework for assessing value for money at the country level
	Strengthen FAC proposal review process	• Secretariat • FAC • Board	• Proposal on revised review process and training prepared for Board approval by November 2013 • Training for FAC members beginning immediately after approval of revised review process • Evaluate revised review process beginning first quarter 2015

	Conduct evaluation of whether financing is effective, efficient and equitable at country and global levels primarily through JSRs	• Secretariat • Board • LEGs	• Explore the feasibility of revising the methodology for allocating resources from the GPE Fund by fourth quarter 2013 • Guidance on country-level evaluation prepared for Board consideration by November 2013 • Monitoring, reporting and discussion of financial commitments in ESPs through JSRs • Disseminate findings by first quarter 2015
	Promote the alignment of external education financing with country education sector plans and greater use of aligned and harmonized funding arrangements (i.e. pooled funding)	• Donors • LEGs • Secretariat	• Reporting by developing country partners through JSRs • Reporting at the global level through annual pledge monitoring report
5.2 Better data and evidence on the quality and volume of education financing to improve the quality of education	Assess the volume of financing to education at the global level, including through the annual GPE pledge monitoring report	• Secretariat • Partners	• Partners provide information on financing to Secretariat • Secretariat develops pledge report • Pledge reports released in second quarter of 2013, 2014 and 2015 • Semi-annual updates published on the GPE website
	Promote evidence-based decision-making to improve the quality and volume of financing to education at the country level	• Secretariat • Developing country partners • LEGs	• Ongoing, from second quarter 2013 (following any potential guideline revision) • Use tools such as PETS, General Education Quality Analysis Framework (GEQAF), SABER and others in development of education sector plans • Revise JSRs to reflect analysis conducted in tools listed above
5.3 Increased education financing through innovative approaches and more effective advocacy	Advocate at the global level (e.g. through the Global Education First Initiative)	• All GPE partners	• From April 2013
	Assess the feasibility of reforming the GPE Fund to increase contributions from private sector and emerging donors	• Secretariat • Board	• Proposal prepared for Board consideration by November 2013

	Encourage financial pledges, including at the 2014 Replenishment for the Global Partnership	• All GPE partners	• GPE replenishment strategy and timeline put to the Board in May 2013 • Campaign to begin in third quarter 2013 • Pledging Conference in May/June 2014
	Encourage non-financial pledges, including at the 2014 Replenishment for the Global Partnership	• All GPE partners	• See timeframe above

C. STRENGTHENING THE PARTNERSHIP

The content of this section of the Implementation Plan is driven by the challenges involved in solving key bottlenecks in the core functions of the partnership. Progress made in removing these bottlenecks will impact positively on the achievements of all five of the Strategic Objectives.

Bottlenecks GPE intends to address

The **effective functioning of inclusive LEGs** is at the heart of the country-led approach of the partnership. The capacity of the LEGs to operate effectively must be strengthened for the partnership to deliver good quality education to all children.

It is difficult to define clearly the **value-added of GPE** as a partnership, beyond providing additional funding to support the development and implementation of national ESPs. While anecdotal evidence of the partnership's value-added is compelling, a more systematic definition is required for greater accountability and credibility.

Improved knowledge-sharing was raised by all five thematic groups in the development of the Implementation Plan (Thematic Group Terms of Reference found in Attachment 1). Knowledge-sharing is viewed as positive and desirable, although there is currently not a clear mechanism or model utilized across the partnership to allow for its efficient and effective functioning.

The roles of **innovation and technology** have been identified as major gaps in all aspects of the work of the partnership. Put simply, there is a tendency for many partners to function traditionally, with insufficient attention paid to innovation. Greater focus needs to be paid to utilizing innovative approaches across the partnership if the five Strategic Objectives are to be achieved.

In order for the partnership to function effectively and the vision, mission, goals and objectives of the Strategic Plan to be achieved, **all partners will need to commit to, and actively engage in, delivering through implementation.** Adequate monitoring and reporting on this will also be necessary.

The following outcomes and actions address these issues.

Outcome	Actions/next steps	Suggested Key actors	Timeframe
C.1 Strengthened capacity of LEG composition and functioning in developing country partners	Review of LEG composition and functioning in developing country partners	• Secretariat • LEGs	• By fourth quarter 2013
	Improved guidelines on the composition and functions of LEGs	• Secretariat • LEGs	• Guidelines finalized by second quarter 2014 • Guidelines disseminated beginning in third quarter 2014
	Greater guidance and support (technical, capacity, financial) to governments to provide for sustainable LEGs	• Secretariat • Donors • Other partners	• Ongoing training on GPE processes and procedures in LEGs
C.2 Value-added of the Global Partnership at the local and global levels delineated, backed by solid evidence	Establish where the GPE adds value and undertake systematic monitoring of GPE processes at the country and global level to assess GPE's "value add" beyond existing processes, (e.g., stakeholder alignment with ESPs adherence to principles of mutual accountability, exchange of knowledge and experience)	• LEGs • Secretariat • Donors • Other partners	• Identification of leading practices in partnership evaluation • Monitoring of processes finalized by fourth quarter 2014 • Findings disseminated in 2015
	Conduct independent impact evaluation of GPE support	• External entity	• By fourth quarter 2015
	Improve the communication of the ways in which GPE adds value to education outcomes	• Developing country partners • Secretariat • All other partners	• Post stories on the GPE website on an ongoing basis • Use the 2014 replenishment campaign as a major communications opportunity on value-added of the partnership • Regular results reporting

C.3 Knowledge and experience on best practices in education shared widely	Use the convening power of the Global Partnership to facilitate knowledge sharing through: • Secretariat country focal points broker access to knowledge for their countries • Annual partner conferences/ knowledge events based around the Strategic Objectives • Hold information sessions in the margins of Board meetings • Use the 2014 GPE replenishment conference as an opportunity for structured debates around the five Strategic Objectives	• Secretariat • Other partners	• Annual conferences • Ongoing
	Establish links with existing knowledge platforms through: • Survey existing platforms to determine appropriate links • Facilitate engagement and linkages with appropriate platforms and ensure that the partnership is informed of these available platforms	• Secretariat • Other partners	• By first quarter 2014
	Provide an interaction space for COPs related to the five Strategic Objectives and cross cutting themes, as appropriate	• Secretariat • COPs	• Space created by third quarter 2013 • Report on effectiveness of space provided on regular basis
	Synthesize and disseminate information and experience gathered	• Secretariat • Global and Regional Activities	• Monitor activities on an ongoing basis • Develop annual report on activities

	through Global and Regional Activities program-funded activities	funding recipients	• Disseminate annual report widely • Highlight information and experiences on the GPE website
C.4 GPE partners significantly more engaged and supportive of innovation and technology in delivering the Strategic Objectives	Establish dynamic COPs for innovation and for technology	• Secretariat • Partners	• COPs established in second quarter 2013 • COPs involved in implementation of additional actions listed under C.4 • COPs provide update on interaction to Board on semi-annual basis
	Promote the use of technology where it supports improved learning for teachers and learners in developing country partners	• Secretariat • Teaching organizations • Developing country partners • Private Sector • Donors	• GRA-funded activities to support • Promotion and mainstreaming of what works
	Explore the options of increased use of technology in the functioning of the governance and operations of the Global Partnership	• Secretariat • Partners	• Audit and first stage plan to improve GPE efficiency and effectiveness through information and communications technology • Ongoing, with a possible report to the Board in November 2013
	Advocate for greater partner contribution toward scaling of innovation process and innovative practices	• Private sector • Civil Society • Other interested partners	• Ongoing, with communication to the partnership and externally
C.5 GPE partners engaged in the delivery and monitoring of the implementation plan and reporting on its effectiveness	Five Thematic groups continue as Communities of Practice, according to need and relevance	• Thematic groups	• Ongoing
	The Technical Group on Indicators helps to drive implementation of any Board-approved recommendations	• Technical Group on Indicators	• Ongoing
	Secretariat reports on progress to the Board annually, including through the Pledge Monitoring Report	• Board • Secretariat	• Annually starting at the first face-to-face Board meeting in 2014

	2014 replenishment will include pledges from partners on how they are and will continue to support implementation of the Strategic Plan	• All partners	• Second quarter 2014
	GPE impact evaluation includes an assessment of the effectiveness of the Strategic Plan and its implementation	• Evaluation Advisory Group • External entity • Board	• By 2015

D. IMPACT INDICATORS: THE WAY FORWARD

The Strategic Plan contains a series of impact indicators aligned to the four Strategic Goals and five Strategic Objectives. While these indicators are not set in stone, they are considered to represent an acceptable idea of the indicators to be used to monitor the impact of the partnership and the Strategic Plan.

For the development of the Implementation Plan, a technical group on indicators was tasked with developing a proposed approach to the finalization of indicators and their adoption, as well as the collection of data, analysis and reporting. The final report of the technical group is attached as Attachment 2. It recommends a structured approach to reporting on all but four of the indicators contained in the Strategic Plan at a marginal cost of approximately US$8 million per year for five years. This is significantly less than what was predicted in November 2012 when the first report of the technical group on indicators was presented to the Board. The recent report represents the development of an approach that makes optimal use of data collection through simple additions to existing sampling methods, such as school surveys, household surveys, systems diagnostics (such as GEQAF, SABER, etc.) and finally, traditional, simple, administrative in-country data collection systems.

The recommendations of the technical group are creative, efficient and realistic and would see a wholesale improvement in the education sector's ability to establish key baselines and report on outcomes. Developing country partners may be encouraged to support the collection of the additional data and the reporting associated with it.

The next steps in terms of implementing the proposal on indicators are the following:

- In May 2013 the Board approves, in principle, the proposed approach to finalizing a set of indicators and implementing the data collection and reporting associated with them.
- From May to June 2013 the Technical Group on Indicators works with the co-leaders of the five thematic groups to finalize the suite of indicators that are fit for purpose and feasible for countries to monitor. However, the number of indicators cannot be increased: only changes and substitution can occur.
- From June to October 2013, liaising closely with the Technical Group on Indicators, the Secretariat will work with partners (such as UIS, UNICEF, UNESCO, World Bank, GMR

etc.) to develop a fully costed, integrated program for the implementation of the agreed indicators, to be submitted to the Board with options for funding.
- In November 2013 the Board approves the final suite of indicators and the means of their implementation.
- Thereafter the Secretariat will monitor whether funding and indicator efforts are in place and report biannually to the Board.

E. MONITORING THE PLAN

The section on plan monitoring and the process indicators that will be reported against annually to the Board will be prepared in time for the face-to-face meeting of the Board in Brussels in May 2013.

F. COST IMPLICATIONS

The cost implications for the Secretariat will be assessed and included in time for the face-to-face meeting of the Board in Brussels in May 2013. This will be done in conjunction with a review of the Secretariat budget.

It is not possible to elaborate the costs to other partners of Plan implementation.

ATTACHMENT 1: THEMATIC GROUP TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terms of Reference
Implementation Plan Thematic Groups

Preamble:

On 31st July 2012 the Board of Directors of the Global Partnership for Education approved a new Strategic Plan for the partnership for the period 2012-2015 (http://www.globalpartnership.org/strategic-plan/who-we-are/strategy/). Framed within the long-term goals of access, equity, learning and strengthening government systems, the Plan identifies five shorter-term core objectives:

1. **Fragile and conflict affected states** able to develop and implement their education plans
2. All **girls** in GPE-endorsed countries successfully complete primary school and go to secondary school in a safe, supportive learning environment
3. Dramatic increase in the number of children **learning** and demonstrating mastery of basic literacy and numeracy skills by Grade 3
4. Improve **teacher effectiveness** by training, recruiting and retaining teachers and supporting them to provide a good quality education
5. Expand the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic **funding** and support to education in GPE-endorsed countries.

The GPE Board of Directors tasked the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) to develop an implementation plan to ensure that the five objectives are properly addressed. The SPWG has highlighted that the biggest risk faced for successful implementation of the Strategic Plan is a lack of partner engagement in that implementation. It has also developed a number of key principles for implementation of the Strategic Plan:

- Opting-in
- Inclusivity and ownership
- For the partnership, not just the Secretariat
- Clarity and simplicity
- Line of sight to the Strategic Plan Objectives
- Achievable
- Accountable

At its meetings in Paris in November 2012, the Board of Directors called for active participation in plan implementation and to this end five thematic groups related to each of the five objectives in the GPE Strategic Plan have been established (fragile and conflict-affected states; girls; learning; teacher effectiveness; funding). The thematic groups will provide a brief report to the SPWG on each of their respective Strategic Objectives which will be used to elaborate a revised draft implementation plan for the Strategic Plan as a whole, and more specifically for each strategic objective (other forms of input will include Board of Directors comments from the meeting in Paris and written comments, among others). These terms of reference apply to the workings and output of each of these thematic groups.

Leadership:

Each thematic group will be jointly led by one donor/international organization/CSO/private foundation or company and one developing country partner. The co-leaders coordinate the work of the thematic group and will report to the SPWG in February 2013. The co-leaders will follow the principles of the GPE Implementation Plan outlined above.

Time-frame:

The thematic groups will be established and functioning in December 2012. Each will provide a written report with suggested details on implementation by 14th February to the SPWG and one of the co-leads of each group will be asked to attend a face-to-face meeting of the SPWG in Europe on 18 or 19 February 2013.

Modus Operandi:

The work of the thematic groups will be primarily conducted electronically and by teleconference calls. Members of the partnership will opt-in to whichever of the five thematic groups is of most interest to them (there is no restriction on the number of groups a partner may participate in) and to which they intend to make an **active** contribution. The Secretariat will participate in each of the thematic groups, principally through representation from the Country Support Team to ensure that the recommendations are relevant to the country context and are transferred to other members of the Secretariat, as needed. The thematic groups will operate very much as a "Community of Practice." Each group will determine whether a face-to-face meeting is feasible or desirable, though there are no funds available from the Secretariat budget to accommodate this. It is expected that the co-leaders of each group will reach out proactively to ensure widespread engagement in each group.

Scope of Work:

The basis of the work of each thematic group is the GPE Strategic Plan, which sets out some of the desired actions under each of the five objectives. The thematic groups will also take into account the work of the SPWG to date in developing some early thinking on the Implementation Plan, the feedback provided by the Board of Directors at its meetings in Paris in November 2012 (summaries will be circulated) and the consultation to date with developing country partners. It is hoped that the thematic groups will assess evidence on the challenges faced in achieving these objectives, and pool resources and work collaboratively and with other partners towards solving these challenges.

In the context of the Strategic Plan, each thematic group will establish a credible approach and related actions for the implementation of each objective by working together to achieve the following, which will ultimately be reported to the SPWG:

- Gather evidence toward the identification of key challenges to achieving the objective
- Assess evidence on the most effective actions to address these barriers (where possible)
- Based on this evidence, identify key outcomes that need to be achieved before 2015 and the actions necessary to deliver these outcomes
- Establish next steps in how these outcomes can be achieved by the partnership and provide an indicative list of key actors who could be involved in achieving each outcome, with specific responsibilities identified where appropriate (in this regard it is hoped that

the thematic groups will develop into proper communities of practice that will deliver the outcomes and that members of the groups will take on some of the responsibilities for outcomes/ deliverables).

- Highlight potential gaps in the proposed approach for each objective, including:
    - Any challenges/ barriers to the achievement of the objective that are not addressed
    - Any outcomes/ actions that do not have an "owner" responsible for their delivery
    - Any additional budgetary resources that may be required to achieve the outcomes
    - Any additional decisions that may be required of the Board of Directors

Each thematic group will provide a short written report to the SPWG by 14th February 2013. A simple template reflecting the dot points above and including examples of "model deliverables" will be circulated before the end of December 2012. The thematic group reports will feed into the next draft of the implementation plan, which the SPWG will develop following this process.

Role of Secretariat:

While the Secretariat is not responsible for the workings of each thematic group, it will provide some support as appropriate, including partnership member contact details, context briefings, responding to questions, supporting teleconference calls and other tasks as needed. Some Secretariat teams, especially the Country Support Team and the Global Good Practices Team, will participate actively in the different thematic groups to provide technical expertise and country-level knowledge, especially since the Implementation Plan will include outcomes that the Secretariat will be leading and may have implications for the current work plan and resources.

However, the Secretariat cannot provide full administrative support to each thematic group: this must come from the co-leaders.

ATTACHMENT 2: FINAL INDICATORS PRIORITIZATION AND COSTING REPORT

Executive Summary

The GPE Strategic Plan approved by the Board of Directors contained a series of impact indicators aligned to the four Strategic Goals and five Objectives. While these indicators were completely final, they were considered as a good final draft of the indicators to be used to monitor the impact of the partnership and its Strategic Plan.

As part of the development of the Implementation Plan, a technical group on indicators was tasked to develop a proposed approach to the finalization of indicators, their adoption, collection of data, analysis and reporting. This note is the final report of the technical group. An intermediate report called "Feasibility and Steps Forward on GPE's Strategic Indicators," more technical and longer than this one, recommended an approach to prioritizing the indicators and contained detailed discussion on all the indicators and the issues that needed to be confronted in producing them. The Strategic Plan Working Group suggested that the indicators group finalize the priorities and actually cost out the indicators.

In thinking about the problem, the indicators group came up with a solution to some of the more difficult indicators, by realizing that even the more difficult indicators can in all likelihood be derived from the same data sources (e.g., the same school surveys) as the simpler ones.

In summary, this final report then recommends a structured approach to reporting on all but four of the indicators contained in the original Strategic Plan at a marginal cost of approximately US$8 million per year as a 5-year project that puts the indicators in place. The price tag assumes that some countries will not opt in to some of the indicators and/or that existing donor or national projects will fill in some of the cost, either by simply continuing to do what they already do, or re-purposing some data work. The price tag does include a significant amount of capacity building so as to make the indicators work more sustainable. Without the capacity building the price tag is a little lower.

The price tag is significantly less than was predicted in November 2012 when the issue of indicators was presented to the GPE Board of Directors and represents the development of an approach that makes optimal use of data collection through simple additions to existing sampling methods, such as school surveys, household surveys, systems diagnostics (such as GEQAF, SABER, etc.) and finally, traditional, simple, administrative in-country data collection systems. In addition, this final report costs capacity development for countries.

The next steps in terms of implementing the proposal on indicators are the following:

- In May 2013 the GPE Board of Directors approves in principle the proposed approach to finalizing a set of indicators and implementing the data collection and reporting associated with them.
- From May to June 2013 the technical group on indicators work with the five Objectives thematic groups to finalize the suite of indicators that is best fit for purpose. However, the number of indicators cannot be increased: changes and substitution can only occur.
- From June to October 2013, liaising closely with the technical group on indicators, the Secretariat will work with partners (such as UIS, UNICEF, UNESCO, World Bank, GMR

etc.) to develop a fully costed, integrated program for the implementation of the agreed indicators, to be submitted to the GPE Board with options for funding.

- In November 2013 the GPE Board approves the final suite of indicators and the means of their implementation.
- Thereafter the GPE Secretariat will monitor whether funding and indicator efforts are in place and report twice-yearly to the GPE Board.

Background

This document accompanies an earlier document ("Feasibility and Steps Forward on GPE's Strategic Indicators," or "Feasibility report" for short), which was produced by the technical indicators task team and was reported to the SPWG. That document provides a description of what it would take to produce all of the indicators in the GPE Strategic Plan. It was concluded in that document, that the technical and institutional challenges of producing all the indicators starting immediately are too large, and that the indicators needed to be prioritized and costed. In addition, it was concluded that an "opting in" approach for engaging with country partners to stimulate them to produce the indicators is superior to a top-down approach. However, GPE does plan to publicize which countries are producing which indicators. Thus, there would be some gentle public-relations and accountability pressure on country partners to increase their output of indicators. The SPWG asked the indicators task team to reaffirm the priority list (and make any needed changes) and to focus on costing in some detail the indicators that had the highest priority.

The "Feasibility report" noted how far behind the education sector is, relative to the health sector, in both data gathering and data use to set policy and management directions. The nearly total lack in the education sector, for example, of a series of surveys comparable to the DHS surveys in health, or the relative size of the health parts of the UNICEF MICS questionnaires, as compared to education, were noted. It was also noted that the lack of data, as well as the tendency not to use what exists, probably undermines the funding and regard with which the education sector is held by global and national decision-makers. Thus, a strong argument was presented for greatly improving the data situation in the sector.

Re-statement of priorities

The team looked at the indicators again and revisited the original indicator prioritization. In most cases, members of the technical group cited technical complications and intricacies associated with the collection of the Strategic Plan indicators, and in a few rare cases disagreed with the original prioritization while recognizing that certain indicators were categorized as low priority due to the challenging and costly nature associated with their collection, or the lead time that it would take to come to agreement on them (in cases where their absolute cost would not be high). The results of this slight change in prioritizations are presented in this section and in a table at the end of this report.

A few specific differences included in the reprioritization are as follows:

1) Two members of the technical working group ranked "Safety and condition of schools, including reporting violence" as a "1" or highly important as opposed to the original ranking of "3". One group member noted that these indicators are not standardized and vary as a result of the vast contextual differences between countries, thus making them exceedingly difficult to track. However, one suggestion included tracking the percent of

schools reaching national standards for key dimensions: space per student, water, sanitation, quality of building, state of repair, etc. On the question of reporting of violence against children, one group member cited the challenge of creating a single collapsible indicator to measure violence, and the need to rely on an effective reporting system, while the other group member cited work being conducted by CIDA as well as Plan International that could contribute to the data gathering associated with this aspect of the safety indicator.

2) The same two working group members ranked "Disability Factors" as a "1" compared to the group's original "3" ranking. Again, despite it being ranked as highly important, the group members cited the huge challenges associated with definitional questions and data collection issues. One member noted the need to assess disability based on local criteria, and questioned how, as a result, global standards of provision for disability would therefore not likely be helpful or possible. The working group member representing civil society noted the strong desire for civil society's need to have disaggregated data on disabled children with respect to their enrollment, attendance, performance, retention, and transition.

3) In the case of several indicators included in the strategic plan, it was noted in the reprioritization that many of the indicators are useful only for GPE's internal monitoring and as a result were prioritized lower by members of the working group. This was done with a lens on costing indicators that would be broadly viewed as contributing to the global discourse on the state of education, rather than to use as a benchmark for GPE's progress with its strategic plan. Examples include input indicators like number of fragile states with GPE-endorsed education plans.

4) A group member raised the issue that indicators for process, such as the meaningful participation of CSOs in LEGs (and note that the issue has also been raised by the teaching profession) should be part of form of process tracking. This highlights the importance of having something akin to the Accountability Matrix as proposed in the GPE Evaluation Strategy (or the Accountability Matrix as proposed).

5) Another group member submitted very detailed comments on the indicators; these could be of use at the implementation stage. They are very useful and available upon request.

6) On the learning outcomes indicator (SO3), it was suggested that GPE closely work with the Learning Metrics Task Force effort of Brookings/ UNESCO. GPE Secretariat staff are doing so in the working groups, and the GPE Chair is actually a member of the Task Force.

The suggestions made during the reprioritization exercise were taken into consideration; however, the costing exercise was very minimally impacted by the slight changes in prioritization that were originally presented in the "Feasibility Report." Furthermore, most group members were happy with the original prioritization exercise. Because there was minimal change, and because the indicators had been worked through over a few phone and email conversations, the team moved forward with costing the indicators in their originally prioritized

order. At the same time, however, it was noted, as we proceeded with the costing exercise, that if one focuses on the source of data (e.g., a household or schools survey), and if (though this is a big if) the indicator can be derived without creating too much addition to household or schools surveys that are to be recommended to gather the priority 1 indicators, then one may as well consider it, and if (again a big if) a committee of experts can agree on how to do it, then perhaps one may as well begin work even on the indicators that were deemed initially to be lower feasibility/urgency, such as disability and safety. For that reason, we proceeded to actually cost the creation of some of these even if in the prioritization exercise they might have been rated as a 3.

The rest of the sections present the assumptions and results of the costing exercise.

Assumptions and methodology used

An important proviso needs to be made about the relationship between prioritization and cost. In the "Feasibility report" some indicators were given a relatively low priority because of their assumed cost or degree of difficulty. This made sense if one thinks of each indicator singly. However, in thinking about the costs as a whole, it was noted that some indicators might be relatively easy to acquire if they are nearly a by-product of either a household or school survey that one is already recommending for some other indicators that were judged to have higher priority or to be easier. In those cases one can perhaps go ahead and gather those indicators whose cost and technical complexity was originally deemed high relative to their immediate utility.

The costing assumptions and process was as follows.

First, the institutions or individuals in the task team with the most experience in certain areas were identified, as follows. UIS was targeted mostly (but not exclusively) for traditional access, enrollment and completion indicators; USAID for its experience with DHS and other types of household surveys; World Bank for its experience with SABER; UNESCO for its experience with GEQAF; and UNICEF for its experience with MICS. In some cases individuals within these organizations were tapped in addition to those who are part of the indicators task team and in some cases (UNICEF and UNESCO home office) an institution that was not originally part of the indicators task team was tapped. In addition, individual team members have experience with surveys and indicators work and drew upon that experience.

Second, a more or less standard set of steps needed was set out. These steps would not be needed for all indicators. For instance, some indicators are already widely known (mostly those pertaining to access, enrollment, completion, etc.) and their methodologies are agreed upon and have been standardized by UIS. In those cases, steps involving methodological development or agreement could be skipped. The important remaining tasks, in those cases, may simply be to build more capacity in reporting them, motivate countries to report on time, etc. In other cases, however, such as learning assessment in the early grades, or the assessment/measurement of disability, there are not only no standardized assessments, but there is not even a completely known set of best practices that are widespread amongst the various partners. In these cases, prior to widespread data-gathering, it would be beneficial to take on a set of prior steps where best practices could be determined, agreed upon, and disseminated. The following set of steps is, therefore, a "maximal" set of steps:

1) "One off" or start-up steps/costs
    a) Rapid assessment of the literature and practices on the indicator

b) Workshop(s) to drive an agreement on the best way to define and collect the indicator
c) Pilot surveys to test the agreed-upon methodology
d) Re-convene experts to assess the results; write up the methodology
e) Offer the methodology to countries via capacity building and training at regional workshops

2) Ongoing or yearly "steps" at global data institutions
   a) Staff time to support and maintain the indicator (request data, clean and collate, report)
   b) Travel to trouble-shoot and improve global data institution's understanding of how countries report
   c) Regional maintenance workshops every two years to improve data gathering and reporting, include new countries "opting in"

3) Per country cost of each survey application
   a) HH surveys
   b) School surveys
   c) Systems surveys (e.g., SABER or GEQAF type)

The various experts in the task team, or experts tapped from within their organizations, were asked to think about all these steps and to prepare estimates of what costs the steps imply. Using this list it is possible to note that:

1. At one extreme, some indicators can be already be produced using value-added analysis applied to entirely secondary data that are already gathered and reported by UIS, or household surveys such as MICS and DHS, even if not with 100% complete coverage of all countries on a timely basis. All that is required in these cases is that calculating these on a regular basis be the "mandated" and budgeted responsibility of staff members at UIS, GMR, GPE Secretariat, other global institution with data analysis capacity, or consultants contracted by these institutions. An example of this area would be some sort of efficiency analysis and indicators, or age-grade analyses that can reveal important quality and efficiency gaps, as requested by several partners for the indicators list.

2. Some indicators (including those that would underpin the secondary analysis noted above) are already being gathered with a standard methodology. Improved reporting and capacity building in usage is "all" that is needed. In just a few cases might there be merit in ascertaining, via expert workshops, how to improve the data-gathering and reporting on them. These would include all the standard access and enrollment indicators.

3. For some indicators there has been quite a bit of experimentation and methodology development, but relatively few countries participate. These would include pencil-and-paper written assessments such as the regional assessments (LLECE, SACMEQ, or PASEC) or PIRLS, TIMSS, and PISA.

4. For some indicators there has been some experimentation and exchanges of papers and technical approaches, but not under official auspices, and not enough for some widely

shared sense of "best practices" to have emerged. An example would be the various early-grade assessments, assessments of school safety, and assessments of disability.

It was further assumed that the ongoing costs of interest are:

1. The costs (both one-off and ongoing or maintenance costs) at the global data institutions
2. Per-survey costs of household or school surveys
3. Costs of capacity building for reporting on new and existing indicators
4. Less urgently but important for long-run: fundamental capacity building in surveys and EMIS

The reason for these assumptions is that these are the only "unusual" or "new" sorts of costs that the use of the new or standard (but with improved quality and timeliness of gathering and reporting) indicators would suppose. For instance, most education systems do not routinely carry out school or household surveys, and typically would not (and maybe should not, because it is a specialized task perhaps better outsourced to other Ministries) have the in-house capacity to do so. Thus, there is a need to budget and explicitly plan for them, if one wants them to be carried out. It is assumed that marginal increases in EMIS costs for standard or traditional indicators would be up to each country or its local development partners, and that this marginal cost is factored into each country's decision to "opt in" to reporting on certain indicators.

Finally, to operationalize the concepts, it was decided to focus the thinking in terms of the specific data-gathering *approaches* that would be needed, since it is the data-gathering approach (and whether the indicator is new or not) that drives the cost, regardless of the specific indicator.

1. Data gathered through existing EMIS (Education Management Information Systems—the standard enrollment and teacher numbers data system)
2. Other administrative records systems (financial, HR)
3. Special-purpose institutional surveys (a la SABER or GEQAF)
4. Household surveys
5. School surveys
6. Purely secondary analyses (thus not requiring any improved data gathering)

As noted above, the realization that one could focus the costs by parsing them by type of data-gathering method, rather than indicator by indicator, might make it possible to include more indicators than originally thought. Since, within limits, surveys have a considerable fixed cost component, extra indicators need not add cost proportionally as long as those indicators are do not add too much time to the surveys, which means that they may need to be less elaborate than the specific interests advocating for the indicator might want). For that reason, it makes sense to analyze the costs, and present them, by focusing on the types of data gathering efforts needed.
Finally, it is assumed that though for some indicators there is already some "lore and literature" on technical approaches (for instance, INEE has done work on school safety, various actors have done work on early grade literacy, others have done work on measurement of disability, and so on), the following are also the case: a) this "lore" may be dispersed amongst various special technical or subject-matter interest groups and is not centralized or vetted by global data institutions, b) the tradition may not emphasize the needed standardization of data-gathering and reporting methods by experts on data, c) insufficient capacity at country level may exist, again, from the data-gathering and reporting point of view. Thus, while the effort described in this document should not "reinvent the wheel" on some of the key indicators, and should instead rely on the "lore and literature" that do exist, there will nonetheless be a need to re-approach the

indicator from a comprehensive data point of view and to take stock of what exists in a manner that allows comparison across indicators and that can allow analysis of what it would take to place the indicators into multi-purpose household or school surveys.

Cost and finance issues

The detailed cost assumptions are presented as footnotes to the Results table in the next section. To drive the costs, "standard" costs were used per type of input (inputs: workshops needed to drive agreement on the indicators, pilot surveys to learn how to apply them, manuals written up, training sessions, etc., defined to a "standardized" size as per the footnotes to the results table). To create those "standard" costs, in turn, we relied on input from the institutions with membership in the technical working group, plus the personal experience of technical working group members, and by reaching out to one or two key institutions in some cases. These were then judgmentally (that is, they were not a simple average but a judgmental blend) blended or averaged by one of the co-chairs, and vetted again by the working group members wishing to give opinion.

The one important aspect to note here is that these are pure cost estimations and have nothing to say about where such costs are incurred, who finances them, what the source of funding is, or how the funding is transferred. It is likely that a very complex mixture of mechanisms will be needed, perhaps with some multilateral partners simply increasing the effort they already carry out, but with more funding from bilateral partners; some bilateral partners may take accountability for measuring certain issues in certain countries; others for measuring the same issues in other countries; countries themselves taking responsibility for certain measurements, etc. Given this complexity, which is no different from the complexity in implementation (as studied by the strategic plan implementation working groups) this is another area that needs to be considered in some sort of mutual accountability matrix or else there would be a real danger that key aspects would not be done.

Similarly it is important to note that these are fairly serious cost estimates, but they are not meant to signify a budgetary "promise" from or liability to any particular institution, in the sense of those institutions undertaking that the work can certainly be done for the estimated budgets. The cost estimates are thus more of a general way to alert the educational community as to the approximate envelope required to significantly increase the data production, along the lines needed for the GPE Strategic Plan (and inter alia making a significant contribution to the world community in general, at least in the GPE countries).

Lastly, the cost estimates are carried out assuming today's technologies and methods. It may be possible in future, and perhaps even today (but consensus would be needed on the best tools) to utilize mobile technology to lower the cost of some of these indicators. One should be open-minded but cautious about these possibilities. Some partners are already working on ideas in this area (e.g., USAID's Grand Challenge) and other partners (e.g., IT groups in the GPE Board) could be challenged to come up with interesting technical approaches.

Suggested next steps

The following table suggests next steps.

Action/ step	Responsible	Timeline
Board to decide how much of the indicators proposal to accept.	Board	As part of approving the SP implementation
Setting out options for either collective or individual funding of the work, seeking out interest of specific partner institutions in production of indicators	Secretariat	May-August 2013
Board to decide on individual and collective funding and division of labor on production	Board decision	2nd Board meeting 2013
Monitoring whether funding and indicator efforts are in place, as part of mutual accountability	Secretariat to report to Board	Ongoing twice-yearly

Results

The following table details the results of the costing exercise.

	Steps needed (approximately sequential from left to right)													Resulting "total" costs			
	Establish methods for new indicators						One-off trainings		Ongoing costs of staffing, monitoring, training			Other ongoing costs		Cost w.o. specific country surveys and w.o. survey training, assuming, for the ongoing or recurrent costs, a 5-year project	Sub-totals per broad area to left	Cost as to the left, but with 1 round of surveys in approx 1/2 of the countries [10]	Cost as to the left, but with survey capacity building in approx 1/2 of the countries [10]
	Commission background lit review (1 per new indicator)[1,2]	Initial workshop (1 per new indicator) [3]	Pilot surveys - HH (1 for the HH-level indicators as a whole)	Pilot surveys - School (1 for the School-level indicators as a whole)[4]	Second workshop (after pilot) (1 per new indicator)	Write-up of manual or approach	Initial capacity-building regional trainings (two sets in each of three regions: one for new and survey-based indicators, one for existing and EMIS-based)[5]	Finalization of manuals for systems indicators, then capacity-building regional trainings on systems indicators[6]	Ongoing staffing at global data institution(s)[7]	Ongoing supervisory / troubleshooting / lesson learning travel[8]	Repeat trainings every two years for each type of indicator[5]	Per country cost of combined HH and school surveys[9]	Country-specific survey training (if interested in capacity-building)				
"New" HH-survey-based include:[11]			3				3		4	7	1.5			4,896,800	5,505,350		
Disability status of learners by attendance or not	2	2			1	1								240,900			
Safety perceptions of school by parents	1.5	1.5			1	1								202,850			
"True" or effective attendance	1	1			1	1								164,800			
"New" School-survey-based include:[11]				3					4	7				2,790,800	3,652,850		
Literacy and numeracy in early grades	1	1			1	1								164,800			
Opportunity to learn and school efficiency	1	1			1	1								164,800			
Input supplies														-			
School safety esp for girls	1.5	1.5			1	1								202,850			
School conditions	1	1			1	1								164,800			
Proxies for learner SES for inequality calculations, SES inequality ca	1	1			1	1								164,800			
"Traditional" and EMIS or other admin records-based include:[11]							3		2	5	1.5			3,478,000	3,635,300		
GER or equivalent in early childhood														-			
Primary completion														-			
Transition to secondary														-			
Proportion and number out of school	0.5					1								31,500			
Class size proxies and PT ratio	1					0.5								25,200			
"Pure" inequality in PT ratios and other inputs	1					1								37,800			
Gender parity in management positions	1			0.5		1								62,800			

"Systems" include (SABER or GEQAF type or based on institutional surveys):[11]							3	3	5	1.5			4,513,000	4,513,000		
Teacher policies, procedures, codes of conduct													-			
Learning outcomes assessment													-			
Aid effectiveness indicators													-			
Proportion of Education Sector Plans adequately addressing teacher issues																
Levels of mobilization of education finance													-			
Progress of country's own-source finance against own targets													-			
Secondary analysis only[11]								2	4				1,337,600	1,337,600		
Efficiency of expenditure													-			
Unit cost													-			
													-			
Total inputs required	13.5	10	3	3.5	8	11.5	6	3	15	28	4.5					
Total cost	170,100	635,000	150,000	175,000	508,000	289,800	1,404,000	1,137,000	2,250,000	240,800	1,053,000			18,644,100	18,644,100		
"Price" of inputs[12]	12,600	63,500	50,000	50,000	63,500	25,200	234,000	234,000	150,000	8,600	234,000	700,000	234,000			
For systems indicators, the finalization of modules noted here as fixed cost:								435,000								
Double check cost														18,644,100		36,144,100	41,994,100
Memorandum note: all indicators would be disaggregated, where feasible, for:																
Fragile and non-fragile countries																
Sex																
Poverty																
Linguistic/ethnic factors																

Technical notes:

[1]To keep things simple, the "size" or length of literature reviews or workshops or other standard inputs needed to come to agreement on key modules of surveys or indicators is signalled simply by using a larger number anchored on a standard of 1. Thus, the number 2 rather than 1 might not imply 2 studies or 2 workshops. It might imply 2 studies or workshops, but it might also simply imply a longer study or a larger/longer workshop, and it would typically signal the fact that less current agreement exists on how to measure those issues.

[2]The "standard" review is assumed to take 1 person month of senior consultant time.

[3]The "standard" workshop (value=1) assumes 10 non-paid experts meeting for 3 days, with attendant airfare and per diem costs, as well as time for temporary staff to organize. These are not conferences but simple working meetings. All fares economy class.

[4]There is only 1 pilot or 1 ongoing survey needed per type of survey to capture all the needed indicators. Thus, the cells for surveys (and other similar instruments) are "merged" across specific indicators. This is the case for survey applications only. For methodological development (e.g., background papers, workshops) it is assumed that indicator specific experts would need to meet.

[5]The three "assumed regions" are Francophone Africa, Anglophone Africa, and Asia. The trainings are assumed to be for 3 days, for 40 persons per region, and the cost assumes travel and per diem. Staff and organizational costs are assumed to be part of ongoing costs of providing institutions. All fares economy class.

[6]It is assumed that a judicious mix of SABER tools and GEQAF is used, depending on purpose and country interests. It is also assume that, when it comes to SABER, the modules pertaining to EMIS, teachers, ECD, assessment, finance, autonomy/accountability, standards are used, given the interests and strategic directions set by the GPE Board. Finally, it is assumed that, in the cost of the training, the cost of finalizing modules is included. Also note that while actually applying SABER or GEQAF in each country would require local work, for the sake of consistency with the approach proposed here, we are visualizing it as a capacity-building activity simply for "accounting" purposes.

[7]Person-years of mid-level staff.

[8]Assumes a 2 week, 2 country trip to representative countries or those showing important lessons learned. All fares economy class.

[9]Assumed to be combined HH and school surveys with reasonable (10-point wide for key indicators) 95% confidence intervals capable of detecting largish movements over time. The cost may be lower than currently indicated but it seems safe to put in a little higher cost as, undoubtedly, more indicators will likely be put on the list (e.g., right now there are no cost-to-family indicators in the school surveys).

[10]Only 1/2 of the partnership countries are considered on the assumption that the rest have ongoing bilateral help and/or already have the capacity and/or will not opt in to actually measuring the new indicators.

[11]There is no implication here that these are the only indicators that would be covered by the surveys or the "traditional" EMIS work. Indeed, it would not be worthwhile to carry out surveys for just these indicators. We have costed things explicitly on the assumption that there is already some infrastructure that, at least for HH surveys and EMIS work, is already capable of doing some of the extra work. On the schools surveys, it is also not logical to use a survey to calculate only the given indicators, so a few more could be considered, if the decision is made to do a set of school surveys. Finally, the assumption is the basic infrastructure for calculating some of the basic or traditional indicators, or the primary data for them, exists. (That is why there are no methodological workshops in those rows.)

[12]Prices are derived from templates using different worksheets, submissions from experienced staff at various GPE partner institutions, and judgmentally blended. The documentation is available.

Priority or phasing of each indicator in the Strategic Plan

Detailed discussion of priority or phasing of indicators in GPE Strategic Plan			
Type	**Specific objective or goal**	**Indicator**	**Phasing**
SG	SG1. Access for All	Various	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Gross Enrollment Ratio (GER) or equivalent in early childhood education or development	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Primary completion ratio (PCR)	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Effective transition rate from primary to secondary or proportion of population entering grade 1 of lower secondary	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Number or proportion of children of primary school age who are out of school	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) in primary school	1
SG	SG1. Access for All	Safety and condition of schools, including reporting of violence	3 – 2 members of the group recommended upping this to 1
SG	SG2. Learning for All	The proportion of students in the early grades who demonstrate against credible national systems that they can read and understand the meaning of grade-level text according to national curriculum	2 – some in the group recommended upping it to 1
SG	SG2. Learning for All	The proportion of students in the early grades who have numerical conceptual understanding and procedural fluency with basic operations	2 – some in the group recommended upping it to 1
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Income or wealth quintile	2 – some in the group recommended upping it to 1
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Sex	1
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Disability factors	3, two members of the group recommended upping it to 1
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Subnational levels of governance	4

DRAFT

Detailed discussion of priority or phasing of indicators in GPE Strategic Plan			
Type	**Specific objective or goal**	**Indicator**	**Phasing**
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Fragile and conflict-affected regions/ countries	1 for countries, 4 for regions
SG	SG3. Reaching Every Child	Inequality of pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) in primary school	2
SG	SG4. Building for the Future	Quality assurance or benchmarking systems that are in place, are linked to information systems, and are being actively used at regular intervals	2
SG	SG4. Building for the Future	Educational sector that is supported according to aid effectiveness principles by GPE partners	1
SG	SG4. Building for the Future	Credible national student and teacher assessment systems for multiple learning outcomes in use	2, one member recommended upping to 1
SO	SO1. Fragile and conflict-affected states plan	Improvement in donor coordination and in operation in GPE fragile states	1, one member recommended reducing to 3
SO	SO1. Fragile and conflict-affected states plan	Number of fragile states with GPE-endorsed education plans	1, one member recommended reducing to 3
SO	SO1. Fragile and conflict-affected states plan	Core access and learning indicators disaggregated at the Global Partnership level by fragile vs. non-fragile states	1, subject to the rating of each individual indicator
SO	SO2. Girls transition, safe	Gender parity in effective transition rate from primary to secondary or in proportion of population entering grade 1 of lower secondary transition to secondary education and/ or in entry into grade 1 of lower secondary	1
SO	SO2. Girls transition, safe	Percentage of staff members in management positions who are female (sex disaggregation of management)	2
SO	SO2. Girls transition, safe	Parity in reading and numeracy results by grade 3	2, one member suggested reducing to 1
SO	SO3. Dramatic increase in early years learning	The proportion of students who, by grade 3, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade-level text	2, one member suggested possibly 1
SO	SO3. Dramatic increase in early years learning	The proportion of students who, by grade 3 of primary schooling, have numerical conceptual understanding and procedural fluency with basic operations	2, one member suggested possibly 1

DRAFT

Detailed discussion of priority or phasing of indicators in GPE Strategic Plan			
Type	**Specific objective or goal**	**Indicator**	**Phasing**
SO	SO3. Dramatic increase in early years learning	Percentage of children receiving early childhood education with meaningful (cognitive and non-cognitive) content	3, one member suggested upping to 2, another to 1
SO	SO 4. Teacher effectiveness improved	Proportion of education plans that adequately address the issues of teacher availability, quality, and conditions of employment	2
SO	SO 4. Teacher effectiveness improved	Proportion of countries with agreed and applied teacher practice and professional standards	3, one member suggested 2
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Percentage of total government budget that goes to education and to basic education	1
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Percentage of total resources spent, and effectively used, at school level, including those procured centrally	4
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Indicators of unit cost, waste, and efficiency in resource allocation, including time on task	Has to be dis-aggregated, too many concepts involved in this one, see below.
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Levels of mobilization of adequate and sustainable external financing for education	1
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Progress of developing country partners against their own targets	1
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Efficiency and waste	2, if simple method is used, 3 or 4 if more complex methods are chosen
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Unit cost	1
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Time on task and other such measures of opportunity to learn	2
SO	SO 5. Volume and effectiveness of finance	Efficiency of resource allocation patterns.	4

DRAFT