GPE RESULTS FRAMEWORK

For Decision

1. STRATEGIC PURPOSE

1.1 This paper presents the Global Partnership for Education's (GPE) Results Framework core and non-core indicators. In particular, it:

- Presents, for *approval*, the non-core indicators of the results framework.
- Presents, for *approval*, the milestones (interim targets) and targets associated with these non-core indicators.
- Presents, for *information*, the baseline data for these indicators, and:
- Presents, for *approval*, adjustments to milestones and targets of some core indicators, as per the end-notes of Board paper BOD/2016/06 DOC 19.

1.2 This will define in greater detail the basis upon which GPE will measure its results and performance over the period of GPE 2020, and with what level of ambition. It serves GPE's objectives of mutual accountability, improved decision-making and institutional learning.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 At its 9-10 December 2015 meeting, in Dakar, the Board endorsed the GPE 2020 Results framework (BOD/2015/12 DOC 08 – Annex 3), based on an agreed theory of change. The framework includes 37 indicators that are hard wired to the goals and objectives of GPE 2020. Within the 37 indicators, 12 were identified by the Board as being core indicators (see Annex 1 and elaborated further below). The results framework is the primary tool for measuring progress and holding all members of the partnership accountable. It is also the vehicle for testing the effectiveness of our operating model and the validity of the theory of change. In Board decision BOD/2015/12-12, the Board of Directors recognized that the next version of the results framework needed to express through its **targets** the level of ambition embraced by GPE 2020.

2.2 Subsequent to this, in its meeting in Oslo of 14-15 June 2016, and as framed in Board decision BOD/2016/06-12, the Board of Directors approved the core indicators with minor changes to some milestones and targets. In the same meeting it was agreed that the non-core indicators would be presented for approval in a call by October 2016. This paper thus recommends the targets for the non-core indicators as well as minor updates to core indicators as per indications in the June paper (end notes). The Secretariat has developed baselines for the non-core indicators, and proposed interim milestones and final 2020 targets, in addition to those for the core indicators (see Annex 1 for the full listing). The same level of ambition as for the core indicators is reflected in the proposed targets for the non-core indicators. For indicators that are impacted directly by GPE's operational model, the Secretariat has been very foot-forward in proposing challenging targets. For other indicators the Secretariat is making proposals that see a notable "bending of the curve", meaning that targets are above what projections based on historical trends indicated.

2.3 As observed with the core indicators, there is significant data shortage for some non-core indicators (e.g. indicators 11 and 13 teacher allocation and internal efficiency coefficient, respectively) that limits the capacity to monitor and report. The improvement of data availability is going to be critical for the Results Framework implementation. The Partnership should increase its effort in that area.

2.4 There are around twice as many non-core indicators as core indicators. Some 30 of them are new indicators and almost one quarter (i.e. 8) of them do not have any historical data available. Among the new indicators an 'equity index' (Indicator 9), developed in cooperation with UNICEF and other partners, is tracking educational equity. A learning assessment system indicator, building on World Bank's SABER methodology, assess capacity of national learning assessment systems (Indicator 15).

Figure 1 sets out the non-core indicators and categorises the level of ambition proposed. (Baselines, milestones and targets data are disaggregated, where relevant and possible, by: (a) gender; and (b) fragile and conflict-affected country (FCAC)). The overall baseline year is 2015, but there is a 2 years lag for UIS data, which means that 2013 data inform the baseline in 2015. For indicators without historical data the baseline year is 2016 (*).

Figure 1

Non-Core Indicators	Level of Ambition	Baseline to 2020 target
3. Cumulative number of equivalent children supported for a year of basic education (primary and lower secondary) by GPE*	Based on 2014 pledges	7.2 million to 22.3 million (2018)
5. Proportion of GPE Developing Country Partners within set thresholds for gender parity index of completion rates for: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	Bending the curve	(a) 62% to 69% (b) 49% to 66%
6. Pre-primary gross enrolment ratio	Bending the curve	28.2% to 32.2%
7. Out-of-school rate for: (a) children of primary school age; (b) children of lower secondary school age	Bending the curve	(a) 20.3% to 17.0% (b) 33.4% to 29.9%
8. Gender parity index of out-of-school rate for: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	Bending the curve	(a) 1.27 to 1.22 (b) 1.12 to 1.04
9. Equity index	Bending the curve	22% to 32%
11. Equitable allocation of teachers, as measured by the relationship (R^2) between the number of teachers and the number of pupils per school in each DCP	Strong ambition	29% to 48%
13. Repetition and drop out impact on efficiency, as measured by the internal efficiency coefficient at the primary level in each DCP	Strong ambition	26% to 42%
15. Proportion of DCPs with a learning assessment system within the basic education cycle that meets quality standards	Strong ambition	32% to 47%
16.b Proportion of ESPs/TEPs that have a teaching and learning strategy meeting quality standards	Strong ambition	58% to 100%
16.c Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to respond to marginalized groups that meets quality standards (including gender, disability and other context-relevant dimensions)	Strong ambition	68% to 100%
16.d Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to improve efficiency that meets quality standards	Strong ambition	53% to 100%
17. Proportion of DCPs or States with a data strategy that meets quality standards	Strong ambition	n/a to 100%
19. Proportion of LEGs with (a) civil society and (b) teacher representation*	Strong ambition	44% to 59%
20. Proportion of grants supporting EMIS/learning assessment systems*	Strong ambition	34% to 60%
21. Proportion of textbooks purchased and distributed through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants*	Strong ambition	79% to 90%
22. Proportion of teachers trained through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants*	Strong ambition	76% to 90%

Non-Core Indicators	Level of Ambition	Baseline to 2020 target
23. Proportion of classrooms built or rehabilitated through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants*	Strong ambition	67% to 80%
25. Proportion of GPE program grants assessed as on-track with implementation*	Strong ambition	78% to 85%
26. Funding to GPE from non-traditional donors (private sector and those who are first-time donors to GPE)*	Based on 2014 pledges	USD 5 million to USD 11.3 million (2018)
28. Proportion of GPE donors that have: (a) increased their funding for education; or (b) maintained their funding	Bending the curve	48% to 56%
30. Proportion of GPE grants using: (a) co-financed project or (b) sector pooled funding mechanisms	Bending the curve	31% to 46%
31. Proportion of country missions addressing domestic financing issues	Strong ambition	47% to 65%
33. Number of policy, technical, and/or other knowledge products developed and disseminated with funding or support from GPE	Strong ambition	4 to 64
34. Number of advocacy events undertaken with partners and other external stakeholders to support the achievement of GPE's strategic goals and objectives*	Strong ambition	11 to 65
35. Proportion of significant issues identified through audit reviews satisfactorily addressed*	Strong ambition	in process** to 100%
36. Proportion of GPE Secretariat staff time spent on country-facing functions	Strong ambition	28% to 50%
37. Proportion of results reports and evaluation reports published against set targets	Strong ambition	n/a to 100%

* Baseline year is FY 2016
** Due to cut-off dates for addressing audit reviews beyond the baseline reference period (FY 2016), in this case, baseline data will be available from 31 December 2016.
- Targets for indicators 3 and 26 are set for 2018 as those for 2020 will depend on the next replenishment.

2.5 As with the core indicators, for each non-core indicator as well, a detailed methodology has been developed outlining indicator background, rationale, definition, calculation method, logistical chain, periodicity, limitations and other variables. These methodologies, along with the methodologies of the core indicators are being published online.

Establishment of baselines, milestones and targets

2.6 2015 or 2016 baselines are established for all of the 37 indicators[1]. While these baselines indicate the situation prior to, or at the beginning of the implementation of GPE 2020, the targets indicate what the partnership expects to have achieved by 2020, and the milestones show the intermediate progress that will be necessary to achieve these targets. Through the annual results report, the Secretariat will report on the extent to which milestones are being achieved for the Board to be informed of the extent to which the partnership is on track to reach its targets.

2.7 Baselines, milestones and targets data are disaggregated, where relevant and possible, by: (a) gender; and (b) fragile and conflict-affected country (FCAC). This reflects the partnership focus on equity.

The detail of the assumptions made in setting each target are presented in a separate document on line.

Adjustments to core indicators

2.9 As indicated in document BOD/2016/06 DOC 19, a results framework is an evolving document, and the GPE 2020 results framework will have to be adjusted in 2018 after the replenishment, dependent on the level of resources raised an additional funding mechanisms. In addition to this, the same paper indicated that some baselines were proxy baselines, subject to further data collection. While targets for these indicators are fixed, the milestones are calculated by annualising backward from end target to baseline, thus resulting in changes to the milestones. This is the case for core indicators 4 (completion rates); 10 (domestic finance); 16.a (ESP/TEP); 18 (JSR); and 29 (alignment). These changes are included in Annex 1.

2.10 Finally, for one core indicator (32, clarity of roles and responsibilities) data collection was underway during the month of the Board meeting, June 2016. These baseline data, with milestones and target are presented in Annex 1 of this paper.

3. RECOMMENDED DECISION

3.1 The Secretariat requests that the Board of Directors approve the following decision:

[1] Except in a few cases, where baselines are not applicable, such as indicators 17, 32 and 37.

BOD/2016/10-XX—Results Framework Core and non-Core Indicators: The Board of Directors:

1. Approves the non-core indicators of the results framework set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2016/10 DOC 06.
2. Approves the milestones and targets associated with these non-core indicators.
3. Approves the adjustments to the core indicators as per the information in Annex 1.

4. BACKGROUND

4.1 As per decision BOD/2015/12-12, the Board endorsed the GPE results framework in its December 9-10, 2015 meeting in Dakar, Senegal, and "recognizing that for some indicators in the results framework the methodologies and baselines still need to be developed, along with overall targets and milestones and core indicators" requested the Secretariat "to develop the next version of the results framework with baselines, milestones, core indicators and targets for Board decision at the June 2016 Board meeting alongside a costed monitoring and evaluation strategy as previously requested by the Board (BOD/2015/05-13)". In June 2016, in Oslo, the Board approved the milestones and targets associated with the core indicators set out in Annex 1 to BOD/2016/06 DOC 19 Revision 1. The Board also mandated the Secretariat to finalize the milestones and targets for non-core indicators with high ambition by October 2016

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

5.1 The results framework is critical for the monitoring of the new strategic plan and for reporting on the results achieved.

6. IMPLICATIONS FOR SECRETARIAT RESOURCES AND RISK ANALYSIS

6.1 The resources necessary for implementation of the results framework have been analyzed separately.

6.2 Main risks are associated with lack of data and non-achievement of the targets.

7. NEXT STEPS

7.1 Following approval of these indicators by the Board, the Secretariat will implement the full results framework and report on it yearly in November/December.

8. PLEASE CONTACT Jean-Marc Bernard (jbernard@globalpartnership.org) for further information.

9. ANNEXES AND GLOSSARY

9.1 Annex 1: Matrix (baseline data, milestones and targets)

Two sets of documents, one presenting the indicator definitions and the assumptions for target setting, and the methodology sheets for all indicators will be available online.

Annex 1: Results Framework: Baselines, milestones, and targets

IMPACT

Strategic Goal 1: Improved and more equitable learning outcomes

Strategic Goal 2: Increased equity, gender equality, and inclusion

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

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
1. Proportion of developing country partners (DCPs) showing improvement on learning outcomes (basic education)	UNICEF, others[2]	Every other year	Overall:[3]	54%	n/a	n/a	60%	n/a	65%
			FCAC:[4]	33%	n/a	n/a	40%	n/a	50%
			Baseline timeframe = CY2000-2013 N = 14 DCPs with international assessment data available						
2. Percentage of children under five (5) years of age who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning, and psychosocial well-being[5]	UNICEF	Every other year	Overall:	66%	n/a	n/a	70%	n/a	74%
			FCAC:	62%	n/a	n/a	-	n/a	-
			Female:	68%	n/a	n/a	71%	n/a	75%
			Baseline timeframe = CY2011-2014 *N = 22 DCPs*						
Strategic Goal 2: Increased equity, gender equality, and inclusion for all in a full cycle of quality education, targeting the poorest and most marginalized, including by gender, disability, ethnicity, and conflict or fragility									
3. Cumulative number of equivalent children supported for a year of basic education (primary and lower secondary) by GPE	UIS and GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	7.2 million	11.3 million	17.3 million	22.3 million	n/a	n/a
			FCAC:	5.6 million	5.6 million	7.2 million	9.5 million	n/a	n/a
			Female:	3.4 million	5.4 million	8.3 million	10.7 million	n/a	n/a
			Baseline timeframe = CY2015 *N = 49 DCPs*						

[2] Including international, regional and national assessments.
[3] Throughout this table, the "Overall" fields display data for all DCPs for which data are available.
[4] Fragile and conflict-affected countries.
[5] "Children under five years of age" refers to children between 36 and 59 months of age.

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
4. Proportion of children who complete: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	UIS	Yearly [two-year time lag]	**(a) Primary Education:**						
			Overall:	72.5%	73.7%	74.8%	76.0%	77.1%	78.3%
			FCAC:	68.1%	69.3%	70.6%	71.9%	73.3%	74.6%
			Female:	70.1%	71.1%	72.3%	73.5%	74.7%	75.9%
			(a) Lower Secondary Education:						
			Overall:	47.9%	48.6%	49.5%	50.3%	51.2%	52.1%
			FCAC:	41.1%	41.9%	42.7%	43.6%	44.5%	45.4%
			Female:	45.7%	46.9%	48.1%	49.3%	50.6%	51.8%
			Baseline timeframe = 2013 *N = 61 DCPs*						
5. Proportion of GPE DCPs within set thresholds for gender parity index of completion rates for: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	UIS	Yearly [two-year time lag]	**(a) Primary Education:**						
			Overall:	62%	64%	65%	66%	68%	69%
			FCAC:	54%	54%	55%	57%	59%	61%
			(b) Lower Secondary Education:						
			Overall:	49%	52%	56%	59%	62%	66%
			FCAC:	36%	32%	38%	43%	48%	54%
			Baseline timeframe = 2013 *N = 61 DCPs*						
6. Pre-primary gross enrolment ratio	UIS	Yearly [two-year time lag]	Overall:	28.2%	29.0%	29.8%	30.6%	31.4%	32.2%
			FCAC:	22.6%	23.3%	24.0%	24.6%	25.3%	26.0%
			Female:	27.5%	28.3%	29.1%	29.9%	30.8%	31.6%
			Baseline timeframe = 2013 *N = 61 DCPs*						
7. Out-of-school rate for: (a) children of primary school age; (b) children of lower secondary school age	UIS	Yearly [two-year time lag]	**(a) Children of Primary School Age:**						
			Overall:	20.3%	19.6%	19.0%	18.3%	17.7%	17.0%
			FCAC:	25.8%	25.0%	24.2%	23.4%	22.5%	21.7%
			Female:	22.7%	21.9%	21.1%	20.2%	19.4%	18.6%
			(b) Children of Lower Secondary School Age:						
			Overall:	33.4%	32.7%	32.0%	31.3%	30.6%	29.9%
			FCAC:	38.4%	37.2%	36.0%	34.8%	33.6%	32.4%
			Female:	35.3%	34.3%	33.3%	32.2%	31.2%	30.2%
			Baseline timeframe = 2013 *N = 61 DCPs*						

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
8. Gender parity index of out-of-school rate for: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	UIS	Yearly [two-year time lag]	**(a) Primary Education:**						
			Overall:	1.27	1.26	1.25	1.24	1.23	1.22
			FCAC:	1.34	1.33	1.32	1.31	1.30	1.29
			(b) Lower Secondary Education:						
			Overall:	1.12	1.10	1.09	1.07	1.05	1.04
			FCAC:	1.19	1.17	1.15	1.14	1.12	1.10
			Baseline timeframe = 2013 *N = 61 DCPs*						
9. Equity index	UNICEF	Yearly	Overall:	22%	24%	26%	28%	30%	32%
			FCAC:	13%	15%	17%	19%	21%	23%
			Baseline timeframe = CY2010-2014 *N = 59 DCPs*						

OUTCOME **Strategic Goal 3: Effective and efficient education systems**									
Strategic Goal 3: Effective and efficient education systems delivering equitable, quality educational services for all									
Indicator	**Source for Data**	**Periodicity**	**Baseline**		**Milestone 2016**	**Milestone 2017**	**Milestone 2018**	**Milestone 2019**	**Target 2020**
10. Proportion of DCPs that have (a) increased their public expenditure on education; or (b) maintained sector spending at 20% or above	DCPs / GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	72% (a - 26%; b - 47%)	76%	79%	83%	86%	90%
			FCAC:	71% (a - 29%; b - 43%)	74%	77%	80%	83%	86%
			Baseline timeframe = CY2015 *N = 47 DCPs*						
11. Equitable allocation of teachers, as measured by the relationship (R^2) between the number of teachers and the number of pupils per school in each DCP	DCPs / GPE Secretariat	Every other year	Overall:	29%	n/a	n/a	38%	n/a	48%
			FCAC:	18%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			Baseline timeframe = CY2010-2014 *N = 21 DCPs*						
12. Proportion of DCPs with pupil/trained teacher ratio below threshold (<40) at the primary level	UIS	Yearly [two-year time lag]	Overall:	25%	27%	29%	31%	33%	35%
			FCAC:	13%	13%	17%	17%	21%	21%
			Baseline timeframe = 2013 *N = 55 DCPs*						
13. Repetition and drop out impact on efficiency, as measured by the internal efficiency coefficient at the primary level in each DCP	DCPs / GPE Secretariat	Every two years	Overall:	26%	n/a	n/a	32%	n/a	42%
			FCAC:	17%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25%
			Baseline timeframe = CY2010-2014 *N = 19 DCPs*						
14. Proportion of DCPs reporting at least 10 of 12 key international education indicators to UIS (including key outcomes, service	UIS	Yearly [two-year time lag]	Overall:	30%	30%	38%	43%	54%	66%
			FCAC:	32%	32%	39%	43%	46%	54%
			Baseline timeframe = 2012-2013 *N = 61 DCPs*						

delivery and financing indicators as identified by GPE)									
15. Proportion of DCPs with a learning assessment system within the basic education cycle that meets quality standards	UIS, UNESCO, World Bank, DCPs	Every other year	Overall:	32%	n/a	n/a	38%	n/a	47%
			FCAC:	21%	n/a	n/a	29%	n/a	36%
			Baseline timeframe = CY2011-2015 *N = 60 DCPs*						

COUNTRY-LEVEL OBJECTIVES

Strategic Objective 1: Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation

(a) Support evidence-based, nationally owned sector plans focused on equity, efficiency and learning

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
16.a Proportion of endorsed (a) education sector plans (ESP) or (b) transitional education plans (TEP) meeting quality standards	GPE Secretariat	Every two years	Overall:	58% of ESPs/TEPs met at least the minimum number of quality standards	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			ESPs:	56% of ESPs met at least 5 quality standards out of 7	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			TEPs:	67% of TEPs met at least 3 quality standards out of 5	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			Baseline = CY2014-2015 *N = 19 sector plans (16 ESPs and 3 TEPs)*						
16.b Proportion of ESPs/TEPs that have a	GPE Secretariat		Overall:	58% of ESPs/TEPs met at least 4	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%

teaching and learning strategy meeting quality standards		Every two years		out of 5 quality standards					
			ESPs:	50% of ESPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			TEPs:	100% of TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			Baseline = CY2014-2015 *N = 19 sector plans (16 ESPs and 3 TEPs)*						
16.c Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to respond to marginalized groups that meets quality standards (including gender, disability, and other context-relevant dimensions)	GPE Secretariat	Every two years	Overall:	68% of ESPs/TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			ESPs:	63% of ESPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			TEPs:	100% of TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			Baseline = CY2014-2015 *N = 19 sector plans (16 ESPs and 3 TEPs)*						
16.d Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to improve efficiency that meets quality standards	GPE Secretariat	Every two years	Overall:	53% of ESPs/TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			ESPs:	50% of ESPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			TEPs:	67% of TEPs met at least 4 out of 5 quality standards	n/a	n/a	95%	n/a	100%
			Baseline = CY2014-2015 *N = 19 sector plans (16 ESPs and 3 TEPs)*						

(b) Enhance sector plan implementation through knowledge and good practice exchange, capacity development and improved monitoring and evaluation, particularly in the areas of teaching and learning and equity and inclusion

Indicator	Source for Data	Perio dicity	Baseline	Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020

17. Proportion of DCPs or States with a data strategy that meets quality standards	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	n/a *Baseline timeframe = FY2015* *N = 1 ESPIG application identified with data gaps to inform key indicators.*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

COUNTRY-LEVEL OBJECTIVES

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

(a) Promote inclusive and evidence-based sector policy dialogue and sector monitoring, through government-led local education groups and the joint sector review process, with participation from civil society, teachers' organizations, the private sector and all development partners

Indicator	Source for Data	Periodicity	Baseline		Milestone 2016	Milestone 2017	Milestone 2018	Milestone 2019	Target 2020
18. Proportion of joint sector reviews (JSRs) meeting quality standards	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	29% of JSRs met at least 3 quality standards out a total of 5	41%	53%	66%	78%	90%
			FCAC:	25% of JSRs met at least 3 quality standards out of a total of 5	38%	51%	64%	77%	90%
			Baseline timeframe = CY15 *N = 35 JSRs*						

(b) Strengthen the capacity of civil society and teacher organizations to engage in evidence-based policy dialogue and sector monitoring on equity and learning, leveraging social accountability to enhance the delivery of results

19. Proportion of LEGs with (a) civil society and (b) teacher representation	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	44% (a – 77%; b – 48%)	n/a	48%	52%	55%	59%

			FCAC:	55% (a – 77%; b – 58%)	n/a	59%	63%	66%	70%
			Baseline timeframe = FY16 *N = 61 LEGs*						
COUNTRY-LEVEL OBJECTIVES **Strategic Objective 3: GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning**									
(a) GPE financing is used to improve national monitoring of outcomes, including learning									
20. Proportion of grants supporting EMIS/learning assessment systems	GPE Secretariat, Grant agents	Yearly	Overall:	34%	n/a	n/a	50%	n/a	60%
			FCAC:	33%	n/a	n/a	43%	n/a	51%
			Baseline timeframe = FY15 *N = 53 active ESPIGs at the end of FY*						

(b) GPE financing is used to improve teaching and learning in national education systems									
Indicator	**Source for Data**	**Periodicity**	**Baseline**		**Milestone 2016**	**Milestone 2017**	**Milestone 2018**	**Milestone 2019**	**Target 2020**
21. Proportion of textbooks purchased and distributed through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants	GPE Secretariat, Grant agents	Yearly	Overall:	79%	n/a	82%	85%	87%	90%
			FCAC:	86%	n/a	87%	88%	89%	90%
			Baseline timeframe = FY16 *N = 33 active ESPIGs with data available*						
22. Proportion of teachers trained through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants	GPE Secretariat, Grant agents	Yearly	Overall:	76%	n/a	79%	82%	86%	90%
			FCAC:	66%	n/a	69%	72%	76%	80%
			Baseline timeframe = FY16 *N = 33 active ESPIGs with data available*						
(c) GPE financing is used to improve equity and access in national education systems									
23. Proportion of classrooms built or rehabilitated through GPE grants, out of	GPE Secretari	Yearly	Overall:	67%	n/a	70%	74%	77%	80%
			FCAC:	50%	n/a	55%	60%	65%	70%

the total planned by GPE grants	at, Grant agents		*Baseline timeframe = FY16* *N = 33 active ESPIGs with data available*						
(d) The GPE funding model is implemented effectively, leading to the achievement of country- selected targets for equity, efficiency, and learning									
24. Proportion of GPE program grant applications approved from 2015 onward: (a) identifying targets in Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning; (b) achieving targets in Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	(a) Not applicable[6] (b) Not applicable[7]	(a) 95% (b) 90%	(a) 95% (b) 90%	(a) 95% (b) 90%	(a) 95% b) 90%	(a) 95% (b) 90%
			FCAC:	(a) Not applicable (b) Not applicable	(a) 90% (b) 90%	(a) 90% (b) 90%	(a) 90% (b) 90%	(a) 90% (b) 90%	(a) 90% (b) 90%
			Baseline timeframe = FY15 *N = (a) 3 ESPIG applications; (b) 0 active ESPIGs with such performance indicators due for assessment in FY15*						
(e) GPE financing is assessed based on whether implementation is on track									
25. Proportion of GPE program grants assessed as on-track with implementation	GPE Secretariat, Grant agents	Yearly	Overall:	78%	n/a	79%	81%	83%	85%
			FCAC:	77%	n/a	79%	80%	82%	83%
			Baseline timeframe = FY16 *N = 54 active ESPIGs at the end of FY*						

[6] This indicator is cumulative and with only 3 applications in 2015, it cannot be assimilated to a baseline (3 out of 3 applications approved, including 2 from FCAC).
[7] Performance data are not available for FY15, as there are no ESPIG applications that identified equity, efficiency, and learning indicators that are up for assessment of target attainment in FY15.

GLOBAL LEVEL OBJECTIVES Strategic Objective 4: Mobilize more and better financing								
(a) Encourage increased, sustainable, and better coordinated international financing for education by diversifying and increasing GPE's international donor base and sources of financing								
Indicator	**Source for Data**	**Periodicity**	**Baseline**	**Milestone 2016**	**Milestone 2017**	**Milestone 2018**	**Milestone 2019**	**Target 2020**
26. Funding to GPE from non-traditional donors (private sector and those who are first-time donors to GPE)	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	5.0 million USD	6.4 million USD	8.5 million USD	11.3 million USD	n/a	n/a
			Baseline timeframe = FY15					
27. Percentage of donors pledges fulfilled	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	100% of pledges fulfilled	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
			Baseline timeframe = FY15					
28. Proportion of GPE donors that have (a) increased their funding for education; or (b) maintained their funding	OECD/DAC	Yearly	48% (a – 38%; b – 10%)	n/a	50%	52%	54%	56%
			Baseline timeframe = CY2010 - 2014 *N = 21 donors*					
(b) Advocate for improved alignment and harmonization of funding from the Global Partnership and its international partners around nationally owned education sector plans and country systems								
29. Proportion of GPE grants aligned to national systems	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall: 34% of ESPIGs meet at least 7 elements of alignment out of a total of 10	37%	41%	44%	47%	51%
			FCAC: 27% of ESPIGs meet at least 7 elements of alignment out of a total of 10	29%	31%	34%	37%	38%
			Baseline timeframe = FY15 *N = 68 active ESPIGs at any point during FY*					
30. Proportion of GPE grants using: (a) co-financed project or (b) sector pooled funding mechanisms	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall: 31% of ESPIGs are co-financed or sector pooled (a – 18%; b – 13%)	34%	37%	40%	43%	46%
			FCAC: 30% of ESPIGs in FCAC are co-financed or sector pooled (a – 19%; b – 11%)	32%	34%	37%	40%	42%

			Baseline timeframe = FY15 *N = 68 active ESPIGs at any point during FY*					
(c) Support increased, efficient, and equitable domestic financing for education through cross-national advocacy, mutual accountability, and support for transparent monitoring and reporting								
Indicator	**Source for Data**	**Periodicity**	**Baseline**		**Milestone 2016**	**Milestone 2017**	**Milestone 2018**	**Milestone 2019**	**Target 2020**
31. Proportion of country missions addressing domestic financing issues	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	Overall:	47%	51%	54%	58%	61%	65%
			FCAC:	62%	65%	65%	65%	65%	65%
			Baseline timeframe = FY15 *N = 57 missions*						
GLOBAL LEVEL OBJECTIVES **Strategic Objective 5: Build a stronger partnership**									
(a) Promote and coordinate consistent country-level roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities among governments, development partners, grant agents, civil society, teacher's organizations, and the private sector through local education groups and a strengthened operational model									
32. Proportion of (a) DCPs and (b) other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities in GPE country processes	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	**All respondents**						
			DCPs:	n/a	n/a	65%	70%	75%	80%
			Other partners:	n/a	n/a	65%	70%	75%	80%
			Respondents in FCAC						
			DCPs:	n/a	n/a	65%	70%	75%	80%
			Other partners:	n/a	n/a	65%	70%	75%	80%
			Baseline timeframe = FY16 *N = 70 respondents in 28 DCPs*						
(b) Use global and cross-national knowledge and good practice exchange effectively to bring about improved education policies and systems, especially in the areas of equity and learning									
33. Number of policy, technical and/or other knowledge products developed and disseminated with funding or support from GPE	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	4		6[8]	21	37	50	64
			Baseline timeframe = FY15						

[8] The target for FY16 was set by the Organization Indicators, which, by definition, does not include KPs developed by partners through GPE funding (GRA KPs).

(c) Expand the partnership's convening and advocacy role, working with partners to strengthen global commitment and financing for education								
Indicator	**Source for Data**	**Periodicity**	**Baseline**	**Milestone 2016**	**Milestone 2017**	**Milestone 2018**	**Milestone 2019**	**Target 2020**
34. Number of advocacy events undertaken with partners and other external stakeholders to support the achievement of GPE's strategic goals and objectives	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	11 *Baseline timeframe = FY16*	n/a	26	38	51	65
(d) Improve GPE's organizational efficiency and effectiveness, creating stronger systems for quality assurance, risk management, country support, and fiduciary oversight								
35. Proportion of significant issues identified through audit reviews satisfactorily addressed	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	*In process* *Baseline timeframe = FY16*	n/a	100%	100%	100%	100%
36. Proportion of GPE Secretariat staff time spent on country-facing functions	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	28% *Baseline timeframe = FY15;* *N = 2,254.74 total work weeks*	32%	36%	40%	45%	50%
(e) Invest in monitoring and evaluation to establish evidence of GPE results, strengthen mutual accountability and improve the work of the partnership								
37. Proportion of results reports and evaluation reports published against set targets	GPE Secretariat	Yearly	n/a *Baseline timeframe = FY15* *N = 1 results report and 0 evaluation reports*	n/a	n/a	71%	89%	100%