Mid-term review 2015-2018 Replenishment Report

MAY 2017



Midterm Review:
2015-2018 Replenishment Report

Executive Summary

This report examines the progress at midterm on achieving the goals set for the Global Partnership for Education's (GPE) second replenishment launched in 2014. At that time, 13 ambitious replenishment targets were set for education access, equity, quality and learning, and efficiency of systems and data. The Secretariat reviewed these targets to see where progress is being made, and what more needs to be done to ensure the promise of the 2014 replenishment is realized.

In the context of this report, it is important to note that the most recent UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) data available are from 2014; that is, before the replenishment period began. Thus, 2014 data were used to update the original baselines, and 2012-2014 trends were used to project the anticipated progress by 2016. GPE adopted the GPE 2020 Results Framework in 2016 and some of the indicators, methodologies and data from that framework were used in the midterm review to better align the replenishment indicators with GPE's current monitoring and evaluation approach. For example, some of the baselines and targets were updated to reflect the most recent data from the results framework, while retaining the level of ambition envisioned in the 2015-2018 replenishment.

In the 2 years since the last replenishment, GPE has raised just over half of its target of US$3.5 billion. With this down payment, GPE has made strides toward strengthening education systems to deliver inclusive and equitable quality education for all. While it is still early in the replenishment period, and data are not yet available for 2016, indicative results show positive trends. The following highlights some of these results:

- **Number of children supported.** GPE funding supported the equivalent to the annual cost of schooling of 13.2 million children in 2015 and 2016, 91 percent of the 2-year target of 14.5 million. Of these children, 10.4 million were living in fragile or conflict-affected countries. The proportion of girls supported increased from 42.5 percent in 2014 to 47.7 percent in 2016 *(*Target 2 of the replenishment)
- **Primary completion rate.** The percentage of children reaching the final grade of primary school rose from 72.7 percent in 2012 to 73.2 percent in 2014, and is projected at 76.0 percent in 2016. Countries experiencing fragility and conflict had even bigger increases in primary completion rates; these rose from 67.8 percent in 2012 to 68.5 percent in 2014, and are projected at 71.9 percent in 2016. The number of females completing primary school increased by about 1 percentage point a year from 2012 to 2014, which, although below the target, is still a real improvement. Lower-secondary school completion rates for girls increased from 44.5 percent in 2012 to 47.0 percent in 2014, and are projected at 50.3 percent in 2016 (Targets 5 and 6).

- **Primary completers with core reading and numeracy skills.** The number of children completing primary education able to demonstrate core reading and numeracy skills is estimated to have risen from 16.7 million in 2014 to 18.0 million in 2016, and is on track to meet the 2018 target of 19.3 million[1] (Target 8).
- **Increased availability of data for key education indicators.** The proportion of GPE developing country partners (DCP) reporting 10 out of 12 key indicators to the UIS increased sharply, from 30 percent in 2013 to 43 percent in 2014. As a result, the 2016 milestone of GPE's results framework (43 percent) has already been reached. While there may be fluctuations from year to year, this result suggests the proportion of DCPs improving the availability of data is on track to meet and possibly exceed 2018's ambitious target of 66 percent. (Target 13).
- **Primary and lower-secondary school drop-out rates.** At the replenishment's halfway mark, primary school drop-out rates are on track to fall by 10 percent if current trends continue. Trends in primary school repetition from 2012 to 2014 show some improvement, which could lead to reaching the goal of a 10 percent decrease in repetition rates over the 4 years of the replenishment. At the secondary level, however, progress on repetition rates has not been made, and will require more work to tackle classroom overcrowding, teacher training and other improvements that can help with retention (Targets 9 and 10).
- **Efficiency.** This is the most off-track replenishment target. GPE aimed to increase the efficiency of education systems by 10 percent from 2014 to 2018, but this indicator has declined due to increases in education spending. Increasing the efficiency of education systems will require much more attention, and GPE will be monitoring this closely (Targets 11 and 12).

The midterm replenishment review shows that progress is steady in many areas, but further work is needed to improve the development and use of data to tackle the areas that are not performing well, particularly in equity, quality and efficiency. While much of the data required to effectively set targets and track progress were not available in 2014, the GPE 2020 Results Framework provides a much more rigorous approach to monitoring progress across the priorities of GPE's strategic plan, and will help to ensure that the established baselines are monitored in a way that can feed back into the partnership's work on strengthening education systems. The results framework indicators, milestones and targets will enable better tracking of the targets for the next replenishment and strategy period leading up to 2020.

[1] This is based on a UNESCO *Global Education Monitoring Report* estimate that about 65 percent of children completing primary education can demonstrate core reading and numeracy skills in DCPs.

TARGET	MIDTERM UPDATE
ACCESS	
Target 1 Raise US$3.5 billion for the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Fund	At the halfway mark, GPE raised US$2.23 billion for the 2015-2018 replenishment period, and allocated US$900 million through 20 grants in 22 countries. GPE funding was, however, adversely affected by exchange rate fluctuations, which reduced the partnership's overall capitalization to US$1.79 billion for 2015-2018 and affected its ability to provide finance to all its eligible countries.[2] Because GPE has not yet fully met its replenishment target, the rest of the replenishment targets —for the purpose of this report—were adjusted proportional to the halfway mark of both the fund-raising target and the timeframe.
Target 2 GPE to support 29 million children, of whom 26.5 million are in primary school and 2.5 million in lower-secondary school. GPE to support 23 million children in fragile and conflict-affected states	For 2015 and 2016, GPE funding covered costs equivalent to 1 school year for 13.2 million children, of whom an estimated 47.6% were girls. The indicator for equivalent children supported is equal to 91% of the 2-year target of 14.5 million children.
EQUITY	
Target 3 90% of GPE developing country partners (DCP) will have detailed analyses of equity issues, and be able to report progress on equity	Fifty-two DCPs—80.6% of DCPs—have detailed analyses of equity issues and are able report on progress in improving equity. Because an education sector analysis, is now a requirement of the funding model, it is expected that most countries receiving GPE support for the development and implementation of education sector plans will include detailed analyses of equity issues. This should increase both the quantity of equity analyses and their quality. On this basis, GPE is on track to meet or exceed the 90% target in 2018.

[2] On an exchange rate adjusted basis, GPE is on track to meet the target for donor contributions to the GPE Fund. In the 2015 financial year, GPE successfully raised additional contributions from Canada and small amounts from a number of other donors. However, due to both exchange rate fluctuations and significant pressure on European donors related to the refugee crisis, the negative impact on the partnership's ability to finance all its eligible countries has been significant. It is therefore important to recognize that while the target has been met, GPE faces significant financial pressures (as noted in the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom's Interim Results Report).

Target 4 80% of DCPs have explicit policies and legislation on education and disabilities	The results show that most DCPs analyzed (92%) have signed or ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. This states that all signatories "recognize the right of persons with disabilities to education" (Article 24.1). A significant number of DCPs (68.5%) also include an inclusive education strategy in their sector plans. Even so, it is not always clear how these broader commitments are translated into national policies. According to an analysis led by the Secretariat, only 29.4% of DCPs have an explicit policy on inclusive education. Of the 51 that have active grants, three have an explicit policy for inclusive education, six are in the process of drafting a policy and six have plans to draft a policy. The GPE 2020 Results Framework made progress on defining and tracking the commitment of national education systems to equity, including the explicit commitment to disability.
Target 5 The number of children who do not complete primary education falls from 9.4 million in 2014 to 8.2 million in 2018	The number of children not completing primary education is projected to fall from 9.4 million in 2014 to 8.7 million in 2016. The indicator appears to be on track to meet the 2018 target of 8.2 million children not completing primary education—a decrease of 12.7%.
Target 6 The primary completion rate of girls increases from 71% in 2014 to 76% in 2018, and the lower-secondary completion rate for girls increases from 47% in 2014 to 52% in 2018	Based on 2014 data, the accurate baseline for the primary completion rate for girls in DCPs is 71%. The 2016 primary completion rate for girls is estimated at 74%. Projections suggest the rate will continue to rise by just over 1 percentage point each year. This is greater than the increase of 2.5 percentage points that GPE hoped would be reached at midterm. Latest data show the lower-secondary completion rate for girls in DCPs was 47% in 2014, higher than the original baseline. In 2016, the rate was estimated at 49.3%; this is almost equal to the increase GPE hoped for midway in the replenishment, and represents significant progress toward the goal.
QUALITY AND LEARNING	
Target 7 90% of DCPs have learning outcomes data that allow better management of quality, as well as better monitoring of and reporting on progress on learning 90% of DCPs have a credible learning assessment	Data collected for the GPE 2020 Results Framework show the 90% goal has not yet been reached, but 70.5% of DCPs have credible data for learning outcomes. Almost 32% have established assessment systems, and can therefore monitor and report on the progress of learning outcomes. An additional 28% (17 DCPs) have learning assessments systems under development. And 60% either have or are on track to having learning assessment systems enabling them to collect data on learning outcomes, and to monitor and report on progress. Baseline data from the results framework show an additional 30% (18 DCPs) have nascent learning assessment systems.

Target 8 The number of children who complete primary education annually and who demonstrate core reading and numeracy skills increases from 16.7 million in 2014 to 19.3 million in 2018	The 2014 baseline for the 61 DCPs of the GPE 2020 Results Framework estimates that 16.7 million students reached the final year of primary education and demonstrated core reading and numeracy skills. The estimate for 2016 with the same methodology reached 18 million, suggesting significant progress and an improvement that is on track to reach the 19.3 million target in 2018.
Target 9 Primary and lower-secondary school drop-out rates fall by 10%	The overall trends in drop-out rates are promising. A 5% reduction in primary and lower-secondary drop-out rates, or a target of 36.7% in DCPs, was the expectation at the replenishment's halfway mark. At the primary level, the 1-year change from 2012 to 2013, for which data are available, point to an improvement that is on track for a 10% decline in dropout rates by 2018 if the trend continued.
Target 10 Primary and lower-secondary school repetition rates fall by 10%	Primary education has seen 3 years of consistent reductions in repetition rates, a promising development. The average change from 2012 to 2014 points to an improvement that is on track to meet a 10% decline in repetition rates over the replenishment period. At the lower-secondary level, less progress was made compared with the primary level. As DCPs work to address the issues that often accompany a rapid expansion of access, including overcrowding and better teacher training, it is likely that repetition rates at the lower-secondary level will decrease.
EFFICIENCY OF SYSTEMS	
Target 11 90% of DCPs have detailed analyses of efficiency issues and be able to report on progress on efficiency	Of the 62 DCPs for which national education sector analyses are available, 38 (62%) had a detailed chapter-level discussion of efficiency. There is room for progress on this indicator, and the GPE effort that targets financial and technical support to DCPs for education sector analyses should help countries meet this goal.
Target 12 The efficiency of education systems in DCPs improve by 10%	The indicator measuring efficiency suggests the overall efficiency of DCPs is not on track to meet the target of a 10% improvement. Indeed, efficiency may have declined over the last 2 years, possibly due to higher spending on education without commensurate improvements in drop-out and repetition rates. The GPE 2020 Results Framework will use a more precise measure to track the internal efficiency of education systems.

DATA	
Target 13 The proportion of countries reporting key indicators increase by 50%, from 43% in 2014 to 66% in 2018[3]	UIS 2014 data show 43% of DCPs reporting key indicators, up from 30% in 2013. This means the 2016 milestone of the results framework (43%) is already reached. While there may be some fluctuations from year to year, the indicator is on track to meet the ambitious 2018 target of 66%.

[3] The initial wording was changed to align to the results framework as this dimension is measured in a slightly different way. The initial wording was, "The percentage of missing data for key international indicators will be reduced by more than half from 46% to 20%."

Introduction

In 2014, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) launched its second replenishment for the period 2015-2018. The replenishment campaign aimed to address some of the most important challenges in education. In 2014, 58 million children of primary-school age worldwide were out of school and hundreds of millions in school were not learning. GPE's *250 Million Reasons to Invest in Education: The Case for Investment* set out a bold and ambitious case to ensure that all children have access to quality education, including those in the most difficult situations and in countries affected by fragility and conflict.

The replenishment goals aimed to measure the success of the replenishment not only in resources raised but also in GPE's impact on access, equity, quality learning and the efficiency of education systems in its developing partner countries (DCP). These replenishment goals also reflected the goals of GPE's Strategic Plan 2012-2015.[4] Since the replenishment in 2014, when GPE adopted its results-based funding model, it has allocated $900 million through 20 grants in 22 countries.

In 2015, world leaders endorsed an ambitious agenda to achieve 17 Sustainable Development Goals, with the fourth goal aiming to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all." In the same year, and alongside this process, GPE launched a far-reaching strategic plan for 2016-2020, GPE 2020.[5] The plan is fully aligned with the fourth Sustainable Development Goal, thereby positioning GPE to support the implementation of the new global agenda for education. GPE 2020 also includes a refined theory of change and new partnership-wide results framework underpinned by mutual accountability. This will enable GPE to fully measure, monitor and report on the implementation, effectiveness and impact of GPE 2020 in the coming years.

This report is a midterm review on GPE's progress toward reaching the goals of the 2015-2018 replenishment period. As such, the data baselines and indicators are drawn from 2012 to 2016[6] to assess the progress made on the replenishment outcomes, and the policy and planning processes supported by GPE. Even though GPE had in some instances access to only partial information because of the midterm nature of this report, the review nevertheless shows important trends in the efforts of GPE and its partners to deliver on the promise of the 2014 replenishment. In the coming years, GPE's impact will be reported on through the recently adopted monitoring and evaluation strategy[7] and based on the GPE results framework, adopted in 2016.[8]

Methodology

[4] Strategic Plan 2012-2015. http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/strategic-plan-2012-2015
[5] GPE 2020. http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2020-strategic-plan
[6] Note that data from 2012 were used to develop the baselines and targets for the replenishment in 2014.
[7] GPE Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy. http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-monitoring-and-evaluation-strategy-june-2016
[8] GPE Results Framework. http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-results-framework-2016-2020

Original goals and targets of the GPE replenishment in 2014 were set using baselines derived from estimates in a dataset of 66 GPE eligible country partners using the latest available data, which primarily covered 2012. The methodologies used in this report to track and monitor progress on the replenishment indicators have been updated with the most recent data (2014) and, where possible, aligned with the results framework. The following factors therefore need to be taken into consideration when interpreting the data:

- **Adjustment of baselines and progress indicators.** The original set of DCPs used to formulate baselines in 2014 included a number of small island states, which have not all joined GPE. But several larger-population countries have, leading to a different set of countries being used to generate GPE's data, which is sourced from UNESCO's Institute for Statistics (UIS). The additional countries added 130 million people to the set of countries now used by GPE, which will affect the indicators based on student population. The baselines and progress indicators have therefore been adjusted to align to the listing of GPE's 61 DCPs of the results framework.[9]

- **Available data.** Because UIS data are usually delayed by 2 years, the data available for the midterm report are from 2013-2014, which does not correspond to the first 2 years of the replenishment period. Data for 2015 and 2016 will be available from the end of 2017. So, where possible, this report estimates expected outcomes for these years based on data trends for 2012-2014. The implication of the delay is that it is possible that progress on the 13 replenishment targets is underestimated due to the inability to assess the full impact of GPE programming and support on the basis of actual rather than projected 2015-2016 data. For the future, of course, the Secretariat will be able to better track progress on targets set in the replenishment and in the GPEesults framework, as updated data will be received annually. Although data availability varies somewhat across the indicators, this report uses average population-weighted progress on all 61 DCPs wherever possible.

- **GPE 2020 Results Framework.** Alongside GPE 2020, the partnership has developed a much stronger framework for measuring, monitoring and reporting results (its monitoring and evaluation strategy). This is designed to assess the extent to which the partnership achieves the goals of GPE 2020. Because the replenishment period straddles both the previous and the current strategic plan, this report integrates the old indicators and methodologies with the new ones set in the results framework.[10] This enables GPE's previous replenishment targets to be monitored alongside the now institutionalized monitoring and evaluation strategy for 2016 to 2020.

This report is organized by the five goals of the last replenishment: access, equity, quality and learning, efficiency of systems, and data. Under each goal in the report, an update on the most recent available results and projections of each target for 2015 and 2016 is included. For the indicators where the baseline or projections shifted due to the aforementioned limitations, a similar indicator and

[9] Based on the number of DCPs at the end of 2014.
[10] GPE Results Framework. http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-results-framework-2016-2020

methodology in the esults framework is referenced to show how GPE continues to measure and monitor progress on these indicators.

REPLENISHMENT GOAL 1: ACCESS

TARGET 1: Raise US$3.5 billion for the GPE Fund

DEFINITION

GPE aimed to raise US$3.5 billion for the GPE Fund. This level was set on the assumption that this will leverage US$16 billion in domestic financing, and that the combined financing can achieve the proposed outcomes and targets set in the 2014 Case for Investment.

Results

At midterm, GPE has raised US$2.23 billion for the 2015-2018 replenishment period. GPE funding has been adversely affected by exchange rate fluctuations, which reduced its overall capitalization to US$1.79 billion for the replenishment period and affected its ability to finance all its eligible countries (footnote 2).

The replenishment targets were set based on the successful mobilization of US$3.5 billion for the GPE Fund and the related assumptions about how much that funding could leverage in domestic resources. In other words, the other replenishment targets were based on the premise that this first target on resource mobilization would be met. To date, GPE has raised US$1.79 billion, just over half of the replenishment target for 2015-2018. Additional financing will be raised for the rest of the replenishment period to make further progress on meeting the replenishment targets in addition to those in the GPE 2020 Results Framework.

TARGET 2: Support 29 million children, of whom 26.5 million are in primary school and 2.5 million in lower-secondary school. Support 23 million children in fragile and conflict-affected states.

DEFINITION

This indicator is calculated by dividing country-level disbursements by country-specific public expenditures per child in basic education for each DCP that received a GPE grant in a year.

One factor to note is that GPE funding is used to support the implementation of national education sector plans, and is thus used differently across countries. This unique sector/system approach does not allow the number of children supported by GPE funding to be directly measured, which other agencies can do. This indicator is therefore a proxy to illustrate the scope of GPE support.

Results

For 2015 and 2016, GPE funding covered costs equivalent to 1 school year for 13.2 million children, of whom an estimated 47.6 percent were girls. The indicator of equivalent children supported is equal to 91 percent of the 2-year target of 14.5 million children, which is remarkable because GPE has raised only half of the US$3.5 billion targeted for the current replenishment. This is partly explained by the fact that GPE, in 2015 and 2016, was still disbursing some of the funding of the previous replenishment, and by the continued increase in GPE's annual disbursement levels. Because of the insufficient financing that GPE faces, the overall figure for the indicator for the replenishment period, as projected in the results framework, will be only about 83 percent of the target of supporting 29 million children.

Equivalent Children Supported	
Target (at 2-year mark)	14.5 million
Achieved (2015 and 2016 data)	13.2 million
Progress to target (%)	91
Data Sources: UIS, World Bank data, Secretariat data and GPE calculations.	

In developing the GPE 2020 Results Framework, GPE set milestones for children supported in 2017 and 2018. Assuming GPE meets these milestones, it will have supported 22.3 million children by the end of 2018.

Children Supported	**2015**	**2016**	**2017***	**2018***	**Total**

Total students	7,218,449	5,963,895	4,117,656*	5,000,000*	22,300,000
Female	3,440,288	2,832,681	2,027,031*	2,400,000*	10,700,000
FCAC	5,649,485	4,713,785	N/A	1,900,000*	11,400,000

Data Source: GPE 2020 Results Framework baselines and targets.

Notes: FCAC = fragile and conflict-affected country; N/A = not available. Asterisk denotes projection.

REPLENISHMENT GOAL 2: EQUITY

TARGET 3: 90% of GPE have detailed analyses of equity issues, and be able to report progress on equity

DEFINITION

This indicator is defined as whether a country has an education sector analysis or similar official document that analyses inequalities in education across different definitions, including gender, wealth and regional inequalities in access and quality. To operationalize this definition, a country meets the target if it has a recent education sector analysis or similar document with an equity chapter in which "recent" is defined as the last 9 years (2007-2016). For the purposes of this analysis, a chapter is defined as a first-level organization, meaning a major section of a report, not a subsection or subheading.

Results

Fifty-two DCPs (80.6 percent) have produced an analysis of educational equity issues, typically in the form of an Education for All national review or an education sector analysis.

All 29 countries receiving a GPE education sector plan development grant since 2014, and for which a finalized education sector analysis is available, have high quality analysis on equity. The inclusion of additional funding for the education sector analysis in an education sector plan development grant[11] means that GPE expects even more countries to make progress on this indicator. In 2016, eight countries received support for education sector planning. This support included a thorough education sector analysis, which require the inclusion of the equity dimension under the requirements of the GPE 2020 Results Framework.

Because an education sector analysis is now a requirement of the funding model,[12] it is also expected that most of the countries receiving support from GPE for the development and implementation of an

[11] US$250,000 dedicated to education sector analysis within the US$500,000 education sector plan development grant.

[12] Exceptions can be considered for countries facing acute crises, but vulnerability and equity analyses are still needed to develop a transitional plan in these situations.

education sector plan (ESP) will include detailed analyses of equity issues. DCPs should then increase both the quantity of equity analyses and the quality of these analyses. On this basis, GPE is on track to meet or exceed the 90 percent target in 2018.

Education Plan Development Grants	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	**2016**
Number	11	6	8	8
Data Source: GPE Portfolio Review (2014, 2015, 2016).				

One of the areas of progress on the equity indicator that GPE is developing with the World Bank, UNICEF and UNESCO are more detailed guidelines for education sector analyses and providing training for national educational officials. In 2014, the *Methodological Guidelines for Education Sector Analysis*, volumes 1 and 2, was published. The guidelines provide detailed information on how to incorporate equity analysis and calculate indicators for an education sector analysis. The updated guidelines include a chapter on equity indicators.

Analysis	**Countries**	**Percent**
Detailed analysis on equity issues	50	80.6
Education sector analysis following GPE guidelines	19	30.6
Data Sources: Documents coded from those publically available on Planopolis; Pole de Dakar; World Bank. Notes: N = 62. Analyses of three countries (Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Somalia) conducted at the subnational level.		

The GPE 2020 Results Framework has made progress on defining and tracking the commitment to equity of national ESPs. Progress in education sector planning will be captured by the results framework through a specific indicator on the quality of education sector planning (indicator 16) and its four subindicators (16a, 16b, 16c, 16d), each of which tracks the proportion of countries meeting specific quality standards in their ESPs. Indicator 16c in the results framework tracks the proportion of ESPs and transitional education plans (TEP) that have a strategy to respond to marginalized groups that meets quality standards (including gender, disability and other context-relevant dimensions). In this more rigorous definition, a strategy for marginalized populations is defined as "a long-term goal, medium-term objectives and targets, and a rough idea of key activities to reach the objectives and targets in order to provide equitable basic education for all, particularly the most marginalized."[13] ESPs and TEPs must meet five quality standards. They must be (1) evidence-based, including the identification of the underlying causes of a challenge; (2) relevant, in that they address the underlying causes of a challenge; (3) coherent, in that they align the action plan to the strategies; (4) measurable, by including indicators with targets; and (5) implementable, in that they identify costs, funding sources, responsible entities and timeframes for operationalization. The results framework will therefore track the percentage of ESPs and TEPs that meet four of these five quality standards. The baseline, based on an analysis of 19 ESPs and TEPs developed in 2014 and 2015, finds that 68 percent of ESPs (12 of 16 ESPs) and 100 percent of TEPs (3 of 3 TEPs) met four of the five quality standards.[14]

[13] GPE 2020 Results Framework: Target Setting, p. 36.

[14] GPE 2020 Results Framework: Target Setting, p. 36 for more information on the quality standards.

TARGET 4: 80% of DCPs have explicit policy and legislation on education and disabilities

DEFINITION

The proxy indicator that was used for measuring this target is the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, but this has limitations. Over the past 2 years, GPE has done extensive stocktaking to better understand existing policy and legislation concerning education and disabilities. The stocktaking report gathered disability data, education data on children with disabilities, data on specific rights to education for the disabled, whether ESPs have an inclusive education component and whether explicit policies and legislation exists on inclusive education. A working paper on the information gathered in the stocktaking report will be published in 2017.

Results

The results show that most DCPs analyzed (92.2 percent) have signed or ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. This states that all signatories "recognize the right of persons with disabilities to education" (Article 24.1). It is not clear, however, how these broader commitments are translated into national policies.

GPE's stocktaking report on disability and inclusion examined countries that have explicit policies for inclusive education. This is more comprehensive than just education and disability, which forms part of this indicator. Although inclusive education goes far beyond target 4's objective, and so is not an entirely appropriate proxy measure, it nevertheless reflects a more strategic approach for GPE and provides an interesting insight about the challenges faced by DCPs. Thus, while 92.2 percent of DCPs analyzed for the stocktaking report have signed the convention, 68.5 percent (37 out of 54 analyzed) have an inclusive education strategy in their national ESPs.

That said, an inclusive educational strategy, while indicating a policy intention, does not necessarily carry the weight of law. According to the stocktaking report, only 29.4 percent of countries have an explicit policy on inclusive education. Of the 51 DCPs that have active GPE grants, the report shows that three have an explicit policy for inclusive education, six are in the process of drafting such a policy and six have plans to draft such a policy.

Policy and Legislation	**Number of Countries**	**Total Analyzed**	**Percent**
Signed and ratified the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	43 ratified, 4 signed but not ratified	51	92.2
Inclusive education strategy in education sector plans	37	54	68.5
Explicit policy for inclusive education	15	51	29.4
Data Source: 2016 GPE Disability Stocktaking Report.			

As just noted, the GPE 2020 Results Framework has made progress on defining and tracking the commitment to equity of national education systems, and this includes an explicit commitment to disability. Going forward, indicator 16c in the results framework will track the "proportion of ESPs/TEPs that have a strategy to respond to marginalized groups that meets quality standards (including gender, disability, and other context-relevant dimensions)."

TARGET 5: The number of children who do not complete primary education falls from 9.4 million in 2014 to 8.2 million in 2018

DEFINITION

The 2014 GPE replenishment committed to decreasing the number of students who do not complete primary education. Using initial estimates for the number of students in the final year who do not complete, (based on estimates and projections for 66 countries in 2012), the target was set to reduce the number of students who do not complete primary education to 7.6 million. However, the original assumptions concerning improvements in completion rates that were used to set the target in 2014 had not been empirically observed, and they overestimated possible improvements in primary completion rates based on historic trends. The original assumptions also underestimated the absolute numbers of out-of-school children due to population growth.

The current estimation is based on 61 DCPs for which primary completion rates and population data were available from 2012 to 2014. Based on primary completion rate trends in this period, the projected value of the rate is obtained for 2018. A projection was also made to obtain the primary-school-age population for 2018. The number of primary education completers and non-completers are derived from the primary completion rate and the primary-school-age population figures. The targets were therefore adjusted from 7.6 million to 8.2 million by 2018, based on the 2014 UIS data and the 61 countries of the GPE 2020 Results Framework.

Results

Primary completion rates in DCPs have increased over the past few years. For both primary and lower-secondary completion rates, this report includes the projected outcomes for 2015 and 2016, based on the targets and milestones in the GPE results framework. The data show that despite a slight decrease in primary completion rates in 2013, DCPs in the following year accelerated progress and are likely to further increase their rates in 2015 and 2016. This progress was even pronounced in fragile and conflict-affected countries in the partnership, where rates—although still lagging behind the average—picked up significantly in 2014, and are projected to continue increasing by more than 1 percentage point each year in 2015 and 2016. As a result, the number of children not completing primary education is expected to fall from 9.4 million in 2014 to 8.7 million in 2016. The indicator appears on track to meet the 2018 target of 8.2 million children not completing primary education, representing a decrease of 12.7 percent.

Primary Completion Rate – Total	2014 (baseline)	2015	2016	2017	2018
Students reaching last year of primary education	25,676,164	26,742,182	27,693,957	28,635,316	29,640,501
Primary completion rate (%)	73.2	74.8	76.0	77.1	78.3
Total non-completers	9,400,563	9,009,398	8,745,460	8,505,172	8,214,545

Data Source: UIS June 2016 release, GPE regional averages, 61 partner countries. Indicator (AIR.1.Glast.r).

Notes: Asterisk denotes target based on projections. Data for 2015-2018 come from the GPE 2020 Results Framework milestones for 2017-2020.

TARGET 6: The primary completion rate for girls increases from 71% in 2014 to 76% in 2018, and the lower-secondary completion rate for girls increases from 47% in 2014 to 52% in 2018

DEFINITION

For both primary and lower-secondary completion rates, this report includes projected outcomes for 2015 and 2016, derived using the methodologies for projecting targets and milestones in the GPE 2020 Results Framework. As noted earlier, the original baselines for this indicator were projections from older data and based on a different subset of countries. The baselines for this replenishment target were adjusted to current DCPs, which decreases the initial baseline (based on 2012 data), from 74 percent to 71 percent for primary completion rates, and increases the baseline from 44 percent to 47 percent for lower-secondary completion rates. The targets were overly ambitious and anticipated a rate of growth of 2.5 percentage points, which is significantly higher than the rate of growth seen in historic trends. The targets are now aligned to the results framework, and were adjusted to the 61 countries of the results framework.

Primary completion rate results

Based on 2014 data, the accurate baseline for the primary completion rate for girls in DCPs is 71 percent. In 2016, the rate is estimated at 74 percent, an increase of 3 percentage points. Projections suggest the rate will continue to rise by just over 1 percentage point each year. This is greater than the 1 percentage point increase currently being achieved and that GPE hoped for at the replenishment's halfway mark.

Primary completion rates are increasing consistently among the countries that had the lowest primary completion rates for girls in 2012. Although not all these countries are making significant progress,

Burkina Faso, Ethiopia and Niger have. Niger, for example, improved the primary completion rate of females from 48 percent in 2012 to 58 percent in 2014.

Primary Completion Rate – Female	2014 (baseline)	2015	2016	2017	2018
GPE average (%)	70.8	72.3*	73.5*	74.7*	75.9*
Data Source: UIS June 2016 release, GPE regional averages, 61 partner countries. Indicator (AIR.1.Glast.r). Notes: Asterisk denotes projection. Data for 2015-2018 from the GPE 2020 Results Framework milestones for 2017-2020.					

Lower-secondary completion rate results

Latest data show the lower-secondary completion rate for girls among all DCPs was 47 percent in 2014, higher than the original baseline. In 2016, the lower-secondary completion rate for girls is estimated at 49.3 percent. The increase in this rate is almost equal to the increase GPE hoped for halfway into the replenishment, and is significant progress toward the goal.

Lower-Secondary Completion Rate – Female	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
GPE average (%)	47.0	48.1*	49.3*	50.6*	51.8*
Data Source: UIS June 2016 release, GPE regional averages, 61 partner countries. Indicator (AIR.2.GPV.Glast.r). Notes: Asterisk denotes projection. Data for 2015-2018 come from the GPE 2020 Results Framework milestones for 2017-2020.					

As with the primary completion rate for girls, some DCPs that had the lowest initial lower-secondary completion rates for females (under 40 percent) are now making real progress. Burkina Faso, Burundi, Ethiopia, Madagascar, Mauritania and Senegal have all seen improvements in the rate for girls of more than 4 percent in the past 2 years. Additional support may still be needed in countries that are falling behind. Niger, at 10 percent, has among lowest lower-secondary completion rate of DCPs. And the rate in Guinea fell from 2012 to 2014.

REPLENISHMENT GOAL 3: QUALITY AND LEARNING

TARGET 7: 90% of DCPs will have learning outcomes data that allow better management of quality, as well as monitoring of and reporting on progress. And 90% of DCPs will have a credible learning assessment.

DEFINITION

This indicator had no baseline when the initial targets were set. At that time, the development of a clear definition of how to define and measure country progress on this target was still underway. Significant progress has now been made in how GPE will define and measure this indicator through the GPE 2020 Results Framework; this better defines how GPE will measure progress toward learning-outcomes data and goals for learning assessment systems. The definition and criteria for assessing the quality of learning assessment systems are guided by the framework for learning assessments developed by the World Bank's Systems Approach for Better Education Results.

Results

According to the data collected for the GPE 2020 Results Framework, the goal of 90 percent is not yet met, but 70.5 percent of DCPs have credible learning outcomes data. However, only 33 percent (20 countries) have at least two data points required to monitor and report on the progress of learning outcomes.

Countries with Credible Learning Outcomes Data	**2015**
Developing partner countries (DCP) with national or international assessments that are representative at national or regional level	43 (70.5%)
Data Source: GPE 2020 Results Framework, indicator 1. *Note: Out of 65 DCPs, four were excluded from the analyses (Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines) because they joined the GPE later than the other countries.*	

As part of the GPE 2020 Results Framework, a new methodology adapted from the World Bank's Systems Approach for Better Education Results allows for the assessment of which countries have an established learning assessment system. In the results framework, a credible learning assessment system is defined as one that has established a national large-scale assessment of learning that meets all the following criteria: (1) it has been carried out at least twice, most recently during 2011-2015; (2) it has at least one subject; (3) it has at least one level of basic education; and (4) it is based on official learning standards and curricula. In addition to these criteria, there must be a permanent agency, institution or office that conducts the assessment, and a publically available methodology and technical document on the assessment—or, if an international large-scale assessment, results are made available

to the public within 12 months. According to this definition, only 32 percent of DCPs had an established learning assessment system in 2015.

Countries with Established Learning Assessment System	**2015**
GPE average (%)	32
Fragile and conflict-affected countries (%)	21
Data Source: GPE 2020 Results Framework, indicator 15.	

As well as the learning outcome data requirement in the GPE funding model, the partnership also launched the Assessment for Learning (A4L) initiative. This is one of the knowledge and good practice exchange initiatives created to improve data for learning outcomes. Better data is one of the strongest areas of demand among DCPs, which want increased support for learning assessment systems that deliver policy-relevant evidence for sector planning and administration. A4L aims to foster support for national learning assessment systems. Two of its five objectives directly link to data needs in assessing learning. A4L also aims to increase the availability of learning data at the country, regional and global levels, and to improve the use of learning data to inform educational policy and teacher training.

TARGET 8: The number of children who complete primary annually and who demonstrate core reading and numeracy skills increases from 16.7 million in 2014 to 19.3 million in 2018

DEFINITION

This indicator is calculated as the number of students who enter the last year of primary school, multiplied by an estimated 65 percent who are thought to demonstrate core reading and numeracy skills. The target is estimated from a predicted increase to 68 percent who will meet core reading and numeracy skills. Given the paucity of data and available methodologies to assess these skills, the assumptions behind these targets will be replaced with more robust data as it becomes available.

Results

The 2014 baseline for the 61 DCPs of the GPE 2020 Results Framework estimates that 16.7 million students reached the final year of primary education and demonstrated core reading and numeracy skills. Using the same methodology, an estimated 18.0 million students achieved this in 2016, suggesting significant progress. GPE is therefore on track to meet the 19.3 million target in 2018.

Primary School Completion	**2014 (baseline)**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
Total in last of year primary	25,676,164	26,742,182	27,693,957	28,635,316	29,640,501
Assume 65%	16,689,507	17,382,418	18,001,072	18,612,955	19,266,326

Assume 68%	17,459,792	18,184,684	18,831,891	19,472,015	20,155,541
Data Source: UIS Data June 2016 release – Country Level Data (SAP.1.Glast, AIR.1.Glast.r), total of 61 DCPs. Note: Asterisk denotes projection.					

It must be noted, however, that the evidence on demonstrating core reading and numeracy skills by the end of primary education is still scarce. Thus, the increase in primary completion rates cannot be confidently correlated—at least not directly—with improvements in the number of students with core reading and numeracy skills. GPE and its partners will clearly need to make more progress in improving the quality of education and learning outcomes. To this end, GPE investments in measuring learning will help to ensure a more accurate accounting of performance in this target.

The GPE 2020 Results Framework will track the percentage of countries that show improved learning outcomes in basic education. The new results framework indicator (indicator 1) measures improvement in learning as the percentage of DCPs that have "a positive and statistically significant difference between two paired learning scores (i.e., initial and final scores), where the most recent (final) score is the higher one." Based on an analysis of 20 DCPs that participated in international large-scale assessments, the baseline found that 65 percent showed learning improvements over two points in time.

TARGET 9: Primary and lower-secondary school drop-out rates fall by 10%

DEFINITION

GPE aims to decrease primary and lower secondary drop-out rates by 10 percent over the 4 years of the replenishment period. Reporting on this indicator lags behind other indicators, and the last year of available data is for 2013. The projections have been calculated by extrapolating from the 3-year trend for the latest available data (2011-2013).

The drop-out rate is calculated as the inverse of the survival rate to final grade of primary school and the final grade of secondary school. UIS provided the primary drop-out rate regional average. The lower-secondary drop-out rate is a population-weighted rate, using UIS data downloaded in December 2016. Missing data are filled with trend analysis or the closest available year in cases of more than 1 year of missing data during 2012-2014.

Results

At the replenishment's halfway mark, a 5 percent reduction in primary and lower-secondary drop-out rates, or a target of 36.7 percent, could be expected. At the primary level, the 1-year change between 2012 and 2013, for which the latest data are available, does indeed point to an improvement that is on track to meet the goal of a 10 percent improvement if previous trends continued. It is important to note, however, that the data for drop-out rates show significant volatility in 1-year changes. That said, the overall trend in drop-out rates are promising, and point to progress in drop-out rates at the primary level that, if continued, show GPE to be on track.

Drop-Out Rate – Primary	2014 (baseline)	2015	2016	2017	2018
GPE average (%)	36.5	35.8*	35.2*	34.5*	33.9*
Data Source: UIS June 2016 release, GPE regional averages, 61 partner countries. Indicator (SR.1.Glast.cp.r). *Note: Asterisk denotes projection.*					

Many countries with primary drop-out rates of over 40 percent in 2012 had made significant progress by 2014: Nepal reduced its drop-out rate to 14.8 percent, Lesotho to 8.1 percent, Madagascar to 4.6 percent, and Benin to 4.0 percent. Other countries will need more support. Burundi's drop-out rate, for instance, increased from 2012 to 2014. Overall, lower-secondary drop-out rates are significantly lower than at the primary level. Projections suggest a 22 percent decrease in the lower-secondary drop-out rate from 2014 to 2016, way better than the target.

Drop-Out Rate – Lower Secondary	2014 (baseline)	2015	2016	2017	2018
GPE average (%)	16.4	14.4*	12.8*	11.2*	9.6*
Data Source: UIS December 2016 lower secondary survival rate. *Notes: Indicator (SR.2.Glast.cp). (N = 45). Missing data (N = 24) filled in with trend data or closest available year between 2012-2014 when only one year of data available. Uganda, Honduras and Togo excluded due to questions over data quality (25%+ change in 1 year). Asterisk denotes projection.*					

The GPE 2020 Results Framework does not track progress on drop-out rates as a single indicator. Instead, both repetition and drop-out rates are included in the results framework as a single indicator of internal efficiency, known as the internal efficiency coefficient.[15]

TARGET 10: Primary and lower-secondary school repetition rates fall by 10%

DEFINITION

GPE aims to decrease primary and lower secondary repetition rates by 10 percent over the 4 years of the replenishment period. In 2014, the primary repetition rate was 7.38 percent. A 10% reduction over the period would set a target of a 0.74 percent reduction, to 6.62 percent by 2018. At the halfway mark, we expected to see a 5 percent reduction in primary and lower-secondary drop-out rates, or a target of 7.01 percent.

UIS provided the repetition rates for both primary and lower-secondary. The indicator is calculated as the number of repeaters in a grade in a school year, expressed as a percentage of enrollment in that grade in the previous school year. It is calculated by dividing the number of repeaters in grade in school year (t+1) by the number of pupils from the same cohort enrolled in the same grade in the previous school year (t). The GPE average is weighted by the 2014 school-age population.

[15] See the GPE 2020 Results Framework: Target Setting, indicator 13 for details.

Results

At the primary level, the average change between 2012 and 2014, for which the latest data are available, points to an improvement, suggesting this indicator is on track to meet the goal of a 10 percent decrease over the replenishment period. Overall trends in drop-out rates are promising, and they point to 3 years of consistent reductions in primary repetition rates. In addition to successfully reducing the repetition rate in DCPs, we have seen real improvements in the countries with the highest repetition rates; that is, those that most need to reduce repetition.

Repetition Rate – Primary	**2014 (baseline)**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
GPE average (%)	7.45	7.11*	6.79*	6.47*	6.15*
Data Source: UIS December 2016 release; GPE country-level data. *Notes: Indicator (REPR.1.cp). N = 48. Missing data (N = 19) filled in with trend analysis (2011-2014), or most recent available country-specific repetition rate in cases of more than 1 year of missing data. Asterisk denotes projection.*					

Cutting repetition rates in lower-secondary education has not made as much progress, though this may have been affected by the expanded access to this level from larger numbers of students enrolling. This implies that students with a wider range of abilities are now able to enter lower secondary school, and we would expect that many of these students struggle to attain the necessary standards to meet a grade. This means that it is quite possible that gains in access to lower-secondary education may result—at least initially—in higher repetition rates. As countries work to address the issues that often accompany expanded access, including overcrowding and better teacher training, it is likely that these repetition rates will decrease.

Repetition Rate – Lower Secondary	**2014 (baseline)**	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
GPE average (%)	8.44	8.52*	8.54*	8.56*	8.57*
Data Source: UIS December 2016 release; GPE country-level data. *Notes: Indicator (REPR.2.cp). N=49. Missing data filled in with trend analysis (2012-2014), or most recent available country-specific repetition rate in cases of more than one year of missing data. Asterisk denotes projection.*					

REPLENISHMENT GOAL 4: EFFICIENCY OF SYSTEMS

TARGET 11: 90% of DCPs will have detailed analyses of efficiency issues and will be able to report on progress on efficiency

DEFINITION

This indicator is defined as whether a country has an education sector analysis or similar official document that analyses internal or external efficiency in education. To operationalize this definition, a country meets the target if it has a recent education sector analysis or similar document with at least one chapter dedicated to efficiency issues, where "recent" is defined as the last 9 years (2007-2016), and a chapter is defined as a first-level organization. If a country does not have an education sector analysis, we also look to whether it has a similarly detailed analysis on efficiency issues, which may come from its ESP.

Results

Of the 62 DCPs for which national education sector analyses are available, 38 (61 percent) had an analysis of efficiency issues. This shows there is room for progress, and the GPE effort that targets financial and technical support to DCPs for education sector analyses should help countries meet this goal. A smaller proportion of countries (32 percent) had an analysis aligned to the GPE-endorsed methodology, which advises a whole chapter of efficiency issues, including detailed analysis of drop-out and repetition rates.

Analyses of Efficiency	**Countries**	**Percent**
Analysis with chapter or subsection on efficiency	38	61.3
High Quality Education Sector Analysis (ESA) with Specific Chapter on Internal Efficiency (in ESA or Education for All 2015 Status Report)	20	32.3
Data Sources: Documents coded from those publically available on Planopolis, Pole de Daka, World Bank. Notes: N = 62. Three countries (Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Somalia) not included because analyses conducted at subnational level.		

As already noted, the GPE 2020 Results Framework has made progress on defining and tracking the quality of ESPs, including an explicit sub-indicator (indicator 16d) on efficiency. Indicator 16d tracks the "proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to improve efficiency that meets quality standards," according to a more rigorous definition of quality.[16] Under the results framework, of 19 sector plans analyzed, 53 percent met at least four of five quality standards, corresponding to 50 percent (8 of 16) ESPs and 67 percent (2 of 3) TEPs.

[16] See the GPE 2020 Results Framework, p. 40.

TARGET 12: The efficiency of educational systems in DCPs improves by 10%

DEFINITION

The indicator for efficiency is calculated as the population-weighted average of school life expectancy in years, covering primary and upper-secondary education, divided by government spending on education as a percentage of gross domestic product. Because the indicator is calculated as a fraction, efficiency decreases when countries spend more money on education, even when the expected years of schooling are increasing. And because the GPE regional average is population weighted, volatility in larger countries on this indicator can obscure progress in other countries.

Because of the difficulties with measuring progress on this indicator, and the extent to which progress discourages spending on education, the GPE 2020 Results Framework will no longer use this indicator for efficiency. Instead, it will distinguish between education spending and internal efficiency. Indicator 10 of the results framework will track the proportion of DCPs that have either increased their public spending on education, or maintained sector spending at 20 percent or above. A separate indicator, indicator 13, calculates an internal efficiency coefficient at the primary level in DCPs.

Results

The 2015-2018 replenishment aimed to improve educational efficiency in DCPs. The replenishment's goal was to improve efficiency by 10 percent, though there was no official baseline for this indicator. So, to calculate progress toward this goal, an efficiency indicator was constructed for the period (2009-2012) before the baselines were developed in 2012, and for the 4 years since the baseline (2013-2016). This indicator suggests the overall efficiency of DCPs is not on track to meet the target of a 10 percent efficiency increase; indeed, efficiency has stagnated. This is likely due to the difficulty of measuring efficiency. As the following table shows, the decline is from increases in spending on education, which may reflect greater commitment to education by governments and less burden on families. However, the lack of progress of school life expectancy is worrisome. The GPE 2020 Results Framework will in future use a more precise measure to track internal efficiency.

	Educational Spending (% of GDP)	**School Life Expectancy (years)**	**Efficiency**
2012 Population-weighted average (N = 30)	3.165	9.326	3.327
2014 Population-weighted average (N = 30)	3.348	9.316	3.260
Data Sources: 30 DCPs with two points of data; school life expectancy and percent of GDP from UIS December 2016 release.			

REPLENISHMENT GOAL 5: DATA

TARGET 13 (Updated): Proportion of DCPs reporting key indicators increases by 50%, from 43% in 2014 to 66% in 2018.

DEFINITION

The updated indicator to track GPE's impact on the quality and availability of education sector data, which is included in the GPE 2020 Results Framework, is calculated as the proportion of DCPs reporting at least 10 out of 12 key international education indicators to the UIS (including key outcomes, service delivery, and financing indicators). This threshold was set by the Secretariat as a quality standard for data reporting. The new milestones incorporated into the results framework find that in 2015 only 30 percent of DCPs (18 of 61) met this new goal. However, data reporting for 2016 exceeded the year-one milestone.

The initial target of 13 was, "The percentage of missing data for key international indicators will be reduced by more than half from 46% to 20%." The results framework reports on data as the proportion of countries, not the proportion of missing data. This is an important shift in how the indicator is now conceptualized as it reflects data systems being at the country level and, ultimately, that national data systems need to be strengthened. GPE decided to use the same indicator to report on target 13.

Results

This section uses the data and projections in the GPE 2020 Results Framework. The target of the results framework is more ambitious than the initial target set with the previous indicator. The projections were made using 2013 data with a baseline of 30 percent of DCPs reporting on at least 10 out of 12 key indicators. The milestone for 2016 is 43 percent. UIS 2014 data show that 43 percent of DCPs now report on the key indicators, a sharp increase from 2013 to 2014. In other words, the 2016 milestone is already reached. While there may be some fluctuations from year to year, the indicator seems to be on track to meet the ambitious 2018 target of 66 percent. Interestingly, progress has been made in DCPs affected by fragility and conflict, with the proportion of these countries reporting at least 10 out of 12 indicators rising from 39 percent in 2014 to 43 percent in 2016.

DCPs Reporting Key Indicators	2014 (baseline)	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total GPE (%)	43	38	43	54	66
FCAC (%)	39	39	43	46*	54*

Data Source: GPE 2020 Results Framework, indicator 14.

Notes: FCAC = fragile and conflict-affected countries. Asterisk denotes projection. Data for 2015 and 2016 from results framework milestones for 2017 and 2018.