GPE 2030 Results Framework: PILC Annexes

Annex A: Goal level results – aligned with SDG4 – outside the Results Framework

Progress on these indicators in GPE partner countries will be monitored and reported on by the UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report. They are a subset of SDG 4 indicators, chosen because they have national targets set for 2025 and 2030, through a process coordinated by the UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics. These targets will enable the partnership to track progress towards partner countries' own objectives. Data will be disaggregated by categories available in the UIS database, including age, sex, disability, and geographic location. GEMR will be requested to report additional disaggregated data from global research and analysis. Reporting on these indicators will include the percentage of partner countries that report on each indicator and the percentage that report on the corresponding disaggregation.

Child-level outcomes:

1. SDG 4.1.1: Learning outcomes in reading and math, by sex and fragility (a) at grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary
2. SDG 4.1.4: Out-of-school rate (1 year before primary, primary education, lower secondary education, upper secondary education)
3. SDG 4.1.2: Completion rates, by sex and fragility (primary, lower secondary, upper secondary).
4. SDG 4.2.2: Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex
5. SDG 4.5.1 Parity indices (e.g., sex, location, wealth quintile) for select indicators

Education delivery and system management:

1. SDG 4.a.1: Proportion of schools offering basic services, by type of service
2. SDG 4.c.1: Proportion of teachers with the minimum required qualifications, by education level
3. SDG 4.c.4: P Pupil to qualified teacher ratio
4. SDG 4.7.1: Extent to which (i) global citizenship education and (ii) education for sustainable development are mainstreamed in (a) national education

policies; (b) curricula; (c) teacher education; and (d) student assessment (subject to data coverage)

5. SDG 4.5.6: Expenditure on education (public, private, international) as a percentage of GDP.

Annex B: Headline results from GPE grants and co-financing that contribute to the partnership goal

Note: These indicators will be required for GPE grant-funded programs and for programs funded through multiplier co-financing and will be reported on through standard reporting templates. Reporting on cofinancing that doesn't flow into the same program as the multiplier grant will be encouraged but not required, and its results will be estimated using data from the rest of the grant and cofinancing portfolio if they are not reported. For grants that flow into pooled funds separate reporting on GPE funds will not be required. These indicators will be reported as both numbers and percentages of the relevant target population in the program area (to be determined by the grant agent).

Indicator	Approach
H1. Number and percent of children and youth supported with improved quality of education [through GPE grants and cofinancing from partners]	**Definition/approach**: All children and youth that benefit from interventions, financed wholly or in part by GPE grants and/or cofinancing from partners, that improve the quality of education (aligned with the SDG4 definitions of education quality). **Disaggregation:** required: sex, level of education, children and youth with disabilities; if applicable (i.e., if targeted by the program): location (e.g., rural, disadvantaged regions), refugee, and IDP children and youth (these categories will be disaggregated by sex).
H2. Number and percent of children and youth that benefit from interventions that promote gender equality [financed through GPE grants and cofinancing from partners]	**Definition/approach:** Children and youth that benefit from pre-defined categories of interventions that promote gender equality through GPE grant-/co-financed programs. The Secretariat will provide an indicative list of interventions that promote gender equality. This list is expected to include, but is not limited to, gender-responsive curricula and teaching materials, community and classroom activities that address negative gender stereotypes, addressing school-related gender-based violence, mentorship programs for vulnerable girls and boys, addressing gender-related financial barriers through

	scholarships and cash transfers, improving school sanitation facilities etc. For beneficiaries of interventions not included in that list to count towards this indicator, the grant agent will justify how that intervention promotes gender equality. **Disaggregation:** required: sex (with further disaggregation by highly marginalized girls, however defined in each context), level of education; if applicable (i.e., if targeted by the program): location (e.g., rural, disadvantaged regions), children and youth with disabilities, refugee, and IDP children and youth (all disaggregated by sex).
H3. Number and percent of out-of-school children and youth provided education and/or training [through GPE grants and cofinancing from partners]	**Definition/approach:** Out-of-school children and youth of the official age range for a given level of education who are not enrolled in education, who benefit from education and training provided through GPE grant-/co-financed programs. Age ranges for each level of education will be in line with the International Standard Classification of Education levels 1 (primary), 2 (lower secondary) and 3 (upper secondary). Although normally up to and including 18-year-olds, an exact age is not given, as this can vary by country, and marginalized youth may be over-aged due to uneven attendance at lower levels of education. Required for programs that target out of school children **Disaggregation:** required: sex, number of out-of-school beneficiaries who enroll/reenroll in formal education after completion of training, children and youth with disabilities, age group; if targeted by the program: location (e.g., rural, disadvantaged regions), refugee and IDP children and youth (all disaggregated by sex)
H4. Number and percent of children [who benefited from GPE grants or cofinancing from	**Definition/approach:** The preferred sources of data for this indicator are existing national learning assessments, wherever available. However, the methodology retains the

partners] with improved learning outcomes	flexibility to use program-specific learning assessments where national learning assessment data is not available. The number of children with improved learning will be defined as one of the following: ○ If the assessment reports the number or percentage of children who meet a learning proficiency benchmark, all beneficiary children who meet the proficiency benchmark. ○ If the assessment reports average scores, improvement will be defined as a positive, statistically significant change in the average score for the sample of children assessed across two comparable assessments (i.e., same subjects assessed, same scoring scale, and equivalent reference population). If the assessment report provides an estimate of the number/proportion of beneficiary children whose learning improved, that estimate will be used. If not, all beneficiary children whose learning is represented by the learning assessment will be counted as having improved learning outcomes, i.e., the population of whom the sample of children assessed is representative (for sample-based assessments) or all children whose learning was assessed for census assessments. Required for programs that aim to improve learning outcomes (some programs in fragile and conflict-affected contexts, for example, may be excluded). Assessments of any subject or holistic learning domain (such as social-emotional learning and problem solving) and any grade/proficiency level in primary or

	secondary education are permissible. No assessment content or psychometric standards will be applied Examinations are excluded from this indicator because they are not usually designed to measure learning improvement The assessments used do not have to be part of the program funded by GPE grants/multiplier co-financing, i.e., existing learning assessments can be used, if they are representative of at least a subset of program beneficiaries, as follows: o If the population for whom the learning assessments are representative is a superset of program beneficiaries, and these assessments show improvement, all program beneficiaries will be considered to have improved. o If the population for whom the learning assessments are representative are a subset of program beneficiaries, and these assessments show improvements, that subset of program beneficiaries will be considered to have improved. **Disaggregation:** required: sex and level of education; if targeted by the program: location (e.g., rural, disadvantaged regions), children and youth with disabilities, refugee and IDP children and youth (all disaggregated by sex)
H5. Number and percent of teachers who benefit from professional development programs/activities [through GPE grants and cofinancing from partners]	**Definition/approach:** Teachers who benefit from activities that develop skills, knowledge, expertise and other characteristics of a teacher through GPE grant-/co-financed programs. **Disaggregation**: required: sex, level of education; if targeted by the program: location (e.g., rural, disadvantaged regions) and disabilities

Annex C: Draft results framework[1]

Indicator	Methodological notes ***These methodological notes describe indicative dimensions that are expected to be included in the indicator methodologies. They will be finalized by the Secretariat based on analysis of partner countries' priority reforms and enabling factors-related actions, allowing the results framework be responsive to country led priorities.**
Objective I: Country owned priority education reforms effectively implemented, fully integrating gender equality, and inclusion of people with disabilities and refugees, and other marginalized groups based on country context	
1. Percent of partner countries whose priority reform is making demonstrable progress in improving key education system components	**Definition/approach**: Government self-assessment of overall reform progress and progress of interventions that promote gender equality, with local education group validation and supporting evidence. Key system components that are improving to be identified through Secretariat categorization of reform objectives. This categorization is likely to include teachers and teaching quality, foundational learning, access to education including quality infrastructure, gender equality and inclusion, administrative capacity, curriculum and learning materials, early learning and school readiness etc. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

[1] Compared to the initial results framework presented to the Board in June, this draft makes the following changes:

- Adds an indicator on the sustainability of grant-financed interventions (indicator 8), an indicator on progress in sector coordination (indicator 12), and reformulates the other partnership indicators (indicators 9-11).
- Removes an indicator on the improvement in average learning levels in partner countries since this lies outside GPE's influence. Nonetheless, this indicator will be tracked through annual reform monitoring to support dialogue on improving learning.

	Data collection: Annual reform monitoring tool. **Illustrative results statements**: - Xx partner countries' reforms are improving learning through foundational skills acquisition - Xx partner countries reforms are improving inclusion in early childhood education
2. Percent of partner countries improving education planning, budgeting, and monitoring that is gender responsive and inclusive	**Definition/approach**: Government self-assessment of progress with local education group validation. Governments will provide a brief description of and supporting evidence for progress achieved against a pre-specified set of dimensions. These dimensions are likely to include legislative frameworks for free, quality, public education; quality, gender-responsive and inclusive education sector plans and policy frameworks; resilience planning; alignment of education plans and policies with budgets; reporting on sector performance etc. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees. **Data collection**: Annual reform monitoring tool. **Illustrative results statement**: Xx partner countries are developing or improving an education sector plan/policy framework that addresses gender inequality and exclusion
3.a Percent of partner countries making progress towards SDG 4.1.1a reporting 3.b Percent of partner countries achieving top-up triggers related to reporting on SDG 4.1.1a	**Definition/approach**: 3a. Government self-assessment of progress with local education group validation. Governments will provide a brief description of and supporting evidence for progress achieved against a pre-specified set of dimensions. These dimensions are likely to

	include the presence and implementation of a roadmap for SDG 4.1.1a reporting; the presence of an institutionalized learning assessment system that meets quality standards; the availability of disaggregated learning data etc. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees. 3b. Top-up triggers achieved of those that are due in each reporting period. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees (unless exempted from top up). **Data collection**: 3a. Annual reform monitoring tool. 3b. Secretariat verification of top-up trigger achievement based on supporting evidence provided by governments. **Illustrative results statements**: 3a. Xx partner countries have taken actions specified in their plan to develop/implement a learning assessment that meets SDG 4.1.1a quality standards 3b. Same as indicator title
4. Percent of partner countries improving the availability and use of data and evidence	**Definition/approach**: Government self-assessment of progress with local education group validation. Governments will provide a brief description of and supporting evidence for progress achieved against a pre-specified set of dimensions. These dimensions are likely to include the presence of an institutionalized data system which meets quality standards; the publication of statistical yearbooks; the availability of disaggregated data; the data system being inclusive of children with disabilities; the availability of sector diagnostic

	reports etc. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees. **Data collection**: Annual reform monitoring tool. **Illustrative results statement**: Xx partner countries have or are developing a disability-inclusive data system
Objective 2: Domestic and external financing mobilized to support and sustain the effective implementation of priority reforms	
5a. Percent of partner countries improving: - the volume of domestic finance for education, - the equity of domestic finance for education, - and the efficiency of domestic finance for education. 5b. Percent of partner countries achieving top-up triggers related to the volume, equity, and efficiency of domestic finance	**Definition/approach**: 5a. Government self-assessment of progress with local education group validation. Governments will provide a brief description of and supporting evidence for progress achieved against pre-specified sets of dimensions. These dimensions are likely to include: - Volume (domestic resource mobilization for education, sustainability of financing, and adequacy of expenditure etc.); - Equity (mechanisms for equitable resource allocation, mechanisms to ensure that resources reach specific marginalized populations etc.); - Efficiency (reducing input costs, improving public financial management; teacher career management etc.) Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees. 5b. Top-up triggers achieved of those that are due in each reporting period. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and

	countries hosting the highest number of refugees (unless exempted from top-up). **Data collection**: 5a. Annual reform monitoring tool. 5b. Secretariat verification of top-up trigger achievement based on supporting evidence provided by governments. **Illustrative results statements**: 5a. - Xx partner countries are improving the equity of domestic finance through more equitable teacher deployment - Xx partner countries are improving procurement systems for education inputs 5b. Same as indicator title
6. Total cofinancing mobilized through GPE grants	**Definition/approach**: Includes both cofinancing mobilized by the multiplier (this includes regular multiplier grants and all other instruments under the multiplier umbrella, such as debt swaps), as described in multiplier expressions of interest approved by the Secretariat, and any cofinancing mobilized through other GPE mechanisms such as KIX, EOL, and Technical Assistance Initiatives. Disaggregation: By sources and types of financing such as bilateral, multilateral, private sector and foundations; grants, loans, GPE Foundation etc. **Data collection**: Secretariat records of approved multiplier expressions of interest and cofinancing mobilized through other GPE mechanisms

	Illustrative results statement: Same as indicator title
7. Percent of donor commitments to the GPE fund fulfilled	**Definition/approach**: Commitments fulfilled refer to cumulative amounts, over the lifetime of a donor pledge, that are received by GPE. Commitments refer to cumulative amounts pledged by donors during a GPE financing cycle. Disaggregation: By type of donor such as bilateral, multilateral, private sector and foundations, GPE Foundation etc. **Data collection**: Signed donor contribution agreements and Secretariat tracking of funding received **Illustrative results statement**: Same as indicator title
8. Percent of GPE implementation grant-funded programs that contribute to the sustainability of priority reforms	**Definition/approach**: Grant agent self-assessment of program contributions to reform sustainability. Grant agents will provide brief descriptions of and supporting evidence for progress achieved against a pre-specified set of dimensions. These dimensions are likely to include the use of country systems (alignment) and harmonized funding modalities; program contributions to strengthening financial, institutional and human capacity; program contributions to strengthening system resilience to shocks; program provisions for post-program outcomes tracking etc. Applies to multiplier, system transformation, and girls' education accelerator grant-financed programs approved under GPE 2025 and later. Excludes accelerated financing. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees.

	Data collection: Standard question in grant reporting templates **Illustrative results statement**: Xx GPE grant-funded programs contributed to reform sustainability by using and strengthening national systems for procurement and financial management
Objective 3: Reforms driven and sustained by coordinated, effective, inclusive, and accountable partnerships, including core system stakeholders	
9. Percent of partner countries where the partnership is demonstrating mutual accountability for effective partnership	**Definition/approach**: Countries where there is evidence of at least four cases of partnership activity (e.g. LEG meetings or JSRs) and/or actions to support the implementation of the priority reform (actions categorized as partnership actions in the annual reform monitoring tool) in each reporting period. An indicative list of partnership activities and actions that count towards this indicator will be included in the annual reform monitoring tool. These dimensions are likely to include actions to establish pooled financing mechanisms, actions to align partner resources and capacities to priority reforms, joint reviews of reform or sectoral progress, actions to align reporting requirements and mechanisms across programs etc. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees. **Data collection**: Evidence provided through the annual reform monitoring tool. **Illustrative results statements**: - A joint priority reform monitoring exercise by LEG partners was conducted in xx partner countries

	- External funders of education are taking actions to align their programs to priority reforms in xx partner countries
10. Percent of partner countries with inclusive local education groups	**Definition/approach**: Local education groups will be considered inclusive if they have meaningful and effective participation from both teachers' organizations and national civil society organizations and at least two out of youth groups, private sector, women-led organizations, organizations of persons with disabilities, and external funders of education. Only applies to countries where a LEG has been constituted (i.e. the framework for partner countries affected by fragility and conflict does not apply). Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees. Note: The quality of engagement will be assessed on a sample basis through country level evaluations/reviews and is not part of this indicator. **Data collection**: Secretariat maintains a database of LEG membership; any changes to LEG membership to be described in annual reform monitoring tool. **Illustrative results statement**: Xx partner countries have included youth groups in their local education group.
11. Number of policy changes in partner countries influenced by civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or the private sector	**Definition/approach:** Significant changes in education policies achieved with the influence of civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or the private sector for advancing the universal right to education in national, regional, local laws and policies; education plans, curricula, and methodologies; teachers' skills; education

	public administration etc. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees. **Data collection:** Education Out Loud results framework (which already has an equivalent indicator) and Secretariat assessment of any policy changes documented in the annual reform monitoring tool. **Illustrative results statement:** Youth groups influenced significant changes in education policy in xx partner countries
12. Percent of partner countries improving sector coordination	**Definition/approach:** Government self-assessment of progress with local education group validation. Governments will provide a brief description of and supporting evidence for progress achieved against a pre-specified set of dimensions. These dimensions are likely to include improving the effectiveness of local education groups or equivalent bodies; strengthening engagement with ministries of finance for sustainable education finance; ensuring collaboration between humanitarian and development actors and/or other sectors; fostering a culture of learning, innovation and collective improvement amongst education actors etc. Disaggregation: Countries affected by fragility and conflict and countries hosting the highest number of refugees. **Data collection:** Annual reform monitoring tool. **Illustrative results statement:** Local education groups in xx partner countries strengthened their interface with other sectors (e.g., health, child protection) to improve education programming

Annex D: Data from operational monitoring, including value for money

Grant/program	Monitoring approach
Implementation grants (system transformation grants, multiplier grants, girls' education accelerator)	- Tracking overall implementation progress and progress towards objectives on learning, gender equality, inclusion, teachers, curriculum, climate through grant progress reports - Categorizing grant interventions by the thematic categories above and calculating the amount of financing allocated to each thematic category - Tracking standard grant outputs (number of teachers trained, textbooks distributed, and classrooms constructed or rehabilitated) through grant progress reports (system already in place) - Tracking the measurement of and improvements in the intermediate outcomes that are targeted by each grant, including student progression or completion, teaching quality, the availability of teaching and learning materials etc. Reporting will include both the proportion of grants that measure these intermediate outcomes and the proportion that achieve their corresponding targets. **Illustrative results statements**: - Xx% of implementation grants are on track to meet their learning-related objectives

	- Xx% of implementation grant funding was allocated to interventions that support children with disabilities - Xx million textbooks were distributed through GPE grants and cofinancing from partners - Xx% of implementation grants measured teaching quality, of which xx% grants met their objectives with respect to improving teaching quality
System capacity grants	Tracking overall implementation progress by system capacity grant windows through grant progress reports **Illustrative results statement:** Xx% of system capacity grants are on track with respect to activities to mobilize coordinated action and financing
Key results from the KIX, EOL, and Technical Assistance Initiatives.	Annual reporting against each program's results framework. **Illustrative results statement:** EOL established Xx learning collaboratives on effective advocacy strategies.

Value for money framework

Value for money proposition

The value for money framework defines GPE's value for money proposition across three domains:

- The partnership: Harnesses the expertise, capacities, and resources of all partners to deliver nationally owned education reforms.
- The GPE fund: Maximizes the impact of every dollar by leveraging domestic and international resources and incentivizing system-wide reforms.
- The GPE secretariat: Facilitates collaboration across the partnership through lean, fit-for-purpose administrative and operational support.

Value for money dimensions

The framework builds on existing value for money frameworks that typically have four dimensions— economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and equity— and adds a fifth dimension, sustainability:

- Economy refers to obtaining an appropriate quality of inputs at a reasonable cost;
- Efficiency refers to converting inputs into desired outputs;
- Effectiveness refers to converting the outputs of an intervention into the desired results;
- Equity refers to considering the opportunities and constraints that people, particularly the most marginalized, face in spending and programming decisions; and
- Sustainability refers to the extent to which the positive impacts of GPE funding and support to partner countries continue (or are likely to continue) after the initial funding or support ends.

Value for money data

The indicators in the framework are derived entirely from existing data. No one indicator in the framework can be used to draw conclusions on GPE's value for

money. All five dimensions should be considered holistically along with supplemental qualitative evidence on these dimensions from evaluations.

Measurement framework (data sources in brackets)

	Partnership	**GPE fund**	**Secretariat**
Economy	Percent of partner countries where education sector partners are taking actions to align their capacities and resources to priority reforms (derived from results framework, indicator 9)	Total co-financing mobilized through GPE grants (results framework, indicator 6) Grant agent fees and direct grant agent costs as a percentage of the active grant portfolio (Secretariat administrative data)	Secretariat operational expenditure within Board approved parameters (Secretariat administrative data)
Efficiency	Percent of partner countries improving sector coordination (results framework, indicator 12)	Cumulative percentage of grant funds approved under GPE 2030 versus targets (Secretariat administrative data) Percentage of active implementation grants that are on track to meet their objectives (grant progress reports)	Ratio of GPE Secretariat staff to number of partner countries (Secretariat administrative data)
Effectiveness	Percent of partner countries where the partnership is demonstrating	Number and percent of children [who benefited from GPE grants or cofinancing	Percentage of Secretariat key performance indicators met in each reporting

	mutual accountability for effective partnership (results framework, indicator 9)	from partners] with improved learning outcomes (results framework, indicator H4) Percentage of implementation grants that meet their objectives at completion (grant completion reports)	period (Secretariat reports to Board executive committee)
Equity	Percent of partner countries with inclusive local education groups (results framework, indicator 10)	Percentage of GPE grant financing that is allocated to (i) low-income countries (ii) countries affected by fragility and conflict (Secretariat administrative data) Number and percent of children with disabilities supported with better education [through GPE grants or cofinancing from partners] (results framework, indicator H1) Number and percent of children and youth that benefit from interventions that	Secretariat equity indicator to be developed

		promote gender equality [financed through GPE grants and cofinancing from partners] (results framework, indicator H2) Number and percent of out-of-school children and youth provided education and/or training [through GPE grants and cofinancing from partners] (results framework, indicator H3) Proportion of grant financing allocated to interventions to improve (i) gender equality (ii) disability inclusion (gender and disability marker data)	
Sustainability	Percent of partner countries whose priority reform is improving key education system components (results framework, indicator 1)	Percent of GPE implementation grant-funded programs that contribute to the sustainability of priority reforms (results framework, indicator 8)	

	Number of policy changes in partner countries influenced by civil society organizations, teachers' organizations, youth groups, or private providers of education (results framework, indicator 11)	Percent of partner countries achieving top-up triggers related to the volume, equity, and efficiency of domestic finance (results framework, indicator 5b) Percent of partner countries achieving top-up triggers related to reporting on SDG 4.1.1a (results framework, indicator 3b)	

Cost-effectiveness

A potential indicator of cost-effectiveness, the amount of GPE grant funding utilized per child supported with improved quality of education, was considered. However, this indicator is affected by high variability in GPE's programs and contexts – from system strengthening support to service delivery.

GPE prioritizes supporting the most marginalized children, which often involves a higher cost per child. There are also likely to be measurement issues stemming from differences in how programs count the number of children they support, which cannot be fully mitigated by applying a standard methodology.

Therefore, instead of reporting a single value for the grant funding utilized per child supported with improved quality of education across the entire portfolio, value for money reporting will include analysis of this indicator by different types of grants, contexts, and interventions (e.g., grants in partner countries affected by fragility and conflict; grants with different values for gender and disability markers; including and excluding system-focused interventions etc.)