Annex 1 – Committee Meeting Minutes

A. GPC and FRC feedback on proposed shifts for GPE's next Strategic Plan

The GPC and FRC met jointly on October 22 for a two-hour session on the Strategic Plan. During the session they discussed findings from the Strategy survey and provided input on the strategic shifts proposed for inclusion in the next Strategic Plan. Below is a consolidated list of their input on the shifts for consideration by the SIC and GEC.

GPC and FRC input

On process:

- Essential to get DCP engagement as was insufficient through the survey.
- Will be important to consider how committees will engage following December.

For consideration when presenting the proposed shifts:

- Generally, like the direction that this is going.
- Try to position education within a broader development strategy – making next generation productive, and able to lead – can empirically demonstrate benefits of investing in education and affecting SDG goals.
- Outline a slightly clearer narrative- what we've learned, where we want to get to, and how we're going to do it.
- Clarify what problem(s) GPE is trying to solve and how GPE is going to become more effective in solving it. Need to get to the core essence of the story- GPE should be a better financier, facilitator of knowledge/exchange, more effective advocate.
- How will the proposed strategic shifts help GPE have a clear value add compared to other initiatives and decrease fragmentation in the sector?
- Where are we and what do we need to do better? What should we do to get there? – have some wider discussions about what is GPE's role in the world? What do we want GPE to be in the future? – not a discussion that we've had.
- There is the what and the how but little about the why, the goal.
- Provide more detail on how to prioritize within the shifts and implications for operationalizing them.

Areas where there may be conflicting views:

- There is a series of tensions that exist within what we are proposing:
  - Establishing a high-level partnership target versus aligning to SDG 4- could look at results framework to provide more specificity instead of a high-level target.
  - Efficiency agenda vs context specificity agenda – while we want to be responsive to context, transaction costs could be very high
  - Focus on themes vs being context driven- don't want to adopt a top-down approach
- Focus on depth vs breadth- doing a few things really well, vs trying to do everything.

- Countries have not taken the step of aligning their education systems to SDG4- is GPE going to play a roll through process supporting countries to align to SDG 4? GPE can't take on the whole SDG.
- SDGs meant to be indivisible from all the other goals- hard to take up pieces of SDG4, should use our analysis and judgement to decide what investment is right for any country at any time.
- When we speak about flexibility, we're not asking what we need to keep. ESP at a technical level is about building consensus around what education is for and what it should do: this is valuable and unique to GPE. Flexibility implies a risk of lack of standards, requirements do have a role.

To be considered within context of the next strategy:

- GPE can really make the case that it can close the resource gap- need to ensure it can move money and show results- need to unblock money and measure results.
- How do we deliver on our ambition? We say that gender and equity is at the heart of what we do but how do we actually deliver on those areas?
- Maintain and emphasize focus on teaching and learning.
- Remain oriented towards supporting the goals of countries- alignment is essential.
- Better reflect GPE's significant convening power at country level.
- Efficiency of spending money needs attention.
- Stepping up incentivization for evidence-based plans and implementation or domestic financing would be useful.
- Domestic resource mobilization- core area to focus on.
- Need to ensure we link learning to grant monitoring and implementation.
- Evaluate how we can ensure that we create ownership at country level.
- What is the evidence of global public goods in supporting global and national efforts?

B. SIC and GEC feedback on proposed shifts for GPE's next Strategic Plan

The SIC and GEC met jointly on October 30 for a whole dedicated to the Strategic Plan. After an introduction by the two Chairs, David Archer and Nesmy Manigat, Alice Albright, CEO, set the stage for the discussions. Committee members first discussed findings from the Strategy survey and provided input on the strategic shifts proposed for inclusion in the next Strategic Plan. In the afternoon, they broke into groups for workshops on the various strategic shifts and reconvened to consolidate their input. Below is a consolidated list of their input on the shifts for consideration to the Board:

<u>Discussion on the survey.</u>

- **Survey background and methodology:** Committee members noted the low response rate from DCP and asked for further consultations to gather DCP input. This should be sufficiently open and not focus only on the already proposed strategic shifts. Committee members also clarified the survey methodology and how data were collected and analyzed, in order to understand the survey responses.

- **Validity of the operational model:** Did the survey response suggest that the current operational model is not working? Or do they put forth ways to improve it? What is the level of support for improving the operational model? The Secretariat responded that the survey responses suggested improvements to the operational mode.
- **Scope:** full SDG agenda comes very strongly through the survey, there seems to be support for looking at education in the context of wider public sector support and other SDGs
- **GPE's role:** it would be useful to map the ToC against the various evaluations. What is GPE specific role and how is it capable of doing all that was presented in the survey? What can GPE do and has done to make a difference in wider public management/financing / system strengthening?
- **Impact of the new strategy:** How do we make sure that the new strategic planning will have an impact in the classroom? How many teacher groups contributed to the survey?

Inputs to the strategic shifts:

- **About strategic shifts:** more information is welcomed on Strategic Shift 1**,** a lot of the shifts about the HOW but how about policy content? Questions on the disruptive nature of the shifts: isn't some of this what the GPE is already doing? Are they all really shifts?
- **New proposed shifts:** the overall shift to invest in people should focus on teachers for the learning crisis is a teaching crisis, new strategic shift on learning and teaching
- **Global Fund:** Emphasis on the fact that GPE is primarily a financing mechanism created to mobilize external funding in order to support government and use its leverage to catalyze more funding in education; there is more that can be done to ensure GPE funding is an effective leverage to increase domestic funding – and this could be a shift as well.
- **Need to provide more context on the previous strategic plan**: what are we shifting from and why did we not reach the objectives? Lessons learned from EPR
- **GPE 's role at global and local levels:**
    - Major challenge of being influent globally (defining GPE's central role in the changing architecture) and locally (fully inclusive partnerships at country-level, role of LEG)
    - Partnership v. leadership => are we leading education or making a strong partnership with multilateral sectors?
- **Governance:** Need to provide more clarity on the governance process for developing the strategy and the role of the committees. How will we ensure the ISE consistently informs the process?
- **Alignment with SDG4**: some members stressed the importance to be aligned with SDG4 while other emphasized the limited capacity to deliver on all of these and the need to establish GPE's comparative advantages as to prioritize efforts, on SDG 4.1 for example. Should the focus for financing be set by GPE centrally or determined by country priorities and needs?
- **Geographical scope**: geographical scope and mandate of GPE, there is a concern that GPE is too thinly spread
- **Flexibility**: some remarks were made about the definition of flexibility, flexibility v. customized context, concern that flexibility would water down the requirements and GPE's core principles
- Need to focus on the **out of school children** and those who do not have access to school

Workshops and report back

SIC and GEC members broke into 4 groups to discuss three strategic shifts in workshop before reporting back to the committees. The proposed shifts were overall welcome with the following inputs from the groups:

- **Sharpen Focus:** country priorities and country process should stay as the focus informed by understanding of wider national context, system-focus is key but with impact at school level, need to focus on coordination and alignment, leveraging of other resources, evidence as a way to drive focus on delivery
- **Stronger Partnership:** need to strengthen existing partnership at country-level (LEG) / internally then reach out outside the partnership to other players in the country (e.g. education clusters where relevant, local universities, other public services) and incentivize the engagement, need to coordinate the approach at country and global level
- **Learning Partnership:** some question on whether this is a shift like others, countries should be supported to generate and use evidence (ownership), core support of global actors with expertise e.g. on statistics, monitoring, planning; build in level of flexibility and ability to respond to lessons learned
- **Greater Flexibility:** shift should be towards ongoing implementation rather than upstream planning / engagement, address differentiation in categories of country contexts, need to clarify flexibility and ensure it doesn't imply watering down the requirements/ GPE's core values, balance between ensuring that funds go to the most in need while not demotivating those who are well performing;

Recommendation and Wrap-Up

Committee members recommended that Committee feedback be reflected in the document going to the board in December. Some major inputs were reiterated in the concluding session: need to further explain shift 1, need to sharpen focus on delivery, possibility of other shifts (teachers and teaching, domestic financing), importance of stressing what we are shifting from and what is non-negotiable, central to GPE identity, considering the balance between encouraging countries making good progress while still making sure that GPE's resources go to those most in need, ensuring that the ISE properly informs the strategic planning, emphasis on country ownership and accountability to children. The question of the full SDG agenda as opposed to a more specific focus (on SDG 4.1 for example) was also debated.

A proposed governance model for guiding the next stage of the strategy process was put forth, which will be examined by the CC in November: the chairs of each committee and a couple of members from each committee would be a sounding board for the pieces of work that are relevant for their committees.