METHODOLOGY SHEET FOR GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION (GPE) INDICATORS

Indicator title	**Indicator (19)** Proportion of DCPs[1] with Civil Society Organizations (CSO) and teacher representation (TO) on LEGs[2]
Result measured (from GPE Results Framework):	**Country-level objective - Strategic Objective (2)** Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring (b) Strengthen the capacity of civil society and teachers' organizations to engage in evidence-based policy dialogue and sector monitoring on equity and learning, leveraging social accountability to enhance the delivery of results

JUSTIFICATION FOR INDICATOR

Background/context for indicator:	Country ownership and inclusive partnerships are principles embraced by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), in alignment with the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action. "Ownership" entails that developing countries themselves set their own strategies for poverty reduction, improve their institutions, and tackle corruption. "Inclusive partnerships" refers to involvement of all partners, including Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) as well as donors and foundations.[3] Local Education Groups (LEGs) are an important vehicle to make the abstract concept more concrete and they are, consequentially, a key element of GPE's Operational Model. The Secretariat supports LEGs to self-assess, identify gaps, and agree on actions to enhance inclusiveness and effectiveness. This support includes promoting conditions for representative structures such as effective Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and teacher organizations (TOs). The premise of this support is that through inclusion, countries have more say over their development processes via wider participation in development policy formulation, stronger leadership on aid co-ordination and more use of country systems for aid delivery.[4] Further, as stated in the Accra Agenda for Action, all partners, including foundations and civil society are to participate fully[5]. Further, Teacher organizations (TO) may influence not only teachers' working conditions, but also important education policy decisions. In general, teacher organizations support policies that seek to increase the provision of education services because they entail employment of more teachers, more affiliates, and therefore increase the power of the organization itself. Therefore, it is critical to learn how teacher organizations can be incorporated into the decision-making process to support not only these types of policies, but also those that seek to improve the quality of education in general[6].

[1] Developing Country Partners
[2] Local Education Groups
[3] http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/parisdeclarationandaccraagendaforaction.htm
[4] Ibid
[5] Accra Agenda for Action (AAA, 2008), http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/45827311.pdf
[6] World Bank, *SABER-Teachers: Data Collection Instrument* (SABER 2011) http://wbgfiles.worldbank.org/documents/hdn/ed/saber/supporting_doc/Background/TCH/Questionnaire_Teachers.pdf

Rationale for indicator selection:	This indicator is included in the results framework to reflect policy inclusive policy coordination at the country-level. Inclusion is one of the concepts that were submitted to GPE's board as an element of LEGs minimum standards. Inclusion focuses on the extent to which LEG composition reflects key education sector stakeholders. The LEG, at a minimum when GPE-related processes are on the agenda, should include representation from: The Ministry of Education; other line ministries; Development Partners; Civil Society Organizations; Teacher organizations; and Private sector partners. The principle of inclusive partnerships and support are highlighted in GPE's 2016-2020 strategic plan, and reflected in the results framework under country level objective 2, under which GPE "efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning". More specifically, this indicator helps GPE assess the capacity of civil society and teacher organizations to engage in evidence-based policy dialogue and sector monitoring on equity and learning, leveraging social accountability to enhance the delivery of results.[7] Further, it reflects GPEs support to ensuring that CSOs and TOs should play a dynamic role in making citizens' concerns and needs heard.
DEFINITION	
Indicator definition:	This indicator tracks the proportion of Developing Country Partners (DCP) that have representation of both Civil Society Organization(s) (CSO) and Teacher Organization(s) (TO) in their Local Education Groups (LEGs), out of all DCPs in a given calendar year. • **Local Education Group (LEG):** The term LEG is used by GPE in reference to groups whose mandate is to engage at the country level in policy dialogue and alignment and harmonization of education sector support to a country-owned education sector plan (ESP). The specific composition, title, and working arrangements of the LEG may vary according to country contexts. This indicator also considers mechanisms or structures that are recognized nationally as groups that perform the equivalent role as LEGs but are not called LEGs per se. • **Civil Society Organization (CSO):** The World Bank has adopted a definition of civil society developed by a number of leading research centers: [8] "the term civil society to refer to the wide array of non-governmental and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious or philanthropic considerations. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) therefore refer to a wide of array of organizations: community groups, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), labor unions, indigenous groups, charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, and foundations.

[7] GPE *2016-2020 Strategic Plan* (2016) http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2020-strategic-plan

[8] http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/CSO/0,,contentMDK:20101499~menuPK:244752~pagePK:220503~piPK:220476~theSitePK:228717,00.html

	• **Teacher Organization (TO):** A non-governmental association that provides a range of services to teachers. Teacher organizations may provide, among other things, initial teacher education programs and continuing professional development, legal counseling, welfare assistance, lobbying services, political representation and/or representation of teachers' interests. [9] • **Representation:** GPE acknowledges that the term representation may reflect different forms of engagements that may be formal or informal, and may vary in terms of inclusiveness and influence on decision making, depending on the context. As an example, representation may be demonstrated by teacher's ability to negotiate compensation packages, working hours, working conditions, and other matters of the employment relationship (collective bargaining). Teacher organizations may also influence important education policy decisions about curriculum, length of compulsory education, classroom sizes, school finances and organization, etc. Notes: - This indicator tracks the representation of both CSO and TO. Therefore, a DCP that has CSO representation on the LEG but not TO representation will not be counted. Similarly, a DCP that has TO representation but not CSO representation will not be counted either. - In instances where TOs are considered CSOs from a legal status standpoint, they would be counted under this indicator as "TO" and not "CSO."
Unit of measurement:	"n out of N," expressed as a percentage, where: - n refers to the number of DCPs who have representation of ***both*** CSO(s) ***and*** TO(s) on their LEG; and - N refers to the total number of DCPs with any active GPE grant (both ESPIGs and small grants) in a given fiscal year.
Disaggregation:	Fragile/conflict-affected Country (FCAC)
Year for data reported (select only one and mark an "x")	_X_ fiscal year __ calendar year
Frequency of data collection:	Annually

DATA TREATMENT

Source of information for collecting data:	Source document, template, etc.:	The data supplied by CLs will come from various sources, including minutes of LEG meetings, aide memoires, Joint Sector Reviews, partner meetings, mission reports, participant lists from LEG and other meetings and emails from partners at country level.
	Source agency:	Country Leads of GPE Secretariat
Formula:		**<u>Coding at the item level</u>** Once the data was gathered individual responses for CSO and Teacher's Unions *(TO)* representation were assessed to ensure the validity of each response. Each item has multiple responses which

[9] http://wbgfiles.worldbank.org/documents/hdn/ed/saber/supporting_doc/Background/TCH/Questionnaire_Teachers.pdf

	were coded as follows: $$U_{j,t} = \begin{cases} 1\ Civil\ Society\ organization\ (CSO) \\ 2\ Teacher\ society\ organization\ (TSO) \end{cases}$$ $$AREP_{j,i,,u,t} = \begin{cases} 0\ no\ representation \\ 1\ there\ is\ representation \\ 100\ documentation\ exists\ but\ could\ not\ be\ obtained \\ 101\ not\ applicable\ to\ the\ country \\ 102\ representation\ not\ formally\ documented\ but\ exists\ based\ on\ CL\ observations\ and\ meetings \\ 103\ Unsure\ of\ representation \end{cases}$$ $U_{j,t}$ is the type of organization in country *j* in reporting period *t* $AREP_{j,i,u,t}$ answers to item *i* in country *j* and in year *t* in *u* type of organization **Coding at grant level-** Once each response item was coded, each grant belonging to a particular country/federal state was assessed on basis of coding of both CSO and Teacher's Union representation to see if the requirement of this indicator was met. The following was assigned to mark representation or the lack off by individual grants: $$CODE_{j,t} = \begin{cases} 0\ No\ combined\ representation\ of\ Teacher's\ Unions\ and\ CSOs\ on\ the\ LEG) \\ = \text{ if at least one of the two items received a code of 0} \\ 1\ (CSOs\ and\ Teachers\ Unions\ are\ both\ represented\ on\ the\ LEG) \\ = \text{ if both responses were coded as 1.} \\ 100\ (Documentation\ on\ representation\ exists\ but\ could\ not\ be\ obtained) \\ = \text{ if both items for the grant were coded 100} \\ \text{or one item was coded 100 and the other one was coded 1} \\ 101\ (Not\ applicable\ to\ country) = \text{if both items for the grant were coded as 101} \\ \text{or one item was coded 101 and the other one was coded 1} \\ 102\ (Representation\ exists\ but\ not\ formally\ documented) = \text{if both} \\ \text{items for the grant were coded as 102} \\ \text{or one item was coded 102 and the other one was coded 1} \\ 103(Unsure\ of\ representation) = \text{if both} \\ \text{items for the grant were coded as 103} \\ \text{or one item was coded 103 and the other one was coded 1} \end{cases}$$ **Formula at the aggregate level** **Assess whether DCP *j* has both CSO and TO representation on the LEG during a given reporting period ($CSO\&TO_{j,t}$ = 1):** $$CSO\&TO_{j,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if country } CODE_{j,t} = 1 \\ 0, & otherwise \end{cases}$$
Aggregation formula:	**Coding at the portfolio level.** After coding each individual grant, the data was aggregated to reflect the following: **Representation** - all grants that had both CSO and Teacher's Union representation **No representation** - All grants that had either individual or no CSO and Teacher's Union representation on the LEG **Inconclusive** – grants for which the grant level coding was a combination of 100's and 102's **Not applicable** - cases where representation was not applicable to the current context of the country

	The number of countries with representation of both CSO and TO was then summed, and divided by the total number of DCPs in the reporting year. Only countries that had LEG representation of both CSO and TO were counted. **<u>Formulas at the portfolio level</u>** **At the portfolio level, calculate the proportion of DCPs with both CSO and TO representation on the LEG *(%DCP$_{CSO\&TO}$)*:** Sum the number of DCPs with representation on both CSO and TO (***CSO&TO j,t*** = 1) and divide the result by the total number of DCPs in the sample, ***Nt***. Multiply by 100 to obtain a percentage. $$PROP\ (CSO\&TO_{j,t} = 1) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N} CSO\&TO_{j,t}}{Nt} * 100$$
Data limitations (if any known / anticipated):	Additional types of data are needed to understand the role teachers play in unions as a collective group in education. Also, the following information is not captured through this indicator: • Level of inclusiveness of CSO/TO (input, contribution, etc.) is not defined • Number of CSOs/TOs represented on the LEG • Frequency of LEG meeting attendance by CSO/TO representatives
Interpretation	A high value indicates a high degree of representation of CSOs and TOs in LEGs across the Partnership. Representation may reflect different forms of engagements that may be formal or informal, and may vary in terms of inclusiveness and influence on decision making. Thus, these data should be complemented with additional information as to have more nuanced understanding of the role and impact CSOs and TOs have on policy dialogue and other sector related processes within countries.

REFERENCES

- Global Partnership on Education. *GPE Strategic Plan 2016-2020*. 2016 http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2020-strategic-plan
- World Bank. System Approach for Better Education Results, *SABER-Teachers: Data Collection Instrument.* 2011, http://wbgfiles.worldbank.org/documents/hdn/ed/saber/supporting_doc/Background/TCH/Questionnaire_Teachers.pdf

ANNEXES

Annex 1- Data Collection tool

Data collection tool utilized for collecting the data, if any:	CSO/TO representation in LEG Worksheet (provided in Annex 4)

Annex 2- Standard Operating Procedure

Process Name: Data Collection, Quality Assurance, & Storage for Indicator # 19 of the GPE Results Framework	**Owner:** R&P Team	**Updated:**
Function: Measuring GPE Impact	**Version #:** 1	**Review:**
Material changes from prior version of SOP None; this is the first version.		

Summary

This SOP describes the process for data collection, quality assurance, and storage for indicator # 19 (Proportion of LEGs with (a) civil society and (b) teacher representation) of the GPE results framework.

Results / Outputs

This process should result in the results framework being updated with quality assured data on indicator #19.

Interim outputs of the Secretariat:

Completed data collection template

Final Output:

Updated results framework database

Scope

- Begins: The process begins with the Operations Analyst from MU requesting for CSO/TO LEG information from the Country Leads.
- Ends: The process ends with updated data being integrated into the results framework database by the Monitoring and Evaluation Data Manager.
- Includes: All procedural aspects
- Excludes: Methodological aspects of calculating the indicator value. These can be found in the methodology sheet.
- Note: Data will be collected annually using the Calendar Year.

Standards (Policies, Approvals, Deadlines, etc.):

- Policies: GPE 2020, Monitoring Sheet for GPE Results Framework Indicator #19
- Deadlines: M & E Data Manager updates results framework database with the Indicator # 19 data by November 15th
- Approval: The completed data template is prepared by the Operations Analyst (MU) and includes quality checks by the M & E Data Manager and final approval from the Head of M&E

Issues /Risks:

- Relevant documents such as the minutes of LEG meetings might not be available to the country leads on time.

Overview:



By 15th September | By 30th September | By 30th October | By 15th November

Steps in the Process	Roles / Responsibilities	Outputs / Deliverables	Tools / Templates
1. Data Collection Typically by 15th July			
• Request for CSO/TO LEG representation information from country leads in the worksheet designed for collecting data on CSO/TO representation	• Operations Analyst (MU)		Worksheet for CS/TO LEG representation (Annexed)
• Provide data on CS/TO LEG representation to the Operations Analyst (MU)	• Country Leads	Completed worksheet for CS/TO LEG representation	

Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data Typically by 30th September			
• Perform quality assurance checks on the worksheets received from the country leads	• Operations Analyst (MU)		
• Compile the worksheets provided by the various country leads.	• Operations Analyst (MU)	Worksheets with quality assured data	
Aggregate Data Typically by 30th October			
• Enter data into the template provided by the M&E Data Manager	• Operations Analyst (MU)		• Data Collection template
• Compute indicator values using the completed data collection template, based on the latest available classification of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict and forward to M & E data Manager.	• Operations Analyst (MU)	• Completed data collection template and indicator values	• List of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict from the GPE Intranet
• Review completed data collection template and send comments/queries to the Operations Analyst (MU)	• M & E Data Manager		
• Respond to the comments/queries, update data collection template as necessary and forward to M & E data Manager	• Operations Analyst (MU)	Updated data collection template.	
Update Results Framework Database Typically by 15th November			
• Forward data collection template to the Head of M & E for review and approval	• M & E Data Manager		
• Review and approve completed data collection template	• Head of M & E	Approved data collection template	

• Update database using completed template submitted by the Indicator Lead	• M & E Data Manager	Updated database	N/A
• Notify the secretariat on the availability of data in the results framework database through the intranet	• M & E Data Manager	Notification on GPE intranet	

Annex 3- Additional Analysis

(1) Divide the number of DCPs who *only* have CSO representation on LEG by the total number of DCPs in the reporting period:

$$PROP(N_{CSO,t}) = \frac{N_{CSO,t}}{N_t} * 100$$

Where:

$PROP(N_{CSO,t})$ = percentage of DCPs with *only* CSO representation on the LEG during a given reporting period t
$N_{CSO,t}$ = number of DCPs with *only* CSO representation on the LEG during a given reporting period *t*
N_t = total number of DCPs during a given reporting period *t*

(2) Divide the number of DCPs who *only* have TO representation on the LEG by the total number of DCPs in the reporting period:

$$PROP(N_{TO,t}) = \frac{N_{TO,t}}{N_t} * 100$$

Where:

$PROP(N_{TO,t})$ = percentage of DCPs with *only* TO representation on the LEG during a given reporting period t
$N_{TO,t}$ = number of DCPs with *only* TO representation on the LEG during a given reporting period t
N_t = total number of DCPs during a given reporting period t

At the portfolio level
Sum the number of DCPs with representation of *both* CSO *and* TO, and divide the result by the total number of DCPs in the reporting year.

Example
Table A presents the number of DCPs that included CSO and TO representation on LEG in a given reporting period. According to the data in the table, there were 20 missions that included both CSOs and TOs during that reporting period. Therefore, the proportion of DCPs with CSO and TO representation is 20% for that reporting period.

	With CSO representation on LEG	With teacher representation on LEG	With both CSO and TO representation on LEG
Number of DCPs	30	60	20
Total number of DCPs	100		
Proportion of DCPs	30%	60%	20%

Annex 4 - Worksheet used to collect data for FY15 and FY16:

Cluster	Country Lead	Education Specialist	Country	FY2015		FY2016		Respondents Name	Documentation Filed (Y/N)
				Civil Society Organizations	Teacher Organizations	Civil Society Organization	Teacher Organizations		