Results agreement with the World Bank on Out-of-School-Children
Under the Global and Regional Activities (GRA) program

Date: March 28, 2014

1. Thematic Area
   - Out of School children

2. Subtheme
   - Addressing the out-of-school-children data and policy gaps

3. Managing Entity Contact Information
   - World Bank: Quentin Wodon, Adviser (principal contact, qwodon@worldbank.org), and Oni Lusk-Stover, Education Operations Officer (alternate, pluskstover@worldbank.org), both with the Human Development Network Education Team

4. Amount out of GPE Fund
   - US$ 1,583,027

5. Proposed Start Date/End Dates
   - March 2014 to September 2016

6. Reporting on Implementation
   - Monitoring reports due June 30 and December 31; completion report due within 3 months after end date of implementation

Note: as explained in the table with the detailed outcomes/results, UNICEF will be responsible for part of the work program.

7. Regional Focus/Beneficiary Countries
   - Global but with a strong emphasis on GPE countries, especially in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia (plus poor countries in Middle-income regions such as Yemen in the Middle East and North Africa).
     - A small part of the work will be conducted on a large number of countries using data including though not limited to comparable Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) data.
     - The in-depth country studies and the capacity building efforts will focus on countries with large out-of-school populations such as (tentatively): DR Congo, Ethiopia, possibly some Indian states, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Senegal, Rwanda, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, and Yemen. Many of these countries are fragile states.
     - Other post-conflict countries will also be included such as Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Burundi, and countries such as Eritrea and Djibouti with high OOSC rates are also a possibility. In selecting countries, UIS, UNICEF, and the World Bank will coordinate and there will be a clear division of labor to avoid duplication of efforts and ensure consistency in policy recommendations.
     - A few comparator countries with better enrollment in basic education will be included as well, especially Ghana and Uganda.
     - For country studies, participation will require strong country interest and demand from the Ministry of Education in particular.

---

1 The information under 1 – 9 should be taken from Form A of the final GRA program proposal and be updated where necessary.
8. Knowledge/Capacity Gap to be Addressed (in very brief form)

- Component 1: Diagnostic – Sequential and conditional decompositions of (learning-adjusted) attainment gaps and analysis of public cost efficiency in basic education using integrated and comparative benchmarking approach.
- Component 2: Simulations – Analysis of potential cost and impact of basic education interventions using Simulations for Equity in Education (SEE).
- Component 3: Private schools/costs – Assessing the contribution of private schools and the cost of schooling for households.
- Component 4: Vulnerable groups – In-depth thematic studies of selected vulnerable groups combing quantitative and qualitative data.
- Component 5: SEE model improvements - Expanding the model to make it even more useful as well as robust for staff from Education Ministries.
- Component 6: Interventions database - Expanding the database of interventions and preparing briefs for practitioners based on the literature.
- Component 7: Capacity building and dissemination - Working closely with country governments to build capacity and disseminate deliverables.

9. Results Expected (in very brief form; see also detailed table below)

See the table below – the three main outcomes correspond to the seven components of the program.

10. Readjustment and mid-term review

If the Managing Entity sees a need for a change amounting to more than 20% of the grant allocation, a request can be sent to the Secretariat for consideration. Based on the monitoring results of the implementation the Secretariat can propose changes too.

The Secretariat will conduct a mid-term review in July 2015 which aims at ensuring that the activity stays on track and relevant to GPE strategic objectives. This may lead to adjustments in the activity.
Detailed Expected Outputs, Results and Outcomes (Please see the Instructions in the Annex):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Outcomes (What will be delivered?)</th>
<th>Outcome indicators, timescales, milestones and targets</th>
<th>Program Outputs (Program Deliverables) with indicators and targets</th>
<th>Activities (planned to obtain or to contribute to achieving stated outcomes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Outcome 1**: Countries, donors, and stakeholders are better informed about the drivers of out-of-school children, lack of learning and cost efficiency of education systems, including in terms of reaching specific highly vulnerable groups of children | **Indicator**: Number of country, donor, or stakeholder documents using results from the sequential analysis (component 1) and/or the thematic studies on highly vulnerable groups (component 4) in their strategies/planning or other reports  
**Timescale/Milestones**: Assessment at project end (one third by mid-point)  
**Target**: 10 country, donor, or stakeholder documents | **Component 1**  
**Output**: Estimation of sequential and conditional probabilities of education transition and benchmarking of cost efficiency  
**Indicator**: Number of countries with sequential analysis adjusted where feasible for learning and assessment of cost efficiency  
**Target**: 40 (20 with learning and/or cost efficiency assessment)  
 **Component 4**  
**Output**: Thematic case studies on specific vulnerable groups and policies (focusing on poverty, street children, child marriage, location disadvantage, and disability)  
**Indicator**: Number of studies  
**Target**: 5 | **Component 1**  
- Diagnostic work based on household surveys using decomposition of education attainment/learning gaps  
- Analysis of public cost efficiency in education systems based on the sequential decomposition and system cost data  
 **Component 4**  
- Diagnostic and thematic case studies using various data sources on high risk groups: the extreme poor, street children, girls marrying early, children in disadvantage locations, and children with a disability |
| **Outcome 2:** Policy-makers and practitioners have a higher capacity to assess the cost effectiveness of interventions in a subset of countries and have improved their education strategies and/or interventions to reach out-of-school children. | **Indicator:** Number of countries where capacity has been increased and where Ministries or other are using the SEE tool and other outputs including those on private providers and household costs (components 2, 5, and 7) | **Component 2:** 
**Output:** SEE simulation results and report for targeted countries; improvements in SEE model 
**Indicator:** Number of countries with SEE simulations on cost-effectiveness of interventions with in subset of countries impact at higher levels/carry-over costs 
**Target:** 8 for SEE model, 6 for carry-on impacts and costs | **Component 2:** 
- Implementation of the SEE costing model with country counterparts in target countries (4 countries led by World Bank staff, 4 countries led by UNICEF) 
- Revision of the model to improve it, including on carry-on impacts and costs |
| **Timescale/Milestones:** Assessment at project end (and partial overall assessment at mid-point); plus feedback from workshop participants and users | **Component 3:** 
**Output:** Diagnostic work on the role of private schools in education provision and on the private costs of schooling for households. 
**Indicators:** Number of countries with assessment of private schools; Number of countries with assessment of household costs 
**Target:** 4 for private schools; 8 for household costs | **Component 3:** 
- Studies with assessment of contribution of private schools to education systems 
- Studies with assessment of the private costs for households of schooling |
| **Target:** 8 countries for the workshops, 6 countries for the use of the SEE model; 4 countries for the work on private schools and 8 countries for the work on the cost of schooling for households. | **Component 7** 
**Output:** Capacity building workshops and dissemination of the project’s principal results through various channels 
**Indicator:** Number of workshops to train Ministry staffs, policymakers, and practitioners in using the SEE model; Number of detailed country studies published; Number of other publications (policy notes, working papers, technical papers; others) 
**Target:** 8 workshops; 8 country studies; 20 additional publications | **Component 7** 
- Organization of workshops for training on using the SEE model (half of the workshops led by UNICEF) 
- Synthesis country studies for targeted countries (half led by UNICEF) 
- Publications and other forms of dissemination through various means (including web, blogs, etc.) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3: Policymakers and practitioners have access to and are using an improved costing model on interventions for out-of-school children as well as an improved database of interventions that increase attainment and learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator:</strong> Number of users (including country teams and other practitioners as well as researchers) of the expanded SEE model and the expanded database of interventions and evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timescale/Milestones:</strong> Assessment at project end (one third by mid-point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> 150 users (as measured through user registration and other tools)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Component 5: | Output: Revised and improved SEE costing model and extensions as needed for costing of programs to reach out-of-school children |
|---|
| Indicator: Excel-based SEE simulation tool and manual |
| **Target:** 1 tool (plus extensions as needed) and 1 manual; other outputs as needed |

| Component 6: | Output: Expanded database on interventions that increase attainment and learning |
|---|
| Indicator: Number of additional impact evaluations included in the database; Number of impact evaluations with cost data; Number of learning notes summarizing the results of intervention areas for policy makers and practitioners |
| **Target:** 50 impact evaluations added, total of 60 evaluations with cost data; 10 learning notes |

<p>| Component 5: | Programming for revisions to and expansion of SEE model (plus extensions as needed) and preparation of manual including examples from country case studies |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 6:</th>
<th>Literature review on new impact evaluations related to education attainment and learning including cost of intervention when available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Inclusion in database and write up of series summary policy notes on main results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex: Information and Instructions for the detailed table on outputs, outcomes/results:

1. Definitions:

- **Overall program goal** (mauve shaded row): Higher level goal (impact) to which the program will contribute.

- **Outcomes**: Expected demand-side behavioral responses by the direct beneficiaries outside the control of the managing/implementing partner that demonstrate uptake, adoption and use of the project outputs, Example: New practices adopted, children in school, reduction in absenteeism, students show improved reading performance, Governments use new databases. The focus should be on outcome for which the program can reasonably be held accountable and does not encompass higher level objectives beyond the responsibility or the program.

- **Indicators**: Indicators are statements of measure: E.g. Number or Percentage of something which improve / increase / decrease. They are meant to verify an expected result is achieved, but they do not themselves express the result. E.g. "Annual training takes place on how to run parenting groups" is the result and not an indicator, while number or percentage of parenting groups trained per year could be the indicator. The indicators should be **SMART**: Specific, Measurable, Attributable, Realistic and relevant, Time-bound, meaning they can be measured, and have baselines, milestones and targets. Example: in follow up survey, X% staff use concepts/skills from learning activity, stakeholder consultations held, feedback reflected in revision of education sector policy, network of official formed after participation in program/workshop, meet regularly etc.

The indicators for the **overall goal** (in the mauve shaded row) should be publicly measurable and tracked. When formulating the **indicators for the outcomes** please ensure they can be measured by someone involved in the project including how the information will be gathered, processed and reported. Preferably the outcome indicators should not be all end of project indicators, sequencing is recommended.

- **Outputs**: Program deliverables (on the supply side) within the control of the managing/implementing partner; tangible products of services that can be counted. Examples: Training plan completed, local staff trained, report completed, new curriculum materials developed, school built, etc. For the outputs indicators and targets should be provided as well including planned dates for completion (e.g. indicate how many staff will be trained and by when).

- **Activities**: Action taken or work performed by which inputs are converted into specific outputs to achieve or to contribute to the achievement of the expected outcomes listed under the first column Training, study, workshop etc.).

2. Guidance:
• Start with providing a clear statement what is the program’s overall goal (changes in institutional performance or behavior / practices of target groups) along with 1 - 3 key indicators to measure this goal. These indicators should be publicly measurable and tracked. They should be at a higher level and relate to the MDGs and/or the GPE strategic goals and objectives the program will contribute to.

3. Then list the major expected program outcomes in the rose colored column 1. Please make sure to clearly define what is intended to be achieved as a result of the interventions (activities) and avoid stating deliverables (which are outputs) under outcomes. Example: “Teachers trained” is an output. The respective outcome could be “students show improved reading performance”. The higher level goal (overall program goal) in this example would be “literacy rates increase”. There should be not more than 3 major outcomes for the whole program.

4. The number of key indicators per outcome should also be limited to a maximum of 3 per outcome so that the monitoring and reporting efforts don't become too complicated.