



Guidelines for Transitional Education Plan Appraisal

May 2017

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of GPE concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city, or area or its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

Published by:

The Global Partnership for Education

900 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington DC, 20006, USA

www.globalpartnership.org

Cover Photos:

Students read GPE supplied supplemental reading books in the library at Billy Town Primary School, a GPE constructed and supported school; Brewerville, Montserrado County, Liberia, July 2016

Credit: GPE/ Kelley Lynch

Peace Mulbah, 5. Nursery and ABC class, Billy Town Public School GPE constructed school; Brewerville, Montserrado County, Liberia

Credit: GPE/ Kelley Lynch

Srei writes on blackboard in class at the Angthlork Reang Sey School in Cambodia, March 2015

Credit: GPE/Livia Barton

Acknowledgments

The transitional education plan (TEP) appraisal guidelines were prepared by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Secretariat and were reviewed by key partners active in the field of education in emergencies and protracted crises. The authoring team would like to thank for their constructive contributions as peer reviewers: Ellen van Kalmthout and Lisa Bender (UNICEF), Kjersti Mowe (Global Campaign for Education), Nina Papadopoulos (USAID), Andrea Naletto (NRC), Sonia Gomez (UNHCR), Randi Gramshaug (Norad), and Anton De Grauwe, Morten Sigsgaard and Leonora MacEwen (IIEP).

The authoring team and overall development process was led on the GPE side by Hugues Moussy, Senior

Education Specialist in charge of Quality Assurance, and by Raphaëlle Martinez, Senior Education Specialist in charge of Planning, System Strengthening and Finance. The authoring team was composed of consultants Anna Haas and Corinne Ilgun with the support of Lynne Bethke. Technical support and inputs from GPE Secretariat were provided by Arianne Wessal, Janne Kjaersgaard Perrier, Daisuke Kanazawa, Louise Banham and Marc-Antoine Percier.

Special acknowledgment is due to GPE Secretariat colleagues who have been essential in the finalization of these guidelines: Krystyna Sonnenberg, Chantal Rigaud and Christiane Yelibi.

Contents

Acknowledgments	i
Acronyms	v
INTRODUCTION	VI
I. APPRAISAL PROCESS	1
II. GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR THE APPRAISAL	5
2.1. Introduction	7
2.2. Is the TEP Strategic?	7
2.2.1. Relevance of Policy and Program Priorities ..	7
2.2.2. Coherence	8
2.3. Is the TEP Targeted?	8
2.3.1. Choice of Priorities	9
2.3.2. System Capacity	9
2.4. Is the TEP Shared?	9
2.4.1. Leadership and Ownership	9
2.4.2. Participatory Process	9
2.4.3. Capacity Development	10
2.5. Is the TEP Evidence-Based?	10
2.5.1. Evidence-Based Analysis	10
2.6. Is the TEP Operational?	11
2.6.1. Financial Feasibility	11
2.6.2. Soundness of the Action Plan	12
2.6.3. Governance and Accountability	12
2.6.4. Robustness of the Results Framework	13

2.7. Is the TEP Sensitive to the Context and Does It Pay Attention to Disparities?.....	13
2.7.1. Vulnerability Analysis.....	13
2.7.2. Attention to Disparities.....	14
III. CORE APPRAISAL QUESTIONS	15
3.1. Matrix with Core Appraisal Questions	18
ANNEX: List of Pre-Check Questions	27

Acronyms

EMIS	Education management information system	LEG	Local education group
ESP	Education sector plan	NGO	Nongovernmental organization
GPE	Global Partnership for Education	TEP	Transitional Education Plan
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan	UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
IIEP	International Institute for Education Planning	UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
INEE	Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies		
KPI	Key performance indicators		

Introduction

At the World Education Forum, held in Incheon in May 2015, the international community stressed that the *success of the 2030 agenda requires sound policies and planning as well as efficient implementation arrangements, and that the aspirations encompassed by Sustainable Development Goal 4 cannot be realized without a significant and well-targeted increase in financing.*

The new global education agenda 2030¹ places strong emphasis on countries affected by adverse situations. It urges governments to put in place robust and responsive policies, strategies and systems to ensure quality education in challenging contexts. It also calls upon the international community to provide coordinated support and investments where education needs are the most acute, and “to develop education systems that are more resilient and responsive in the face of conflict, social unrest and natural hazards.”

In response to the call for greater effort and investment in crisis-affected and challenging situations, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) and UNESCO’s International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) developed transitional education sector plan (TEP) appraisal guidelines to support countries in developing robust TEPs. A TEP is justified where the changing nature of the situation makes development of a longer-term education sector plan (ESP) either technically unfeasible or inadvisable. As the name indicates, a TEP is transitional in nature; its aim is to steer and mobilize resources that will help maintain education services in times of crisis. At the same time, a TEP helps the education sector to progress by including reforms to ensure that education systems become more accountable, inclusive and effective over time. As such, the TEP forms a

national response and a roadmap for how to respond to the call for sound policies and adequate planning arrangements.

The objective of these guidelines is therefore to assist education stakeholders, in particular development partner groups (DPGs),² in appraising the soundness of TEPs. The TEP guidelines complement the plan preparation guidelines by providing a set of questions that together shape the assessment of the soundness and credibility of the plan. The appraisal is meant to be an independent assessment, carried out by actors who have not contributed to the TEP’s preparation in order to provide a fair review of its strengths and of areas needing improvement. Ultimately, the goal of the appraisal is to support partner countries in the development and finalization of a sound TEP before endorsement by partners, which signifies their commitment to support the implementation of the TEP.

The appraisal guidelines include three main sections. The first describes the appraisal process; the second includes a series of guiding questions that cover the key characteristics of a credible TEP. As discussed in the Transitional Education Plan Preparation Guidelines, a credible TEP is evidence-based, sensitive to context, and pays attention to disparities—strategic, targeted and operational.³ These guiding questions are broad and aim to reflect what would be useful to ask in a variety of contexts. Not all questions may be relevant for all countries; some will need to be adapted to the national context and to the specific needs of the education system, whereas others will need to be added to reflect national and local contexts and concerns.

1 The Incheon Declaration, adopted at the World Education Forum held in Incheon, Republic of Korea, in May 2015, constitutes the commitment of the education community to Education 2030 and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The Education 2030 Framework for Action provides guidance for implementing the Education 2030 agenda at global, regional and national levels.

2 The composition of the DPG varies across countries, but generally includes all partners supporting the development, financing and implementation of the education sector plan. It is the DPG’s responsibility to appraise and endorse the TEP. In a broader sense, these appraisal guidelines are also relevant for the local education group (LEG). For further details on the roles and responsibilities of the LEG and the DPG, see the GPE Country-Level Process Guide (2015): <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/country-level-process-guide>.

3 See pp. 7–8 of the Transitional Education Sector Plan Preparation Guidelines.

The third section of these guidelines presents a more focused set of core appraisal questions to be applied to all TEPs. This section also provides a method for assessing the extent to which the plan meets the minimum requirements for a sound and credible TEP, using a scoring system that enables cross-country comparability over time. Finally, the annex presents an even shorter list of pre-check questions that the stakeholders in charge of the appraisal at the country level can use

to assess the extent to which the TEP is ready for the external appraisal.

These guidelines are not exhaustive. They draw heavily on the IIEP-GPE Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Appraisal⁴ and the appraisal processes followed are essentially the same, although the scope and emphasis may vary based on the context. The guidelines will be updated regularly based on country experiences and feedback.

4 <http://www.globalpartnership.org/sites/default/files/2015-06-gpe-iiep-guidelines-education-sector-plan-appraisal.pdf>.

I. Appraisal Process

The appraisal is an independent assessment, carried out by actors who have not contributed to the TEP's preparation in order to provide a fair review of its strengths and areas needing improvement. The goal of the appraisal is to support partner countries in the development and finalization of a sound TEP.

The appraisal process is based on five key steps which include: (i) a clear methodology, (ii) beginning the process early, (iii) commissioning the appraisal based on terms of reference, (iv) an independent assessment, and (v) political and technical dialogue for development of the plan.

Experience has revealed five key steps in making the appraisal process work well:

- **Agree on a clear methodology** and timeline for the appraisal process at an early stage of the plan preparation process.
- **Start the appraisal process early** enough to allow sufficient time for decision makers to discuss and address the findings and recommendations in the appraisal report. The appraisal needs to be seen as an integral part of the plan preparation process and as essential to its finalization.
- **Commission the appraisal based on the terms of reference agreed** upon by the local education group (LEG). The annexed pre-check questions may serve to verify if the critical elements of a credible TEP are in the plan. The pre-check questions can also be used to identify areas that should receive particular attention and areas of improvement. The DPG is responsible for commissioning the appraisal.
- **Conduct the appraisal independently** from the actors who have contributed to the preparation of the plan. This is to avoid conflicts of interest with regard to political decisions with a bearing on the development of the plan and its implementation. The external evaluator should be familiar with the national context and have sufficient expertise to develop a well-informed and objective appraisal.
- **Ground the appraisal process in a transparent, participatory, political, and technical dialogue** for the development of the plan. The process must involve consultations and interviews with key stakeholders, along with a desk review of both the TEP and a selective list of relevant documents. It should also include field visits, if feasible, and it is good practice to organize a validation workshop of the appraisal report's findings and recommendations.

II. Guiding Questions for the Appraisal

The guiding questions aim to facilitate the appraisal of a TEP. These questions are based on six key characteristics of a sound and credible TEP. The questions provide guidance to assess the extent to which a TEP is: (i) strategic, (ii) targeted, (iii) shared, (iv) evidence-based, (v) operational, and (vi) sensitive to context and whether it pays attention to disparities.

2.1. Introduction

This section provides a number of guiding questions for the TEP appraisal. To facilitate the work, the guiding questions are structured along the essential characteristics of what constitutes a sound and credible TEP. The appraisal is not expected to respond to all guiding questions, but to focus on those that are most appropriate and relevant in relation to the country context.

The appraisal must be flexible and adapted to the specific circumstances of each case. Throughout the appraisal work, always keep the following in mind:

- ➊ **Keep capacity development in focus.** The TEP provides an excellent opportunity for system capacity development, with implications for the content and direction of the whole plan. It is important that the appraisal pay strong attention to the ways in which capacity constraints are dealt with in all parts of the TEP. The plan is not required to include a thorough capacity development plan based on already existing assessments, but it should include a realistic roadmap for how to assess, plan and develop capacities during the TEP implementation period. To be effective, capacity development entails long-term commitment and resourcing from both government and supporting partners. While the TEP generally covers a three-year time period, it should pave the way for longer-term investment and engagement in developing national capacities.
- ➋ **Do not forget lessons learned.** Learning from earlier experiences needs to be an integral part of the plan preparation and appraisal processes. This ability is at the very center of a knowledge-based and learning organization. Applying lessons learned from earlier experiences will make the TEP more realistic and likelier to be effective, and can increase implementation progress. The appraisal should therefore make good use of existing documentation, and the appraisal team should hold discussions with key

stakeholders in the sector. In this way, the appraisal can assess the soundness of the plan against previous experiences.

- ➌ **Be selective and document why.** There are many expectations and demands placed on the appraisal in terms of documentary review, interviews, consultations and analysis. The task can easily become overwhelming unless the appraisal efforts are concentrated on the issues that are of particular importance in a specific TEP and at a specific time. It is therefore vital that the appraisal focus on priorities and document the rationale for why certain aspects are given priority while others are not.

2.2. Is the TEP Strategic?

A sound and credible TEP is strategic: The plan identifies strategies that not only help address the education system's immediate needs, but also build the foundation for realizing the system's long-term vision. The TEP presents arguments for the choice of these strategies; the direction it offers guides national authorities and its partners. It therefore helps avoid the type of ad hoc, uncoordinated action that may prevail in situations where significant amounts of project-based support occur outside the government's education sector plan.

2.2.1. RELEVANCE OF POLICY AND PROGRAM PRIORITIES

Overall question: Do the proposed policy and program priorities form an appropriate response to the key education challenges?

- ➊ Does the TEP identify the main underlying causes for the key challenges in education access, quality and management?

- Does the TEP include an analysis of the impact of the crisis on education?
- Does the TEP reflect analysis of realistic scenarios and associated contingency plans?
- Does the TEP include an analysis of the extent to which the education system may have contributed to the conflict/crisis and appropriate actions to promote and contribute to peacebuilding and social cohesion going forward?
- Do the identified policy and program priorities address some of the underlying causes of the key education challenges? Are the links between causes, key challenges and priorities clearly explained?
- Are the policy and program priorities informed by the evidence presented in the education situation analysis?
- Are the policy and program priorities well defined?
- Does the choice of policies and programs take into account lessons learned from past implementation experiences?
- Do the planned policy and program priorities reflect the needs of the citizens, in particular those most marginalized?
- Does the choice of policy and program reflect the reality of budget support to education?
- Has there been an analysis of the recurrent budget for education and projections for donor, national government and other types of resource mobilization?
- Does the TEP follow a logical structure? Is it well organized?
- Is the TEP grounded in evidence-based interventions and program logic?
- To what extent is there consistency between the policy objectives and the programs? Between the programs and their activities?
- Does the costing include all planned programs and activities?
- Do the key indicators to be monitored properly reflect all plan priorities and expected outcomes?
- Are the targets set to monitor progress realistically, and do they include tools for data collection?
- Is the plan sufficiently directive to serve as guidance for ministry staff and development partners over the medium term?
- To what extent do development partners and non-governmental organizations align their support with the TEP?
- To what extent do humanitarian and development partners harmonize their efforts to align with the TEP?

2.2.2. COHERENCE

Overall question: Does the plan present a coherent set of priorities to address key challenges in the education sector?

- Are the policy priorities aligned with the evidence presented in the situation analysis?

2.3. Is the TEP Targeted?

A sound and credible TEP is targeted: The plan focuses on critical education needs in the short and medium terms, and on system capacity development, including the preparation of the next ESP. It focuses on a limited number of policy priorities most likely to drive effective results over the planned period, taking into account the scarcity of the resources available and the capacity/contextual constraints. As such, the TEP may not cover the full education sector. It is an intermediate document and tool within a progressive approach to education sector development.

2.3.1. CHOICE OF PRIORITIES

Overall question: How appropriate and relevant is the choice of priorities in relation to existing challenges and needs?

- Does the TEP focus on a limited number of policy and program priorities? Are they sufficiently targeted? Are they sufficiently phased?
- Do the policy and program priorities address immediate needs, often caused by the crisis situation?
- Do the policy and program priorities address longer-term needs that will help to strengthen the functioning of the education system?
- Does the TEP strike a good balance between the short- and longer-term needs?
- Are short-term needs addressed in a way that contributes to longer-term development of the sector?

2.3.2. SYSTEM CAPACITY

Overall question: To what extent does the plan identify and address existing capacity constraints for the implementation of the plan?

- Does the TEP include a description of the capacities of the ministry's core management functions (including planning, finance, human resources, EMIS, procurement)? Or is an assessment of these capacities planned as part of the TEP?
- Does the TEP include a plan for the preparation of a comprehensive education sector plan?

2.4. Is the TEP Shared?

A sound and credible TEP is shared: The plan is government-driven and developed through a participatory process, ensuring commitment of key actors in the education sector and relevant ministries to support its implementation.

2.4.1. LEADERSHIP AND OWNERSHIP

Overall question: To what extent are national leadership and partners' ownership reflected in the TEP?

- Was there consistent leadership of a national ministry team in developing and writing the TEP?
- Has the plan preparation process contributed to the strengthening of the ministry of education's ability to assume technical leadership?
- How well do the TEP policy priorities correspond to the priorities of national development/poverty-reduction strategies and medium-term expenditure frameworks (if these exist)?
- Does it facilitate a transition between the humanitarian response plan (HRP) for the education sector, and any medium- or longer-term development plans?
- How well is the role and commitment of other ministries described in the TEP (including finance, health, and women's and children's affairs)?
- Where an education cluster or UNHCR Refugee Coordination Model is active, does the TEP present the mechanisms of coordination between the government, the LEG, the education cluster and the UNHCR coordination groups?
- Is the LEG sufficiently inclusive/representative of relevant stakeholders given the education challenges to be addressed?

2.4.2. PARTICIPATORY PROCESS

Overall question: What is the level of involvement of the key stakeholders and partners in the plan preparation process?

- How did the plan preparation process involve the units and people responsible for program implementation, including at subnational levels?

- How did the ministry of finance participate in the preparation of the TEP?
- Which other ministries participated in the plan preparation process?
- Did the ministry of education use a communication strategy to promote the involvement of different stakeholders in the preparation of the TEP?
- What consultations were conducted and to what extent were they inclusive? Did they include a broad range of stakeholders, such as civil society organizations, teacher unions, parent-teacher associations, students, university researchers, nongovernmental education providers, development and humanitarian partners? Were inputs from such stakeholders taken on board?
- To what extent were representatives of all parts of the country involved in consultations? Were representatives of groups that have suffered or are suffering from education disadvantages consulted?
- Are the outcomes of stakeholder consultations adequately reflected in the TEP?

2.4.3. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Overall question: To what extent was the plan preparation used as an opportunity to develop national capacities in education policy and planning?

- Did development partners provide technical support to the preparation process? If yes, what kind of support and for what purposes?
- To what extent was the technical support provided by development partners coordinated?
- If external technical assistance is provided, do those providing such assistance work closely with and support the national team?

- Is such support leading to sustained capacity development?
- Does the TEP include a plan for targeted capacity development? Or does the TEP elaborate on strategies to develop capacities?
- Is the capacity development plan phased and costed?
- Are the skills development needs of staff at central and decentralized levels sufficiently considered in the TEP and included in the budget?

2.5. Is the TEP Evidence-Based?

A sound and credible TEP is evidence-based:

The plan addresses key challenges identified through an evidence-based analysis of the education system. In situations where a comprehensive education sector analysis is not practical due to limitations in data or the amount of time and capacity required for a thorough analysis, the best available data and evidence are used to identify immediate and longer-term needs and to examine the causes of the issues identified. Following this, responsive and viable shorter- or medium-term remediation strategies are developed.

2.5.1. EVIDENCE-BASED ANALYSIS

Overall question: What empirical evidence was available and was it used effectively?

- Does the TEP include an evidence-based education situation analysis?
- Does the TEP include provisions to carry out a comprehensive education sector analysis?

- Is the TEP based on basic financial and education data?⁵
- Are the data recent (maximum three years old)?
- How reliable are the data on which analysis is based?
- If or when the TEP supplements ministry data with data from other sources (rapid needs assessments, surveys, evaluations, research studies, donor reports, citizen-generated data), are the data sources referenced clearly and the assumptions explicitly stated in the TEP?
- Does the TEP include a time-bound, costed plan to strengthen the education management information system (EMIS) and the collection, analysis and provision of disaggregated education data?

2.6. Is the TEP Operational?

A sound and credible TEP is operational: The TEP is a feasible, multiyear plan that includes well-argued implementation and financial hypotheses not only for meeting agreed-upon priorities but also for system development and strategies to overcome financial, data, technical and political constraints. It provides a detailed framework for implementing programs, regularly monitoring progress achieved and corresponding expenditures, as well as assessing the effectiveness of the strategies implemented. It is a lively policy instrument that is monitored regularly and adapts to the changing environment in the course of its implementation. At a minimum, a TEP should be carefully costed, clearly identify implementation roles and responsibilities, and include an achievable results framework.

2.6.1. FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

Overall question: Is the financial framework adequate and realistic?

- Is the plan fiscally viable? Are the financial assumptions realistic?
- Does the estimated cost of the TEP cover all planned program expenditures (capital and recurrent expenditures)?
- Does the plan include quantitative scenarios? Were the scenarios generated by a simulation model?
- Do the projections cover enrollment, human and physical resources, and financial requirements?
- To what extent are the projections based on recent and reliable baseline data?
- To what extent are the projections based on clear and reliable assumptions of unit costs (including for school construction/rehabilitation in remote areas)?
- How realistic are the macroeconomic assumptions made to project domestic resources? Were they validated by the ministry of finance?
- If the TEP includes recruitment of additional teachers, is the increase in salary payments financially sustainable?
- Is the TEP sufficiently explicit about the limitations and assumptions underpinning the financial framework?
- To what extent does the estimation of financial resources cover all domestic and external resources (including those from bilateral and multilateral agencies and NGOs)?
- If domestic financing is insufficient, are potential sources of external financing identified (e.g., donors, private sector, foundations, remittances) and quantified?

⁵ See Annex 1 in the plan preparation guidelines for the list of basic financial and education data.

- Is the funding gap clearly identified and reasonable?
- Are the scenarios to fill the funding gap convincing?

2.6.2. SOUNDNESS OF THE ACTION PLAN⁶

Overall question: Does the action plan provide a sound operational framework?

- Is an annual or multiyear action plan available?
- Are the activities sufficiently comprehensive to fulfill the TEP program objectives?
- To what extent are the volume and timing of activities realistic in relation to available human and financial resources, and in relation to current or potential new threats including conflict and disaster?
- Are all activities clearly defined and linked to targets?
- Does the action plan specify risks to implementation, including those related to possible negative changes in the crisis situation?
- To what extent are the activities costed?
- To what extent are the sources of funding for each activity identified?
- Is the action plan structured so that it is compatible with the budget lines/classification?
- Does the action plan specify the responsible units for each activity?
- Does the structure and content of the action plan lend itself to regular reporting and annual review?

2.6.3. GOVERNANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Overall question: Does the plan include strategies to improve and establish good governance practices, transparency and management accountability?

- To what extent are the responsibilities and accountabilities for the overall implementation of the plan as well as for the different priority programs clearly defined?
- Does the ministry have clear definitions or job descriptions of the roles and responsibilities, and for the corresponding profiles of education staff at different administrative levels? If not, is there a plan to develop them?
- Does the TEP provide a strategy that will help stakeholders at different levels understand their respective roles and responsibilities, so that there is better coordination and communication within the education system?
- In what ways does the TEP aim to strengthen accountability to beneficiaries (such as mechanisms for community feedback)?
- Does the TEP include actions to monitor education expenditure and leakage (such as education expenditure reviews and tracking of disbursed resources from the central to the school level)?
- Does the TEP assess implementation risks and propose measures to avoid or reduce such risks?
- Does the plan assess the reliability of public financial management systems and ability of the education system to strengthen its own financial management over time?
- Have financial management risks been sufficiently assessed and appropriate mitigation measures identified?

⁶ May also be called operational plan or implementation plan.

- Have key implementation capacity constraints been assessed, and are measures included to address them?

2.6.4. ROBUSTNESS OF THE RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Overall question: Does the results framework include an adequate set of indicators to monitor progress toward fulfilling the TEP objectives?

- Are the outcome and output indicators to monitor progress relevant in relation to the TEP objectives?
- Is the coverage of indicators sufficient to monitor progress toward the TEP objectives? Or, conversely, does the results framework include too many indicators?
- To what extent are they based on reliable data?
- To what extent does the results framework include baselines and yearly targets for the included indicators?
- If baseline data are not available, does the plan indicate how they will be collected?
- Does the TEP describe monitoring mechanisms at the national and subnational levels?
- Is there sufficient human resources capacity for effective monitoring? Does the plan include provisions to strengthen such capacities?

2.7. Is the TEP Sensitive to the Context and Does It Pay Attention to Disparities?

A sound and credible TEP is sensitive to the context and pays attention to disparities: The plan includes an analysis of the vulnerabilities specific to the country. These might include consideration of the immediate and longer-term negative effects of conflicts, disasters, or political or economic crises on education, as well as the potential for the education system to exacerbate tensions and conflict through, for example, existing policies, curriculum and textbook content or exclusion of marginalized groups. To reduce the risk that education might contribute to societal grievances, a TEP identifies and addresses existing disparities based on sex, age, race, color, ethnicity, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property or birth, as well as persons with disabilities, migrants, indigenous peoples, and children and youth.

2.7.1. VULNERABILITY ANALYSIS

Overall question: Does the TEP assess and address the presence of risks, such as conflict and disasters, and their potential impact on the education system?

- Does the TEP describe the main contextual risks (security, political, economic, social and environmental) for the implementation of the plan?
- Does the TEP make provision for education in short-term and protracted displacement contexts, including internal displacement and refugee situations?
- Has a vulnerability analysis been conducted, or does the TEP include provisions to carry out such an analysis?

- To what extent do planned policies and programs follow the principle of “do no harm” and address the above risks and vulnerabilities?
- Do the proposed policy and program priorities aim to reduce the potential for conflict, increase peace-building efforts and address disaster risk-reduction efforts across the education system over time?
- Are concerns about safety, resilience and social cohesion reflected in the results framework?

2.7.2. ATTENTION TO DISPARITIES

Overall question: To what extent are the policy and program priorities relevant to addressing existing education disparities?

- What disaggregated data are available to assess disparities in education access and quality?
- What gaps are identified, and how well does the TEP set out plans to strengthen the collection and analysis of such data?
- Does the education situation analysis identify the main challenges with regard to achieving equal access, gender, equity and quality in the education system?
- Does the TEP point to the underlying causes for the main disparities in education?
- Are the programs relevant to addressing the underlying causes?
- Are there specific strategies for disadvantaged groups, including girls, children with disabilities, and groups in remote and crisis-affected areas?
- Do the proposed programs and activities promote a more equitable distribution of resources and inputs to the system (such as school constructions, provision of materials and teachers)?
- Does the TEP specify the mechanisms and criteria to be used to improve the targeting and allocation of resources to disadvantaged areas and groups?
- Are there sufficient details as to how quality education will be provided for displaced and refugee children, including clarity on coordination, safety and school-related gender-based violence (SRGBV), security and protection mechanisms?
- How will the results framework be used to monitor disparities in education, and is this adequate?

III. Core Appraisal Questions

The core appraisal questions represent a methodology in the form of a matrix to systematically assess and capture the minimum requirements for the contents of a sound and credible TEP. Responses to the core questions and related scorings should be informed by, and used in combination with, the responses and analysis resulting from the guiding questions in the previous section to produce a robust appraisal report.

This section presents a core set of questions that the appraisal must address at the final stage of its work. Contrary to the previous section covering a large number of guiding questions, the appraisal is expected to respond to all the core questions in the matrix on the following pages. The purpose of this exercise is to promote the use of a transparent set of minimum requirements for the content of a sound and credible TEP. The responses to the core appraisal questions are provided as scorings. This makes the TEP appraisal

reports comparable across countries and facilitates the use of fair and transparent standards.

The appraisal should not, however, be reduced to the use of this matrix only. It is evident that many of the core appraisal questions and the scorings are proxies, unable to fully capture the TEP characteristics. This is why the use of the more exhaustive and open-ended list of guiding questions needs to complement the use of this matrix.

3.1. Matrix with Core Appraisal Questions

TEP Characteristics A Sound and Credible TEP Is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
<p>A. Strategic: It identifies strategies that not only help address the education system’s immediate needs, but also build the foundation for realizing the system’s long-term vision. The TEP presents arguments for the choice of these strategies; the direction it offers guides national authorities and their partners. It therefore helps avoid the type of ad hoc, uncoordinated action that may prevail in situations where significant amounts of project-based support occur outside the government’s education plan.</p>	<p>A1. Does the TEP clearly identify the main underlying causes for its key challenge in EQUITY?</p> <p>A2. Are the underlying causes of the EQUITY challenge identified by the TEP addressed in the strategic plan?</p>	<p>2: The key challenge has a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it.</p> <p>1: The key challenge does not have a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it.</p> <p>0: The challenge could not be defined in the TEP.</p> <p>2: All causes specified were addressed.</p> <p>1: Some of the causes specified were addressed.</p> <p>0: Causes were not addressed or there were no causes specified for the challenge.</p>		
	<p>A3. Does the TEP clearly identify the main underlying causes for its key challenge in LEARNING?</p>	<p>2: The key challenge has a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it.</p> <p>1: The key challenge does not have a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it.</p> <p>0: The challenge could not be defined in the TEP.</p>		

TEP Characteristics A Sound and Credible TEP Is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
	A4. Are the underlying causes of the LEARNING challenge identified by the TEP addressed in the strategic plan?	2: All causes specified were addressed. 1: Some of the causes specified were addressed. 0: Causes were not addressed or there were no causes specified for the challenge.		
	A5. Does the TEP clearly identify the main underlying causes for its key challenge in EFFICIENCY?	2: The key challenge has a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it. 1: The key challenge does not have a cause clearly specified or acknowledges the need to specify it. 0: The challenge could not be defined in the TEP.		
	A6. Are the underlying causes of the EFFICIENCY challenge identified by the TEP addressed in the strategic plan?	2: All causes specified were addressed. 1: Some of the causes specified were addressed. 0: Causes were not addressed or there were no causes specified for the challenge.		
	A7. Is the content that addresses the EQUITY, LEARNING and EFFICIENCY challenges consistent throughout the TEP?	2: All content is consistent. 1: There are a few minor inconsistencies. 0: There are major or many inconsistencies.		

(continued)

TEP Characteristics A Sound and Credible TEP Is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
<p>B. Targeted: The plan focuses on critical education needs in the short and medium terms, and on system capacity development, including the preparation of the next ESP. It focuses on a limited number of policy priorities most likely to drive effective results over the planned period, taking into account the scarcity of the resources available and the capacity/contextual constraints. As such, the TEP may not cover the full education sector. It is an intermediate document and tool within a progressive approach to education sector plan development.</p>	<p>B1. Does the TEP identify and prioritize responses to critical education needs?</p>	<p>2: The TEP targets programmatic responses to critical needs identified in the situation analysis. 0: The TEP does not focus on critical needs, or critical needs are clearly identified but no programmatic responses are included.</p>		
	<p>B2. Does the TEP articulate immediate and longer-term priorities?</p>	<p>2: The TEP articulates (with a clear sequencing/phasing of the priorities) immediate and longer-term priorities. 1: The TEP mixes immediate and longer-term priorities with no clear articulation. 0: The TEP does NOT mix immediate and longer-term priorities (focusing exclusively on immediate or longer terms), or immediate and longer-term priorities are not clearly identified and distinguished, thus no articulation is provided.</p>		
	<p>B3. Does the TEP include a plan for the preparation of a comprehensive ESP?</p>	<p>2: The TEP includes a specific plan for developing a sector-wide ESP in the course of the TEP implementation (identified as one program/activity). 1: The TEP mentions that an ESP will be prepared, but there is no “plan” as such (not strictly identified in a program or activity). 0: Otherwise.</p>		

TEP Characteristics A Sound and Credible TEP Is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
	B4. Does the TEP include a capacity-building plan or elaborate on strategies to build capacity?	<p>2: The TEP includes a development plan for administrative, institutional and management capacities (pedagogical activities such as teacher training are not considered relevant for this question).</p> <p>1: The TEP includes strategies to build capacities, but no plans or details.</p> <p>0: The TEP does NOT include a capacity-building plan, or capacity-building strategies are not elaborated upon.</p>		
<p>C. Evidence-Based: The plan addresses key challenges identified through an evidence-based analysis of the education system. In situations where a comprehensive education sector analysis is not practical due to limitations in data or the amount of time and capacity required for a thorough analysis, the best available data and evidence are used to identify immediate and longer-term needs and to examine the causes of the issues identified. Following this, responsive and viable shorter- or medium-term remediation strategies are developed.</p>	C1. Is the TEP based on a situation analysis or on the best available data and evidence?	<p>2: The TEP mentions the existence (and use) of a situation analysis and summarizes key results, OR the TEP provides an analysis section with the best available data and evidence.</p> <p>1: The TEP mentions the existence (and use) of a situation analysis, BUT does not summarize key results.</p> <p>0: The TEP does not mention the existence of a situation analysis and does not summarize any results, nor does it make use of the best available data or evidence in an analytical section.</p>		

(continued)

TEP Characteristics A Sound and Credible TEP Is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
<p>D. Operational: The TEP is a feasible, multiyear plan that includes well-argued implementation and financial hypotheses not only for meeting agreed-upon priorities but also for system development and strategies to overcome financial, data, technical and political constraints. It provides a detailed framework for implementing programs, regularly monitoring progress achieved and corresponding expenditures, as well as assessing the effectiveness of the strategies implemented. It is a lively policy instrument that is monitored regularly and adapts to the changing environment in the course of its implementation. At a minimum, a TEP should be carefully costed, clearly identify implementation roles and responsibilities, and include an achievable results framework.</p>	<p>D1. Does the TEP provide operational elements for the whole planned period?</p>	<p>2: The TEP includes activities AND provides the vast majority (as described in pp. 23–24 of TEP guidelines):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) A precise timeline (by month, quarter or year). (ii) Responsible authority for implementation. (iii) Information about the cost. (iv) Information on the source of funding. <p>1: The TEP includes activities AND provides the vast majority (as described in pp. 23–24 of TEP guidelines):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) A precise timeline (by month, quarter or year). (ii) Responsible authority for implementation. (iii) Information about the cost. <p>0: The TEP does not include operational elements at the level of the activity OR it does not provide information on one of the three items above.</p>		

TEP Characteristics A Sound and Credible TEP Is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
	D2. Is the TEP care-fully costed?	<p>2: Using a projection model, the TEP includes the “regular functioning” of the subsectors, such as the overall staff salaries as well as the additional programmatic costs.</p> <p>1: The TEP mostly includes the pro-grammatic costs, i.e., the sum of the activity costs, and assumptions are available (unit costs, quantity of inputs etc.).</p> <p>0: The TEP includes no costing or par-tial costing.</p>		
	D3. Are the OUT-COMES formulated in the key learning strategy relevant for measuring the objectives?	<p>2: All objectives have corresponding outcomes.</p> <p>1: Some objectives have corresponding outcomes.</p> <p>0: There are no outcomes.</p> <p>Notes: When a results framework(s) exists, we will only refer to the infor-mation inside the results framework(s) to complete this section. If there is more than one results framework and they are consistent/complementary, we can draw information from all results frameworks. When there are multiple results frameworks that are incon-sistent, please only assess the most complete/coherent one. When there is no results framework, please obtain the information from other relevant sections in the TEP.</p>		

(continued)

TEP Characteristics A Sound and Credible TEP Is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
	<p>D4. Does the TEP include a set of key performance indicators (KPIs) that are well defined?</p>	<p>2: All KPIs for marginalized populations are well defined. 1: Some KPIs for marginalized populations are well defined. 0: No KPIs are well defined, or there are no KPIs.</p>		
	<p>D5. Does the TEP describe monitoring tools and mechanisms at the relevant geographical levels?</p>	<p>2: The TEP describes the monitoring tools AND mechanisms at the relevant levels (see p. 29 and following of TEP guidelines). 1: The TEP plans to develop relevant mechanisms and tools (included in the strategies section), OR the TEP only discusses some of the monitoring tools and mechanisms (regular monitoring, joint annual review meetings, results framework). 0: No description is included.</p>		

TEP Characteristics A Sound and Credible TEP Is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
<p>E. Sensitive to the context and pays attention to disparities: The plan includes an analysis of the vulnerabilities specific to the country. These might include consideration of the immediate and longer-term negative effects of conflicts, disasters, or political or economic crises on education, as well as the potential for the education system to exacerbate tensions and conflict through, for example, existing policies, curriculum and textbook content or exclusion of marginalized groups. To reduce the risk that education might contribute to societal grievances, a TEP identifies and addresses existing disparities based on sex, age, race, color, ethnicity, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property or birth, as well as persons with disabilities, migrants, indigenous peoples, and children and youth.</p>	<p>E1. Does the TEP mention identified risks for implementation and propose solutions?</p> <p>E2. Is the TEP based on a vulnerability/fragility/conflict analysis, or does it refer to one?</p>	<p>2: The TEP provides a description of the risks related to the implementation and provides solutions.</p> <p>1: The TEP only provides descriptions of the implementation risks but does not propose solutions.</p> <p>0: No information is provided.</p> <p>2: A specific analysis has been conducted and is mentioned as such and summarized in the TEP.</p> <p>1: It is unclear whether a specific vulnerability analysis has been conducted, or there is no particular reference to an analysis of vulnerability—BUT vulnerability, fragility and conflict are discussed, OR a vulnerability analysis is planned as part of the TEP activities.</p> <p>0: It is unclear that a vulnerability analysis has been conducted AND no elements are presented.</p>		

(continued)

TEP Characteristics A Sound and Credible TEP Is:	Core Appraisal Questions	Guidance for Scoring	Score	Comments
	<p>E3. Does the TEP include the gender parity index (GPI) on any of the indicators GER, GIR, CR or similar (like sex-disaggregated enrollment ratios) OR, when data are not available, does it include a gender analysis?</p>	<p>2: The indicator/analysis is available for primary and secondary. 1: The indicator/analysis is available at least for primary. 0: Otherwise.</p>		
	<p>E4. Does the TEP include an analysis of geographic disparities?</p>	<p>2: The analysis is available for primary and secondary. 1: The analysis is available only for primary. 0: Otherwise.</p>		

Annex: List of Pre-Check Questions

The questions listed in this table point to critical elements of a sound and credible TEP. The development partner group may use these pre-check questions as a quick scan to assess whether the plan is ready for the appraisal. The questions can also be used to identify areas that should receive particular attention during the appraisal. Please indicate whether the listed elements are present in the TEP and provide any comments on the aspects that are missing or need to be improved.

Pre-Check Questions	Yes	No	Comments
1. Does the TEP include an education situation analysis that identifies the key challenges in education access, equity, quality and management, including those linked to conflict and disaster risks?			
2. Are the proposed policy and program priorities relevant to addressing the key challenges and their underlying causes?			
3. Is the TEP sufficiently targeted? Does it focus on a limited number of priority programs?			
4. Does the TEP include a sound financial framework?			

(continued)

Pre-Check Questions	Yes	No	Comments
5. Does the TEP include a sound annual or multiyear action plan? Or has a separate action plan been developed?			
6. Are the indicators for monitoring implementation relevant in relation to the TEP objectives?			
7. Are the different components of the TEP consistent and do they follow a logical structure?			
8. Does the TEP include a plan for capacity development or elaborate on strategies to develop capacity?			
9. Did the government demonstrate leadership in the plan preparation process?			
10. Did the plan preparation process include consultations with a broad range of stakeholders?			



GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP
for **EDUCATION**
globalpartnership.org

Office Location:

1850 K Street N.W.
Suite 625
Washington D.C., 20006
USA

Mailing Address:

Global Partnership for Education
MSN IS6-600
1818 H Street NW
Washington D.C., 20433
USA

www.globalpartnership.org

 facebook.com/globalpartnership

 twitter.com/gpforeducation