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Executive Summary

Evaluation purpose and approach

This evaluation is part of a larger study of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) that comprises 30 country level evaluations (CLE). The overall study runs from 2017 until 2020. It aims to assess (i) GPE contributions to strengthening national education systems and, ultimately, education results related to learning, equity, equality and inclusion; and hence (ii) the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of GPE’s theory of change (ToC) and country-level operational model. The assessment is based on a theory-based, mixed social science research methodology known as contribution analysis.

This study was conducted in December 2017 and covered GPE support to Burkina Faso from 2012 to 2017. It draws on document, database and literature review, as well as on consultations with a total of 47 governmental, multilateral, bilateral, academic, school-level, and non-governmental stakeholders in Burkina Faso and Washington DC.

Education in Burkina Faso

Burkina Faso is a landlocked country in West Africa with a population of 18.6 million. The country continues to face food security challenges, made worse by severe droughts experienced in the past five years, and political instability in its northern areas due to conflict spilling over from neighbouring Mali. Despite possessing rich deposits of minerals and gold, around 80 percent of Burkina Faso’s adult population relies on subsistence agriculture to survive.

Responsibility for the education sector is shared between the Ministry of National Education and Literacy (MENA), in charge of basic education, and the Ministry of Higher Education (MESRSI), which manages the country’s secondary and higher education. Additionally, 51 percent and 54.1 percent of the preschool and the primary to post-primary populations in Burkina Faso respectively receive their education in private schools (faith-based or secular) that function outside of the public-school system. Most private schools are officially licensed and approved by MENA (although many are not recognized and thus not represented in official data). Another category of private schools is Quranic schools which operate without an official license and are particularly prevalent in the Sahel region.

To date, Burkina Faso has developed two comprehensive education sector plans (ESPs), one originally intended for the period 2012 – 2021, and another, developed in 2016, for the period 2017-2030. This evaluation takes both ESPs into account when assessing the quality of the ESP elaboration process, albeit with an emphasis on the first process in 2012 which led to the development of the Strategic Basic Education Program (PDSEB). While the PDSEB is a sub-sector plan for basic education, it became in practice the principal sector plan for the period 2012-2021.

The PDSEB is built around five overarching strategies: (a) developing a comprehensive basic education cycle from preschool to lower secondary school, (b) reducing disparities in access to education, (c) improving the quality of education, (d) decentralizing the management of the education system, and (e) improving overall literacy and developing non-formal education.

GPE in Burkina Faso

Burkina Faso joined the Global Partnership for Education in 2002 and is represented on the Board of Directors through the Africa 2 constituency group. Burkina Faso has received
three education sector plan implementation grants (ESPIGs) of decreasing size, the first one amounting to US$102 million received in 2009. The country has also received one education sector plan development grant (ESPDG), in 2016, and one program development grant (PDG), in 2012. Burkina Faso benefitted from three Global and Regional Activities (GRA) grants which focused on teaching and learning effectiveness in bilingual contexts (ELAN), teaching and learning effectiveness for learning outcomes (OPERA), and learning outcomes in early grades in reading.

GPE contributions to sector planning

State of sector planning in Burkina Faso, 2012-2017

The planning processes for both ESPs for 2012-2021 and 2017-2030 were country-led and involved extensive stakeholder and partner consultations. The 2012-2021 ESP covered all sub-sectors under the overarching objectives of Access, Quality, Non-formal education, and System Strengthening. Despite these strengths, the 2012-2021 ESP lacked country ownership and never became a shared reference point for education stakeholders. As the plan was developed in haste primarily to meet GPE ESPIG funding requirements, there were insufficient consultations with stakeholders representing secondary and higher education. As such, while the ESP 2012-2021 contained planned strategies which satisfactorily addressed gaps related to the basic education sector, the practical relevance of the plan for addressing sector gaps outside of basic education was weak. In addition, the plan suffered from insufficient prioritization of objectives and interventions, a mismatch between targets and available resources, absence of a clear long-term strategy, and insufficient information on implementation achievability, e.g. in relation to related Ministry capacity.

The 2017-2030 ESP addressed several shortcomings identified for the previous sector plan. While it is too early to assess whether the 2017-2030 ESP acts as a shared reference point for the sector, consulted stakeholders noted their increased participation in sector planning since 2012, following the conducting of a broader elaboration process which better consulted stakeholders from the whole sector (basic, secondary and higher education). Participation in sector planning processes led to more frequent and closer collaboration and coordination of interventions among development partners, particularly through their participation in the MENA-led steering and technical committees. Nevertheless, capacity gaps remain in relation to budget planning, and MENA has struggled with balancing competing priorities with available financial resources.

GPE contributions

GPE’s funding requirements provided an incentive and constituted a key motivation for the development the 2012-2021 ESP preparing the 2017-2030 sector plan.

GPE provided resources to facilitate sector planning through Burkina Faso’s PDG, received in 2012, to facilitate the development of the 2012 Strategic Basic Education Program (PDSEB), which in turn informed the 2012-2021 ESP. Furthermore, an ESPDG for preparing the 2017-2030 ESP allowed UNICEF, as the coordinating agency, to carry out consultations with stakeholders and fund the two committees that led ESP drafting.

GPE guidelines for sector plan preparation, were helpful and relevant for in-country actors involved in the process of developing and appraising the ESPs. Consulted stakeholders agreed that developing the two education sector plans strengthened individual and collective in-country capabilities for systematic and collaborative sector planning.
The Secretariat provided quality assurance feedback on draft versions of both ESPs during their development. UNICEF and Agence Française de Développement (AFD) respectively also provided technical assistance and quality assurance during the process of developing the two ESPs.

**GPE contributions to sector dialogue and monitoring**

**State of sector dialogue and monitoring in Burkina Faso, 2012-2017**

The Local Education Group (LEG), referred to as the Cadre partenarial (pour l’éducation) in Burkina Faso consists of representatives from government, civil society organizations, teacher organizations, bilateral and multilateral development partners. Development partners are represented by the Partenaires Techniques et Financiers (PTF) group, which is in turn led by the Chef de file who acts as a spokesperson for the PTF vis à vis the government and fills the role of GPE coordinating agency. Both the LEG and PTF meet once a month. Sector dialogue has become more inclusive (with civil society and teacher organizations representation), transparent and relevant, evidenced by more in-depth multi-stakeholder participation in sector planning. There is room for improvement, however, in including private school representatives and stakeholders involved in higher and secondary education to a greater extent.

Sector monitoring slightly improved since 2012. The development of a common PDSEB monitoring framework for basic education provided a basis for more systematic and transparent (sub)section monitoring than had been possible in the past. Annual Joint Sector Reviews (JSRs) have been informing discussions between sector stakeholders and have positively influenced PDSEB implementation (see ‘emerging good practice’ below). Nevertheless, sector monitoring remains an ongoing challenge due to persistent gaps in MENA’s data collection and data management capabilities, leading to continuous gaps in the availability of data on several key indicators in the PDSEB results framework.

**GPE contributions**

During the review period, GPE contributed to strengthening education sector dialogue and monitoring through:

- **Providing incentives** for improved sector dialogue and regular and participatory sector reviews, via ESPIG funding application, which asks what stakeholders were involved in dialogue as part of the application;

- **Providing financial support, facilitation and capacity development**, e.g. to help strengthen data collection and management capabilities of MENA staff in the Department of Statistics (DGESS). The development of the results framework for the 2013-2017 Basic Education Program was co-funded through a GPE program development grant;

- **Advocating for the inclusion of civil society**, by the Secretariat, in education sector planning and pushing for the availability of resources for the inclusion of civil society in planning activities.

**GPE contributions to sector financing**

**State of sector financing in Burkina Faso, 2012-2017**

Domestic education financing in Burkina Faso grew by 86 percent from 141 billion to 263 billion
CFA in the period 2009-2015. Despite this substantial increase, relative domestic financing to education, as a proportion of overall government expenditures, has fluctuated considerably but increased overall from 2009 to 2015—from 13.6% in 2009 to 18.8% in 2015. The share of the education budget used on teacher salaries increased from 58 percent in 2009 to 71 percent in 2015.

While official development assistance (ODA) financing to Burkina Faso’s education sector grew substantially in absolute and relative terms after 2006, reaching US$ 130.8 million by 2009, it declined rapidly after 2011, to US$ 67.5 million in nominal terms in 2016. The proportion of education ODA going to basic education also declined from 59 percent in 2012 (US$44.8 million out of US$75.1 million) to 34.5 percent in 2016 (US$23.3 million out of US$67.5 million). Overall ODA to Burkina Faso decreased only marginally in the same period, despite the complete withdrawal of funding from the Netherlands and Denmark.

**GPE contributions**

By working through the Compte d’Affectation Spécial du Trésor (CAST) funding mechanism, GPE has contributed to maintaining the existing quality of education financing to Burkina Faso. The CAST is a pooled funding mechanism for education which is managed by the government, and receives most bilateral education funding to Burkina Faso, as well as a large portion of multilateral funding. It was characterized by a high degree of alignment with national procedures and institutions, flexibility and predictability of funding. However, stakeholders also noted that the CAST’s focus on funding the PDSEB has neglected secondary and higher education. By allocating ESPIG funds to CAST and thus to basic education, rather than, for example, pushing for financing the whole sector though pooled funding, GPE was perceived to have (unintentionally) contributed to perpetuating this funding gap. However, the CAST’s focus on implementing the PDSEB was a choice made by the LEG and not dictated by GPE funding rules.

GPE initially (in 2009) contributed to leveraging additional international funding to the education sector. At the time, other development partners, especially bilateral aid agencies, perceived GPE support as providing a “quality mark” for Burkina Faso’s education sector and wanted to take advantage of GPE’s support to the country.

However, GPE has not leveraged additional international education financing from 2012-2016. While bilateral donor contributions to GPE have increased at the global level in the last decade, GPE donor partners decreased their ODA to education in Burkina Faso.

While domestic spending on education in Burkina Faso increased during the period under review, there is no evidence that GPE influenced this development.

**GPE contributions to sector plan implementation**

**State of sector plan implementation in Burkina Faso, 2012-2017**

Burkina Faso made moderate to high progress towards implementing planned activities of the PDSEB, and data from MENA shows that from 2014 to 2016, annual completion of activities fluctuated between 64 percent and 83 percent. The least progress was made in implementing activities related to non-formal basic education, as only half of the 42 scheduled activities in 2015 and 2016 were implemented as planned.

Nevertheless, progress towards the achievement of planned results was low. Deterioration or stagnation was observed between 2014 and 2016 in areas which had previously shown improvements in the past decade, such as admission rates for primary, pre-
primary and secondary schools, construction of classrooms and delivery of school books, and fund absorption at the regional level.

Limited progress towards results were likely brought about by (i) the turbulent political context of 2014-2015; (ii) financing inefficiencies relating to both a lack of funding and lack of capacities to absorb financing; (iii) a lack of coherence between some sector targets, national implementation capacities and financial resources available within the PDSEB; (iv) gaps in MENA staff capacities for monitoring and evaluation, and data management.

**GPE contributions**

GPE financial support to the PDSEB contributed towards bridging the financing gap for basic education in Burkina Faso. The gap between available domestic financing and basic education needs was estimated at 144 billion CFA, or 16.2 percent of PDSEB costs. GPE is the single largest source of financing for CAST and provided 32 percent of all CAST funding from 2013-2016. Funding for the 2013-2017 ESPIG was channeled through CAST, and provided 3.88 percent of financing (US$78 million) for PDSEB implementation.

AFD as the ESPIG grant agent provided technical assistance to the departments of Statistics (DGESS) and Human Resources (DRH) of the MENA during the implementation of the PDSEB. DGESS staff members noted their strengthened collective capabilities as a result of this support.

**Factors other than GPE contributions affecting change**

Factors that positively influenced change included (i) commitment to inclusive dialogue and participatory planning among MENA and other education stakeholders; (ii) the existence of the CAST pooled funding mechanism and its strong alignment with national education systems; and (iii) funding and technical assistance provided by other donors outside of their roles as GPE members, such as the $200 million to support PDSEB implementation from 2013-2015.

Factors that negatively influenced change included (i) gaps in availability of data and insufficiencies in the monitoring framework for the PDSEB; (ii) the 2014-2015 political crisis which brought about difficulties in implementing planned budgets and overall management of the sector; and (iii) changes in donor priorities which has caused a decline in nominal and relative education ODA to Burkina Faso.

**Unintended results of GPE support**

The evaluation did not find evidence of any unintended, positive or negative, effects of GPE support to sector planning, dialogue and monitoring, and sector plan implementation.

**System level change**

Between 2013 and 2016, Burkina Faso made some, albeit inconsistent progress in addressing key challenges to basic education access, quality and (sub-)sector management. Progress and remaining challenges are summarized as follows:

**Access to education:**

- 25 percent increase in the number of primary school classrooms. However, this increase during the 2013-2016 period was primarily driven by growing numbers of private schools, indicating that the construction of public schools has not kept up with demographic pressures. There is a lack of a comprehensive national strategy for developing school infrastructure;
- Use of multi-grade and double-shift classes declined during the period under review;
- Some improvements to quality of school infrastructure, as seen in increases in the proportion of primary schools (public and private) with drinkable water (48 to 57 percent) and functional latrines (70 to 74 percent) from 2013 to 2016;
- Increased proportion of children in rural areas living less than 3 km from a school, from 86.9 to 88.3 percent between 2013 and 2016, through the construction of new primary schools in rural areas and due to implementation of interventions aimed at reducing gender disparities (such as awareness campaigns on the importance of girl education, grants for grade 1 girls, and construction of functional latrines in schools).
- Few of the planned measures aimed at improving education access for children with disabilities in the PDSEB were carried out, and the government has yet to introduce a comprehensive national strategy for children with disabilities.

**Improved quality of education services:**

- Growth in the number of teachers and improvement of pupil/teacher ratios. The number of pupils per teacher for primary education decreased from 52.7/1 in 2011 to 41.6/1 in 2015;
- Pupil/trained teacher ratios also improved from 54/1 in 2014 to 49.3/1 in 2016 at the primary-level;
- Inefficiency in teacher allocation continued, as, in 2015, around 30 percent of teachers were not allocated to schools based on any assessment of teacher needs. The proportion of schools with an insufficient teacher ratio increased from 26 to 29 percent between 2006-2014;
- Quality of teaching remains inadequate, despite progress made in strengthening in-service training opportunities, especially in public preschools and primary schools. This was largely due to the lack of scaling up of existing interventions to a comprehensive national strategy. Efforts to improve pre-service teacher training have been made through development of a new pedagogical approach aligned with the curriculum development framework. However, it is too early for related effects on teaching quality to show;
- Gaps in the availability of teaching and learning materials remained as only 2.17 million of 4.89 million planned schoolbooks were purchased and delivered from 2014 to 2016, while 235,000 textbooks for teachers were purchased but not delivered;
- Some progress in improving school curricula, as seen in the development of a new first grade curriculum in 2015-2017, with subsequent development, testing and distribution of curricula for grades 1-4 planned to be completed by 2020. Also, a framework for developing new curricula was established in 2015;
- Decentralization of school feeding programs (SFPs) management and financial resources to the Communes, and the production of a User Guide for all Communes on the management of SFPs in 2017. The proportion of schools with canteens has, however, declined from 78 to 59 percent from 2013 to 2016.

**Developing Non-Formal Education:**

- Partial implementation of interventions aimed at improving access to and quality of non-formal education. Nevertheless, from 2013-2016 the number of non-formal education (ENF) literacy centers and number of adolescent students at these centers declined.
**Systems strengthening:**

- **Modest progress towards decentralization of governance of education sector.** While decision-making has been effectively decentralized, stakeholders stressed the slow pace of delegation of authority, and the recent 2017-2030 ESP is yet to include a plan for transferring capacities and skills to the regions.

- **The education continuum reform,** aimed at allowing for continuous learning from the ages of 3 to 16 through mandatory and free basic education for all, stands as a key reform, especially in response to the ongoing challenge of low transition rates from primary to lower secondary school;

- **The 2013-2017 ESPIG supported an Education Management Information System (EMIS),** though available documentation does not indicate whether the PDSEB included measures to implement an EMIS for 2012-2017.

---

**Likely links between sector plan implementation and system level change**

Available evidence partly supports the assumed link between the ESP (PDSEB) and observed system-level changes. Some tangible changes, such as the reduction in regional disparities in access to education were likely due to specific interventions carried out in 2012-2017 such as the construction of new schools in targeted Communes, and aligning new policies, procedures and strategies with the new education structure, such as the 2015 framework for developing new curricula (COC) and the related new pedagogic approach for initial teacher training.

---

**Learning outcomes and equity**

**Changes in learning outcomes, equity and gender equality**

During the review period, Burkina Faso achieved modest improvements in education access, completion and gender parity rates in basic education. There has been no progress in improved learning outcomes. Progress, and existing challenges, are summarized as follows:

**Equity, gender equality and inclusion**

- **Gross enrolment rates** at the primary level improved modestly from 81.3% in 2013 to 86.1% in 2016;

- **Gross pre-primary enrollment** has decreased from 3.5 to 3 percent from 2013-2016, likely reflecting the relatively low priority given to this sub-sector in Burkina Faso. (Only 0.5 percent of the education budget was spent on pre-primary education in 2016, compared to 60 percent for basic education).

- **Primary completion rates** improved modestly by 5 percentage points between 2012 and 2013 but remained at 62 percent between 2013 and 2015. This is nevertheless a substantial improvement from 2005, which saw a primary completion rate of only 32 percent;

- **Primary out-of-school rates** decreased substantially, from 34 percent in 2012 to 24 percent in 2016. Increased primary school intake and enrollment rates were observed especially in PDSEB priority Communes where new schools had been constructed;

- **Lower secondary completion rates** continued to improve, with 30 percent of children completing lower secondary education in 2016 compared to 20 percent in 2012;
Lower secondary out-of-school rates decreased from 50 percent in 2012 to 42 percent in 2015. This figure subsequently increased to 48 percent in 2016;

Gender parity of out-of-school and completion rates at the lower secondary level improved during the period of review. However, there was no improvement in gender parity of out-of-school and completion rates at the primary level.

Reduced geographic disparities in access to education, as seen in the increased proportion of children in rural areas living less than 3 km from a school (see section on system-level changes), and increases in intake rates from 62 to 78 percent in primary schools and enrollment rates from 50 to 55 percent across priority Communes in rural areas from 2013-2016.

Learning Outcomes

Learning outcomes for basic education consistently declined as evidence by a steady downward trend in test scores in national learning assessments from 2006-2014;

Burkina Faso scored above average compared to other West African countries according to the 2014 PASEC assessments. The percentage of students in 6th grade with adequate competencies in French and mathematics were 14.4 and 17.8 percentage points higher than the PASEC average;

Likely links to observed system level changes

System-level changes from 2012-2017 are too recent or not yet sufficiently advanced to have influenced impact-level improvements observed, with the possible exception of primary out-of-school rates. Improvements such as the introduction of new curricula framework (COC) and the comprehensive guide for school feeding programs were only established between 2015 and 2017 and are thus yet to make contributions to impact. Improvements in completion and out-of-school rates stand as long-running positive trends which began before the evaluation’s period of review, and thus predate the system-level changes observed from 2012-2017. For example, primary completion rates have been on the rise since 2006, increasing from 32 percent to 47 percent in 2010.

Recent decreases in primary out-of-school rates, however, may have at least been partially influenced by improvements in the pupil/teacher ratio during the 2012-2017 period, and the targeted efforts to construct schools in priority Communes.

Conclusions/ Overall observations

Emerging good practice

Two approaches observed in Burkina Faso are noteworthy and of potential interest to other countries.

A functioning (sub)sector feedback loop consisting of (i) regular monitoring of the PDSEB to identify implementation roadblocks; (ii) discussion of identified roadblocks during JSRs; (iii) formulation of specific recommendations during regular meetings of thematic groups; (iv) reporting on progress of implementation of recommendations of subsequent JSRs.

The identification of priority Communes with enrollment and completion rates which were substantially lower than the national average was significant in the PDSEB’s efforts to address urban-rural disparities in access to education.
**GPE contributions**

GPE support has made positive contributions to sector planning, mutual accountability (for basic education) and (sub)sector plan implementation in Burkina Faso. Evidence only partially supports the notion that GPE contributed to more or better sector financing.

The AFD fulfilled its role as grant agent effectively, with stakeholders noting a high degree of satisfaction with its technical leadership in overseeing the implementation of the 2013-2017 ESPIG. UNICEF played an indirect role in PDSEB implementation as the coordinating agency, and made contributions (as Chef de file) to ongoing sector dialogue and joint sector reviews.

The support provided by the Secretariat and its Focal Point to in-country actors was greatly appreciated by consulted stakeholders, especially in relation to: managing GPE grant application processed, timelines and requirements; providing technical assistance; and advocating for the participation of civil society in education sector planning and dialogue.

**Perceived relevance of GPE support**

GPE is primarily perceived as a donor by government and development partner stakeholders, and ESPIG funding requirements have provided important incentives that are likely to further progress in country-level objectives related to sector planning and mutual accountability.

While grant application and reporting processes seemed clear and well-understood, stakeholders questioned the long and burdensome process of applying for GPE grants, especially in light of their relatively short-term and potentially diminishing amounts.

Government and civil society stakeholders noted that sector funding was distributed disproportionately across all parts of the education system. They further felt that the strong focus of government and donor spending on basic education undermined the performance of higher and technical education sub-sectors. This challenge was perceived, by both international and national in-country stakeholders, to be partially influenced by GPE’s focus on basic education, and/or as an issue that GPE could and should help to resolve.

**System level change**

Burkina Faso made progress towards strengthening several components of the education system, including: (i) decentralization of the system; (ii) taking action to reduce inequity and disparities in education access; and (iv) reforming curricula according to local needs.

No progress was made, however, in identifying and addressing the needs of learners with special needs, and the government has not yet introduced a comprehensive national strategy for children with disabilities.

**Impact level change**

Evidence remains inconclusive in relation to the assumed link between system-level changes observed and impact-level trends.
# Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Agence française de développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA</td>
<td>Advocacy and Social Accountability Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Contribution Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Compte d’Affectation Spécial du Trésor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ</td>
<td>Country-level evaluation question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Creditor Reporting System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>Catholic Relief Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEF</td>
<td>Civil Society Education Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCP</td>
<td>Developing Country Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education for All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGRA/EGMA</td>
<td>Early Grade Reading Assessment/Early Grade Match Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td>Education Management Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENF</td>
<td>l’Éducation Non Formelle (non-formal education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Education Sector Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPDG</td>
<td>Education Sector Plan Development Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG</td>
<td>Education Sector Program Implementation Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTI</td>
<td>Fast Track Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPE</td>
<td>Global Partnership for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRA</td>
<td>Global and Regional Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRD</td>
<td>International Bank for Reconstruction and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIEP</td>
<td>International Institute for Educational Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISCED</td>
<td>International Standard Classification of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSR</td>
<td>Joint Sector Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Learning Assessment System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEG</td>
<td>Local Education Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>Ministère de l'Éducation Nationale et de l'Alphabétisation (Ministry of National Education and Literacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESRSI</td>
<td>Ministère de l'enseignement supérieur, de la recherche scientifique et de l'innovation (Ministry of Higher Education, Scientific Research and Innovation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJFIP</td>
<td>Ministère de la Jeunesse, de la Formation et de l'Insertion Professionnelle (Ministry of Youth and Employment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Nongovernmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERA</td>
<td>Observation des Pratiques Enseignantes dans leurs Rapports avec les Apprentissages des élèves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASEC</td>
<td>Programme d’Analyse des Systèmes Éducatifs de la CONFEMEN (La Conférence des Ministres de l’Éducation des pays ayant le français en partage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDDEB</td>
<td>Plan Décennal de Développement de l’Éducation de Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDSEB</td>
<td>Burkina Faso’s Strategic Basic Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>Partenaires Techniques et Financiers (country-level technical and financial development partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEN</td>
<td>Rapport sur l’état du système éducatif national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SABER</td>
<td>Systems Approach for Better Education Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Secretariat Permanente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIS</td>
<td>UNESCO Institute for Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment</th>
<th>Basing support on partner countries’ national development strategies, institutions and procedures.¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic education</td>
<td>Pre-primary (i.e., education before Grade 1), primary (Grades 1-6), lower secondary (Grades 7-9) and adult literacy education, in formal and non-formal settings. This corresponds to International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) 2011 levels 0-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>In the context of this evaluation we understand capacity as the foundation for behavior change in individuals, groups or institutions. Capacity encompasses the three interrelated dimensions of motivation (political will, social norms, habitual processes), opportunity (factors outside of individuals e.g., resources, enabling environment) and capabilities (knowledge, skills).²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education systems</td>
<td>Collections of institutions, actions and processes that affect the educational status of citizens in the short and long run.³ Education systems are made up of a large number of actors (teachers, parents, politicians, bureaucrats, civil society organizations) interacting with each other in different institutions (schools, ministry departments) for different reasons (developing curricula, monitoring school performance, managing teachers). All these interactions are governed by rules, beliefs and behavioral norms that affect how actors react and adapt to changes in the system.⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>In the context of education, equity refers to securing all children’s rights to education, and their rights within and through education to realize their potential and aspirations. It requires implementing and institutionalizing arrangements that help ensure all children can achieve these aims.⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial additionality</td>
<td>This incorporates two not mutually exclusive components: (a) an increase in the total amount of funds available for a given educational purpose, without the substitution or redistribution of existing resources; and (b) positive change in the quality of funding (e.g., predictability of aid, use of pooled funding mechanisms, co-financing, non-traditional financing sources, alignment with national priorities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td>The equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women, men, girls and boys, and equal power to shape their own lives and contribute to society. It encompasses the narrower concept of gender equity, which primarily concerns fairness and justice regarding benefits and needs.⁶</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁵ GPE, 2010. Equity and Inclusion in Education. A guide to support education sector plan preparation, revision and appraisal. p.3.
Harmonization
The degree of coordination between technical and financial partners in how they structure their external assistance (e.g., pooled funds, shared financial or procurement processes) to present a common and simplified interface for developing country partners. The aim of harmonization is to reduce transaction costs and increase the effectiveness of the assistance provided by reducing demands on recipient countries to meet with different donors’ reporting processes and procedures, along with uncoordinated country analytic work and missions.\(^7\)

Inclusion
Adequately responding to the diversity of needs among all learners, through increasing participation in learning, cultures and communities and reducing exclusion from and within education.\(^8\)

---

\(^7\) Adapted from OECD, Glossary of Aid Effectiveness Terms [http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/aideffectivenessglossary.htm](http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/aideffectivenessglossary.htm), and from Methodology Sheet for Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Indicators. Indicator (30) Proportion of GPE grants using: (a) co-financed project or (b) sector pooled funding mechanisms.

\(^8\) GPE 2010, p. 3.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background and purpose of the summative evaluation

1. The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) is a multilateral global partnership and funding platform established in 2002 as the Education for All Fast Track Initiative (EFA/FTI) and renamed GPE in 2011. GPE aims to strengthen education systems in developing countries, in order to ensure improved and more equitable student learning outcomes, as well as improved equity, gender equality and inclusion in education. GPE brings together developing countries, donors, international organization, civil society, teacher organizations, the private sector and foundations.

2. This evaluation is part of a larger GPE study that comprises a total of 22 summative and eight formative country level evaluations (CLE). The overall study is part of GPE’s monitoring and evaluation (M&E) strategy 2016-2020, which calls for a linked set of evaluation studies to explore how well GPE outputs and activities contribute to outcomes and impact at the country-level. The objective of each summative CLE is to assess (i) GPE contributions to strengthening education systems and, ultimately, the achievement of education results within a partner developing country in the areas of learning, equity, equality and inclusion; and hence (ii) the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of GPE’s theory of change (ToC) and of its country-level operational model.

3. The primary intended users of the country level evaluations are members of the Global Partnership for Education, including DCP governments and members of local education groups (LEGs) in the sampled countries, and the Board. The secondary user is the Secretariat. Tertiary intended users include the wider education community at global and country levels.

---


10 In the context of this assignment, the use of the term ‘impact’ is aligned with the terminology used by GPE to refer to sector level changes in the areas of learning, equity, gender equality and inclusion (reflected in GPE Strategic Goals 1 and 2 described in the GPE 2016-2020 Strategic Plan). While examining progress towards impact in this sense, the country evaluations do not constitute formal impact evaluations, which usually entail counterfactual analysis based on randomized control trials.

11 Assignment Inception Report (based on the evaluation TOR), p.1
1.2 Methodology overview

4. The guiding frameworks for the evaluation are the evaluation matrix (Appendix I) and the country-level theory of change for Burkina Faso (Appendix II). A summary of the country evaluation methodology is provided in Appendix III of this report. For further details, please refer to the Inception Report for the overall assignment (January 2018).

5. For the Burkina Faso CLE, the evaluation team consulted with a total of 47 stakeholders from MENA, development partners, civil society and the Secretariat (see Appendix IV for a stakeholder analysis and Appendix V for a list of consulted stakeholders), and reviewed a wide range of relevant documents, databases, websites as well as selected literature (see Appendix VI for a list of reviewed sources).

6. The report presents findings related to the three ‘Key Questions’ (KQs) from the evaluation matrix, which trace the contribution of GPE support to country-level objectives (KQ I); of country-level objectives to better systems (KQ II); and of better systems to progress towards impact (KQ III). The findings of this report are accordingly presented under three sections that each correspond to one of the KQs. In turn, each section is divided into sub-sections of findings that address the contribution claims under each KQ. The three KQs and the six contribution claims (A, B, C, D, E, F) are presented in Figure 1.1.

**Figure 1.1 The evaluation presents findings on key evaluation questions and contribution claims**

12 The country-specific ToC was adapted from the generic country-level ToC in the Inception Report.
13 Ministère de l’Éducation Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation (Ministry of National Education and Literacy)
1.3 Structure of the report

7. Following this introduction, Section 2 gives an overview of the national context of Burkina Faso, with a focus on the education sector (section 2.1), and on the history of the country’s involvement with GPE support (section 2.2).

8. Section 3 presents evaluation findings related to GPE’s claimed contributions to country-level objectives related to changes in sector planning; fostering mutual accountability through inclusive policy dialogue and sector monitoring; sector plan implementation; and sector financing.

9. Section 4 discusses education system-level changes in Burkina Faso with a focus on the period 2012-2017 and likely links between these changes and progress made towards the country-level objectives discussed in section 3.

10. Section 5 presents an overview of the impact-level changes\(^\text{14}\) observable in Burkina Faso and possible links to the noted changes in the national education system. Finally, Section 6 presents the overall conclusions of the evaluation.

\(^{14}\) In the context of this assignment, the term ‘impact’ is aligned with the terminology used by GPE to refer to changes in the areas of learning, equity, gender equality and inclusion (reflected in GPE Strategic Goals 1 and 2 described in the 2020 Strategic Plan). While the country evaluations examine progress towards impact in this sense, they do not constitute formal impact evaluations, which usually entail counterfactual analysis based on randomized controlled trials.
2 Context

2.1 Overview of Burkina Faso

11. Burkina Faso is a landlocked country in West Africa covering an area of 274,200 square kilometers with a population of 18.6 million (in 2016). It is classified as a Least Developed Country with a per capita Gross National Income of US$1,730 (2016) and a Human Development Index rank of 185 out of 188 (2015). Burkina Faso faces several complex and interconnected challenges that are shared by other countries in the Sahel region. Food insecurity, an ongoing challenge, has been made worse by severe droughts that have affected the region in the past five years due to strong climatic variations and irregular rainfall. Insecurity and political instability are other major concerns, and the security situation in northern areas of Burkina Faso has deteriorated in recent years due to a spillover from the conflict in neighboring Mali. Although the country has large mineral deposits with gold being the main export commodity, the economy slowed down in 2014 and 2015 after several years of solid growth. Around 80 percent of the adult population rely on subsistence agriculture to survive.

12. A former French colony, Burkina Faso gained its independence in 1960 under the name Upper Volta and was renamed Burkina Faso (land of the honest men) by President Thomas Sankara in 1984. The country has had a turbulent history with multiple military coups since independence. Former President Sankara was overthrown and executed in 1987 in a military coup by Blaise Compaoré, who remained as president for 27 years. Compaoré was forced into exile in 2014 following large-scale demonstrations in opposition to a proposed constitutional amendment that would have allowed him to stand for re-election in 2015. In September 2015, elements of the military attempted to overthrow the transitional government, but civilian rule was restored soon after. Roch Marc Christian Kaboré became president after winning the general elections in November 2015.

13. Burkina Faso’s overall national development strategy is outlined in the National Plan for Economic and Social Development (PNDES) for 2016 to 2020. The plan calls for strong, sustainable and inclusive economic growth and national development along three strategic axes.

---

18 Following a democratic election process, Kaboré was elected President Faso in the November 2015 general election, receiving 53.5% of the vote against 29.7% for the second-place candidate, Zephirin Diabré.
20 The three axes are overarching priority areas for achieving economic and social development through: reforming and modernizing the administration, developing human capital, and making key economic sectors more dynamic.
2.2 The education sector in Burkina Faso

14. Originally modeled on the French system, the current education system in Burkina Faso was reformed in 2007 with the Loi d’orientation et de l’éducation,21 which established an education continuum (comprehensive education cycle) that made basic education from pre-primary to lower secondary mandatory and nominally free for all. Its overarching objective is to allow for continuous learning from the ages of 3 to 16 and to increase transition rates between all education levels.

Table 2.1 Basic education in Burkina Faso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>AGE GROUP (YEARS)</th>
<th>GRADES</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF ENROLLED STUDENTS (PUBLIC, COMMUNITY, PRIVATE)</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF STUDENTS IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>Nursery, Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten</td>
<td>40,572</td>
<td>72,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>Grades 1-6</td>
<td>1,906,279</td>
<td>2,594,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Primary (also called Lower Secondary)</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>Grades 7-10</td>
<td>368,825</td>
<td>691,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


15. The 2007 reform consolidated the provision of all basic education22 services (see Table 2.1) under the Ministry of National Education and Literacy (MENA).23 The ministry is organized into 19 directorates24 and the present minister of education has been in office since January 2018. Secondary and higher education are managed by the Ministry of Higher Education (MESRSI).25 Students transition to lower secondary education by taking the CEP26 exam at the end of sixth grade, and graduate from the basic education cycle by taking the BEPC27 certificate for general studies or the CAP28 certificate for technical and professional courses. In line with the French system, students graduate from upper secondary education after three years with a diploma in general studies or in technical vocational education and training (TVET).

16. The education system also includes private schools (faith-based or secular) that function outside of the public school system (see Table 2.1). While most private schools are officially licensed and operate

22 In Burkina Faso, basic education is defined as including preschool, primary and lower secondary levels.
23 Ministère de l’éducation nationale et alphabétisation.
24 In addition to other decentralized directorates.
25 Ministère de l’enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche scientifique et de l’innovation.
26 Certificat d’études primaires
27 Brevet d’Études du Premier Cycle.
28 Certificat d’aptitude professionnelle
with the approval of MENA, a large proportion of schools are not recognized and thus not represented in official data,²⁹ which has some implications for the accuracy of the data used throughout the report.³⁰

Another distinct category of private schools that operate without an official license are Quranic schools (éducation informelle), which are particularly prevalent in the Sahel region.³¹

17. Burkina Faso is faced with a rapidly expanding population and has had annual growth rates of around three percent in the last decade.³³ In 2015, 70 percent of the population (i.e., 13 million people) was younger than 25 years, compared to 50 percent in 1996 (i.e., 7 million people). This has put substantial strains on the education system with a continuous demand for more classrooms and teachers.

18. To date, Burkina Faso has developed two education sector plans (ESPs): one in 2012 originally intended for the period 2012-2021, and another in 2016, for the period 2017-2030. This evaluation takes both ESPs into account when assessing the quality of the ESP elaboration process, albeit with an emphasis on the first process (in 2012).

19. Initially, in preparation for the country’s application for a GPE education sector program implementation grant (ESPIG) for the period 2013-2017, country stakeholders had worked towards developing a Strategic Basic Education Program (PDSEB)³⁴ as a comprehensive framework for improving basic education for the period 2012-2021.³⁵ The 2012-2021 ESP covering the whole sector then had to be developed in a period of less

---


³⁰ The proportion of private schools is likely higher than indicated in official data.

³¹ Not to be confused with Islamic, bilingual schools (Franco-Arabic), that largely operate within the framework of recognized faith-based schools.


³⁴ Programme de Développement Stratégique de l’Éducation de Base.

³⁵ Several government and development partner stakeholders involved in the development of the ESP indicated that the Secretariat had not provided them with sufficiently clear instructions on the requirement to develop a sector plan that addressed all levels of the education system. Initially, in preparation for the country’s application for ESPIG for 2013-2017, country stakeholders had worked towards developing the PDSEB as a comprehensive approach to improving basic education only.
than three months to meet GPE’s funding requirements for ESPIGs. Consequently, it never gained strong credibility or usage among national stakeholders. The ESP and the PDSEB are well aligned (Box 2.1) and this report uses the PDSEB as the overall focus of analysis for Burkina Faso.

20. In 2008, Burkina Faso conducted an Education Sector Analysis (ESA)\(^{36}\) that identified key improvements and challenges in the education sector from 1996-2006. While neither the 2012-2021 ESP nor the 2012-2021 PDSEB made robust use of sector analysis data, our review of these documents found that the PDSEB overall responds to the key areas of improvement noted in the sector analysis (Table 2.2). Burkina Faso conducted another ESA in 2017, which informed the new 2017-2030 ESP.

### Table 2.2  The PDSEB responds to key areas of improvements noted in the 2008 ESA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED IN SECTOR ANALYSIS (2008 RESEN)</th>
<th>SPECIFIC STRATEGIES IN THE 2012-2021 PDSEB TO ADDRESS THESE CHALLENGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low completion rates in primary schools</td>
<td>Implement the comprehensive education cycle (continuum) reform to create coherence between preschool, primary school and post-primary through coordinated programming of school construction and teacher recruitment; organize for “bridges” (passerelles) between non-formal and formal education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient number of schools to keep up with the rapid population growth</td>
<td>Improve initial and continued training of teachers; develop and revise curricula and teaching manuals and increase their availability; use national languages as learning supports at all levels; reinforce on-the-job professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low levels of learning in primary schools</td>
<td>Introduce a national education strategy for girls for the years 2011-2020,(^{37}) promote the value of education for girls and provide scholarships for girls to attend school; increase the availability of functional latrines; promote inclusive education that takes account of children with special education needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large geographic disparities in access to education</td>
<td>Focused efforts to improve access in 43 priority Communes with lower-than-average enrollment and completion rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and other disparities in access to education</td>
<td>Expand ENF [non-formal education] supply and demand at all levels; improve the quality of ENF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of illiteracy nationwide</td>
<td>Implement the reform to deconcentrate and decentralize the education system’s management; experiment with transferring resources directly to the schools through the COGES.(^{39})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of regional and local capacities to manage school construction and procurement(^{38})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{36}\) (Kamano 2010)

\(^{37}\) This strategy, the SNAEF (Stratégie nationale d’accélération de l’éducation des filles) is a separate national strategy, but is taken into account in the PDSEB.

\(^{38}\) This issue was highlighted in the 2009 evaluation of the 2002-2011 strategic basic education program, the PDDEB (Plan Décennal de Développement de l’Éducation de Base). (M. a. Ginolin February, 2013, 14)

\(^{39}\) Comités de Gestion
21. In Burkina Faso, the role of the Local Education Group (LEG) is played by the Cadre partenarial (pour l'éducation), whose members include representatives from the government, civil society organizations, teacher organizations, bilateral and multilateral development partners. It is chaired by the government (MENA) and was established in 2007 to function as a framework for dialogue and consultation between the government and other sector stakeholders. To date, the LEG has fulfilled this function primarily in relation to basic education. The Partenaires Techniques et Financiers (PTF) represent a subset of the LEG led by a Chef de file who acts as a spokesperson for the PTF vis à vis the government and fills the role of GPE coordinating agency. Both the LEG and the PTF meet once a month.

22. Table 2.3 presents a timeline of education sector-related events in Burkina Faso from 2012-2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Joint Sector Review (JSR)</th>
<th>ESP 2012-2021 (ended 2017)</th>
<th>Coup/Instability</th>
<th>Kaboré government</th>
<th>ESP 2017-2030 (Mid-Term)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>JSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>JSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>JSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>JSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>JSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>JSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>JSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 GPE in Burkina Faso

23. Burkina Faso joined the Global Partnership for Education in 2002 and is represented on the Board of Directors through the Africa 2 constituency group, which consists primarily of francophone West-African countries.

24. To date, Burkina Faso has received three education sector plan implementation grants (ESPIGs), one of which is still under implementation, one education sector plan development grant (ESPDG) and one program development grant (PDG). It also benefited from three global and regional activities (GRA) grants and one civil society education fund (CSEF) grant from 2013-2017 (see Table 2.4).

---

40 (Ministere de l'enseignement de base et de l'alphabetisation 2007)
41 I.e., the planning and monitoring for the two strategic programs for basic education, the PDDEB (2002-2011) and the PDSEB (2012-2021).
42 Country-level technical and financial development partners
43 Equivalent to a Sector Lead
44 Through which national stakeholders participated in technical workshops, peer-learning events and conferences.
### Table 2.4 GPE grants received by Burkina Faso since becoming a GPE member in 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANT TYPE</th>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>ALLOCATIONS IN US$</th>
<th>GRANT AGENT</th>
<th>KEY OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Implementation (ESPIG)</td>
<td>2018-2021</td>
<td>33,800,000</td>
<td>AFD(^{45})</td>
<td>Will support the implementation of the 2017-2030 ESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td>78,200,000</td>
<td>AFD</td>
<td>Pooled funding (through CAST) that financed an estimated 4% of the implementation of the PDSEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
<td>102,000,000</td>
<td>IBRD</td>
<td>Direct budget support for implementing basic education interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Plan Development (ESPDG)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>208,041</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Supported the elaboration of the 2017-2030 ESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development (PDG)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>44,885</td>
<td>AFD</td>
<td>Supported the elaboration of the 2012-2021 PDSEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global and Regional Activities (GRA)</td>
<td>2013-2015</td>
<td>1,408,200</td>
<td>8 countries</td>
<td>ELAN: Effectiveness of teaching and learning in bilingual context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013-2016</td>
<td>996,855</td>
<td>Countries involved in IFADEM(^{46})</td>
<td>OPERA: Teaching and learning effectiveness for learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF)</td>
<td>2013- To date(^{47})</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Grant to Coalition Nationale pour l’Education Pour Tous (CN-EPT) to identify barriers to access and achievement, set up and train advocacy groups; awareness raising.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Global Partnership for Education (website)

---

\(^{45}\) Agence française de développement  
\(^{46}\) Éducation à distance pour la formation à distance des maîtres  
\(^{47}\) Total allocation data is not available. CN-EPT also received a CSEF grant from 2010-2013, with the aim to (a) track the resources allocated to the education sector, and (b) provide feedback to government on the key findings of the education budget tracking.
25. The country’s first ESPIG was given as direct budget support to the Burkinabe government, with the World Bank as the grant agent.

26. The second ESPIG (2013-2017) was disbursed through the Compte d’Affectation Spécial du Trésor (CAST) with AFD as the grant agent. CAST is a pooled funding mechanism established in 2005 as a response to the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and receives most bilateral education funding to Burkina Faso, as well as a large portion of multilateral funding. CAST financing is managed by the government but kept separate from financing through the government budget. The second ESPIG contributed to financing a portion of the country’s PDSEB for the period 2013-2017,\(^{48}\) rather than being used to fund a stand-alone project with specific activities and expected results.

27. The third ESPIG was given to Burkina Faso in December 2017 with a value of US$33.8 million, with AFD as the grant agent.

\(^{48}\) An analysis of executed expenditures for 2013-2016 show that GPE financed 3.88 percent of the PDSEB. This will be further detailed in section 3.4.
3 GPE contributions to sector planning, implementation, dialogue/monitoring and financing

3.1 Introduction

28. This section summarizes findings in relation to Key Question I of the evaluation matrix: “Has GPE support to Burkina Faso contributed to achieving country-level objectives related to sector planning, to sector dialogue and monitoring, to more/better financing for education, and to sector plan implementation? If so, then how?”

29. The GPE country-level theory of change, developed in the inception report and adapted to the Burkina Faso context (Appendix II), outlines four contribution claims for GPE’s contributions to country-level objectives (one claim per objective). Each contribution claim is based on several underlying assumptions (see Appendix VII).

30. This section is structured around the four country-level objectives and their corresponding contribution claims. It tests each of the four contribution claims by answering two sub-questions for each phase of the policy cycle. First, what has changed in the country, during the period under review? And second, has GPE contributed to these changes and, if so, how? Answers to these questions are presented in the form of findings, and a summary assessment of the contribution claim is presented at the beginning of each sub-section. The summary assessments are colored to indicate whether evaluation evidence supports (green), partly supports (amber), or does not support (red) the respective contribution claim, or if there is insufficient data to assess the respective claim (grey). Appendix VII explains the underlying rating criteria and provides an overview of the evaluation’s assessment regarding the likely application of each of the underlying assumption related to each of the contribution claims.

---

49 In the generic country-level ToC developed during the inception phase, country-level objectives identify envisaged improvements in the areas of education sector planning, mutual accountability for sector progress, education sector financing, and ESP implementation. This largely mirrors how country-level objectives are defined in the GPE 2016-2020 strategic plan, except for mobilizing more and better education sector financing, which in the GPE 2020 is framed as a global-level objective. While acknowledging that GPE global-level influence and efforts may affect sector financing at the country level, the summative evaluations approach the issue of sector financing as a country-level objective to reflect that the focus is on changes in sector financing for the specific country under review.

50 Improved planning, dialogue/monitoring, financing, and plan implementation correspond to Country-Level Objectives (CLOs) 1, 2, 3 and 4 of GPE’s 2016-2020 strategic plan.

51 This question corresponds to Country Evaluation Questions (CEQ) 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2 in the evaluation matrix.

52 This corresponds to CEQ 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2.
3.2 Education sector planning

Box 3.1: Assessment of contribution claim A

Claim: “GPE (financial and non-financial) support and influence contribute to the development of government owned, credible and evidence-based sector plans focused on equity, efficiency and learning.”

Assessment: The evaluation found that available evidence supports the GPE contribution claim related to strengthening education sector planning. As is discussed in the following findings, this assessment relates more strongly to the 2017-2030 ESP than to the 2012-2021 ESP.\(^{53}\)

Assessment is based on the following: (a) The envisaged result was achieved, i.e., during the review period the government of Burkina Faso developed sector plans that, despite some areas for improvement (in particular related to country ownership), are credible and evidence-based; (b) Available evidence indicates that the likelihood of the five assumptions underlying the GPE contribution claim holding true in the Burkina Faso context are strong for four and moderate for one;\(^{54}\) (c) The evaluation found no additional factors beyond GPE support that would, on their own, suffice to explain the noted progress in sector planning. This overall assessment is elaborated on in the following paragraphs.

Please see Appendix VIII for a visual representation of evaluation findings on GPE contributions to sector planning.

Strengths and weaknesses of sector planning during the period under review\(^{55}\)

Finding 1: Both ESPs (2012-2021 and 2017-2030) were of good quality and their development contributed to strengthening individual and collective in-country capabilities for sector planning. Nevertheless, the 2012-2021 ESP lacked country ownership and never became a shared reference point for education sector stakeholders.

31. The 2012-2021 ESP involved a total of 21 objectives under the four overarching objectives of (i) Access, (ii) Quality, (iii) Non-formal education and (iv) System Strengthening.\(^{56}\) The specific objectives outlined under these priority areas respond to the Strategic Goals as outlined in the GPE 2020 Strategic Plan (see Box 3.2).\(^{57}\) While the objectives themselves are relevant considering the key gaps identified in the 2008 Sector Analysis Report (see Table 2.2 in Section 2.2), the relevance of the ESP as a plan for addressing sector gaps outside of basic education is weak due to a limited ownership by stakeholders.

\(^{53}\) This sub-section addresses evaluation question CEQ 1.1 (What have been strengths and weaknesses of education sector planning during the period under review?) and CEQ 1.3 (CEQ 1.3 Has GPE contributed to the observed characteristics of sector planning? How?) from the evaluation matrix. Evaluation question CEQ 3.1 (What factors other than GPE support are likely to have contributed to the observed changes (or lack thereof) in sector plan development, sector financing and plan implementation, and in sector dialogue and monitoring?) is addressed throughout this section.

\(^{54}\) Please see sub-section on ‘validity of assumptions’ below as well as Appendix VII.

\(^{55}\) Evaluation question CEQ 1.1.

\(^{56}\) These four categories are aligned with the overarching strategies of the PDSEB (Box 2.1).

\(^{57}\) Improved and more equitable learning outcomes; Increased equity, gender equality, and inclusion; and Effective and efficient education systems.
32. The Partenaires Techniques et Financiers (PTF) endorsed the 2012-2021 ESP in March 2013 (and the PDSEB in December 2012). The ESP represented broad agreement by sector stakeholders on the key policies and structural reforms in the education sector in Burkina Faso, which illustrates significant progress compared with the lack of an overarching framework that previously defined the sector. The appraisal report noted a variety of strengths of the elaboration process and of the document itself but also highlighted several weaknesses in the quality of the plan. A key shortcoming of the elaboration process is that it did not make robust use of a sector analysis to inform the strategies selected, although our review of the plan and the sector analysis indicate that the planned strategies satisfactorily addressed gaps related to the basic education sector (Section 2.2). Several CSO, government and development partner stakeholders commented that the ESP and the PDSEB did not sufficiently prioritize different objectives and interventions, with the result that planned sector targets, national implementation capacities and available financial resources were not consistently aligned.

Table 3.1 summarizes the key strengths and weaknesses of the ESP based on our analysis of available data.

33. Overall, the ESP met five of the seven internal GPE quality criteria under RF indicator 16a, namely those related to being guided by overall vision, holistic, evidence-based, sensitive to content, and attentive to disparities. It did not meet the criteria for long-term strategy and implementation achievability.

---

58 This objective includes increasing equity and reducing disparities at all levels.
59 Country-level Technical and Financial Partners group
60 (M. a. Ginolin February 2013, 14)
61 The PDSEB preparation process also included a retrospective assessment of the first ten-year basic education program (Plan décennal de développement de l’éducation de base, PDDEB), which was conducted in February 2012 and shared with the participants involved in the preparation. (Global Partnership for Education March 2, 2013)
62 This was noted in the independent evaluation of the 2012-2021 ESP. Our own analysis was congruent with the results of the independent review. (M. a. Ginolin February, 2013, 13)
63 No data are available in relation to the 2012-2021 ESP on GPE RF indicators 16b, 16c and 16d.
### Table 3.1 Strengths and weaknesses of the 2012-2021 ESP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>STRENGTHS</th>
<th>GAPS/WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country-led, participatory and transparent process of ESP development</td>
<td>The consultative process and drafting of the 2012-2021 ESP was country-led (managed by MENA) and reflected national development priorities. It was a participatory process that encompassed extensive consultations with a wide range of stakeholders such as development partners, civil society organizations, private faith-based school representatives and regional level representatives.</td>
<td>Several consulted civil society organization (CSO) representatives indicated that they lacked substantial participation, i.e., consultations on operational aspects of the ESP, not only on strategic aspects. Due to being developed in haste primarily to meet GPE ESPIG funding requirements, there were insufficient consultations with stakeholders representing secondary and higher education. The final ESP had limited ownership with stakeholders not involved in basic education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing key challenges of the education sector in relation to equity, efficiency and learning</td>
<td>The 2012-2021 ESP implicitly responded to key gaps identified in the 2008 RESEN and was informed by available sector data. Overall, the proposed ESP strategies satisfactorily addressed issues of equity (increased access and reduced disparity); efficiency (sector reforms) and learning (improved teacher training and revised curricula and manuals) for the basic education sector.</td>
<td>The 2012-2021 ESP did not make robust use of a sector analysis to inform the strategies selected. No updated ESA was conducted prior to ESP elaboration. While the ESP formulated objectives for addressing challenges for secondary and higher education, it did not put forward clear strategies for achieving them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic financing, implementation and monitoring arrangements</td>
<td>The 2012-2021 ESP was based on satisfactory budget simulation models and had largely realistic financing arrangements, although it did not present a clear plan for bridging the estimated funding gap for implementation.</td>
<td>The 2012-2021 ESP had limited prioritization among the various objectives and insufficient alignment between planned sector targets, national implementation capacities and available financial resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 Our analysis of strengths and weaknesses is based on stakeholder consultations, the appraisal report, as well as our analysis of the ESP document and the 2008 RESEN.

65 The dimensions used in this table to structure observations constitute a blend of the GPE/UNESCO IIEP ESP appraisal criteria as described in the 2015 Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Appraisal and the GPE ESP quality criteria. As such, they address both process as well as content related characteristics of the sector plan.

66 Ministère de L'Éducation Nationale et de l'Alphabétisation

67 The national development strategy from 2011 (SCADD, Stratégie de Croissance Accélérée et de Développement Durable) and the national education strategy from 2016 (SNDEI, Stratégie Nationale de Développement de l'Éducation Inclusive) both call for the establishment of universal basic education with equal participation of boys and girls.

68 This was noted in the independent evaluation of the 2012-2021 ESP. Our own analysis was congruent with the results of the independent review. (M. a. Ginolin February, 2013, 13)
### Issue
Despite shortcomings in implementation arrangements, the proposed ESP strategies were overall achievable and presented a coherent framework for implementing key education sector reforms.

### Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GAPS/WEAKNESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ESP had several weaknesses in its implementation arrangements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lacked clear procedures for implementing the construction of schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lacked a clear and coherent plan for capacity strengthening and for transferring capacities to the regions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did not have operational policies for improving the quality of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Did not consider the capacities of actors to conduct proposed interventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. The 2017-2030 ESP addressed several of the shortcomings identified for the previous sector plan, most importantly by conducting a broader elaboration process that better consulted stakeholders from the whole sector (basic, secondary and higher education). It is too early to fully assess whether the 2017-2030 ESP acts as a shared reference point for the sector, but MENA stakeholders indicate stronger country ownership and relevance than for the previous ESP. Most consulted stakeholders noted that their participation in sector planning has increased since 2012, although certain CSO stakeholders (for instance parent-teacher associations) have expressed insufficient involvement in the planning process.

35. The 2017 -2030 ESP draws more explicitly on data and recommendations from the 2017 Sector Analysis Report to inform the strategies selected, and it met all seven GPE internal quality criteria for ESPs, and 22 out of 24 GPE/UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) appraisal criteria. At the same time, the plan has several weaknesses in its implementation arrangements, and it is again not yet clear how the government is intending to bridge the estimated funding gap of 40.9 billion CFA (3.5 percent) for implementing the new ESP.

---

69 As noted by GPE’s internal quality rating (GP RF indicator 16a).

70 Based on the independent appraisals conducted in 2012 and 2016 by the consulting company Le Vif Du Sujet.

71 Although unlike the 2012-2021 ESP, the 2017-2030 ESP elaboration process did not conduct a survey of beneficiaries.

72 Available documentation does not indicate to what extent stakeholder participation has changed between the two ESP processes.

73 (M. a. Ginolin February, 2013, 13)

74 It also draws on data from the 2014 PASEC report.

75 1) Overall vision; 2) Strategic; 3) Holistic; 4) Evidenced-based; 5) Achievable; 6) Sensitive to context; 7) Sensitive to disparities.

76 The ESP partially met the criteria for wide stakeholder consultations (stakeholders were primarily consulted on general objectives rather than operational aspects of the plan) and the criteria for capacity reinforcement (it did not conduct a gap analysis for sector stakeholders).

77 For example, it does not include a clear plan for strengthening government capacities at central or regional levels.

36. Available evidence suggests that the process of developing the two education sector plans has strengthened individual as well as collective capabilities for systematic and collaborative sector planning. During the sector planning process in 2012, the grant agent and MENA tasked a team of public servants with gathering and analyzing sector data to inform ESP preparation. The departments of Statistics (DGESS), Finance (DAF) and Human resources (DRH) from MENA had to work together to gather and analyze data related to financing, outcome indicators and capacity gaps. All consulted staff from these departments reported that the nature of this preparatory process triggered closer and more effective cross-department collaboration after 2012, including during preparation of the 2017-2030 ESP.

37. Participation in sector planning processes led to more frequent and closer collaboration and coordination of interventions among development partners (see also Section 3.3 on strengthened coordination through mechanisms for sector monitoring).

38. During the elaboration of the 2017-2030 ESP, national stakeholders participated in two MENA-led committees: a steering committee (pilotage) to oversee the process and a technical committee (with sub-committees) for data collection and analysis, soliciting and incorporating stakeholder inputs, and drafting the sector plan. National stakeholders as well as development partners unanimously stated that this experience had increased their knowledge, skills and confidence related to developing quality and evidence-based sector plans that incorporate different priorities and needs.

39. Nevertheless, capacity gaps remain in relation to budget planning and MENA has struggled with balancing competing priorities with available financial resources. In some cases, resulting weaknesses in sector planning negatively affected implementation of the PDSEB.

Did GPE contribute to the observed characteristics of sector planning? 

How?

Finding 2: GPE funding has been the key incentive for developing quality ESPs. Financial resources, guidelines and technical assistance provided by GPE have facilitated the planning process, albeit more successfully for the 2017-2030 ESP than for the 2012-2021 ESP.

40. Based on available evidence from stakeholder consultations and document review, the evaluation found that GPE, through its various modalities, has substantially contributed to education sector planning in Burkina Faso in the following four ways.

79 Based on stakeholder consultations, as well as the 2016 mid-term review of the PDSEB, which noted that “budget management is overall weak.” (Ziegler October, 2016, 8). These challenges arose despite the ESP having been assessed to have achieved the highest possible score on all the ‘implementable’ and ‘financially sustainable” criteria in GPE’s internal quality assessment (RF 16 data).

80 One example is in 2015-2016, when schoolbooks that had already been produced were not delivered due to lack of planned funds for transport and delivery. (Ziegler October, 2016, 33)

81 Evaluation question CEQ 1.3

82 Financing, capacity building, quality assurance, demand for mutual accountability
Providing an incentive: GPE requires all ESPIG applications to develop a comprehensive national education sector plan that is endorsed by the country’s development partners. Consulted stakeholders widely agreed that the expectations of receiving implementation grants from GPE was the main driver for developing the 2012-2021 sector plan and constituted a key motivation for preparing the 2017-2030 sector plan.

Providing resources: A program development grant (PDG) in 2012 facilitated the development of the PDSEB, which informed the 2012-2021 ESP. An education sector plan development grant (ESPDG) for preparing the 2017-2030 ESP allowed UNICEF as the grant agent to provide MENA with resources to carry out consultations with stakeholders and fund the two committees that led ESP drafting. Additionally, one of the GRA grants that benefitted Burkina Faso (OPERA) led to a report on learning capacities that informed the 2017-2030 ESP.

GPE guidelines: The Secretariat shared information with in-country actors on the process of developing and appraising a good ESP and several government and development partner representatives indicated that they found this information helpful and relevant, particularly the guidelines on sector plan preparation.

Technical assistance and facilitation: UNICEF and AFD provided technical assistance and quality assurance during the process of developing the two ESPs. The Secretariat provided additional quality assurance by providing feedback on draft versions of both ESPs. GPE also provided quality assurance on Burkina Faso’s application for the 2018-2021 ESPIG through country missions from the Secretariat.

Validity of assumptions

Available evidence suggests that the combination of GPE financial and non-financial support positively contributed to sector planning by strengthening country-level stakeholder capabilities, motivation, and opportunities (i.e., financial resources) for participatory and evidence-based sector planning. Of importance, the existence of an implementation grant with related funding requirements encouraged the process of jointly working on developing the 2012-2021 ESP. This enabled closer and more effective collaboration across departments and among development partners (see Box 3.4) and

---

https://www.globalpartnership.org/funding/gpe-grants

84 Although the country’s 2012 sector plan was not directly developed with assistance of a GPE grant, it was effectively developed as part of the elaboration process for the PDSEB, which received a PDG of US$ 44,885.

85 (The Global Partnership for Education; AFD; Ministère de l’éducation National et de l’Alphabetisation 2015)

86 The 2012-2021 ESP was developed and appraised based on the 2012 Global Partnership for Education/International Institute for Educational Planning ‘Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Preparation and Appraisal’. The most recent ESP 2017-2030 is based on the updated (2015) ‘Guidelines on sector plan preparation’ and ‘Guidelines on sector plan appraisal’. Consultations conducted for this evaluation provided no indication that stakeholders considered either set of guidelines as more or less relevant or helpful.

87 UNICEF is currently the GPE coordinating agency, but also acted as the grant agent for the ESPDG in 2016. AFD acted as the grant agent for the 2012 PDG.

88 Letters provided by GPE country lead for Burkina Faso. (Baeten May 4, 2016)


strengthened capabilities for systematic and collaborative sector planning. The existence of capabilities, opportunities and motivation are three of the five underlying assumptions related to sector planning outlined in the GPE country-level theory of change (see Appendix VII). Available evidence further supports the fourth assumption that GPE had sufficient leverage in Burkina Faso to influence sector planning. The fifth underlying assumption – that Education Management Information System (EMIS) and learning assessment and reporting systems produce relevant and reliable data to inform sector planning – was found to hold only partially true in the context of developing the 2012-2021 ESP and PDSEB. This is primarily due to the lack of data on the extent to which the country has a functional EMIS.

Additional factors and unintended effects

42. A positive factor beyond GPE support that influenced the observed characteristics of sector planning processes was the commitment to participatory sector planning in MENA and among other education stakeholders. A negative factor, which contributed to lack of prioritization between different national education priorities, was capacity gaps in MENA. Neither of these additional factors suffice, however, to explain on their own the noted characteristics of sector planning during the period under review.

43. The evaluation did not find evidence of any unintended, positive or negative, effects of GPE financial and non-financial support to sector planning.

3.3 Mutual accountability through sector dialogue and monitoring

Box 3.5: Assessment of contribution claim B

Claim: “GPE (financial and non-financial) support for inclusive sector planning and joint monitoring contribute to mutual accountability for education sector progress.”

Assessment: Available evidence supports the GPE contribution claim related to strengthening mutual accountability for education sector progress.

Assessment is based on the following: (a) There has been progress towards the envisaged results of strengthening sector dialogue and monitoring, but important areas for improvement remain regarding the monitoring of the PDSEB and the availability of country-level data on the PDSEB results framework; (b) The extent to which the four assumptions underlying the contribution held true in the Burkina Faso context was rated strong for three, and moderate for one;\(^91\) (c) The evaluation found no additional factors beyond GPE support that would, on their own, suffice to explain the noted progress in sector dialogue and monitoring. This overall assessment is discussed in the following paragraphs.

Please see Appendix VIII for a visual representation of evaluation findings on the contribution claim related to sector dialogue and monitoring.

\(^91\) See sub-section on ‘validity of assumptions’ for a discussion of these assumptions.

\(^92\) This sub-section addresses evaluation question CEQ 2.1 (Has sector dialogue changed during the period under review?), CEQ 2.2 (Has sector monitoring changed?) and CEQ 2.3 (Has GPE contributed to observed changes in sector dialogue and monitoring? How?) from the evaluation matrix.
Has sector dialogue changed during the 2012-2017 period?\(^{93}\)

**Finding 3:** From 2012-2017, education sector dialogue became more participatory and relevant. There is room for improvement though in ensuring meaningful participation of private sector representatives and of stakeholders not directly involved in basic education.

44. The evaluation did not have available data on changes in the composition or the frequency of the LEG and PTF meetings from 2012-2017,\(^ {94}\) although consulted stakeholders indicated that neither the composition nor meeting frequency changed significantly.\(^ {95}\) However, the importance of these mechanisms to the government of Burkina Faso has increased as evidenced by their more in-depth participation in both sector planning (Section 3.2) and sector plan implementation (Section 3.5). Most CSO stakeholders noted that the quality of their engagement with MENA increased during the period under review. By more frequently consulting with sector stakeholders, sector dialogue has become more inclusive and participatory (see Box 3.6).\(^ {96}\)

45. Despite these improvements, a subset of key informants, notably those representing secondary and higher education, feel less inclined to participate actively in the consultative process of the education sector which, from their perspectives, disproportionately prioritizes basic education over other segments of the sector. Several representatives from private schools also noted that they lacked substantive participation in sector dialogue (i.e., participation that went beyond validating drafted documents and reports).

Has sector monitoring changed during the 2012-2017 period?\(^ {98}\)

**Finding 4:** Since 2012, sector monitoring has improved but remains an ongoing challenge.

46. The joint sector review (JSR) is an annual stocktaking exercise for the education sector with wide participation from national government and non-government stakeholders.\(^ {99}\) While secondary and higher education stakeholders participate in JSRs in Burkina Faso, the reviews primarily function as a mechanism for monitoring basic education, as reflected in the official name.\(^ {100}\) The JSRs have three key objectives: (i) monitor and validate PDSEB implementation and results achievement related to the PDSEB results framework; (ii) identify one thematic issue for each of the four PDSEB program areas to be discussed in

---

\(^{93}\) Evaluation question CEQ 2.1.

\(^{94}\) GPE RF indicator 19 for 2016 and 2017 show that the LEG included representation from civil society organizations and teachers for both years.

\(^{95}\) One exception is that JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency) has become a more regular participant at LEG and PTF meetings.

\(^{96}\) The evaluation did not have access to meeting minutes from JSR meetings and was thus not able to evaluate the quality of meeting participation.

\(^{97}\) (Ziegler October, 2016, 45)

\(^{98}\) Evaluation question CEQ 2.2.

\(^{99}\) Including MENA, the PTF, CSOs, teacher unions and private sector stakeholders.

\(^{100}\) *Mission Conjointe de Suivi du Programme de Développement Stratégique de l’Education de Base* (i.e., Joint Monitoring Mission for PDSEB).

\(^{101}\) Terms of Reference, JSR 2016. (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation May 15, 2017)
the thematic groups over the next year; and (iii) monitor the implementation of recommendations made by the previous JSR.

47. Available evidence indicates that the JSRs are largely meeting their objectives. Issues identified in JSRs have informed discussions between sector stakeholders in the thematic groups (see Box 3.7), and 60 percent of the 89 recommendations\(^{102}\) deriving from JSRs for the years 2012 to 2016 were fully or partially implemented the following year.\(^{103}\) Interview data also indicate that feedback from JSRs are used in decision making at the government level, for instance to inform operational adjustments to the PDSEB, revise MENA procedures and enact new national legislation (see Section 4). Furthermore, the JSR held in 2016 met the minimum standards for all five GPE internal quality criteria\(^{104}\) and exceeded the minimum standards on the criteria for being evidence-based and functioning as a policy-making instrument; the 2017 JSR met four criteria and failed the criterion for being evidence-based.\(^{105}\)

48. However, the extent to which the JSRs function as a mechanism to monitor PDSEB implementation and sector results is limited by two factors:

- **The monitoring mechanisms\(^{106}\) for the 2012-2021 PDSEB were inadequate** for conducting regular and efficient monitoring of progress. As a result, MENA was not able to systematically monitor the construction of schools, the development and distribution of new curricula, or the provision of pedagogic support to teachers.\(^{107}\)

---

\(^{102}\) Although a GPE country mission report noted that the JSR recommendations were primarily focused on long-term strategies to be developed for the next year’s JSR, as opposed to concrete actions that should be implemented in the short run. GPE Country Mission Report, 18-21 April, 2017.

\(^{103}\) 14% of recommendations were still being implemented and 26% were not implemented. Available evidence does not suggest any changes in the proportion of recommendations that were implemented from 2012-2017 as compared with 2009-2011. Based on analysis of final JSR reports from 2009-2017.

\(^{104}\) GPE’s five quality criteria are participatory and inclusive; evidence-based; comprehensive (i.e., all subsectors addressed in ESP, as well as non-formal education and adult literacy); function as a monitoring instrument (monitoring of sector performance and key indicators); and function as a policy-making instrument (recommendations feed into addressing weaknesses in plan implementation).

\(^{105}\) GPE RF indicator 18, data from 2016 and 2017

\(^{106}\) The Permanent Secretariat (SP-PDSEB) is responsible for monitoring and coordinating activities under the PDSEB. The PDSEB institutional framework comprises four working levels where monitoring takes place: (a) within the LEG, (b) during the Joint Sector Reviews, (c) the thematic groups, which are responsible for addressing sector concerns in depth and providing input to discussions in the partnership framework, and (d) the “relay” [local] thematic groups in each region, advisory bodies that will oversee the planning of activities and their consistency with the regional program. The AFD as the grant agent is responsible for: (a) regular reporting and coordination for taking important decisions concerning the program with the MENA and the other PTF, and (b) technical management, drawing on the skills and experience of the various technical and financial partners and all the contributions of AFD. (Global Partnership for Education March 2, 2013, 25.)

\(^{107}\) (Ziegler October, 2016, 40)
Gaps in the availability of data: From 2013-2015, no measurable data were available for between 23.8 percent and 47.6 percent of the 42 indicators in the PDSEB results framework. The Department of Statistics (DGESS) of MENA emphasized that, despite capacity building activities conducted with the financial and technical assistance from the GPE grant, important gaps remain in data collection capabilities, and technical and technological capacities for data management remain inadequate especially at the regional (sub-national) level. Burkina Faso conducts bi-annual national assessments of learning outcomes at the primary school level.109

49. Despite these challenges, our analysis of documents and interviews confirms that sector monitoring has improved somewhat. In particular, the ESP/PDSEB established a common monitoring framework for the basic education sector, which was an improvement that allowed for more systematic and transparent (sub)sector monitoring than had been possible in the past (see Box 3.8). However, this framework was not revised or updated during PDSEB implementation, leading to substantial gaps between annual targets and actual progress in certain areas.110 Furthermore, most consulted stakeholders (including non-government representatives) noted and were satisfied with the improved relevance of the sector reviews that increasingly allowed their voices to be heard and their feedback to be taken into consideration for decision making (see Box 3.9). While there are no available data on participation at JSRs between 2012-2015,111 all informants consulted had participated in one or more JSR.

Did GPE contribute to observed changes in sector dialogue and monitoring? How?

Finding 5: GPE has contributed to increased mutual accountability in the basic education sector by providing incentives, as well as financial and technical assistance for more participatory policy dialogue and systematic monitoring. Such mutual accountability does not exist beyond basic education.

50. GPE has contributed to strengthening basic education sector dialogue and monitoring in the following ways:

---

108 Both through CAST financing and through technical support from the GPE grant agent.
109 (Ziegler October, 2016, 23)
110 In comparison, PDSEB implementation is based on triannual action plans (e.g., 2013-2015).
111 A total of 95 stakeholders participated in the 2016 JSR. In 2017, a total of 132 stakeholders participated in the JSR, including 52 donor representatives, 7 CSO representatives and 4 teacher union representatives, and 7 representatives from other ministries beyond MENA. (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation May 6, 2016)
112 Evaluation question CEQ 2.3.
Providing an incentive: Interview data indicate that GPE’s funding requirements have provided the main incentive for improving sector dialogue and conducting regular and participatory sector reviews.

Providing financial support, technical assistance and facilitation: MENA carried out a number of capacity-strengthening activities to improve data collection and management capabilities of staff in the Department of Statistics (DGESS). These measures were supported through pooled-funded CAST financing, and thus – in part – through the GPE implementation grant. GPE has also provided beneficial technical assistance through the grant agent. In addition, the development of the results framework for the PDSEB was co-funded through a GPE program development grant (PDG).

Advocating for the inclusion of civil society: CSO representatives considered GPE’s support to Burkina Faso in advocating for the participation of civil society in education sector planning to have had a positive impact on the ability of CSOs to influence the government and make resources available for specific activities (see Box 3.10). This support was also perceived to have improved the ability of CSOs to stay up-to-date on education sector information and to exchange experiences and share knowledge.

Overall, improvements to sector planning, dialogue and monitoring have strengthened a feedback loop mechanism consisting of the following components (see Appendix XI for a visual representation):

- Regular monitoring of the PDSEB which identifies roadblocks that hinder or limit implementation;
- These roadblocks are discussed by education sector stakeholders during the annual Joint Sector Reviews (JSRs) and assigned to specific thematic groups (of the LEG) to be addressed;
- Sector stakeholders, led by MENA, discuss the roadblocks and formulate specific recommendations during the regular meetings of the thematic groups;
- Subsequent JSRs report on progress towards the implementation of these recommendations.
- The example of the Cantines Scolaires (see Box 3.11) illustrates how this strengthened feedback loop mechanism has improved evidence-based and transparent decision making in the sector, and thus strengthened mutual accountability.

Box 3.10 GPE plays an important role for the participation of civil society and [the wider educational community] in sector dialogue.

Box 3.11: Management of school feeding programs (Cantines scolaires)

School feeding programs (SFPs) provide food to children and create a social safety net for the most vulnerable in a population, concurrently alleviating hunger and tackling barriers which may prevent the poorest from pursuing education. In Burkina Faso SFPs are recognized as a key component of the education system and a means for providing benefits such as alleviating hunger, supporting access to school and increasing attendance.

---

113 The 2013-2017 ESPIG was channeled through the CAST pooled funding mechanism. CAST requires a review of PDSEB’s progress during joint annual monitoring missions (i.e., JSRs). (Global Partnership for Education March 2, 2013, 22)

114 The national coalition for education CSOs (CN-EPT) also received an ongoing CSEF grant in 2013 to: identify barriers to access and achievement, set up and train advocacy groups, and conduct awareness raising. Consulted stakeholders did not indicate if or to what extent this grant had been beneficial.
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Validity of assumptions

52. Available evidence suggests that GPE had sufficient leverage in Burkina Faso to positively influence LEG functioning, although both the LEG and the JSRs was created independently of GPE’s influence. Furthermore, country-level stakeholders had opportunities, including resources, and the motivation, including political will, to work together solve education sector issues. These issues are three of the underlying assumptions in the GPE country-level ToC related to sector dialogue and monitoring (see Appendix VII). A fourth assumption, related to country-level stakeholders’ knowledge and skills for sector dialogue and monitoring, was found to have held true to a more limited extent given the noted weaknesses in monitoring mechanisms and the availability of data.

Additional factors and unintended effects

53. Positive factors beyond GPE support that have influenced the observed characteristics of sector dialogue and monitoring are the commitment to inclusive dialogue MENA and among other education stakeholders. Negative factors beyond GPE support that have influenced the observed characteristics of...
sector dialogue and monitoring are noted gaps in in the availability of data and insufficiencies in the monitoring framework for the PDSEB.

54. The evaluation found no evidence of unintended, positive or negative, effects of GPE support to sector dialogue and monitoring during the period under review.

3.4 Education sector financing

Box 3.11: Assessment of contribution claim C

**Claim:** “GPE advocacy and funding requirements contribute to more and better financing for education in the country.”

**Assessment:** Available evidence partially supports the GPE contribution claim related to more and better international and domestic financing.121

**Assessment is based:** (a) There has been an increase in both nominal and relative domestic financing to the education sector, although available financing for new investments is decreasing; There has been a substantial decline in education ODA to Burkina Faso, (b) The extent to which the two assumptions underlying the contribution held true in the Burkina Faso context was rated moderate for one and “not sufficient data” for one (see Appendix VII); (c) Changing donor priorities and the 2014-2015 political crisis represent additional factors that are likely to have affected the amounts of international and domestic sector financing. This overall assessment is discussed in the following paragraphs.

Please see Appendix VIII for a visual representation of evaluation findings presented in this section.

55. There are certain variations in available financial data from different sources for Burkina Faso in terms of both the methodologies used and the data presented (Figure 3.1).122 For instance, unlike GPE’s internal monitoring data (RF indicator 10), UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) takes debt repayment into account when calculating overall government budgets.123 To ensure consistency, our analysis of domestic education financing is based on data on executed budgets from MENA’s Department of Finance,124 but other sources are cited to enrich the analysis.

---

121 The sub-section addresses evaluation question CEQ 1.5 (Has GPE contributed to leveraging additional education sector financing and improving the quality of financing) from the evaluation matrix.

122 Other differences can stem from whether education financing outside of MENA, MESRSI and MJFIP is included (for instance related pensions or regional expenditures), or whether the calculation considers differences between budgeted and executed financing.

123 UNESCO assesses “total general (local, regional and central) government expenditure on education (current, capital, and transfers), expressed as a percentage of total general government expenditure on all sectors (including health, education, social services, etc.). It includes expenditure funded by transfers from international sources to government.” [http://data.uis.unesco.org](http://data.uis.unesco.org)

124 This is the only source consistently providing annual data from 2009-2015. The analysis is conducted in collaboration with the Department of Finance (DAF) and is based on public data collected and published by the Burkinabé Treasury (mandated by the Loi de Règlement).
Finding 6: Domestic education sector financing has increased in the period under review, but growing expenditures on teacher salaries limit new investments on teaching quality or infrastructure.

From 2009 to 2015, domestic education financing in Burkina Faso increased substantially from 141 billion to 263 billion CFA (an 86 percent increase). There was also a shift in the distribution of financing between the different education levels, with the share given to basic education increasing from 56.5 to 63.8 percent between 2012-2015. Correspondingly, the proportion allocated to secondary and higher education (MESRSI) declined from 34.5 percent (78.6 billion CFA) to 29.4 percent (91.4 billion CFA).

A detailed analysis of executed budgets to the three ministries working in the education sector demonstrated that relative domestic financing to education, as a proportion of the government budget, fluctuated considerably but increased overall from 2009 to 2015. Actual education financing reached 18.8 percent of executed government budget (289.7 billion out of 1 542.2 billion CFA) in 2015 (21.5 percent if debt repayment is excluded) and averaged 15.7 percent (229.6 billion CFA) from 2010-2015 (Figure 3.2). This is meeting GPE’s target of member countries either increasing or maintaining domestic sector financing for education.

---

125 When adjusted for inflation, the growth from 2009 to 2015 represents an increase of 71 percent.
126 In absolute numbers, in 2012 the government dedicated 128.8 billion CFA to basic education out of total education spending of 227.8 billion CFA; in 2015, corresponding figures were 185 billion CFA to basic education out of total education spending of 289.7 billion CFA.
127 Ministère de l’enseignement supérieur, de la recherche scientifique et de l’innovation (Ministry of Higher Education, Scientific Research and Innovation)
128 Data from Loi de règlement, 2009-2015.
129 The evaluation analyzed the money allocated (dotations définitives) and disbursed (montants ordonnancés) from the Burkinabé government to the Ministry of Education (MENA), the Ministry of Higher Education (MESRSI) and the Ministry of Youth and Employment (MJIFPI) in each year, and the proportion of the predicted and actual government budget. Based on public data collected and published by the Treasury under the Loi de Règlement for 2009-2015.
130 An analysis that excludes debt repayment from executed government expenditures provides slightly higher figures from 2009-2015, but corresponds with the overall trend presented in Figure 3.2.
spending at 20 percent or above. Most stakeholders also suggested that the turbulent political situation in 2014-2015 contributed to reducing growth in spending and that the new government is committed to increasing education financing (See Box 3.12). Available data indicate that relative domestic spending continued to increase after 2015.

**Figure 3.2 Domestic education financing**

Source: Loi de règlement, 2009-2015

58. The share of the education budget used for teacher salaries across all education levels increased from 58 percent in 2009 (85.2 billion CFA) to 71 percent in 2015 (187.1 billion CFA) (Figure 3.3). While this trend corresponds to an improved pupil-teacher ratio since 2011 (Section 4), teacher salaries consumed most of the increase in education financing (84 percent of new domestic financing from 2009-2015), thereby reducing available funding for new investments, for instance related to building school infrastructure. Capital investments across all education levels decreased from 18.8 percent (42.9 billion CFA) to 7 percent (18.4 billion CFA) of domestic education financing from 2012 to 2015. Unfortunately, the evaluation team did not find data to support an analysis of spending efficiency, which is a central component of more and better financing.

---

131 GPE RF indicator 10  
132 While a stagnating macro-economic situation was also seen as a key explanatory factor for low growth by most stakeholders, the data do not support this perception. Burkina Faso had strong economic growth from 2005-2012 with annual GDP growth averaging 6.15%. From 2013-2015, annual growth declined to 4.67% while relative domestic education financing increased during the same time. “World Bank Data,” The World Bank, Accessed 10-01-2018, [https://data.worldbank.org/](https://data.worldbank.org/)  
133 Domestic data on executed budgets was not available for 2016. Data from GPE’s RF indicator 10 for 2016 indicate that the executed education budget constituted 27.6% of overall government expenditure (excluding debt repayment).  
134 Executed budgets to MENA, MESRSI and MJFIP (Ministry of Youth and Employment)  
135 Under the budget post “Titre 5: Investissement exécutés par l’Etat” for MENA, MESRSI and MJFIP.
Finding 7: International education sector financing to Burkina Faso was reduced significantly during the period under review, with a substantial decrease in the share of financing for the basic education sub-sector.

59. International education sector financing to Burkina Faso grew substantially in absolute and relative terms after 2006, reaching US$130.8 million or 12.2 percent of ODA in 2009 (Figure 3.4). However, it declined rapidly after 2011, and by 2016 the education sector in Burkina Faso received only US$67.5 million or 6.2 percent of total ODA to the country. The proportion of education ODA going to basic education also declined from 59 percent in 2012 (US$44.8 million out of US$75.1 million) to 34.5 percent in 2016 (US$23.3 million out of US$67.5 million). Traditionally, the large majority of education ODA to Burkina Faso has come from bilateral donors, but the proportion of annual financing from multilateral donors (excluding GPE) jumped from 7 to 20 percent between 2014-2016 (from US$4.6 million to US$13.3 million).

60. Some development partners stopped funding education in Burkina Faso altogether (e.g., the Netherlands and Denmark withdrew in 2014 and 2015 respectively), although overall international ODA to Burkina Faso remained stable or decreased only marginally in the same period. Average education ODA per bilateral donor was also reduced during the same period, suggesting that the reduction in

---

136 International bilateral and multilateral development assistance to the education sector, including basic, secondary and higher education
137 Current figures not adjusted for inflation. If adjusted for inflation (constant prices), education ODA declined from US$ 120.8 million in 2009 to US$ 67.5 million in 2016 (gross disbursements, OECD CRS data).
138 A similar trend is witnessed for international financing to the basic education sector.
139 OECD-DAC CRS data
140 From 2009-2016, 12.5 percent of education ODA came from multilateral donors and 86.7 percent from bilateral donors. Only 0.8 percent came from other donors (private sector, non-DAC donors).
141 Estimated total ODA was US$1.08 billion in 2009, US$1.2 billion in 2012 and US$1.07 billion in 2015.
142 Average education ODA for DAC member countries declined from US$7.8 million in 2009 to US$3.3 million in 2016.
education sector funding likely reflects the existing global decline in ODA to education as a result of competing demands from other sectors.

**Figure 3.4  Education ODA**

![Education ODA to Burkina Faso](image)

**Education ODA as share of overall ODA**

![Education ODA as share of overall ODA](image)

*Source: OECD-DAC CRS*

**How has GPE contributed to leveraging additional education sector financing and improving the quality of financing?**

**Finding 8:** By working through the CAST mechanism, GPE contributed to maintaining the existing quality of education financing to Burkina Faso.

61. Funding for the 2013-2017 ESPIG was channeled through the CAST pooled funding mechanism. CAST funds are held by the Treasury and executed by MENA in accordance with standard government budgetary and accounting procedures and received around two thirds of education ODA to Burkina Faso from the PTF from 2013-2015. Unlike government financing or (in many cases) project-specific financing from development partners, CAST funding is highly flexible as any unspent resources at the end of the fiscal year are rolled over into the next year.143

62. The CAST mechanism was characterized by strong (and improving) alignment with national procedures and institutions for the period under review. GPE’s internal results monitoring for 2016 found the 2013-2017 ESPIG to be aligned with national systems on 9 out of 10 dimensions (the only area without alignment was whether the government’s external auditor would audit grant financial accounts).145 A very large number of consulted government and non-government stakeholders expressed a strong degree of satisfaction with the CAST mechanism given its strong alignment with national procedures and the flexibility of its funding.146 There are no available data to compare whether satisfaction rates have changed over time. Pooling funds with other development partners to finance a portion of the PDSEB147 reduces transaction costs and demands on the Burkina Faso government to meet various donors’

---

143 (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation August, 2017)
144 As noted by the Mid-Term review of the ESP implementation. (Ziegler October, 2016)
145 These 9 dimensions include alignment of the ESP and the national budget, and alignment with national systems for procurement, accounting and reporting. GPE RF indicator 29, data from 2016.
146 Although some CSO stakeholders indicated that procedures for receiving funding from CAST is cumbersome and time-consuming.
147 11.2% from 2013-2016. See Section 3.5 for further details.
reporting processes and procedures,\textsuperscript{148} and this ensured a high degree of harmonization of international education financing to Burkina Faso for the period under review.

63. By disbursing the 2013-2017 ESPIG through CAST, GPE contributed to maintaining the existing high quality (alignment and harmonization) of international financing to education. In addition, stakeholders described the noted (GPE-supported) improvements in sector planning and monitoring as likely having positive effects on the effectiveness and efficiency of education ODA to Burkina Faso.

64. At the same time, stakeholders widely agreed that, until now, the Burkinabé government has neglected strengthening secondary\textsuperscript{151} and higher education, and most government and CSO stakeholders partially attributed this to a lack of dedicated international financing for these sub-sectors. While many stakeholders perceive that GPE perpetuated this funding gap by making ESPIG funds available only for basic education, GPE can in fact finance the whole sector through pooled funding, and CAST’s limitation to the PDSEB was a choice by the LEG. Starting in 2017, CAST financing is intended to benefit the whole education sector (including pre-primary and secondary education).\textsuperscript{152}

**Finding 9:** GPE did not leverage additional international education financing from 2012-2016. While domestic financing increased somewhat in this period, available data do not indicate if (and to what extent) GPE influenced increased domestic spending.

65. Government representatives and several development partners stated that GPE initially (in 2009) contributed to leveraging additional international funding to the education sector. This was due to the fact that bilateral aid agencies wanted to take advantage of GPE’s presence in Burkina Faso since GPE was perceived as providing a “quality mark” for the education sector. Indeed, there was a marked increase in international ODA to the education sector in Burkina Faso in 2009 (see Figure 3.4), although only 34.5 percent went to basic education.\textsuperscript{153}

\begin{itemize}
\item Reporting on PDSEB implementation is done primarily through annual progress reports from the permanent secretariat (SP-PDSEB) at MENA, which are then validated with development partners (and national stakeholders) at the annual joint sector reviews.
\item Reported in the QAR Phase III Final Readiness Report. (Global Partnership for Education March, 2013, 5)
\item Available data do not indicate whether the proposal was accepted by GPE.
\item In Burkina Faso, lower secondary education is part of basic education.
\item Since 2017, CAST funding has been available for all levels of the education sector. (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation August, 2017, 3)
\item From 2009-2016, basic education ODA totaled 44.7% (US$301.68 million of US$674.73 million) of all education ODA to Burkina Faso.
\end{itemize}
66. Since 2009, however, absolute and relative financing from both bilateral and multilateral development partners have declined (Figure 3.4), and there are no indications that GPE leveraged additional international education financing during the period under review as a whole. GPE’s direct contribution to education financing also declined substantially during the period under review. While GPE’s 2013-2017 ESPIG constituted 22 percent of all education ODA to the country from bilateral and multilateral donors, the new ESPIG for 2018-2021 would represent approximately 12 percent of all education funding if compared with the four-year period from 2012-2015.

67. An analysis of the relationship between bilateral donor contributions to GPE and these donors’ support to basic education (preschool, primary and lower secondary) to Burkina Faso showed that, despite an increase in funding to GPE at the global level, GPE donor partners decreased their (relative) ODA to education in Burkina Faso (Figure 3.5). However, evidence from interviews and document review does not support a robust correlation between these two trends, i.e., that bilateral donor partners have substituted bilateral ODA for multilateral funding through GPE.

**Figure 3.5 Donor contributions to GPE relative to ODA**

The largest bilateral donors decrease their relative education ODA to Burkina Faso

% of overall ODA from GPE donor partners to Burkina Faso going to basic education

---

Source: Analysis of GPE funding data and education ODA (OECD-DAC CRS)

68. Some consulted government staff and development partners stated that GPE funding requirements and advocacy have drawn the government’s attention to the goal of developing country partners increasing (or maintaining already high) domestic expenditure on education. Under Strategic Goal 3 (Effective and efficient education systems) in the GPE 2020 Strategic Plan.

---

154 ODA data for 2017 is not yet available. This analysis uses data from 2012-2016 to match the length of the 2013-2017 ESPIG. Total education ODA from 2012-2016 was US$346 million.

155 GPE does not receive funding from multilateral donors (and receives only marginal funding from private sector donors), so the analysis presented only includes the main bilateral donors to GPE.

156 Based on the 12 international donors who contributed more than US$10 million in basic education ODA to Burkina Faso from 2005 to 2016: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, United States.

157 Under Strategic Goal 3 (Effective and efficient education systems) in the GPE 2020 Strategic Plan.
levels, available evidence does not indicate if (and to what extent) GPE has influenced this development.

**Validity of assumptions**

69. The evaluation found that there is only partial support for the underlying assumption that GPE had sufficient leverage to influence the amount of and the quality of domestic and international education sector financing. While domestic financing has increased some in this period, available data do not indicate if (and to what extent) GPE has influenced increased domestic spending (i.e., through the GPE funding requirement that ask the government to commit to increased education financing towards the 20 percent). From 2009-2015, domestic education financing in Burkina Faso has fluctuated but increased both in absolute financing and as a share of overall government expenditures. At the same time, the share of education financing used for investments in education is decreasing as teacher salaries constitute a growing share of the education budget.

70. The combination of GPE financial and non-financial support did not leverage additional international education financing from 2012-2016, but available evidence from interviews suggests it contributed to an increase in education ODA (with the provision of the first ESPIG) in 2009. Official development assistance (ODA) going to the education sector has declined substantially in absolute and relative terms during the period under review.

71. Available evidence suggests that the combination of GPE financial and non-financial support partially contributed to better financing for education in the country. The evaluation finds that the combination of GPE financial and non-financial support contributed to maintaining a high degree of quality of international financing through the existing CAST mechanism (quality is measured by the extent to which ODA is harmonized and aligned with national development strategies, institutions and procedures), but there is no evidence for an improvement in quality during the period under review.

72. The evaluation further concludes that there is not enough evidence to assess the underlying assumption that external (contextual) factors are favorable and permit national and international actors to increase/improve the quality of education sector financing.

**Additional factors and unintended effects**

73. **Positive** factors beyond GPE support that have influenced the observed characteristics of sector financing are the existence of the CAST pooled funding mechanism, and its strong alignment with national systems. **Negative** factors beyond GPE support that have influenced the observed characteristics of sector financing are the domestic political conflict, that led to substantial difficulties with implementing planned budgets from 2014-2016, and the changing donor priorities which has caused a decline in nominal and relative education ODA to Burkina Faso.

---

158 From 2017-2020, the 2017-2030 ESP forecasts that sector financing as a percentage of overall government expenditures will average 22.15 percent, or 1,972 billion CFA of 8,904 billion CFA. (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation August, 2017, 40)

159 I.e., investment/capital expenditures that is separate from recurrent education expenditures (teacher salaries, school functioning etc.)

160 Also see pages iv-v for a complete definition of harmonization and alignment.
74. The evaluation did not find evidence of any unintended, positive or negative, effects of GPE financial and non-financial support to sector planning. In particular, while the evaluation found that GPE donor partners had decreased their relative education ODA to Burkina Faso, available evidence from interviews and document review does not indicate that GPE crowded out international financing.

3.5 Sector plan implementation\(^{161}\)

Box 3.14: Assessment of contribution claim D

**Claim:** GPE (financial and non-financial) support and influence contribute to the effective and efficient implementation of sector plans.

**Assessment:** Evidence derived from the evaluation’s different lines of enquiry partially supports the assumed GPE contribution to sector plan implementation.

**Assessment is based on:** (a) Only the basic education program (PDSEB) of the 2012-2021 ESP has been implemented as planned. There is no available data on the extent to which ESP interventions related to secondary and higher education have been carried out as planned; (b) Available evidence indicates that the likelihood of the six assumptions underlying the contribution claim hold true in the Burkina Faso context is moderate for two and strong for three, while one assumption was not rated due to a lack of data;\(^{162}\) (c) The 2014-2015 political crisis constituted a significant additional (external) factor that negatively influenced ESP implementation. This overall assessment is discussed in the following paragraphs.

Please see Appendix VIII for a visual representation of evaluation findings on the contribution claim related to sector plan implementation.

75. The 2012-2021 ESP for Burkina Faso addressed four key objectives (Section 2.2) across all education levels. For the period 2013-2015 (corresponding to the first PDSEB Action Plan), interventions related to basic education\(^{163}\) and teacher trainings constituted 74.6 percent of planned ESP expenditures, with secondary and higher education making up 25.4 percent (Table 3.2). However, as noted earlier, it was the PDSEB\(^{164}\) rather than the 2012-2021 ESP that served as the core reference document for education stakeholders and monitoring and reporting on (sub) sector progress was based on the PDSEB results framework.\(^{165}\)

---

\(^{161}\) This section addresses evaluation questions CEQ 1.2 (What have been strengths and weaknesses of sector plan implementation during the period under review?), 1.3 (How has GPE contributed to the observed characteristics of sector planning and sector plan implementation?) and CEQ 3 (What factors other than GPE support can explain observed changes (or lack thereof) in sector plan development, plan implementation, sector dialogue and monitoring?).

\(^{162}\) See sub-section on ‘validity of assumptions’ for a discussion of these assumptions.

\(^{163}\) Including preschool, primary and lower secondary education.

\(^{164}\) As noted in section 3.3, the ESP was based on the existing PDSEB (which was created initially).

\(^{165}\) Which is different than the logic framework of the 2012-2021 ESP and the result framework of the 2013-2015 action plan. The JSRs for the period under review also predominantly deal with monitoring PDSEB progress.
76. The evaluation did not have access to data on the extent to which interventions for secondary and higher education were implemented, and this section will thus address sector plan implementation with the PDSEB as the unit of analysis. The indicators in the PDSEB results framework largely relate to results at the system or impact level. Details on key achievements and gaps for the implementation of the PDSEB’s four overarching objectives of Access, Quality, Non-Formal Education and Literacy, and Systems Strengthening are provided in Sections 4 and 5 of this report.

77. Due to differences in the availability of data, this section refers to different time periods. The assessment of progress on the implementation of planned activities, achievement of planned results and data availability is for the period 2014-2016 (based on the PDSEB progress reports). The assessment of planned ESP costs and sources of financing is for the period 2013-2015 (based on the 2013-2015 Action Plan), while the overall assessment of GPE’s financial contribution is for 2013-2016 (to account for the fact that a substantial portion of CAST financing for the PDSEB was disbursed in 2016).

Strengths and weaknesses of ESP 2012-2017 implementation

Finding 10: In spite of the challenging context, implementation of the PDSEB made mixed progress towards the achievement of planned results.

78. Implementation of the 2013-2017 PDSEB was encouraging in some areas and problematic in others. Burkina Faso has made moderate to high progress towards implementing planned activities.\(^{166}\) Available data\(^{167}\) show that from 2014-2016 annual completion of activities fluctuated between 64 percent and 83 percent across the four key objectives of the PDSEB (Figure 3.6).\(^{168}\) Least progress was made in implementing activities related to non-formal basic education: in 2015 and 2016 only half of the 42 scheduled activities were implemented as planned.

---

\(^{166}\) In total, 324 activities and interventions are listed in the 2013-2015 Action Plan (see Table 3.1). The Action Plan does not provide details on which activities will be implemented each year.

\(^{167}\) Data compiled by the SP-PDSEB and presented in the 2016 PDSEB progress report. (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation May, 2017)

\(^{168}\) The 2013 PDSEB progress report does not detail progress towards implementing activities for each key objective.
79. Despite the moderate to high rate of completing planned activities, progress towards the achievement of planned results was low. On average, around 50 percent of results indicators (with available data) show deterioration from the preceding year (Figure 3.7) and many indicators with substantial improvements over the previous decade deteriorated or stagnated from 2014 to 2016. Sections 4 and 5 of this report provide details on key achievements and gaps in the implementation of PDSEB.

80. The following factors contributed to the limited progress towards the achievement of results.

81. **Turbulent political context:** The 2014-2015 political crisis constrained the government’s ability to manage the education sector and ensure completion of the school year within the required timeframe. This negatively affected exam schedules, access to schools in some regions, and, 

---

169 The figure presents an overview of the extent to which planned activities have been implemented, which is separate from the extent to which planned results (as measured in the PDSEB results framework) have been achieved. Data on the actual number of activities implemented is not available.

170 The PDSEB results framework measured progress towards the achievement of results across 42 indicators in six categories: universal primary education; education continuum; reduction of disparities; improving quality; reinforcing decentralization and devolution; and non-formal education and literacy. The indicators measure results on activity level (i.e., number of monthly training school visits), output level (i.e., number of classrooms planned and constructed) and outcome and impact level (i.e., scores on national learning assessments). (Ministère de l’Éducation Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation February, 2013)

171 As measured by indicators with available data: 29 in 2014, 31 in 2015 and 20 in 2016. An overview of the percentage of indicators with available data for each year is presented in Figure 3.7.
consequently, graduation rates.\textsuperscript{172} However, as noted by the mid-term evaluation of the PDSEB, the political context does not fully account for shortcomings (delays, lack of results etc.) related to PDSEB implementation.\textsuperscript{173} Inefficiencies in the education system, which are addressed in Section 4, were also a key contributing factor.

82. **Insufficient financing:** Stakeholder consultations and financial data\textsuperscript{174} indicate that financing inefficiencies (related to both a lack of funding and lack of capacities for absorbing available financing) affected the full and timely implementation of the PDSEB. Several government and CSO stakeholders highlighted that planned PDSEB interventions were delayed, cancelled or scaled down because of insufficient financing.\textsuperscript{175} This was partially due to the previously noted lack of alignment between PDSEB priorities and available funding (Section 3.2). From 2013-2015, implementation of the PDSEB had a shortfall of 19 percent against budgeted funding (722 billion CFA against a budget of 862 billion CFA, Figure 3.8).\textsuperscript{176}

83. In addition to a mismatch between planned and available financing, insufficient capacities for allocating and disbursing\textsuperscript{177} CAST funding also limited PDSEB implementation. From 2014-2015, 64 percent (39.4 billion CFA) of available CAST funding was allocated for PDSEB interventions and only 53 percent (32.7 billion CFA) was finally disbursed (Figure 3.9).\textsuperscript{178} which stakeholders attributed to insufficient national capacities for absorbing funding.\textsuperscript{179} There are limited capacities for fund absorption, especially at the commune\textsuperscript{180} level. This, together with the noted weaknesses in budget planning (Section 3.2), resulted

\textsuperscript{172} See Section 2.1 for the context of this crisis.

\textsuperscript{173} (Ziegler October, 2016, 8)

\textsuperscript{174} PDSEB progress reports from 2013-2016, RESEN 2017.

\textsuperscript{175} The 2013-2015 Action Plan

\textsuperscript{176} However, CAST disbursed an additional 50 billion CFA in 2016. (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation March, 2016)

\textsuperscript{177} Allocation refers to making funding available for specific interventions, while disbursement refers to the distribution of available funds to pay for interventions.

\textsuperscript{178} For 2014 and 2015, available CAST funding totalled 61,543 million CFA, or approximately US$ 117 million.

\textsuperscript{179} Absorption relates to spending (executing) disbursed funds.

\textsuperscript{180} I.e., municipalities in Burkina Faso.
in funding not always being available when needed.\textsuperscript{181}

84. Stakeholders widely referred to insufficient domestic funding as a “reconfiguration” (r\textsuperscript{e}\textsuperscript{a}m\textsuperscript{e}n\textsuperscript{a}g\textsuperscript{e}m\textsuperscript{e}m\textsuperscript{e}n\textsuperscript{e}m\textsuperscript{e}nt) of funds, indicating that this is due to various factors, notably (i) change in government priorities from the initial plans, (ii) a disparity between budgeted and actual government funding, or (iii) funds are not accounted for. In 2014, roughly 10 percent of disbursed CAST funding was not properly accounted for.\textsuperscript{182}

85. **Planning shortcomings:** The PDSEB lacked coherence with regard to the relationship between some of the planned sector targets, national implementation capacities and the financial resources available (Section 3.4).\textsuperscript{183}

86. **M&E capacities:** Available evidence from document review\textsuperscript{184} and stakeholder consultations indicates that insufficient capacities in M&E and data management limited the ability of MENA to effectively monitor the implementation of activities and progress towards the achievement of results.\textsuperscript{185} The 2013-2015 PDSEB Action Plan had insufficient monitoring mechanisms in place and did not provide for regular monitoring activities.\textsuperscript{186} From 2014-2016, between 26 percent and 52 percent of PDSEB results indicators did not have data to monitor progress (Figure 3.10). Moreover, monitoring was hindered by baseline data that were either absent or collected at varying points in time.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure.png}
\caption{Lack of data for PDSEB results indicators, 2013-2015}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{181} However, government representatives and development partners indicated that this has been an area that has improved since 2012. In particular, the establishment of a reconciliation table (tableau de passage) in the current (2017-2030) sector plan was perceived to be a significant improvement.

\textsuperscript{182} The 2014 CAST audit noted a large amount of questionable costs (US$ 4.69 million), equivalent to roughly 10 percent of the 25,713 million CFA that was disbursed that year. (WorldAudit Corporate S.A. December, 2014)

\textsuperscript{183} (M. a. Ginolin February, 2013, 14)

\textsuperscript{184} (Ziegler October, 2016)

\textsuperscript{185} Despite the fact that GPE’s internal quality assessment of the 2012-2021 ESP gave it the highest score on the question “Does the ESP describe monitoring tools and mechanisms at the national and local levels?” (GPE RF indicator 16a).

\textsuperscript{186} (Ziegler October, 2016, 40)
Has GPE contributed to the observed characteristics of ESP 2012-2021 implementation? How?

Finding 11: GPE contributed to PDSEB implementation through funding, by providing technical assistance, and by helping to strengthen in-country capacity for identifying and addressing roadblocks impeding progress.

Contributions through GPE-funded grants:

87. During the period under review, GPE financially supported Burkina Faso with a US$ 78.3 million ESPIG. These funds — together with additional bilateral funding — supported the implementation of Burkina Faso’s Strategic Basic Education Program (PDSEB) for the period 2013-2017.187

88. GPE financial support to implementation has helped bridge the financing gap for basic education. In the initial 2013-2015 PDSEB Action Plan, the gap between available domestic financing and basic education needs was estimated to be 144 billion CFA, or 16.2 percent of PDSEB costs.188 GPE financing was projected to cover 4 percent of this gap.189 The 2013-2017 ESPIG was given as pooled funding and thus did not support specific objectives, but provided 3.88 percent or US$78 million of total financing for the implementation of PDSEB from 2013-2016 (Figure 3.11).190

89. Overall, from 2013-2016, CAST funded 12 percent of the PDSEB with another 5 percent coming from external project-specific funding. GPE has been the single largest source of financing for CAST and provided 32 percent of all CAST funding in the same period.

90. GPE’s other grants in Burkina Faso (ESPDG, PDG) contributed to ESP implementation via their contribution to sector planning and ESPIG development (see section 3.2). The CSEF grant supported CF-EPT in advocacy, awareness-raising and capacity development activities, but there are no data to link these activities to ESP implementation.

Contributions through GPE non-financial support:

91. Among GPE’s most significant non-financial contributions to PDSEB implementation is the strengthening of the “feedback loop” that enables national stakeholders to identify and address issues that affect the effective implementation of the PDSEB. This is further discussed in Section 3.3 of the report.

---

187 Since the ESPIG is given as pooled funding (through CAST) there are no separate grant monitoring mechanism or progress reports to track ESPIG progress.


189 Actual PDSEB costs were significantly lower, in large part due to a 14.5 percent shortfall in government financing (104.4 billion CFA less than the initially allocated 717.8 billion CAF) (see Figure 3.8).

190 Progress reports for PDSEB from 2013-2016.
92. For the 2013-2017 ESPIG, AFD largely fulfilled its role as grant agent effectively and in line with GPE’s terms of references for grant agents (2016). Consulted stakeholders noted a high degree of satisfaction with AFD’s technical leadership in overseeing the implementation of the grant (through CAST) and in improving national capacities. For instance, AFD provided technical assistance to the departments of Statistics (DGESS) and Human Resources (DRH) of the MENA.\textsuperscript{191} DGESS staff members expressed that, despite sustained shortcomings in their data-gathering capacities, the DGESS’ collective capabilities had been strengthened as a result of this support, making the department capable of carrying out a study in 2016 on the overall administrative capacities and needs for the management of MENA.

93. However, AFD at times did not communicate sufficiently with PTF members in relation to decisions taken for the implementation of the ESPIG,\textsuperscript{192} which created some tension with other development partners. For example, it delayed disbursing the variable tranche (US$8.4 million) of the ESPIG for 2015 since progress towards meeting expected results was deemed to be insufficient.\textsuperscript{193} Other PTF members, who considered progress towards results to be sufficient and had disbursed their grant portion for the year, noted that AFD’s reason for withholding the grant portion was not sufficiently explained or communicated to the PTF.

94. UNICEF as the coordinating agency played an indirect role in PDSEB implementation through its noted contributions (as Chef de file) to ongoing sector dialogue and the conduct of joint sector reviews. The same applies to contributions by the Secretariat. Their roles are aligned with the GPE operational model, which assigns responsibility for overseeing ESPIG grant implementation to the country-based grant agent.

95. As regards GPE processes, most consulted LEG members perceived the grant application and program development processes for ESPIG funds to be demanding but reasonable overall, with some room for improvement (see Table 3.3). However, development partner and government stakeholders questioned whether the long and demanding process of applying for (potentially diminishing and relatively short-term) GPE grants will continue to be worthwhile for the government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ESPIG application and program development processes | • Collaborative nature of the ESPIG application and PDSEB elaboration processes  
• Good leadership provided by the grant agent/coordinating agency (AFD/UNICEF)  
• Secretariat country lead shared helpful insights and materials during grant application and | • Unclear communication from Secretariat regarding ESPIG requirements  
• Development partner and government stakeholders questioned whether the process of applying for (potentially diminishing and relatively short-term) GPE grants will continue to be worthwhile for the government. |

\textsuperscript{191} Training focused on: strengthening personal capacities in the areas of elaborating, revising and utilizing program and project reports, action plans and procedural documents; usage of statistical tools and information technology; and strengthening teaching qualities. (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation December 15, 2017)

\textsuperscript{192} One development partner also noted that communication related to GPE (i.e., the ESPIG or ESPIG applications) is largely done through the coordinating agency

\textsuperscript{193} In particular, AFD highlighted the delay in conducting the 2014 audit of CAST funds; the lack of planned measures to ensure the required quality and quantity of teachers and school textbooks; the absence of documentation on progress towards implementing the priority actions of the 2013-2015 Action Plan; and the decline in domestic resources mobilized for education. GPE mission reports to Burkina Faso from April and October 2016, and April 2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program development processes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>diminishing and relatively short-term GPE grants will continue to be worthwhile for the government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaboration between CA, GA and Secretariat during grant application and program development

- General satisfaction of the grant agent and coordinating agency regarding their interactions with the Secretariat.
- Quality of interactions between grant agent, coordinating agency and the Secretariat is occasionally affected by staff turnover, with some loss of information during transitions.

Validity of assumptions

96. Available evidence suggests that the combination of GPE financial and non-financial support partially contributed to the effective and efficient implementation of the sector plan. Development partners have the motivation and opportunity to align their own activities with the priorities of the sector plan (education ODA is largely pooled in Burkina Faso) and to work through the LEG as a consultative and advisory forum. Country-level stakeholders take part in regular, evidence-based joint sector reviews and use recommendations deriving from these reviews to inform sector plan implementation. The evaluation also found that government actors have the motivation (political will, incentives) to implement the sector plan. Together, these constitute three of the six underlying assumptions related to sector plan implementation outlined in the GPE country-level theory of change (see Appendix VII).

97. The evaluation found that two of the three remaining underlying assumptions only partially held true in the Burkina Faso context. A lack of domestic funding and lack of capacities for absorbing available financing affected the full and timely implementation of the PDSEB, and insufficient capacities in M&E and data management limited the ability of MENA to effectively monitor the implementation of activities and progress towards the achievement of results. Available documentation does not indicate whether the PDSEB included measures to develop and implement an EMIS.

Additional factors and unintended effects

98. Additional factors beyond GPE support that positively affected ESP implementation were funding and technical assistance provided by other donors outside of their roles as GPE members, in particular the US$200 million that supported the implementation of the PDSEB from 2013-2015 (constituting roughly 10 percent of overall PDSEB costs). The main factor negatively affecting ESP implementation was the 2014-2015 political crisis, which had implications for available resources (see section 3.4) and overall management of the education sector.

99. The evaluation found no evidence of unintended positive or negative effects of GPE support to sector plan implementation.
4 Progress towards a stronger education system

100. This section summarizes evaluation findings in relation to Key Question II from the evaluation matrix: “Has the achievement of country-level objectives contributed to making the overall education system in Burkina Faso more effective and efficient?”

101. Progress in this regard is measured by drawing on evidence of achievements in each of the four key objectives outlined in the 2012-2021 Education Sector Plan. The analysis focuses on changes that go beyond specific activities or outputs, and that instead constitute changes in the existence and functioning of relevant institutions (e.g., COGES or MENA), as well as changes in relevant rules, norms and frameworks (key reforms, policies, standards, curricula, teaching and learning materials) that influence how actors in the education sector interact with each other.

Box 4.1: Assessment of Contribution Claim E

Claim: “The implementation of realistic evidence-based sector plans contributes to positive changes at the level of the overall education system.”

Assessment: The evaluation found that available evidence partly supports the contribution claim related to strengthening the education system.

Assessment is based on: (a) There has been some, albeit limited and fragmented progress towards the envisaged areas of systems strengthening; (b) the likelihood of four assumptions underlying the contribution claim holding true in the Burkina Faso context was rated ‘moderate’ for all four (see Appendix VII); (c) implementation of the education continuum – as an overarching framework guiding the ESP and the PDSEB - can explain some of the noted system level changes. This overall assessment is discussed in the following paragraphs.

---

194 This section addresses evaluation questions CEQ 4 (During the period under review, how has the education system changed in relation to (a) quality of teaching/instruction, (b) evidence-based, transparent decision making, and (c) country-specific areas of system strengthening?). Following a recommendation by the Secretariat, the section is structured according to the ESP 2012-2021 Key Objectives.

195 In particular, the implementation of the ESP.

196 (i) Developing access; (ii) Improving quality; (iii) Developing non-formal education; and (iv) Education system strengthening.

197 Please see definition of ‘education systems’ in the terminology table of this report. The GPE 2020 corporate results framework defines six indicators for measuring system-level change: (a) increased public expenditure on education (RF10, covered in section 3.4 of this report on education financing); (b) equitable allocation of teachers, as measured by the variance in the ratio of pupils to trained teachers across schools (RF11, covered under Improving the quality of education services); (c) improved ratios of pupils to trained teachers at the primary level (RF12, covered under Improving the quality of education services); (d) reduced student dropout and repetition rates (RF13, covered under Systems Strengthening); (e) the proportion of key education indicators the country reports to UIS (RF14, covered under Systems Strengthening), and (f) the existence of a learning assessment system for basic education that meets quality standards (RF15, covered under Systems Strengthening).
During the period under review, how has the education system changed?

**Finding 12:** Despite the turbulent context, Burkina Faso has set in motion several reforms that, once fully implemented, have the potential to effect positive change in the overall education system.

102. Between 2013 and 2016, some progress was made in strengthening the education system in Burkina Faso. While several important reforms were set in motion that have started addressing key cross-cutting challenges in the sector, progress has been inconsistent across key PDSEB objectives. The 2016 mid-term review concluded that substantial changes in planning and implementation were needed to fully reach key objectives related to system-level changes. Additional evidence gained through document review and stakeholder consultations confirm this overall assessment for the period under review.

103. Following is a summary of key achievements and remaining challenges and gaps in the four key objectives of the PDSEB 2012-2021. The comprehensive education cycle (continuum) is a reform that cuts across all four key objectives and that is largely addressed in the last sub-section on System Strengthening. See Appendices IX and X for details on key indicators.

**Access to education**

104. A key objective of the 2012-2021 PDSEB was to work towards achieving universal basic education by 2021. While access remains far behind the stated target, Burkina Faso has implemented several interventions aimed at removing existing barriers to equitable school access, with mixed results to date.

105. PDSEB interventions focused on constructing infrastructure have been implemented to a limited extent. While the overall number of primary school classrooms increased by 25 percent from 2013-2016 (by 12,229 to 59,938 schools in 2016), a growing proportion of primary schools are private (faith-based or secular), indicating that the construction of public schools has not been able to keep up with...
the high demographic pressure. The mid-term review concluded that this represents one of the main challenges for achieving universal basic education in Burkina Faso.  

106. The construction of new primary schools was delayed substantially. From 2014-2016, only 2,643 of the 11,809 new classrooms planned for in the PDSEB were built. In addition to the issues noted in Section 3.5, factors that contributed to delay in school constructions include the lack of a comprehensive national strategy for developing school infrastructure and significant capacity shortcomings related to constructing and managing schools at the regional and local levels (see also “System strengthening” section below).  

107. The use of multi-grade and double-shift classes also declined during the period under review, with the proportion of teachers in multi-grade schools dropping from 11.5 to 9.9 percent (from 5,432 to 5,863 teachers), and the proportion in double-shift schools from 0.5 to 0.3 percent (from 245 to 186 teachers).  

108. There has been some improvement in the overall quality of school infrastructure. From 2013 to 2016, the proportion of primary schools (public and private) with drinkable water increased from 48 to 57 percent, and the proportion of schools with functional latrines increased from 70 to 74 percent (Figure 4.1). At the same time, the proportion of schools with canteens declined from 78 percent to 59 percent. Available evidence does not indicate a reason for this decline.  

109. One of five overarching strategies of the 2012-2021 PDSEB was to reduce disparities in access to education. In Burkina Faso, the primary factors creating disparities in access to education are geography, socio-economic background, gender and

---

205 The 2017 RESEN projects a demographic growth from 18.4 million to 24.2 million between 2015 and 2025 (estimated average growth rate of 3.1% annually). (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation, UNICEF and Pôle de Dakar de IIEP (UNESCO) 2017, 24)  
206 (Ziegler October, 2016, 19)  
207 A national strategy for constructing school infrastructure has been planned since 2011 but had not yet been developed in 2016. There are no available data to indicate whether the elaboration of this strategy has been started since 2016.  
208 (Ziegler October, 2016, 22)  
209 A recent study on the efficiency of the education system in Burkina Faso suggests that “increasing children’s access to specific goods and services (for example, access to clean water), can help address the issue of inefficiency in the provision of primary education.” (Meningou 2017, 11)  
210 I.e., 5,949 out of 12,394 schools in 2013 and 8,353 out of 14,655 schools in 2016.  
211 I.e., 8,675 out of 12,394 schools in 2013 and 10,844 out of 14,655 schools in 2016.  
212 I.e., 9,667 out of 12,394 schools in 2013 and 8,646 out of 14,655 schools in 2016.  
213 By focused efforts in 43 priority Communes with lower-than-average enrollment and completion rates; by increasing the availability of separate latrines, promoting the value of education for girls and providing scholarships for girls; and by improving infrastructure (access ramps, equipment) and providing learning material adapted for children with disabilities. (Ministère de l’Éducation Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation February, 2013, 17)
disability. The PDSEB implemented various interventions aimed at reducing gender disparities in the education system,214 such as introducing the 2011-2020 national education strategy for girls,215 launching awareness campaigns on the importance of girl education, providing grants for girls attending grade 1, and constructing functional latrines in schools. The PDSEB also focused on constructing new primary schools in rural areas, and from 2014-2015 constructed 449 new primary school classrooms in 43 priority Communes with lower-than-average enrollment rates.216 These efforts have reduced regional disparities, while there has been moderate progress in making primary and lower secondary education more equitable217 for girls (see Section 5). By providing increased access in areas with the most out-of-school children, the education system has become more efficient.

110. The 2012-2021 PDSEB also provided some measures aimed at improving access to education for children with disabilities,218 but few of the planned interventions were carried out and the government has not yet introduced a comprehensive national strategy for children with disabilities.219 Beyond what was programmed in the PDSEB, international NGOs220 introduced several innovations during the period under review,221 representing positive steps towards improving access for children with disabilities.

### Improving the quality of education services

111. Burkina Faso continues to face a shortage of qualified teachers at all education levels, and rapid population growth creates continued high demand for new teachers.222 Like many former French colonies, the country is also still struggling to find the right balance between its adherence to bureaucratic norms and procedures (la hiérarchie) and a pragmatic approach to governing and focusing on delivering results. School curricula continue to transmit norms, values and skills often disconnected from the local context and almost always disconnected from the labor market,223 leading to high unemployment rates for students graduating from all levels of the education sector.224 Taken together, these factors are

---

214 The evaluation has not been able to evaluate the extent to which all gender-related interventions have been implemented, but the PDSEB Mid-Term Review and PDSEB progress reports indicate that these interventions were implemented.

215 SNAEF - Stratégie nationale pour l’accélération de l’éducation des filles.

216 Surpassing the planned target of 297 constructed classrooms with 40 percent. However, the Mid-Term review noted both the low disbursement rate of allocated CAST financing (27 percent) and the poor implementation rate of planned activities (38 percent), based on an evaluation of 10 priority Communes by the end of 2015. (Ziegler October, 2016, 15)

217 Which is also related to the issue of equity. Achieving equity in education provides for securing rights of all children to education, by ensuring that their personal and social circumstances are not obstacles to realize their educational potential.

218 By promoting inclusive education that takes account of children with special education needs.

219 In part due to a lack of funds as a result of budget mistakes in the 2013-2015 Action Plan. (Ziegler October, 2016, 17)

220 Such as Handicap International, Light/CBM and UNICEF

221 Such as amending the construction standards for new schools to include access ramps and specific latrines, and elaborate and training module primary school teacher training that emphasizes inclusive education.

222 In 2014, an estimated 14 percent (i.e., 2,144) of all educational institutions (public and private across all levels) (i.e., 15,043 in total) had no teachers with formal qualifications. (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation, UNICEF and Pôle de Dakar de IIPE (UNESCO) December, 2015, 107)

223 An issue highlighted by most consulted stakeholders. Also see (A. E.-F. Calvès 2013)

224 For example, 68 percent of those finishing higher education end up unemployed. (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation, UNICEF and Pôle de Dakar de IIPE (UNESCO) 2017, 12)
important contributors to the overall poor learning outcomes (Section 5). To address these concerns, one of the objectives of the PDSEB had been to improve the overall quality of the sector by recruiting more teachers, strengthening the quality of teaching and improving the quality of learning material.225

112. The pupil/teacher ratio for primary education improved from 52.7/1 in 2011 to 41.6/1 in 2016 (Figure 4.2).226 This corresponds to an increasing proportion of the education budget used for teacher salaries.227 Data on the pupil/teacher ratio across all basic education levels are not available. While PDSEB targets for recruiting more primary school teachers have been met,228 the allocation of teachers has not become more efficient. In 2015, around 30 percent of teachers were not allocated to schools based on any assessment of teacher needs, and between 2006-2014, the proportion of schools with an insufficient teacher ratio229 increased from 26 to 29 percent.230 The PDSEB did not include any specific interventions for improving teacher allocations.

113. The PDSEB planned for strengthening teaching quality by improving both pre- and in-service training of teachers, reforming (and increasing the availability of) teaching manuals. The ratio of pupils to trained teachers231 in primary education improved from 54/1 in 2014 to 49.3/1 in 2016 (GPE RF indicator 12). However, while close to 100 percent of teachers (i.e., 50,306) at the public preschool and primary level were formally qualified (i.e., obtained the minimum required teaching diploma) in 2014, only 22 percent of private primary teachers and between 58-72 percent of public (lower and upper) secondary teachers were qualified.232

114. Representatives from government, development partners and CSOs widely agreed that the quality of teaching at all education levels is inadequate and remains a key challenge for improving learning outcomes in Burkina Faso, despite progress made under the PDSEB towards strengthening in-service

---

225 These initiatives are closely linked to the implementation of the comprehensive education cycle reform, detailed under “Systems Strengthening”. (Ministère de l’Éducation Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation February, 2013, 25)

226 Based on data from UNESCO UIS. Data used in the PDSEB progress reports show a similar but less accentuated trend during the same period (from 52.2/1 in 2013 to 48.7/1 in 2016).

227 See section 3.4

228 14 400 primary teachers were recruited from 2014-2015. In comparison, for 2015-2016, only 80 out of 218 new preschool teachers and 641 out of 2 500 lower secondary teachers were recruited. (Ziegler October, 2016, 20)

229 Based on an indicator measuring the proportion between students and teachers in public primary schools.

230 GPE’s RF indicator 11 that measures the variance in pupil/trained teacher ratio across schools also show that Burkina Faso did not meet the 0.8 R² criteria for the equitable allocation of teachers in 2016 (0.71).

231 UNESCO defines a trained teacher as one who has received at least the minimum organized pedagogical teacher training pre-service and in-service required for teaching at the relevant level in a given country.

232 However, in private primary schools, only 22 percent of teachers (2,488 out of 11,311) were qualified in 2014, indicating a decline from 34 percent (846 out of 2,490) in 2000. (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation, UNICEF and Pôle de Dakar de IIPE (UNESCO) 2017, 280)
training opportunities. For instance, several new modalities to improve in-service training of teachers were tested, including a pilot project across 44 schools that offered a 10-day pedagogical training to 176 teachers in 2015 and 2016. However, the modesty of these approaches combined with the lack of a comprehensive national strategy for scaling them up and sustaining them over long periods of time, and their adhocracy, limits their effectiveness and sustainability.

Additionally, initial training of teachers in the national teaching schools (ENEP) have incorporated elements of the new pedagogic approach (API) that was adopted as part of the reform of basic education curricula. Stricter requirements for opening private teaching schools (EPFEP) were implemented to improve the overall standard of initial teacher training, and the number of applications to open new teaching schools has decreased by two thirds since 2016.

The quality of teaching is further impeded by gaps in the availability of teaching and learning materials. From 2014 to 2016, only 2.17 million out of 4.89 million planned schoolbooks were purchased and delivered, and from 2013-2016, 235,000 textbooks for teachers were purchased but not delivered. At the same time, there was some progress in improving school curricula. A framework for developing new curricula based on the new pedagogic approach (and aligned with the basic education cycle) was adopted in 2015. A new curriculum for the first grade was developed and tested in 2015-2016. Development, testing and country-wide distribution of new curricula for grades 1-4 is scheduled to be completed by 2020.

Little progress was made in implementing planned PDSEB interventions for using national languages as learning support in basic education. The NGOs Solidar Suisse and Tintua supported...
bilingual schools in the Est region with good results, but learning performance declined substantially when the management of these schools was transferred to MENA.246

Developing non-formal education

118. Despite substantially improved access to education over the last decade (see Section 5) Burkina Faso still has a low literacy rate for the overall population. In 2010, only 24.6 percent of adults were considered functionally literate (18 percent for women and 32 percent for men).247 To address this issue, the PDSEB included a range of measures to improve the access to and quality of non-formal education (ENF)248 at three different levels: preschool, children aged 9-14, and adolescents and adults above 15 years.

119. However, these interventions were only partially implemented as planned (see Figure 3.6) and little progress has been achieved to date. In fact, key indicators show deterioration from 2013-2016: the number of ENF literacy centers declined from 14,962 to 3,700, and the number of adolescent students at these centers declined by 53 percent (from 267,946 to 121,411) from 2013 to 2015.249 Several factors contributed to the lack of progress, most importantly a decline in financing from the government and CAST partners to the national fund for developing ENF (FONAENF).250 In addition, the initial PDSEB objectives were largely unrealistic.251

Systems strengthening

120. Of the eight indicators in the PDSEB 2012-2021 results matrix related to systems strengthening, two had been met and progress on three indicators was on-going.252 As of 2016, three system-level indicators had either not been met or had deteriorated against the baseline results (see Appendix IX).253 This section discusses key achievements and remaining gaps in relation to the system strengthening priorities outlined in the PDSEB and relevant GPE RF indicators.

121. Monitoring has been one of the key weaknesses of PDSEB implementation, with established mechanisms not able to conduct regular and efficient monitoring of progress in the education system.254 Nevertheless, there has been some progress in improving MENA’s capacity to collect and manage sector

---

246 Partially because MENA did not provide the same level of support as the NGOs, such as adapted textbooks. (Ziegler October, 2016, 29)

247 (UNICEF Burkina Faso July, 2017, 217)

248 This term refers to all education and vocational training taking place outside of the formal education system (e.g., preschools, primary schools and lower secondary/secondary schools). In Burkina Faso, this includes different structures, for example the Centres d’Éducation de Base Non Formelle (CEBNF) for adolescents and Centres permanents d’alphabétisation et de formation (CPAF) for adults.

249 (Ziegler October, 2016, 40)

250 Fonds pour l’Alphabétisation et l’Éducation Non Formelle

251 Key objectives included to eliminate illiteracy for adolescents (9-14) and achieve 60 percent literacy rates for everyone aged 15-24 years by 2021. (Ministère de l’Éducation Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation February, 2013, 45)

252 Indicators related to the effective appointment of teachers by July 15 (nationally) or September 1 (priority Communes) had been met. The indicator related to the construction of planned classrooms had progressed but not met the target, while the two indicators related to the implementation of the education continuum showed that positive steps had been taken (but did not present clear data to allow for measuring the results against planned targets).

253 Indicators for making teaching manuals available by 30 July the latest

254 (Ziegler October, 2016, 40)
data and evidence (Section 3.3), and decision making in the education sector has become more transparent and increasingly evidence-based over at least the past five years (as further detailed in Finding 13). Available documentation does not indicate whether the PDSEB included measures to develop and implement an EMIS from 2012-2017, but 2017 data on GPE’s RF indicator 20 indicate that the 2013-2017 ESPIG supported an EMIS. Burkina Faso also conducts bi-annual national learning assessments at the primary school level that meet GPE’s quality standard (RF indicator 15, 2016 data).

122. Through PDSEB, Burkina Faso has initiated and, to varying degrees, implemented several reforms aimed at strengthening different aspects of the education system, such as the education continuum reform and efforts to decentralize the education sector.

123. The low transition rate from primary to lower secondary school and beyond has been an ongoing challenge in Burkina Faso, affecting access to education and learning. To address this, a mandatory and nominally free basic education cycle from pre-primary through lower secondary was launched in 2007 (but fully initiated only in 2012). The overarching objective of this comprehensive education cycle (or education continuum) is to allow for continuous learning from the ages of 3 to 16 and increase transition rates between education levels. A key objective of the 2012-2021 PDSEB was to steer this transition process and to fully implement the education continuum.

124. The evaluation found that this reform emanates from a solid analysis of country needs and was well implemented overall during the period under review. New policies, procedures and strategies are aligned with the new education structure, most importantly the 2015 framework for developing new curricula (COC) and the related new pedagogic approach for initial teacher training. At the same time, an increasing proportion of domestic education financing was allocated to primary education (see Section 3.4), and the sharp decline in the number of active preschools contributed to small reduction in enrolment rates at this level, despite the expectation that the continuum reform will lead to increased demands for preschool and lower secondary education.

---

255 Furthermore, GPE RF indicator
256 In 2016 and 2017, Burkina Faso provided data on 10 out of 12 education indicators UIS (GPE RF indicator 14).
257 ESPIG application, PDSEB program document and the 2012-2021 ESP
258 Education Management Information Systems. A comprehensive EMIS is defined as not only including administrative and student data, but also financial, human resources, and learning data.
259 The learning assessments cover different grades every two years, meaning that the same grade will be assessed every four years (i.e., 2006, 2010, 2014).
260 In 2011, only 63.4 percent of children completing primary school enrolled in lower secondary school. However, GPE’s RF indicator 13 shows that Burkina Faso improved its Internal Efficiency Coefficient (IEC) from 68.6 to 75.1 between 2007 and 2017. The IEC is a measurement of repetition and dropout rate in the education system, ranging from 0 (no students complete a full cycle at the relevant level) to 1 (all students who initially enroll graduate without any repetition or dropout – i.e., perfectly efficient system). Thus, an IEC above 0.7 reflects a high overall level of internal efficiency of the primary education system in producing graduates.
261 When the Burkinabé government reorganized and consolidated responsibilities for the basic education cycle within the MENA.
262 (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation February, 2013, 9)
263 (Ziegler October, 2016, 29-31)
264 From 2013-2016, 345 community pre-schools were classified by MENA as being “inactive”. (Ziegler October, 2016, 17)
265 (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation February, 2016, 141)
266 From 2013-2016, pre-primary enrolment decreased from 3.5 to 3%. Ibid.
125. Since 2009, Burkina Faso has articulated an overarching national policy on gradually decentralizing public functions, with the aim of improving efficiency of access to all education services. To support this policy shift, the PDSEB proposed a transfer of decision-making authority, resources and capacities related to the procurement, construction and management of pre-primary and primary schools to the regional level of government.267

126. Some positive steps have been taken towards the implementation of this reform, but overall progress has been inconsistent.268 A legal framework underpinning the reform was put in place in 2014 and there is evidence of progress (albeit slow) in transferring skills related to school construction and management to the regions.269 Interviewed representatives from MENA highlighted several areas where decision-making authority has been effectively decentralized. They stressed, however, that the pace at which true delegation occurs is painfully slow and only time will tell if this reform is truly effective.270 The recent ESP for 2017-2030 does not include a plan for transferring capacities and skills to the regions, and there has not yet been effective decentralization of funding from CAST.271

**Did ESP implementation contribute to system-level changes?**

**Finding 13:** Overall, it is difficult to establish clear linkages between ESP (PDSEB) interventions and system-level improvements, but the implementation of the education continuum and a reduction of regional disparities are likely due to specific measures put in place during 2012-2017.

127. The GPE country-level theory of change is based on the assumption that the effective development, implementation and monitoring of realistic evidence-based sector plans contributes to stronger education systems. In Burkina Faso, available evidence partly supports the assumed link between ESP (i.e., PDSEB) implementation and observed system-level changes in that it appears to be the most plausible explanation for at least some of these changes.

128. For many of the system-level improvements described above it is difficult to identify how specific contributions have contributed to these improvements, although some of the tangible system-level improvements, such as the implementation of the education continuum and a reduction of regional disparities in access to education, are likely due to specific interventions put in place during 2012-2017. These include school construction in targeted Communes, and aligning new policies, procedures and strategies with the new education structure, such as the 2015 framework for developing new curricula (COC) and the related new pedagogic approach for initial teacher training.

**Validity of assumptions**

In the country-level theory of change, the contribution claim linking ESP implementation to system-level change was based on four underlying assumptions: That education sector plan implementation would

---

267 (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation February, 2013, 36)

268 A key issue highlighted in the Mid-Term Review was the absence of any real responsibility for the functioning of decentralized educational services. (Ziegler October, 2016, 17)

269 (Ziegler October, 2016, 39)

270 The mid-term evaluation of ESP implementation found that one explanation for the lack of progress was a failure by the thematic groups to actively take charge of this reform due to “a weak understanding of these reforms ... and of the opportunities they represent [for improved implementation].” (Ziegler October, 2016, 50)

271 Furthermore, two system-level indicators in the PDSEB results framework show either deterioration (in the absorption rate for resources transferred to the Communes), or no progress (in percentage of MENA budget except salaries transferred to the Communes). (M. N. Ginolin March 3, 2017, 18)
lead to improvements of previous shortcomings in relation to: 1) sector management, 2) learning, 3) equity, and that 4) there is sufficient national capacity or relevant technical assistance to analyze, report on and use available data and maintain EMIS and Learning Assessment System (LAS). Based on the available evidence, the evaluation found that the likelihood of these holding true in Burkina Faso from 2012-2017 was moderate for all four assumptions. Key factors that are likely to have affected the limited applicability of these assumptions include interruptions to education sector management (and ESP implementation) due to the 2014-2015 political crisis, as well as the existence of the PDSEB as the de facto ESP that was only applied to basic education.

Additional factors and unintended effects

129. The evaluation identified no other specific factors beyond PDSEB implementation that are likely to have contributed to the noted system-level changes.
5 Progress towards stronger learning outcomes and equity

130. This section summarizes evaluation findings in relation to Key Question III from the evaluation matrix: “Have changes at education system level contributed to progress towards impact?”

Box 5.1: Assessment of Contribution Claim F

Claim: “Education system-level improvements result in improved learning outcomes and in improved equity, gender equality, and inclusion in education.”

Assessment: The evaluation found that available evidence was not sufficient to assess the likely validity of the contribution claim related to progress towards impact. This does not mean that available data would put the assumed link between the two in question. Instead, it largely reflects the fact that the evaluation focused on a relatively limited time period, and that resulting data did not suffice to assess the contribution claim based on evidence. Of the two underlying assumptions related to this contribution claim, there was insufficient evidence to assess the first, and the second was rated weak (see Appendix VII).

This is elaborated on below.

How has the education sector changed during the review period in terms of learning outcomes, equity, gender equality and inclusion?

Finding 14: From 2012 to 2016, Burkina Faso achieved modest improvements in access, completion and gender parity rates in basic education, but there was no progress towards improved learning. Reported improvements continue longer-term positive trends that started before the period under review.

Equity, gender equality and inclusion

131. Burkina Faso has made substantial progress in improving completion and enrollment rates over the last 10 years, although progress slowed down some for primary education from 2012-2016. Of the indicators in the PDSEB 2012-2021 results matrix, 17 relate to learning outcomes, equity or gender equality, and data are available for 15 of these. As of 2016, results for eight impact-level indicators (related to learning outcomes, primary completion and pre-primary enrollment rates, and ENF literacy and enrollment rates) had not been met and had deteriorated against the baseline results. Progress on five other indicators is ongoing, while planned results on two indicators had been met (see Appendix IX).

---

272 While the period under review was 2012-2017, UIS data for key indicators are only available up to 2015.
273 For most indicators, data is only available up until 2015.
274 While country-level data show that primary completion rates declined from 59.5% to 57.9% between 2013 and 2016, UIS data indicate that completion rates remained at 62% during the same period.
275 Indicators for the pass rate for BEPC, and the transition rate to post-secondary education.
132. This section discusses key achievements and remaining gaps in relation to the system strengthening priorities outlined in the PDSEB and relevant GPE RF indicators. Available data indicate improvements in the following areas.

133. **Primary completion rates improved** by 5 percentage points between 2012 and 2013, but remained at 62 percent from 2013-2016.\(^{276}\) This is nevertheless a substantial improvement compared to 2005, when only 32 percent of children completed primary school. **Primary school out-of-school rates improved substantially** (from 34 to 24 percent) from 2012-2016, indicating that more children were able to access education services at the primary level (Figure 5.1).\(^ {277}\)

134. **Lower secondary completion rates continued to improve** during the period under review, with 30 percent of children completing lower secondary in 2016 compared to 20 percent in 2012.\(^ {278}\) **Lower secondary out-of-school rates dropped** from 50 percent in 2012 to 42 percent in 2015, before increasing to 48 percent in 2016 (Figure 5.2).\(^ {279}\) Available data do not provide any explanation for this recent increase in the proportion of children not attending lower secondary school. However, it is worth mentioning that Burkina Faso still retains the end-of-primary exam (CEP) for entrance into lower secondary education. Although national CEP pass rates improved from 60.9 percent to 67.3 percent from 2013-2016 (with a corresponding increase in post-primary transition rates from 52 to 65.8 percent),\(^ {280}\) the 2017 RESEN noted (without concluding) that the education continuum reform had implications for whether the CEP exam should be continued.\(^ {281}\)

\(^{276}\) In absolute numbers, the number of students enrolled in 6th grade increased with 19,739 from 331,661 to 351,400 between 2012-2016 (UIS data).

\(^{277}\) In absolute numbers, the number of out-of-school children for primary schools dropped from 945,661 in 2012 to 761,443 in 2016, a reduction of 184,218 children (UIS data).

\(^{278}\) In absolute numbers, the number of students enrolled in 10th grade (last grade of lower secondary) increased with 67,696 from 121,236 to 188,932 between 2012-2016 (UIS data).

\(^{279}\) In absolute numbers, the number of out-of-school children for lower secondary schools increased from 782,745 in 2012 to 858,989 in 2016, an increase of 70,244 children (UIS data).

\(^{280}\) Based on PDSEB results indicators.

\(^{281}\) (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation, UNICEF and Pôle de Dakar de IIPE (UNESCO) 2017, 41)
135. From 2012-2017, there was moderate progress in making primary and lower secondary education more equitable for girls. The inclusivity of girls in education remains a priority for the government of Burkina Faso. At the lower secondary level, gender parity of out-of-school rates improved during the review period. In 2015, male and female students were equally likely to not attend lower secondary school, with a small disparity in favor of girls in 2016 (Figure 5.3). Similarly, gender parity for lower secondary completion rates improved substantially (from 0.80 to 0.98) from 2012-2016, indicating that boys and girls were equally likely to finish this level.

136. At primary level, female learners remain slightly more likely to be out of school than boys, with a marginal deterioration in gender parity between 2012-2016 (Figure 5.3). Completion rates for primary school reached gender parity in 2013, but have since shifted to be slightly in favor of girls.

137. Gender is not the only factor affecting continued inequities. Children between ages of 6 and 11 in rural areas were nearly twice as likely to not attend school as children in urban areas. In 2010, out-of-school rates in the Sahel region and the Eastern region are nearly three times as high as in the Central region, and poor children were far more likely to not attend school than others.

---

282 As confirmed by consulted stakeholders and the 2014 PASEC.
283 Based on the UNESCO Adjusted Gender Parity Index (GPIA). In general, a value less than 1 indicates disparity in favor males, and a value greater than 1 indicates disparity in favor of females. However, the interpretation is different for indicators that should ideally approach 0% (e.g., repetition rate, dropout rate, out-of-school rate, etc.). In these cases, a GPIA less than 1 indicates disparity in favor of females and a value greater than 1 indicates disparity in favor of males.
284 It needs to be noted, however, that gender parity does not necessarily mean that the educational situation for a gender group has improved. It may, instead, mean that opportunities for the other group have declined.
285 UNESCO UIS data
286 From 2012-2015, the gender parity index for primary school completion rates went from 0.95 to 1.03, while the gender parity index for lower secondary school completion rates went from 0.81 to 0.90 (UIS data).
287 A gender parity index of 1.07 in 2016. UNESCO UIS data
288 The 2017 RESEN noted that 59 percent of rural children were out-of-school, compared to 30 percent for urban children. (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation, UNICEF and Pôle de Dakar de IIPE (UNESCO) 2017, 59)
289 Ibid, p. 60
138. There has been a marked improvement in making the education system more equitable by reducing geographic disparities. The construction of new primary schools in rural areas has increased the proportion of children in rural areas living less than 3 km from a school from 86.9 to 88.3 percent between 2013 and 2016. Similarly, there has been progress in improving access in priority communes. From 2013-2016, intake rates in primary schools across the priority Communes increased from 62 to 78 percent (or 16 percentage points), while school enrollment rates in these Communes modestly improved from 50 to 55 percent (Figure 5.4). By providing increased access in areas with the most out-of-school children, the education system has become more efficient.

139. Historical data on the extent to which children with disabilities have access to education in Burkina Faso is lacking. In 2013, only 35-39 percent of children with disabilities attended school.

Learning outcomes

140. In Burkina Faso, there was a small deterioration in learning outcomes for basic education from 2006-2014, as evidenced by a consistent decline in test scores in national learning assessments conducted in this period. For instance, average scores (out of 100) for 5th grade competency levels declined from 45.3 to 35.4 in French and from 43.8 to 38 in mathematics; 2nd grade competency levels declined from 50.4 to 41.1 in French and from 43.9 to 38.8 in mathematics (see Figure 5.5). The assessments noted considerable geographic disparities, and students in urban schools and private schools scored higher than the national average. Boys overall scored higher than girls in all subjects at both grades, although the

---

290 Which is also related to the issue of equity. Achieving equity in education provides for securing rights of all children to education, by ensuring that their personal and social circumstances are not obstacles to realize their educational potential.

291 Ibid, p. 19. It is possible that these figures are not accurate, given large proportion of private (unrecognized) schools that are not included in official data.

292 Country-level documents does not provide a clear definition of how “intake” ratio is defined.

293 Based on UNESCO UIS data for gross enrolment ratio for primary schools.

294 Defined as the number of students enrolled in a given level of education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the official school-age population corresponding to the same level of education.

295 (Ziegler October, 2016, 16)

296 For children of the ages between 6 and 11, 12,159 of 31,177 were in school, whereas for those of the ages between 12 and 15, 6,642 children of 18,979 attended school. (Ziegler October, 2016, 16)

297 In Burkina Faso, basic education includes preschool, primary and lower secondary levels.

298 These assessments are comparable over time, and include both public and private schools. The number of students tested varies. For example, in 2006, 1852 students (of which 137 were in private schools) were tested at the CP2 level and 1747 students (of which 97 were in private schools) were tested at the CM1 level.

299 For example, in the 2010 national learning assessment, 2nd grade students in urban schools scored 6.9 and 7.5 points higher than students in rural schools in French and mathematics, respectively. Disaggregated data on learning outcomes were not available for 2014. (Ministère de l’Education Nationale et de l’Alphabétisation 2011, 31-33)
differences were marginal for French. Most consulted stakeholders noted that the lack of progress towards improved learning is one of the most pressing challenges facing the education sector in Burkina Faso.

**Figure 5.5 Learning scores from national assessments, 2006-2014**

In the 2014 PASEC assessments, Burkina Faso nevertheless scored above average scores for comparable countries in West Africa. The percentage of students in 6th grade in Burkina Faso with adequate competencies in French and mathematics were 14.4 and 17.8 percentage points higher than the PASEC average, a gap that is greater than the 6.8 and 6.3 percentage point differences for French and mathematics respectively registered in 2nd grade.

Evidence derived from consultations and document review identified several factors that limit students’ ability to learn effectively, in particular: low quality of teaching, insufficient number of teachers (despite improvements in the teacher-pupil ratio) and high rates of teacher absenteeism. Government representatives recognized that efforts to strengthen the quality of teaching (see Section 4) have not yet led to improved learning for students.

**Table 5.1 Percentage of students with sufficient competencies (2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Burkina Faso</th>
<th>PASEC Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2014 PASEC

---

300 Test scores for girls and boys had declined equally in French and mathematics from 2006-2010. Ibid.
302 PASEC (Programme d’Analyse des Systèmes Educatifs de la CONFEMEN) is a learning assessment system administered to 13 countries in Francophone West Africa. Its methodology differs slightly from the national learning assessments conducted by Burkina Faso, as the 2014 PASEC measured the proportion of students who possessed adequate competencies and knowledge in French and mathematics to achieve learning. (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation, UNICEF and Pôle de Dakar de IIEP (UNESCO) 2017, 141)
303 Only Burundi scored higher than Burkina Faso for end of primary school assessments (sixth grade). (PASEC 2016, 42)
304 Recent data are not available. In 2005-2006, more than half of all teachers in basic education was absent from school for more than two days each month. (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation, UNICEF and Pôle de Dakar de IIEP (UNESCO) 2017, 141)
143. The 2014 PASEC report identified the use of national languages as learning support and enrollment in preschool as key factors that contribute to improved learning outcomes for students in primary education. The low priority given to pre-primary education in Burkina Faso is limiting learning outcomes. From 2013-2016, enrollment decreased from 3.5 to 3 percent (Section 4), far behind most other West African countries. In 2016, only 0.5 percent of the education budget was spent on pre-primary education compared to around 60 percent for basic education. The PDSEB included substantial measures for improving access to and quality of pre-primary education, including constructing 340 formal (CEEP) and 96 community-based (Bisongo) pre-schools between 2013 and 2015, but available documentation does not allow for a comprehensive assessment of the extent to which these measures were implemented.

Is there evidence to link changes in learning outcomes, equity, gender equality and inclusion to system-level changes identified? What other factors can explain observed changes (or lack thereof)?

Finding 15: The system-level changes achieved from 2012-2017 are too recent or not yet sufficiently advanced to have influenced impact-level data related to learning outcomes and equity. One possible exception is the recent improvement in primary out-of-school rates, which may have been influenced by efforts to improve access to primary education in regions with a high ratio of children not in school.

144. Most of the system-level achievements detailed in Section 4 of this report represent relevant positive steps that lay the foundations for (potential) future change. However, the extent to which these improvements at the system level contribute to progress towards impact is limited by the following reasons:

145. The noted education system-level improvements are too recent to have been likely to affect changes in impact-level indicators for the period 2012-2017. For example, the new education curricula framework (COC) and the comprehensive process guide for school feeding programs were only established in 2015 and 2017 respectively. Many improvements are not (yet) sufficiently advanced to have made a contribution to impact. This particularly relates to aspects of the comprehensive education cycle reform intended to improve teaching quality. For example, initiatives to test new modalities for in-service training of teachers and the development of new curricula for primary and lower secondary education are not yet sufficiently far advanced to have made a difference at the school level. Additionally, progress towards improving efficiency of access to education services by decentralizing public functions has to date been inconsistent and slow. Even once measures in these two reforms are

305 (PASEC 2016, 36)
306 (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation March, 2016, 141)
307 In 2016, average gross enrollment ratio in Sub-Saharan Africa was 32.33 percent (UIS).
308 (Ministères en charge de l’éducation et de la Formation, UNICEF and Pôle de Dakar de IIPE (UNESCO) 2017, 142). Data on the percentage of children under the age of five who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning and psychosocial well-being is not available for Burkina Faso.
309 Centres d’éveil et d’éducation préscolaire
310 Formally called EECE (espaces d’entraide communautaire pour l’enfance).
311 The testing and country-wide distribution of new curricula for grades 1-4 is scheduled to be completed by 2020.
fully implemented, it will likely take several years until related changes contribute to measurable effects on impact.\textsuperscript{312}

146. In terms of completion and out-of-school rates, existing impact-level improvements largely continue positive trends that began before the relatively limited period reviewed by the evaluation. For the reviewed indicators, the rate of change did not increase during this period.\textsuperscript{313} While some of the observed improvements in the education system may have contributed to maintaining the momentum, they do not explain the longer-term trends.\textsuperscript{314}

147. There is, however, one exception. The recent increase in primary out-of-school rates may, at least in part, have been influenced by the strong improvement in pupil-teacher ratio for primary school during the 2012-2017 period, as well as by the fact that targeted efforts to build more schools in priority Communes increased access in areas with the most out-of-school children. To a lesser extent, available evidence suggest that the modest improvement in gender parity\textsuperscript{315} can be explained by the strong political focus on reducing gender disparities in access to education (which is reflected in the PDSEB priorities), by improved capacities for regularly monitoring gender indicators and by the increase in the proportion of schools with functional latrines.

148. Table 5.2 summarizes the evaluation’s reflections on the extent to which system-level changes achieved during the period under review (see Section 4) are likely to have affected the noted impact-level improvements (or lack of improvements) described in this chapter. The absence of such linkages largely reflects the fact that the evaluation focused on the relatively short time period 2012-2017. In most cases it would be unrealistic to expect that education system improvements achieved during that period would already be reflected in learning outcomes or equity-related indicators.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Link (or absence thereof) between system-level changes and impact-level trends}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{IMPACT-LEVEL TRENDS} & \textbf{LIKELY RELATION TO ANY SYSTEM-LEVEL IMPROVEMENTS} \\
\hline
Substantial improvement in primary out-of-school rates & \textbf{Plausible link to system-level improvements.} Improvements are likely due to the implementation of the comprehensive education cycle reform, which include dedicated efforts to improve access to education in priority areas with higher than average out-of-school rates, in addition to a substantial increase in the pupil/teacher ratio for primary schools. \\
\hline
Small improvement in lower secondary & \textbf{Plausible link to system-level improvements made during 2012-2017 period} \\
& The initial improvements in lower secondary OOS rates (from 2012-2015) are likely due to the implementation of the comprehensive education cycle reform, which include dedicated efforts \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[312] This ‘time lag’ between system level change and likely effects on learning outcomes also applies to those parts of the education system that have not improved during the 2014-2017 period. For example, while pupil-teacher and pupil-qualified teacher ratios have worsened since 2012, student learning outcomes, as described above, modestly improved during the review period.
\item[313] With the exception of lower secondary completion rates, which improved with 10 percentage points from 2012-2016 and 6 percentage points from 2007-2011, and gender parity rates for lower secondary education.
\item[314] For example, improvements in school infrastructure (new schools built in areas with lower-than-average enrollment rates, improved water, sanitation and hygiene [WASH] facilities) and in pupil-teacher ratios achieved under the PDSEB may have contributed to maintaining positive trends in school completion and out-of-school rates (overall and in gender parity), but it is not possible based on available data to comprehensively identify how exactly or to what extent.
\item[315] Gender equity for lower secondary out-of-school and primary completion rates.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPACT-LEVEL TRENDS</th>
<th>LIKELY RELATION TO ANY SYSTEM-LEVEL IMPROVEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>out-of-school rates</td>
<td>to improve access to education in priority areas with higher than average out-of-school rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small deterioration in learning outcomes</td>
<td><strong>No clear relationship to system-level improvements made during 2012-2017 period</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of improvement in learning outcomes can plausibly be (partially) explained by the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enrolment in preschools remains very low (3 percent in 2016) with only marginal improvement during the period under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Little progress has been made in implementing planned PDSEB interventions for using national languages as learning support in basic education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efforts to improve the quality of teaching and instruction are not yet sufficiently advanced (and not comprehensive enough) to show any improvement at the impact level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements in gender parity in lower secondary completion and out-of-school rate</td>
<td><strong>No clear relationship to system-level improvements made during 2012-2017 period.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The interventions listed below were carried out during the 2012-2017 period. While they are relevant to increasing gender equity, there is no rigorous evidence (yet) to link them to observed improvements in gender equality in completion and out-of-school rates during the same period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased the proportion of schools with functional latrines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduced the 2011-2020 national education strategy for girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Launched awareness campaigns for the importance of girl education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provided grants for girls attending grade 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No improvement in primary completion rates</td>
<td><strong>No clear relationship to system-level improvements made during 2012-2017 period.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of improvement in primary completion rates can plausibly be explained by the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efforts to improve the quality of teaching and instruction are not yet sufficiently advanced (or comprehensive enough) to have had any effect on primary or lower secondary completion rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• System-level improvements related to the education continuum that likely contributed to decreasing OOS rates are too recent in time to have had any effect on completion rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial improvement in lower secondary completion rates</td>
<td><strong>No clear relationship to any system-level improvements made during 2012-2017 period.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no plausible link (yet) between any system-level improvements and the improvements in lower secondary completion rates. System-level improvements related to the education continuum that likely contributed to decreasing OOS rates are too recent in time to have had any effect on completion rates, and efforts to improve the quality of teaching and instruction are not yet sufficiently advanced to have had any effect on primary or lower secondary completion rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Conclusions

149. This final section of the report draws overall conclusions deriving from the evaluation findings.

150. The summative country-level evaluation set out to assess (i) GPE contributions to strengthening education systems and, ultimately, the achievement of education results in GPE partner developing countries in the areas of learning, equity, equality and inclusion; and hence (ii) the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of GPE’s theory of change and country-level operational model. The following conclusions are structured accordingly.

Contributions to results and validity of the GPE country-level theory of change

151. Figure 6.1 presents a simplified version of the country-level theory of change, which provides a visual overview of key evaluation findings in relation to GPE contributions and the validity of the GPE country-level theory of change in Burkina Faso. In the graphic, the items labeled A-F indicate the six contribution claims that logically link the elements in the ToC to each other. The color ratings indicate the extent to which available evidence supports (green), partly supports (amber), or does not support (red) the respective contribution claim. Items in grey indicate insufficient data to make an assessment. Full definitions of color ratings are provided in Appendix VII. The elements depicted are further described below.

**Figure 6.1**  Assessment of contribution claims in the country-level theory of change for Burkina Faso
Contributions to sector planning, dialogue and monitoring, and sector plan implementation

152. Evaluation findings support contribution claim A related to GPE’s influence on sector planning and contribution claim B related to mutual accountability. For both contribution claims, GPE positively influenced government capacity in Burkina Faso in the three dimensions of motivation (through the financial incentive of obtaining an ESPIG and through advocacy), opportunity (by funding sector planning and monitoring activities through ESPDG and ESPIG) and capabilities (by disseminating and sharing tools and guidelines and by providing capacity-building support in the form of training, workshops and other technical assistance approaches).

153. GPE’s contribution enabled closer and more effective collaboration across departments and among development partners, and strengthened capabilities for systematic and collaborative sector planning. While there has been progress towards the envisaged results of strengthening sector dialogue and monitoring, areas for improvement remain regarding the monitoring of the PDSEB and the availability of country-level data on the PDSEB results framework.

154. Additional factors beyond GPE support that influenced sector planning processes was the commitment to participatory sector planning in MENA and among other education stakeholders, although capacity gaps in MENA contributed to a lack of prioritization between different national education priorities. The main additional factor that influenced sector dialogue and monitoring was the commitment to inclusive dialogue by MENA and among other education stakeholders; gaps in data and insufficiencies in the PDSEB monitoring framework negatively affected the ability of MENA to systematically monitor implementation.

155. Evaluation findings partially support contribution claim C related to influencing international and domestic education sector financing. By channeling ESPIG funding through the pooled CAST mechanism, GPE contributed to maintaining the quality of international funding but had no detectable influence (to date) on improving it, e.g., in relation to strengthening harmonization and alignment, and equally benefiting all parts of the education system beyond basic education. Available evidence did not indicate if (and to what extent) GPE influenced the increase in domestic education financing from 2012-2016.

156. The CAST pooled funding mechanism and its alignment with national systems represents a key additional factor that influenced sector financing, while the domestic political conflict led to substantial difficulties with implementing planned budgets from 2014-2016, and the changing donor priorities caused a decline in nominal and relative education ODA to Burkina Faso.

157. Evaluation findings partially support contribution claim D related to influencing sector plan implementation. GPE financial support through the ESPIG positively influenced related opportunities and capabilities. Nevertheless, ESP implementation was achieved only partially due to several additional factors including the political crisis in 2014 which destabilized the country and led to a new administration.

316 Out of five assumptions underlying this contribution claim, the likelihood of them applying in the Burkina Faso context was rated ‘strong’ for four, and ‘moderate’ for one assumption.

317 Out of four underlying assumptions, the likelihood of them applying in the Burkina Faso context was rated ‘strong’ for three and moderate for one.

318 In this report, we understand ‘capacity’ as deriving from the combination of motivation (including incentives), opportunity (including resources, conducive environment) and capability (individual and collective knowledge and skills). Change occurs when existing or emerging capacity affects the behavior of targeted actors, organizations, or institutions.

319 For this contribution claim, the validity of assumptions was found to be ‘moderate’ for five of the underlying assumptions, and ‘weak’ for one.
and new government priorities, which led to a focus on implementing the basic education program PDSEB rather than the full ESP.

**Cross-cutting observations**

**Roles played by country-level partners and the Secretariat**

158. The government of Burkina Faso (through MENA) provided leadership throughout the phases of the education sector policy cycle, including for stakeholder participation in sector planning, dialogue and monitoring, and implementing the PDSEB. LEG members, including development partners, civil society and government representatives, provided input to the draft education sector plans 2012-2021 and 2017-2030, and provided inputs to GPE grant applications and ESPIG program development. LEG members and other stakeholders also participated in joint sector reviews.

159. AFD largely fulfilled its role as grant agent effectively and in line with GPE’s terms of reference for grant agents. Consulted stakeholders noted a high degree of satisfaction with AFD’s technical leadership in overseeing the implementation of the 2013-2017 ESPIG (through CAST) and in improving national capacities. However, AFD at times did not communicate sufficiently with PTF members in relation to decisions taken for the implementation of the ESPIG, which created some tension with other development partners (see section 3.5).

160. UNICEF as the coordinating agency played an indirect role in PDSEB implementation through its noted contributions (as Chef de file) to ongoing sector dialogue and the conduct of joint sector reviews. Its role was aligned with the GPE operational model, which assigns responsibility for overseeing ESPIG grant implementation to the country-based grant agent.

161. Data collected on the GPE country-level operational model cast a positive light on the role played by the Secretariat and its Focal Point. Their ongoing support to in-country actors was greatly appreciated in relation to: managing GPE grant application processes, timelines and requirements; providing technical assistance; and advocating for the participation of civil society in education sector planning and dialogue.

**Other observations on the (perceived) relevance and quality of GPE support to Burkina Faso**

162. GPE is primarily perceived as a donor by government and development partner stakeholders in Burkina Faso. When referring to GPE, stakeholders usually mean the Secretariat in its role as a grant-making entity. ESPIG funding requirements have provided important incentives that are likely to have furthered progress towards country-level objectives related to sector planning and mutual accountability.

163. Grant application and reporting processes seem to be clear and well understood. However, in-country stakeholders raised questions over whether the long and burdensome process of applying for (potentially diminishing and relatively short-term) GPE grants will continue to be worthwhile for the government.

164. Most in-country government and civil society stakeholders noted that, currently, sector funding is not proportionally distributed across all parts of the education system. The strong focus on basic education of overall government and donor spending undermines the ability of higher and technical education sub-sectors to perform optimally. Both international and national in-country stakeholders

---

320 Observations related to sector planning, dialogue and monitoring, sector financing and ESP implementation.

321 One development partner also noted that communication related to GPE (i.e., the ESPIG or ESPIG applications) is largely done through the coordinating agency.
appear to perceive this as a challenge that has been at least partly influenced by GPE’s focus on basic education, and/or as an issue that GPE could and should (help to) resolve.

165. Stakeholders did not mention CSEF or GRA grants and did not seem aware of them in most cases.

**Education system level change**

166. Burkina Faso has made progress towards strengthening several components of its education system including: a) decentralizing the education system; b) implementing the education continuum (Comprehensive Education Cycle); c) taking actions to reduce inequity and disparities; d) engaging in reform of curricula to better align with local needs. The evaluation also highlighted how existing feedback loop mechanisms have strengthened the country’s ability to identify and address roadblocks. For example, progress in improving the *cantines scolaires* program allows tracing system-level improvements back to GPE support in the areas of sector planning, dialogue and monitoring.

167. The GPE country-level theory of change is based on the assumption that the effective development, implementation and monitoring of realistic evidence-based sector plans contributes to stronger education systems (contribution claim E). In Burkina Faso, available evidence partly supports the assumed link between ESP (i.e., PDSEB) implementation and observed system-level changes in that it appears to be the most plausible explanation for at least some of these changes.\(^{322}\)

**Impact level change**

168. With respect to the validity of GPE’s theory of change in relation to the assumed links between a stronger education system and impact-level changes (contribution claim F), data remain inconclusive. This is primarily because most positive trends observed during the period under review started long before this time, and while some of the reported recent system improvements may have contributed to maintaining existing momentum, they do not suffice as explanations for this change.\(^ {323}\)

---

\(^{322}\) All four assumptions underlying this contribution claim were rated ‘moderate’.

\(^{323}\) One assumption related to this contribution claim (availability of data) was rated as moderate, while the other (system changes affect learning/equity outcomes) was not rated for lack of evidence. This lack of evidence for validating this step in the GPE theory of change is not the same as disproving the ToC. It merely illustrates the difficulty of establishing clear cause and effect relationships when reviewing a relatively short period of time, given that impact-level change likely derives from longer-term processes.
## Appendix I Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key question I: Has GPE support to [country] contributed to achieving country-level objectives related to sector planning, sector plan implementation, sector dialogue and monitoring, and more/better financing for education?(^{324}) If so, then how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ 1: Has GPE contributed to education sector planning and sector plan implementation in [country] during the period under review? (^{325}) How?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CEQ 1.1 What have been strengths and weaknesses of education sector planning during the period under review? | - Extent to which the country’s most recent sector plan meets GPE/UNESCO IIEP appraisal criteria.\(^{326}\)  
  - Plan preparation process has been country-led, participatory, and transparent  
  - Plan constitutes a solid corpus of strategies and actions addressing the key challenges of the education sector  
  - Issues of equity, efficiency, and learning are soundly addressed to increase sector performance  
  - There is consistency between different components of the sector plan  
  - Financing, implementation and monitoring arrangements offer a good perspective for achievement | - Current and past sector plans (including from period prior to country joining GPE if available)  
- GPE ESP/TSP quality assurance documents  
- JSR reports  
- Other relevant reports or reviews that comment on the quality of previous sector plans  
- Interviews | - Pre-post analysis (where data on previous policy cycles is available)  
- Triangulation of data deriving from document review and interviews |

---

\(^{324}\) OECD DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency.

\(^{325}\) The core period under review varies for summative and prospective evaluations. Prospective evaluations will primarily focus on the period early 2018 to early 2020 and will relate observations of change back to the baseline established at this point. The summative evaluations will focus on the period covered by the most recent ESPIG implemented in the respective country. However, for selected indicators (and subject to data availability) the summative evaluations will look back up to five years prior to the country becoming a GPE member to conduct a trend analysis of relevant data.

### MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Extent to which previous sector plans met current GPE or other (e.g., country specific) quality standards (if and where data is available) • Stakeholder views on strengths and weaknesses of (most recent and previous) sector planning processes in terms of: – Leadership for and inclusiveness of sector plan preparation – Relevance and coherence of the sector plan – Adequacy of sector plan in addressing equity, efficiency and learning issues – Timeliness of plan preparation processes</td>
<td>• Current and past sector plans (including from period prior to country joining GPE if available) • DCP government ESP/TSP implementation documents including mid-term or final reviews • Relevant program or sector evaluations, including reviews preceding the period of GPE support under review • JSR reports • Reports or studies on ESP/TSP commissioned by other development partners and/or the DCP government • CSO reports • Interviews</td>
<td>• Pre-post analysis (where data on previous policy cycles is available) • Triangulation of data deriving from document review and interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CEQ 1.2 What have been strengths and weaknesses of sector plan implementation during the period under review?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Progress made towards implementing sector plan objectives/meeting implementation targets of current/most recent sector plan. (If data is available: compared to progress made on implementing previous sector plan) • Extent to which sector plan implementation is fully funded (current/most recent plan compared to earlier sector plan if data is available) • Stakeholder views on timeliness, effectiveness and efficiency of sector plan implementation, and on changes therein compared to earlier policy cycles, due to: – Extent to which plans are coherent and realistic – Implementation capacity and management – Funding – Other (context-specific)</td>
<td>• Current and past sector plans (including from period prior to country joining GPE if available) • DCP government ESP/TSP implementation documents including mid-term or final reviews • Relevant program or sector evaluations, including reviews preceding the period of GPE support under review • JSR reports • Reports or studies on ESP/TSP commissioned by other development partners and/or the DCP government • CSO reports • Interviews</td>
<td>• Pre-post analysis (where data on previous policy cycles is available) • Triangulation of data deriving from document review and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS</td>
<td>INDICATORS</td>
<td>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ 1.3 Has GPE contributed to the observed characteristics of sector planning? How?</td>
<td>a) Contributions through GPE ESPDG grant and related funding requirements:</td>
<td>• ESP implementation data including joint sector reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ESPDG amount as a share of total resources invested into sector plan preparation. Evidence of GPE ESPDG grant addressing gaps/needs or priorities identified by the DCP government and/or LEG</td>
<td>• GPE grant agent reports and other grant performance data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Contributions through other (non ESPDG-related) support:</td>
<td>• Secretariat reports, e.g., country lead back to office/mission reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support directed at priority needs/gaps identified by the DCP government and/or LEG</td>
<td>• GPE ESP/TSP quality assurance documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support adapted to meet the technical and cultural requirements of the specific context in [country]</td>
<td>• Other documents on technical assistance/advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support aimed at strengthening sustainable local/national capacities for sector planning or plan implementation</td>
<td>• Country-specific grant applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholder views on relevance and appropriateness of GPE technical assistance, advocacy, standards, guidelines, capacity building, facilitation, CSEF and ASA grants, and knowledge exchange in relation to:</td>
<td>• Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Addressing existing needs/priorities</td>
<td>• Education sector analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Respecting characteristics of the national context</td>
<td>• Country’s poverty reduction strategy paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Adding value to country-driven processes (e.g., quality assurance provided by Secretariat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

327 Technical assistance and facilitation provided primarily through the GPE Secretariat, the grant agent and coordinating agency. Advocacy can include inputs from Secretariat, grant agent, coordinating agency, LEG, and GPE at global level (e.g., Board meetings, agreed upon standards). Knowledge exchange includes cross-national/global activities related to the diffusion of evidence and best practice to improve sector planning and implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CEQ 1.4 Has GPE contributed to the observed characteristics of sector plan implementation? How? | a) Contributions through GPE EPDG and ESPIG grants, related funding requirements and variable tranche (where applicable)  
- Absolute amount of GPE disbursement and GPE disbursement as a share of total aid to education  
- Maximum allocation amounts and actual amount a country received from GPE through the fixed and/or the variable tranche and reasons for not receiving the total MCA;  
- Evidence of GPE grants addressing gaps/needs or priorities identified by the DCP government and/or LEG.  
- Progress made towards targets outlined in GPE grant agreements as triggers for variable tranche, compared to progress made in areas without specific targets (where applicable)  
- Proportion of overall sector plan funded through GPE ESPIG  
- Proportion of textbook purchases planned under current/most recent sector plan funded through GPE grant  
- Proportion of teachers trained under current/most recent sector plan funded through GPE grant  
- Proportion of classrooms built under current/most recent sector plan funded through GPE grant  
Progress made towards objectives/targets outlined in GPE grant agreement (where applicable: compare progress made in areas with specific targets as triggers for release of variable tranche compared to progress made in areas without specific targets) | • ESP implementation data including joint sector reviews  
• GPE grant agent reports and other grant performance data  
• Secretariat reports, e.g., country lead back to office/mission reports  
• GPE ESP/TSP quality assurance documents  
• Other documents on technical assistance/advocacy  
• Country-specific grant applications  
• Interviews  
• Education sector analyses  
• Country’s poverty reduction strategy paper | • Triangulation of data deriving from document review and interviews  
• Where applicable: Comparison of progress made towards ESPIG grant objectives linked to specific performance targets with those without targets (variable tranche) |

328 Where applicable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Timeliness of implementation of GPE grants (Education Sector Plan Development Grant, Program Development Grant, Education Sector Plan Implementation Grant) | • Grant implementation is on budget  
b) Contributions through non-financial support  
• GPE support aimed at strengthening sustainable local/national capacities for plan implementation  
• Stakeholder views on relevance and appropriateness of GPE non-financial support in relation to:  
  - Addressing existing needs/priorities  
  - Respecting characteristics of the national context  
c) Adding value to country-driven processes (e.g., quality assurance provided by Secretariat) |                                                                                                                                             |     |
| CEQ 1.5 Has GPE contributed to leveraging additional education sector financing and improving the quality of financing?  
a) Leveraging of additional finance from the government?  
b) Leveraging additional finance through multiplier funding | a) Leveraging additional finance from government  
• Changes in country’s public expenditures on education during period under review (by sub-sector if available)  
b) Leveraging additional finance through multiplier funding | Interviews with national actors (e.g., Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Education, Local Education Groups/ Development partner groups) | • Trend analysis for period under review  
• Comparative analysis (GPE versus other donor contributions) |

329 Technical assistance and facilitation provided primarily through the GPE Secretariat, the grant agent and coordinating agency. Advocacy – including inputs from Secretariat, grant agent, coordinating agency, LEG, and GPE at global level (e.g., Board meetings, agreed upon standards). Knowledge exchange - including cross-national/global activities related to the diffusion of evidence and best practice to improve sector planning and implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| b) Leveraging of additional finance from other partners through the GPE multiplier funding mechanisms (where applicable)? | • Extent to which country has achieved, maintained or exceeded 20% of public expenditures on education during period under review  
• Amount received through the GPE multiplier fund (if applicable). | • GPE data (e.g., grant documents, country commitments and disbursements, donor pledges and contributions)  
• Creditor Reporting System (CRS) by OECD-DAC  
• UIS data by UNESCO  
• National data (e.g., Education Management Information System) | • Triangulation of quantitative analysis with interview data |
| Leveraging of additional finance from other partners through means other than the multiplier funding mechanism? | • Extent to which country has achieved, maintained or exceeded 20% of public expenditures on education during period under review  
• Amount received through the GPE multiplier fund (if applicable).  
• Leveraging additional finance through other means  
• Amounts and sources of domestic resources mobilized through GPE advocacy efforts  
(b and c):  
• Changes in relative size of GPE financial contribution in relation to other donor’s contributions  
• Trends in external and domestic financing channelled through and outside of GPE, and for basic and total education, to account for any substitution by donors or the country government  
• Changes in donor aid to country; Extent to which GPE Program Implementation Grant-supported programs have been co-financed by other actors or are part of pooled funding mechanisms; Amounts and sources of non-traditional financing (e.g., private or innovative finance) that can be linked to GPE leveraging | |
| c) Improvements in the quality of education finance (e.g., short, medium and long-term predictability, alignment with government systems)? | • Alignment of GPE education sector program implementation grants with GPE’s system alignment criteria (including the 10 elements of alignment and the elements of harmonization captured by RF indicators 29, 30 respectively)  
• Possible reasons for non-alignment or non-harmonization (if applicable) | Systems, school censuses and surveys, National Education Accounts, Joint Sector Reviews, public expenditure reviews | |
<p>| d) Quality of education finance | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB- QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEQ 2 Has GPE contributed to strengthening mutual accountability for the education sector during the period under review? If so, then how?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ 2.1 Has sector dialogue changed during the period under review?</td>
<td>• Composition of the country’s LEG (in particular civil society and teacher association representation), and changes in this composition during period under review</td>
<td>• LEG meeting notes</td>
<td>• Pre-post comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Frequency of LEG meetings, and changes in frequency during period under review</td>
<td>• Joint sector reviews or equivalents from before and during most recent ESPIG period</td>
<td>• Triangulate results of document review and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholder views on changes in sector dialogue in terms of:</td>
<td>• GPE sector review assessments</td>
<td>• Stakeholder analysis and mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Inclusiveness</td>
<td>• ESP/TSP, and documents illustrating process of their development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Frequency, consistency, clarity of roles and responsibilities</td>
<td>• Back to office reports/memos from Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Relevance (i.e., perceptions on whether stakeholder input is taken into account for decision making)</td>
<td>• Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>− Quality (evidence-based, transparent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ 2.2 Has sector monitoring changed?</td>
<td>• Frequency of joint sector reviews conducted, and changes in frequency during period under review</td>
<td>• LEG meeting notes</td>
<td>• Pre-post comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extent to which joint sector reviews conducted during period of most recent ESPIG met GPE quality standards (if data is available: compared to JSRs conducted prior to this period)</td>
<td>• Joint sector reviews or equivalents from before and during most recent ESPIG period</td>
<td>• Triangulate the results of document review and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence deriving from JSRs is reflected in DCP government decisions (e.g., adjustments to sector plan implementation) and sector planning</td>
<td>• GPE sector review assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Measures in the current sector plan to strengthen sector monitoring (especially monitoring the quality of teaching and learning, equity, equality and inclusion) are implemented</td>
<td>• Grant agent reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Back to office reports/memos from Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS

- Stakeholder views on changes in JSRs in terms of them being:
  - Inclusive and participatory
  - Aligned to existing sector plan and/or policy framework
  - Evidence based
  - Used for learning/informing decision-making
  - Embedded in the policy cycle (timing of JSR appropriate to inform decision making; processes in place to follow up on JSR recommendations)

- Stakeholder views on extent to which current practices of sector dialogue and monitoring amount to ‘mutual accountability’ for the education sector.

#### CEQ 2.3 Has GPE contributed to observed changes in sector dialogue and monitoring? How?

- **a)** Through GPE grants and funding requirements
- **b)** Through other support

- **a)** Grants and funding requirements
- **b)** Non-grant related support

#### MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION

- LEG meeting notes
- Joint sector reviews or equivalents from before and during most recent ESPIG period
- GPE sector review assessments
- Grant agent reports
- Back to office reports/memos from Secretariat
- Interviews

#### ANALYSIS

- Triangulate the results of document review and interviews

---


331 Technical assistance, advocacy, standards, quality assurance, guidelines, capacity building, facilitation, and cross-national sharing of evidence/good practice
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB- QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) and b)</td>
<td>Stakeholder view on relevance and appropriateness of GPE grants and related funding requirements, and of technical assistance in relation to:</td>
<td>changes in priorities pursued by (traditional/non-traditional) donors related implications for [country]</td>
<td>results of document review and interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Addressing existing needs/priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Respecting characteristics of the national context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adding value to country-driven processes (e.g., around JSRs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ 3: Has GPE support had unintended/unplanned effects? What factors other than GPE support have contributed to observed changes in sector planning, sector plan implementation, sector financing and monitoring?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ 3.1 What factors other than GPE support are likely to have contributed to the observed changes (or lack thereof) in sector plan development, sector financing and plan implementation, and in sector dialogue and monitoring?</td>
<td>Changes in nature and extent of financial/non-financial support to the education sector provided by development partners/donors (traditional/non-traditional donors including foundations)</td>
<td>Documents illustrating</td>
<td>Triangulate the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributions to sector planning, plan implementation, sector dialogue or monitoring made by actors other than GPE</td>
<td>Relevant studies/reports commissioned by other education sector actors (e.g., donors, multilateral agencies) regarding nature/changes in their contributions and related results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changes/events in national or regional context(s)</td>
<td>Government and other (e.g., media) reports on changes in relevant national contexts and implications for the education sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Political context (e.g., changes in government/leadership)</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Economic context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social/environmental contexts (e.g., natural disasters, conflict, health crises)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other (context-specific)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ 3.2 During the period under review, have there been unintended, positive or negative, consequences of GPE financial and non-financial support?</td>
<td>Types of unintended, positive and negative, effects on sector planning, sector financing, sector plan implementation, sector dialogue and monitoring deriving from GPE funding (grants)</td>
<td>All data sources outlined for CEQs 1 and 2 above</td>
<td>Triangulate the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types of unintended, positive and negative, effects deriving from other GPE support.</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>results of document review and interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS

**Key question II:** Has the achievement of country-level objectives\(^{332}\) contributed to making the overall education system in [country] more effective and efficient?

#### INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEQ 4 During the period under review, how has the education system changed in relation to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a)</strong> Quality of teaching/instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b)</strong> Evidence-based, transparent decision making(^{333})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c)</strong> Country-specific areas of system strengthening for furthering equity and/or learning, and for ensuring effective and efficient use of resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Quality of teaching/instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in pupil/trained teacher ratio during period under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in equitable allocation of teachers (measured by relationship between number of teachers and number of pupils per school)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Evidence-based, transparent decision making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in number of education indicators that country reports to UIS during period under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes in whether country has quality learning assessment system within the basic education cycle during period under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other, country-specific indicators illustrating changes in evidence-based, transparent data collection, reporting and decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Indicators for specific areas of education systems strengthening as outlined in the country’s current sector plan related to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sector management (e.g., changes in ministerial, district and/or school level management structures, guidelines, staffing, financing, approaches to ensuring effective and efficient use of resources)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Education Management Information System (EMIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UIS data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• World Bank data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Household survey data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ASER/UWEZO other citizen-led surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grant agent progress reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementing partner progress reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mid-term Evaluation reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GPE annual Results Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appraisal Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public expenditure reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CSO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• SABER database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Literature on good practices in education system domains addressed in country’s sector plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-post comparison of statistical data for periods under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Triangulate the results of document review with statistical data, interviews and literature on ‘good practice’ in specific areas of systems strengthening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{332}\) GPE country-level objectives related to sector planning, plan implementation, and mutual accountability through sector dialogue and monitoring

\(^{333}\) Sub-questions a) and b) reflect indicators under Strategic Goal #3 as outlined in the GPE results framework. Sub-questions c) explores additional, country-specific indicators for system-level change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB- QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Learning (appropriate and available education inputs, additional country-specific efforts to enhance the quality of teaching/instruction, e.g., through new/improved incentives for schools/teachers)  
• Equity (removal of barriers to school participation for all learners; creating inclusive learning environments)  
(a-c): Stakeholder perceptions of areas within the education system that have/have not changed during period under review | • | • | • |

CEQ 5 How have changes in sector planning, plan implementation, and mutual accountability contributed to observed changes at education system level?

• The specific measures put in place as part of sector plan implementation address previously identified bottlenecks at system level  
• Alternative explanations for observed changes at system level (e.g., changes due to external factors, continuation of trend that was already present before current/most recent policy cycle, targeted efforts outside of the education sector plan)  
• Stakeholder perceptions of reasons for observed changes

• Sources as shown for CEQ 4  
• Literature on good practices in education system domains addressed in country’s sector plan  
• Education sector analyses  
• Country’s poverty reduction strategy paper

Key question III: Have changes at education system level contributed to progress towards impact?

| CEQ 6: During the period under review, what changes have occurred in relation to:  
a) Learning outcomes (basic education)?  
b) Equity, gender equality and inclusion in education?  
| a) Learning outcomes:  
• Changes in learning outcomes (basic education) during period under review.  
• Changes in percentage of children under five (5) years of age in COUNTRY who have been developmentally on track in terms of health, learning and psychosocial well-being. Or changes in other early childhood care and education measures from country-level surveys  
| Sector performance data available from GPE, UIS, DCP government and other reliable sources  
Teacher Development Information System (TDIS)  
Education Management Information System (EMIS)  
| Pre-post comparison of available education sector data during period under review  
Triangulation of statistical data with qualitative document analysis and interviews |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| b) Equity, gender equality, and inclusion:  | • Changes in proportion of children who complete (i) primary, (ii) lower-secondary education  
• Changes in out of school rate for (i) primary, (ii) lower-secondary education  
• Changes in the distribution of out of school children (girls/boys; children with/without disability; ethnic, geographic and/or economic backgrounds)  
• Education sector plan sets gender parity index/targets for (i) primary, (ii) lower-secondary education  
• Extent to which these targets have been achieved  
• Stakeholder perceptions on extent of, and reasons for, impact-level changes during period under review  
(a and b): Additional country-specific indicators as outlined in current sector plan and/or related monitoring framework | • National examination data  
• International and regional learning assessment data  
• EGRA/EGMA data  
• ASER/UWEZO other citizen-led surveys  
• Grant agent and Implementing partner progress reports  
• Mid-term Evaluation reports  
• GPE annual Results Report  
• Appraisal Reports  
• Interviews | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND SUB-QUESTIONS</th>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>MAIN SOURCES OF INFORMATION</th>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interviews</td>
<td>• Weigh supporting and refuting evidence of GPE contributions to sector outcomes during period of review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II  GPE country-level theory of change for Burkina

Direction of change

**S.O. # 1**
Government produces and owns credible and evidence-based sector plan that addresses: Education access, equity and completion, quality and relevance of education, and systems strengthening.

**S.O. # 2**
GPE advocates and establishes mechanisms for increased, harmonized, and better aligned international financing for education.

**S.O. # 3**
Country implements and inclusively monitors credible evidence-based, nationally-owned sector plan and thereby ensures: 1. Improved access, equity and completion (6 objectives related to improving access and reducing disparities); 2. Improved education quality (6 objectives related to improving initial and continued teacher training, and developing and revising curricula and teaching manuals); 3. Improved non-formal education (improving the availability and quality of non-formal education); 4. Stronger and better managed education system (6 key objectives, including implementing the education continuum reform and the reform to decentralize the education system).

**S.O. # 4**
More and better international financing is mobilized for education.

**S.O. # 5**
GPE fosters clear roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities among stakeholders in policy dialogue and their collaboration in a coordinated, harmonized way to solve sector issues.

**Knowledge and information exchange:**
GPE promotes and facilitates cross-national sharing of evidence and good practice including through GRA 2, 3 and 4

**Partnership strengthening:**
GPE fosters clear roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities among stakeholders in policy dialogue and their collaboration in a coordinated, harmonized way to solve sector issues

Country-specific contextual factors (negative: Ebola crisis, decline in iron ore prices negatively affecting economic context. Positive: political stability)

GPE ESP standards and processes, quality assurance procedures, guidelines, capacity building and technical guidance

ESPDG (2016, $ 208,041) and requirements

CSEF I, II and III grants to CN-EPT coalition

PDG funding (2012: $ 44,885) and requirements


GPE quality assurance processes, guidelines, capacity building and technical guidance for ESPIG development/
**Faso**

### LEGEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>Non-financial GPE inputs/support (technical assistance, facilitation, advocacy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>GPE financial inputs/support (grants) and related funding requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red</td>
<td>Country-level objectives that GPE support/influence directly contributes to. Underlined items are issues (at least partly) supported through the ESPIG-funded PDSEB sub-sector plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown</td>
<td>Global-level objectives that GPE support/influence directly contributes, which have consequences at country level (policy cycle continuum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown</td>
<td>Global-level objectives with ramifications at country level, that are influenced but not solely driven by GPE’s global and country-level interventions and/or influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blue</td>
<td>Intermediate outcomes: Education system-level changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pink</td>
<td>Impact: Changes in learning outcomes, equity, equality, and inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lightblue</td>
<td>Contextual factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Corresponding Strategic Objective in the GPE 2020 Strategic Plan

Numbers represent the key areas where logical linkages (explanatory mechanisms) connect different elements of the theory of change to one another (*because of x, y happens*). Numbers are aligned with the anticipated sequencing of achievements (1. sector plan development, 2. sector plan implementation, sector monitoring and dialogue, 3. education system-level changes, 4. envisaged impact).
### Table ii.1  Key explanatory mechanisms and underlying assumptions in the adapted country ToC for Burkina Faso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY MECHANISM</th>
<th>CRITICAL UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>(IMPLICIT) CONTRIBUTION CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>BECAUSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) GPE provides Education Sector Plan Development Grants and guidance, quality assurance, capacity development and technical guidance, and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contribution claim A: GPE (financial and non-financial) support and influence contribute to the development of government owned, credible and evidence-based sector plans focused on equity, efficiency and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) GPE promotes (at global and country levels) evidence-based and adaptive planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) GPE promotes and facilitates cross-national sharing of evidence and good practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Data on systems, equity, and learning generated through quality EMIS and LAS are fed back and used to inform sector planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Burkina Faso government produces and owns credible and evidence-based sector plans focused on equity, efficiency, and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country level stakeholders (MENA, LEG members) have the capabilities (knowledge and skills), opportunities (resources, conducive external environment), and motivation (political will, incentives) to jointly and collaboratively improve sector analysis and planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPE has sufficient leverage within the country for GPE financial and non-financial support to influence sector planning, including LEG existence and functioning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMIS and learning assessment and reporting systems (LAS) produce relevant and reliable data.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

334 Critical assumptions are events and conditions necessary for the respective logical link (mechanism) to work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY MECHANISM</th>
<th>CRITICAL UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>(IMPLIED) CONTRIBUTION CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 | BECAUSE  
(1) GPE provides GRA grants,  
(2) GPE supports and promotes evidence-based and inclusive national sector monitoring and adaptive planning at global and country levels, and  
(3) GPE promotes and facilitates cross-national sharing of evidence and good practice,  
– there is mutual accountability for sector progress through inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring. | GPE has sufficient leverage at global and country levels to positively influence LEG existence and functioning. Country level stakeholders (MENA, LEG members) have the capabilities (knowledge and skills), opportunities (including resources), and motivation (including political will and incentives) to work together to solve education sector issues. | Contribution claim B: GPE (financial and non-financial) support for inclusive sector planning and joint monitoring contribute to *mutual accountability* for education sector progress. |
| 2.2 | BECAUSE  
(1) GPE advocates for and establishes mechanisms for increased, harmonized, and better aligned international financing for education, and  
(2) GPE funding requirements include the promotion of improvements in domestic financing for education promotes  
– there is more and better financing for education is mobilized in the country. | GPE has sufficient leverage to influence the amount of and the quality of domestic and international education sector financing. External (contextual) factors permit national and international actors to increase/improve the quality of education sector financing. | Contribution claim C: GPE advocacy and funding requirements contribute to more and better financing for education in the country. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY MECHANISM</th>
<th>CRITICAL UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS</th>
<th>(IMPLIED) CONTRIBUTION CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 | **BECAUSE** –  
1. GPE provides funding through PDGs and ESPIGs,  
2. GPE provides quality assurance, processes, guidelines, capacity building and technical guidance for ESPIG development and implementation,  
3. There is mutual accountability for education sector progress,  
4. The country has developed a credible and evidence-based sector plan,  
5. More and better domestic and international financing for education is available,  
6. GPE promotes and facilitates cross-national sharing of evidence and good practice (including through GRA-supported projects)  
7. Data on systems, equity, and learning generated through quality EMIS and LAS are fed back and used to inform sector plan implementation  
   - Burkina Faso implements and monitors credible, evidence-based sector plans based on equity, efficiency and learning. | Relevant country-level actors have the technical capabilities, motivation (political will, incentives) and opportunity (funding, conducive environment) to implement all elements of the sector plan. Available domestic and international funding is sufficient in quantity and adequate in quality to implement all elements of the sector plan. Country-level development partners have the motivation and opportunity (e.g., directive from respective donor government) to align their own activities with the priorities of the sector plan and to work through the LEG as a consultative and advisory forum. Country-level stakeholders (MENA, LEG members) take part in regular, evidence-based joint sector reviews and apply recommendations deriving from these reviews to enhance equitable and evidence-based sector plan implementation. The sector plan includes provisions for strengthening EMIS and LAS to produce timely, relevant and reliable data. | Contribution claim D: GPE (financial and non-financial) support and influence contribute to the effective and efficient implementation of sector plans. |
### EXPLANATORY MECHANISM

**BECAUSE**
Burkina Faso implements and monitors realistic, evidence-based education sector plans based on equity, efficiency and learning – the education system becomes more effective and efficient towards delivering equitable quality educational services for all.

### CRITICAL UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS

Education sector plan implementation leads to improvements of previous shortcomings in the education system including related to each of, as well as to the interaction between elements such as:

- **Sector management**
- Effective and efficient use of available resources
- Effective sector management at national, sub-national and local/school levels
- Evidence-based, transparent decision making – e.g., regularly conducted quality learning assessments, regularly collected data on EMIS, transparency and reporting of data, integrated and effective data systems to facilitate use
- **Learning:**
  - Appropriate and available education inputs – e.g., curricula, textbooks and other teaching/learning materials, school infrastructure, lesson plans/teacher training tools, numbers and allocations of trained teachers, teachers trained in using existing curricula and related materials, incentives for teachers, teacher supervision
  - Quality of teaching/instruction – e.g., instructional time, language of instruction, appropriate pedagogy (teaching at right level), teacher-learner relationship, effective school management
- **Equity:**
  - Removal of barriers to school participation for all learners
  - Inclusive learning environment

### (IMPLIED) CONTRIBUTION CLAIM

Contribution claim E: The development, implementation and monitoring of realistic evidence-based sector plans contributes to positive changes at the level of the overall education system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>EXPLANATORY MECHANISM</th>
<th>CRITICAL UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS 334</th>
<th>(IMPLICIT) CONTRIBUTION CLAIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>BECAUSE (1) sector plan implementation includes provisions for strengthened EMIS and LAS, and (2) because GPE promotes and facilitates sharing of evidence and mutual accountability for education sector progress – country produces and shares disaggregated data on equity, efficiency, and learning.</td>
<td>There is sufficient national capacity (technical capabilities, political will, resources) or relevant technical assistance to analyze and report on available data and maintain EMIS and LAS. There are clearly delineated roles and responsibilities to produce data, report against data, and use data to monitor implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BECAUSE of improvements at the level of the overall education system, there are improved learning outcomes and improved equity, equality, and inclusion in education.</td>
<td>Changes in the education system positively affect learning outcomes and equity. Country-produced data on equity, efficiency and learning allow measuring/tracking these changes.</td>
<td>Contribution claim F: Education system-level improvements result in improved learning outcomes and in improved equity, gender equality, and inclusion in education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. From system-level change (intermediate outcomes) to impact
Appendix III  Evaluation methodology

169. The evaluation aims to assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of GPE’s inputs at the country level and the validity of GPE’s theory of change to establish if and how GPE outputs and activities contribute to outcomes and impact.\(^{336}\) The guiding frameworks for the evaluation are the evaluation matrix (Appendix I) and the country-level theory of change for Burkina Faso (Appendix II).\(^{337}\)

170. The overall approach to this evaluation is theory-based and uses contribution analysis (CA). CA is a theory-based approach to evaluation designed to identify the contribution a program or (series of) interventions is making to observed results through an increased understanding of why observed changes have occurred (or not occurred) and the roles played by the intervention and by other internal and external factors respectively.\(^{338}\).

171. The evaluation team chose contribution analysis as the main approach to this assignment as it is particularly useful in situations (i) where a program is not experimental, but has been implemented on the basis of a relatively clearly articulated theory of change; (ii) where the change processes in questions are complex rather than one-dimensional, i.e., where change is influenced due to a variety of inter-related factors as opposed to single policy interventions that could be isolated; (iii) where the change processes in question are highly context-specific. A report deriving from applying contribution analysis does not provide definite proof, but rather provides an evidence-based line of reasoning from which plausible conclusions can be drawn on the types and reasons for contributions made by the program/intervention in question. CA draws upon both quantitative and qualitative evidence to build the ‘contribution story’ for the program or intervention(s) under review.

172. The process for this country evaluation involved four stages: (i) assessing the availability and quality of data, adapting the country-level theory of change and conducting a country-specific stakeholder mapping to determine priorities for consultations during the in-country site visit (see Appendix IV); (ii) in-country data collection during an eight-working day mission to Burkina Faso from December 4-13, 2017; (iii) assembling and assessing the GPE contribution story; and (iv) writing the evaluation report.

---

\(^{336}\) In the context of this assignment, the term ‘impact’ is aligned with the terminology used by GPE to refer changes in the areas of learning, equity, gender equality and inclusion (reflected in GPE Strategic Goals 1 and 2 described in the 2020 Strategic Plan). While examining progress towards impact in this sense, the country evaluations do not constitute formal impact evaluations, which usually entail counterfactual analysis based on randomized controlled trials.

\(^{337}\) This country-specific ToC was adapted from the generic country-level ToC that had been developed in the assignment Inception Report.

173. Data collection and analysis were conducted by a team of two international and one national consultant. Methods of data collection included:

- Document and literature review (see Appendix VI for a bibliography).
- Stakeholder consultations through individual and focus group discussions in Burkina Faso. In addition, telephone interviews were conducted with the country lead based in Washington DC. Appendix V provides a list of consulted stakeholders. In total, the evaluation team conducted interviews for 47 individuals (see Box iv.1), of which nine were women.
- Education sector performance data analysis, drawing upon publicly accessible information on learning outcomes, equity, gender equality and inclusion, and education financing.\(^{339}\)

174. The evaluation team analyzed the available data using qualitative (descriptive, content, comparative) and quantitative techniques, thereby triangulating data from different sources and methods of data collection.

---

\(^{339}\) The key sources of data are the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) database, data.uis.unesco.org; the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) Creditor Reporting System (CRS), https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CRS1; and country-level datasets and data sources.
Appendix IV  Stakeholder mapping

175. The table below is adapted from the generic stakeholder mapping presented in the assignment inception report and tailored to the Burkina Faso context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>INTEREST IN/INFLUENCE ON GPE COUNTRY-LEVEL PROGRAMMING IMPORTANCE FOR THE EVALUATION</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE COUNTRY-LEVEL EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Interest: High. Influence: High. The Secretariat operationalizes guidance on overall direction and strategy issued by the Board. Importance: High</td>
<td>The main internal stakeholders and users of the evaluation; Key informants; country lead facilitated the evaluation team’s contacts with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board members (from developing countries included in the sample)</td>
<td>Interest: High. Influence: High. Board members influence the direction, strategy development and management of GPE, and they ensure resources. The extent to which DCP Board members are involved in and intimately familiar with GPE grants in their respective countries likely varies. Importance: High</td>
<td>Burkina Faso is represented on the Board through the constituency Africa 2. Current Board members are from Chad (board member) and Madagascar (Alternate). These board members were not consulted during the course of this country evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Country-level

Government of Burkina Faso

Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation, MENA) | Interest: High Influence: High. Responsible for shaping and implementing education sector policy and managing related financing. Importance: High. Main partner for GPE grant design and implementation. | Key informants at country level. Directors of all key MENA directorates were interviewed in person during the country visit (see Appendix V, list of stakeholders). The Permanent Secretariat for the Strategic Basic Education Program (SP-PDSEB, Secrétariat permanent du plan |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>INTEREST IN/INFLUENCE ON GPE COUNTRY-LEVEL PROGRAMMING IMPORTANCE FOR THE EVALUATION</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE COUNTRY-LEVEL EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other ministries with responsibilities for the education sector: Ministry of Higher Education, Scientific Research and Innovation (Ministère de l’enseignement supérieur, de la recherche scientifique et de l’innovation) Ministry of Youth, Training and Vocational Integration (Ministère de la jeunesse, de la formation et de l’insertion professionnelle)</td>
<td>Interest: Medium. Higher education and TVET are not directly supported by GPE funds. Influence: Medium (same reason). Importance: Medium (same reason).</td>
<td>Stakeholders from the two other ministries with responsibilities for education were consulted. Given that most of the focus in-country has been on the basic education program, these ministries, not covered under that program, were less involved in sector dialogue and ESP implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Finances and Development (Ministère de l’économie, des finances et du développement)</td>
<td>Interest: Medium-High. Education is one among various competing priorities in Burkina Faso. Influence: High. Responsible for budget allocations to the education sector. Importance: High.</td>
<td>Key informants at country level. Two senior staff members were interviewed during the country visit, including the General Budget Director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Social Welfare, Gender and Children’s Affairs (in Burkina Faso: Ministère de la femme, de la solidarité nationale et de la famille).</td>
<td>Interest: Medium-Low Influence: Low. The ministry was not mentioned as a relevant player in influencing the education sector. Importance: Medium-Low</td>
<td>The ministry was not consulted for this evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Education Sector Stakeholders (national level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant agent: Agence Française de Développement (AFD)</td>
<td>Interest: High Influence: High. Responsible for managing last two ESPIGs in Burkina Faso. Importance: High</td>
<td>Key informants at country level. Consulted during the visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAKEHOLDER</td>
<td>INTEREST IN/INFLUENCE ON GPE COUNTRY-LEVEL PROGRAMMING IMPORTANCE FOR THE EVALUATION</td>
<td>ROLE IN THE COUNTRY-LEVEL EVALUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Coordinating agency: UNICEF Burkina Faso                                   | Interest: High  
Influence: Medium-High. Through its facilitating role, the coordinating agency plays an important role in the functioning of the LEG.  
Importance: High                                                                                           | Key informants at country level - interviewed during the country visit (both education chief and education specialist).                     |
Influence: Medium-High, through their participation in the LEG, in sector monitoring exercises, as well as to their own activities in the education sector.  
Importance: High                                                                                          | Key informants at country level were interviewed in person during the country visit.                       |
| International non-governmental organizations: Light of the World; Catholic Relief services; Plan International; Planète, Enfants & Développement | Interest: High  
Influence: Medium. Members of the LEG with growing, but still somewhat limited influence compared to bilateral/multilateral development partners.  
Importance: High                                                                                          | Key informants at country level. Were consulted during the country site visit.                             |
| Domestic non-governmental organizations: EFA coalition  
(Coalition nationale pour l’éducation pour tous), Cadre de Concertation des ONG et Associations actives en Education de Base; Le Fonds National pour L’alphabétisation et L’Éducation Non Formelle (FONAENF);  
Fédération des Associations Islamiques du Burkina (FAIB); Secrétariat national de l’Enseignement catholique (SNEC); Fédération des églises et missions évangéliques du Burkina (FEME); National Union of Parents’ Associations of Secondary and Higher Education (Union nationale des associations des parents d’élèves du secondaire et du supérieur) | Interest: High  
Influence: Medium-Low. Most are not members of the LEG but several have participated in sector planning consultations and education sector reviews.  
Importance: Medium-High. Many schools in the countries are faith-based; and non-formal education plays an important role in the sector. | Key informants at country level. Were consulted during the country site visit.                             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>INTEREST IN/INFLUENCE ON GPE COUNTRY-LEVEL PROGRAMMING IMPORTANT FOR THE EVALUATION</th>
<th>ROLE IN THE COUNTRY-LEVEL EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private sector representatives: Union nationale des établissements d'enseignement privés (UNEEP)</td>
<td>Interest: medium-high. Influence: Medium. Responsible – yet not in a coordinated way – for a substantial share of schools in Burkina Faso. Importance: Medium-High. Many schools are private in Burkina Faso, although this particular union did not represent all private schools in the country (some are very informal).</td>
<td>Key informants at country level. Were consulted during the country site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philanthropic Foundations</td>
<td>Interest: NA</td>
<td>There was no indication of philanthropic foundations playing any role in the Burkina Faso education sector. No consultations conducted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

176. Based on consultations with MENA, the evaluation team did not conduct any consultations at the local and/or school level.
Appendix V  List of consulted stakeholders

177. 42 individuals were consulted over the course of this evaluation (of which, 9 women). All stakeholders except those marked with an asterisk (*) were consulted in person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>LAST NAME, FIRST NAME</th>
<th>TITLE (AND DEPARTMENT)</th>
<th>M/W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>BAETEN, Sven</td>
<td>Country Lead for Burkina Faso</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation)</td>
<td>KINDA, Patarb Tellé Emma Clarisse</td>
<td>Director, DGREIP (Direction générale de la recherche en éducation et de l’innovation pédagogique)</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation)</td>
<td>YAMÉOGO, Zourata</td>
<td>Director, DGEFTP (Direction générale de l’enseignement et la formation technique et professionnelle)</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation)</td>
<td>SAWADOGO, François</td>
<td>Director, DGESS (Direction générale des études et des statistiques sectorielles)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation)</td>
<td>OUÉDRAOGO, Angèle</td>
<td>DGESS</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation)</td>
<td>SAWADOGO, Sibiri Evariste</td>
<td>Director, DRH (Direction des ressources humains)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation)</td>
<td>SIDIBÉ, Ousmane</td>
<td>Director, DAF (Direction des affaires administratives et financières)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation)</td>
<td>DABIRÉ, Guillaume</td>
<td>SPB/DAAF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation)</td>
<td>BAKO, Jean Bernard</td>
<td>Director, DGENF (Direction générale de l’Education non-formelle)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of National Education and Alphabetization (Ministère de l’éducation nationale et de l’alphabétisation)</td>
<td>DAHANDI, Bourgou</td>
<td>DGEFTP (Direction générale de l’Enseignement et la Formation techniques et professionnels)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Secretariat for the Strategic Basic Education Program (SP-PDSEB, Secrétariat permanent du plan développement sectoriel de l’éducation de base)</td>
<td>KABORÉ, Ibrahima</td>
<td>Permanent Secretary</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Secretariat for the Strategic Basic Education Program (SP-PDSEB, Secrétariat permanent du plan développement sectoriel de l’éducation de base)</td>
<td>ZIDA, Jean Edmond</td>
<td>Chef de service coordination des composantes</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Secretariat for the Strategic Basic Education Program (SP-PDSEB, Secrétariat permanent du plan développement sectoriel de l’éducation de base)</td>
<td>BOURGOU, Moussa</td>
<td>Manager, non-formal education (ENF)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>LAST NAME, FIRST NAME</td>
<td>TITLE (AND DEPARTMENT)</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Higher Education, Scientific Research and Innovation</td>
<td>SANOU, Arsène</td>
<td>SAF</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ministère de l’enseignement supérieur, de la recherche scientifique et de l’innovation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Higher Education, Scientific Research and Innovation</td>
<td>BATIONO, Saturnin</td>
<td>Director, DGESS (Direction générale des études et des statistiques sectorielles)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ministère de l’enseignement supérieur, de la recherche scientifique et de l’innovation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Youth, Training and Vocational Integration (Ministère de la jeunesse, de la formation et de l’insertion professionnelle)</td>
<td>OUÉDRAOGO, Hassane</td>
<td>DGESS (Direction générale des études et des statistiques sectorielles)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Youth, Training and Vocational Integration (Ministère de la jeunesse, de la formation et de l’insertion professionnelle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Finances and Development (Ministère de l’économie, des finances et du développement)</td>
<td>SOULAMA, Vieux Abdoul Rachid</td>
<td>General Budget Director</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Finances and Development (Ministère de l’économie, des finances et du développement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Finances and Development (Ministère de l’économie, des finances et du développement)</td>
<td>LIN Hien</td>
<td>Manager of Disbursement Operations Services</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Economy, Finances and Development (Ministère de l’économie, des finances et du développement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF Burkina Faso</td>
<td>SISSAO, Moussa</td>
<td>Chef de File</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition nationale pour l’éducation pour tous</td>
<td>TRAORÉ, Adama</td>
<td>Education Specialist</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition nationale pour l’éducation pour tous</td>
<td>DEMBÉLÉ, Samuel</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition nationale pour l’éducation pour tous</td>
<td>OUATTARA, Boubacar</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition nationale pour l’éducation pour tous</td>
<td>NÉBIÉ, Modeste B.</td>
<td>Communication Manager</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadre de Concertation des ONG et Associations actives en Education de Base</td>
<td>Logobana, Juste Koumara</td>
<td>Member, National Union of Education and Research Workers (Syndicat National des Travailleurs de l’Education et de la Recherche)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadre de Concertation des ONG et Associations actives en Education de Base</td>
<td>Ouedraogo, Saidou</td>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadre de Concertation des ONG et Associations actives en Education de Base</td>
<td>Minigou, Martine</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadre de Concertation des ONG et Associations actives en Education de Base</td>
<td>Goabaga, Emmanuel</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Fonds National pour L’Alphabétisation et L’Éducation Non Formelle (FONAENF)</td>
<td>BAGBILA, Elie</td>
<td>Country Representative, Burkina Faso</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Relief services</td>
<td>KABORE, Issaka</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>LAST NAME, FIRST NAME</td>
<td>TITLE (AND DEPARTMENT)</td>
<td>M/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan International</td>
<td>MONTVERT, Ariane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planète, Enfants &amp; Développement</td>
<td>DAH, Ollo Difrothey Gilbert</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fédération des Associations Islamiques du Burkina (FAIB)</td>
<td>DÉMÉ, Hatimi</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BANCÉ, Ousmane</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secrétaire national de l’Enseignement catholique (SNEC)</td>
<td>SAWADOGO, Frère Victor</td>
<td>Deputy National Secretary</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KIEMDÉ, Abbé Hubert</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fédération des églises et missions évangéliques du Burkina (FEME)</td>
<td>KALKOUUMDO, Emmanuel</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union nationale des établissements d'enseignement privés (UNEEP)</td>
<td>BAZÉMO, Abraham</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agence Française de Développement (AFD)</td>
<td>SAWADOGO, Anne Marie</td>
<td>Project Officer, Education/Vocational Training</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DANDJINOU, Joelle</td>
<td>Project Officer, Education</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada</td>
<td>SCHIFF, Noah</td>
<td>First Secretary (Development), Canadian High Commission, Accra</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NÉBIÉ, Auguste</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Union of Parents’ Associations of Secondary and Higher Education (Union nationale des associations des parents d'élèves du secondaire et du supérieur)</td>
<td>FAYAMA, Adama</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI  List of reviewed documents


"Rencontre avec les représentants du Secrétariat du PME, 4ème Mission Conjointe de Suivi du PDSEB." Meeting minutes, Ouagadougou, April 13, 2016.


Appendix VII  Ratings of contribution claims and assumptions

To illustrate evaluation findings on the likely validity of the different elements, and the assumed logical linkages between these elements, in the GPE country-level theory of change, the evaluation team used a simple color rating approach to rate (i) the extent to which available evidence supported different contribution claims outlined in the ToC; (ii) the strength of the various assumptions that had been identified as underlying each contribution claim. Tables vii.1 and vii.2 below illustrate the criteria applied to guide these ratings.

Table vii.1  Definition of color-coded ratings for contribution claims

| Evidence supports the contribution claim.\(^340\) | • Envisaged objective has been fully or mostly achieved (e.g., a country owned credible ESP has been developed)  
• All or most of the underlying assumptions as outlined in the theory of change apply (i.e., are rated ‘strong’)  
  and/or  
• There are no alternative explanations that would suffice/are more likely than elements in the ToC to explain the change |
|---|---|
| Evidence partly supports contribution claim | • Envisaged objective has been partly achieved (e.g., ESP has been developed, but is not country-owned)  
• Half or more of the underlying assumptions as outlined in the theory of change apply only partially (i.e., are rated ‘moderate’)  
  and/or  
• There are some alternative explanations that are as or more likely than elements in the ToC to explain noted change |
| Evidence does not support contribution claim | • Envisaged objective has not or only marginally been achieved (e.g., ESP has not been developed; no positive change in quality/amounts of education sector funding)  
• Half or most of the underlying assumptions as outlined in the theory of change do not apply (i.e., are rated ‘red’)  
  and/or  
• There are alternative explanations that are more likely than the elements of the ToC to explain the noted change  
• No/insufficient data on whether the envisaged objective has or has not been achieved  
• For all or most of the underlying assumptions as outlined in the theory of change it is unclear if they apply or not (i.e., they are rated ‘white’, see assumptions rating below) |

\(^340\) While it does not prove the claim, evidence suggests that contribution claim is more likely than not to be true
Table vii.2 Rating grid for underlying assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strong       | Evidence deriving from all or most lines of enquiry indicates that this assumption applies in the given context.  
And                                                                  | There is no evidence that contradicts the application of this assumption |
| Moderate     | Evidence deriving from all or most lines of enquiry indicates that the assumption only partly applies in the given context.  
And/or                                                               | There is some evidence that indicates that this assumption does not apply |
| Weak         | Evidence from all or most lines of inquiry indicates that this assumption does not apply in the given context. |
| Insufficient data | Available evidence does not allow assessing the assumption, i.e., available evidence either does not address the specific assumption or is inconclusive on whether it applies or not. |

Table v.3 applies this color coding to the Burkina Faso context and illustrates the relationship between the six contribution claims and the various underlying assumptions for each of them.\(^{341}\)

Table vii.3 Rating of underlying assumptions for Burkina Faso

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution Claim</th>
<th>Underlying assumptions</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: GPE (financial and non-financial) support and influence contribute to the development of government owned, credible and evidence-based sector plans focused on equity, efficiency and learning.</td>
<td>Country level stakeholders have the capabilities (knowledge and skills) to jointly and collaboratively improve sector analysis and planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country level stakeholders have the opportunities (resources, conductive external environment) to jointly and collaboratively improve sector analysis and planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country level stakeholders have the motivation (political will, incentives) to jointly and collaboratively improve sector analysis and planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPE has sufficient leverage within the country for GPE support to influence sector planning, including LEG existence and functioning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMIS and learning assessment and reporting systems (LAS) produce relevant and reliable data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: GPE (financial and non-financial) support for inclusive sector planning and joint</td>
<td>GPE has sufficient leverage at global and country levels to positively influence LEG existence and functioning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country level stakeholders have the capabilities (knowledge and skills) to work together to solve education sector issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{341}\) We have slightly adapted the list of underlying assumptions that had been presented in the inception report, by in one case separating one complex assumption into three separate ones (to distinguish between changes in key actors’ motivation, opportunity and capabilities), and in another case merging two assumptions that addressed the same issue (reporting and use of EMIS data).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution Claim</th>
<th>Underlying assumptions</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>monitoring contribute to mutual accountability for education sector progress.</td>
<td>Country level stakeholders have the opportunities (including resources) to work together to solve education sector issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country level stakeholders have the motivation (including political will and incentives) to work together to solve education sector issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: GPE advocacy and funding requirements contribute to more and better financing for education in the country.</td>
<td>GPE has sufficient leverage to influence the amount of and the quality of domestic and international education sector financing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External (contextual) factors permit national and international actors to increase/improve the quality of education sector financing</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: GPE (financial and non-financial) support and influence contribute to the effective and efficient implementation of sector plans.</td>
<td>Relevant government actors have the motivation (political will, incentives) to implement all elements of the sector plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant government actors have the opportunity to implement all elements of the sector plan. (Conducive environment, domestic and international funding is sufficient in quantity and adequate in quality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant government actors have the technical capabilities to implement all elements of the sector plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country-level development partners have the motivation and opportunity (e.g., directive from respective donor government) to align their own activities with the priorities of the sector plan and to work through the LEG as a consultative and advisory forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country-level stakeholders take part in regular, evidence-based joint sector reviews and apply recommendations deriving from these reviews to enhance equitable and evidence-based sector plan implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sector plan includes provisions for strengthening EMIS and LAS to produce timely, relevant and reliable data.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: The development, implementation and monitoring of realistic evidence-based sector plans contributes to positive changes at the level of the overall education system.</td>
<td>Education sector plan implementation leads to improvements of previous shortcomings in the education system including in relation to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sector management (e.g., effective and efficient use of available resources)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning (e.g., appropriate and available education inputs – e.g., curricula, textbooks and other teaching/learning materials, school infrastructure, instructional time, school management)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity (e.g., removal of barriers to school participation for all learners)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is sufficient national capacity (technical capabilities, political will, resources) or relevant technical assistance, to analyze, use and report on available data and maintain EMIS and LAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Education system-level improvements result in</td>
<td>Changes in the education system positively affect learning outcomes and equity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution Claim</td>
<td>Underlying assumptions</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>improved learning outcomes</em> and <em>improved equity, gender equality and inclusion</em> in education.</td>
<td>Country-produced data on equity, efficiency and learning allow measuring/tracking these changes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VIII  Visual summary of contribution claim analyses

Figures viii.1 – 4 below provide a visual summary of evaluation findings on whether and how GPE inputs/activities as well as additional (external) factors are likely to have contributed to the different results envisaged by the country level theory of change. The graphics use the same color coding described in Appendix VII.

**Figure viii.1  GPE contributions to strengthening sector planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPE support</th>
<th>+ Additional factors</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sector planning capacity</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Behaviour change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPE offers ESP/G based on the condition of country having quality ESP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation (incentive) to develop quality ESP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso develops government-owned, credible and evidence-based sector plan(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP/G facilitates ESP development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity (resources) to develop quality ESP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and technical support from other donors</td>
<td></td>
<td>In-country capabilities (knowledge, skills) to develop credible, evidence-based ESP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPE shares guidelines/standards on how to develop and appraise an ESP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance from GPE Secretariat, grant agent and coordinating agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector data available (albeit to varying degrees) from EMIS and external studies (WB, UNESCO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core and competent MEST staff/national consultants involved in several planning cycles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

342 GPE contributions marked with a star are those that appear to have made the most distinct contribution to capacity changes.
### Sector dialogue and monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPE support</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Sector dialogue/monitoring capacity</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Behaviour change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPE offers ESPIG based on condition of country having LEG and regular sector reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation (incentive) to establish and maintain inclusive LEG and conduct regular sector reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusive, regular sector dialogue and joint sector monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for inclusive sector dialogue and monitoring (GPE Secretariat, coordinating agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a well functioning <em>Cadre partenarial en éducation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST mechanism for pooled funding in education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong will at the most senior level of the MENA to engage in evidence-based sector planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG provides (co)funding for education sector reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity (resources) to organize regular sector reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance (CA, GPE Secretariat)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capabilities of civil society partners/to engage in sector dialogue and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure viii.3  GPE contributions to more and better sector financing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPE support</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Domestic and international sector financing capacity</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Behaviour change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG funding conditions require government commitment to increase domestic</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong> (incentive) to improve amount/quality of domestic and international education sector funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>More and better domestic sector financing, Better international sector financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy at global and country levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso political crisis 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso government funding priorities influenced by competing considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG provides funding for ESP implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Opportunity</strong> (resources, pooled funding, external environment) to increase amount/quality of sector financing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional funding through CAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor priorities affected by multiple factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sector plan implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GPE support</strong></th>
<th><strong>Effect</strong></th>
<th><strong>ESP implementation capacity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Effect</strong></th>
<th><strong>Behaviour change</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG provides (co-)funding for ESP implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Opportunity</strong> (resources, pooled funding, conducive environment) to implement ESP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective and efficient implementation of sector plan(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional donor (co-)funding and technical assistance to MENA through CAST for ESP implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance to MENA</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Capabilities</strong> of MENA to lead ESP implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional donor (co-)funding and technical assistance to MENA through CAST for ESP implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing priorities at the government level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political crisis of 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix IX  Progress towards PDSEB 2012-2021 objectives

### Table ix.1  Progress on key indicators related to Access, Equity and Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIVERSAL PRIMARY EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary completion rate</td>
<td>59,50%</td>
<td>63,90%</td>
<td>57,60%</td>
<td>68,20%</td>
<td>58,40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of domestic resources for the education sector</td>
<td>19,90%</td>
<td>19,90%</td>
<td>16,41%</td>
<td>20,00%</td>
<td>19,80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of domestic education financing to basic education</td>
<td>75,50%</td>
<td>73,70%</td>
<td>75,80%</td>
<td>71,90%</td>
<td>66,35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrolment rate primary</td>
<td>81,30%</td>
<td>86,90%</td>
<td>83,00%</td>
<td>91,10%</td>
<td>83,70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of transition to post-primary</td>
<td>52,00%</td>
<td>56,90%</td>
<td>53,70%</td>
<td>61,90%</td>
<td>67,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrolment rate pre-primary</td>
<td>3,50%</td>
<td>4,20%</td>
<td>4,00%</td>
<td>4,60%</td>
<td>4,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil/teacher ratio in primary</td>
<td>56,10/1</td>
<td>56,00/1</td>
<td>51,40/1</td>
<td>56,00/1</td>
<td>51,40/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classrooms constructed for primary school</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3580</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3898</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary steps to consolidate the implementation of the education continuum</td>
<td>(Data not available to measure progress)</td>
<td>(Data not available to measure progress)</td>
<td>(Data not available to measure progress)</td>
<td>(Data not available to measure progress)</td>
<td>(Data not available to measure progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key elements for the education</td>
<td>(Data not available)</td>
<td>(Data not available)</td>
<td>(Data not available)</td>
<td>(Data not available)</td>
<td>(Data not available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

343 Source: PDSEB progress reports 2013-2016
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>RESULT</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>RESULT</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuum are available</td>
<td>to measure progress)</td>
<td>to measure progress)</td>
<td>to measure progress)</td>
<td>to measure progress)</td>
<td>to measure progress)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The annual planning of school construction takes into consideration the new education cycle and is harmonized with planned priorities.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classrooms in primary schools built by local communities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classrooms in primary schools built by municipalities</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender parity index for primary completion ratio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender parity index for transition ratio to post-primary</td>
<td>0,91</td>
<td>0,92</td>
<td>0,89</td>
<td>0,94</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross enrolment rate for primary schools in 43 priority Communes</td>
<td>50,40%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>52,20%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>53,80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of additional primary classrooms build in the priority Communes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of girls in the experimental Communes that are new beneficiaries for RA</td>
<td>No target</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of inclusive education projects integrated into PEQ or EQAme projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score in CP2 in French</td>
<td>51,1/100</td>
<td>55,1/100</td>
<td>41,1/100</td>
<td>Not met (worse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score in CM1 in French</td>
<td>43,2/100</td>
<td>47,2/100</td>
<td>39,8/100</td>
<td>Not met (worse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score in CP2 in mathematics</td>
<td>43,0/100</td>
<td>47,0/100</td>
<td>34,5/100</td>
<td>Not met (worse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score in CM1 in mathematics</td>
<td>41,2/100</td>
<td>45,2/100</td>
<td>38,0/100</td>
<td>Not met (worse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass rate CEP</td>
<td>60,90%</td>
<td>64,40%</td>
<td>82,23%</td>
<td>68,10%</td>
<td>72,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil/SDC ratio in post-primary</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score in 5th grade in French</td>
<td>52/100</td>
<td>56/100</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score in 5th grade in mathematics</td>
<td>45,5/100</td>
<td>50/100</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass rate BEPC</td>
<td>22,70%</td>
<td>29,10%</td>
<td>28,63%</td>
<td>35,40%</td>
<td>41,80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher appointments effective by 15. July the latest</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher appointments in 43 priority Communes effective by 1. September the latest</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching manuals are made available at the provincial level by 30. July</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>RESULT</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>RESULT</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours teachers are present in classrooms in the</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experimental Communes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of schools in the experimental Communes starting their classes on the</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first day of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of plans to improve reading in CP1 and CP2 implemented by CEB in</td>
<td>No target</td>
<td>No target</td>
<td>No target</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the experimental Communes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution rate of resources transferred to the Communes</td>
<td>51,08%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of resources transferred to the Communes in the MENA budget (excluding</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20,60%</td>
<td>23,70%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15,50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salaries and CAST funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of planned classrooms implemented by Communes before October 1.</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of monthly visits for continued teacher training in CEB-</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managed schools in the experimental Communes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>RESULT</td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>RESULT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adolescents above 15 years enrolled in initial literacy</td>
<td>195,919</td>
<td>355,197</td>
<td>187,069</td>
<td>372,957</td>
<td>120,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students being declared literate (in ENF)</td>
<td>202,318</td>
<td>314,117</td>
<td>189,581</td>
<td>348,125</td>
<td>113,443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix X  Data on GPE Results Framework

## Table x.1  2013-2017 ESPIG Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPE RF INDICATOR / EVALUATION MATRIX INDICATOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR VALUE (GPE DATA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RF20: ESPIG supports EMIS/learning assessment system | 2017 data:  
On EMIS: Yes.  
On learning assessment system: Yes.  
2016 data  
On EMIS: no.  
On learning assessment system: no. |
| RF21: Proportion of textbook purchases of ESP funded through ESPIG | The GPE results framework does not present any data for Burkina Faso. |
| RF 22: Proportion of teachers trained of ESP funded through ESPIG | The GPE results framework does not present any data for Burkina Faso. |
| RF 23: Proportion of classrooms built of ESP funded through ESPIG | The GPE results framework does not present any data for Burkina Faso. |
| RF 25: Progress made towards objectives/targets outlined in ESPIG agreement | Moderately unsatisfactory (slightly behind).  
The only implementation progress reports accessible for the evaluation are the PDSEB progress reports. |

---

344 GPE results framework tables for this indicator code ESPIG support to EMIS and LAS as ‘No data, without further explanation.

345 GPE results framework tables for this does not provide any further explanation.
### Table x.2  System-Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPE RESULTS FRAMEWORK INDICATORS</th>
<th>VALUES FOR BURKINA FASO (GPE DATA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RF10: increased share of public expenditure allocated to education (covered in section 4.3 of this report); | Improvement.                                                                
The share of public expenditure allocated to education is above 20 percent, and has increased between 2014 (18.3 percent) and 2016 (27.6 percent), GPE results framework data, 2017 collection. |
| RF11: equitable allocation of teachers, as measured by the variance in the ratio of pupils to trained teachers across schools (covered under measures for equity); | Unsatisfactory level of equitable allocation of trained teachers in 2014. The $R^2$ value of the ratio of pupils to trained teachers across schools in Burkina Faso was below the 0.8 threshold, indicating a below desired level of equitable allocation of trained teachers to pupils across districts. The $R^2$ value of pupils to teachers across schools was 0.71 in 2014. |
| RF12: improved ratios of pupils to trained teachers at the primary level (covered under quality of teaching/instruction); | No signs of improvement. GPE’s data indicates a primary PTTR of 49.38 in 2016, a decline from 2014 (57) and 2013 (54). |
| RF13: reduced student dropout and repetition rates (covered under sector management); | Limited data shows signs of mild improvement. GPE data on the Internal Efficiency Coefficient (IEC) of Burkina Faso is sparse, with only two data points: 2007 (score of 68.6) and 2014 (slightly higher score of 75.1). |
| RF14: the proportion of key education indicators the country reports to UIS (covered under evidence-based, transparent decision-making), | No improvement in recent years. Burkina Faso currently reports 10 out of 12 key indicators to UIS (latest GPE data). This is a strong score as only 18 of 63 GPE member countries affected by fragility and conflict reported on at least 10 indicators. |
| RF15: the existence of a learning assessment system for basic education that meets quality standards (covered under evidence-based, transparent decision-making) | Learning assessment system fully established. GPE’s 2016 data on this indicator classifies Burkina Faso’s learning assessment system as “Established”. Bi-annual learning assessments were conducted during the period under review. The assessments cover different levels of the primary education level. The levels reported on in this report (CP2 and CM1) was assessed in 2006, 2010 and 2014. |
### Table x.3  Impact-Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Area</th>
<th>Latest Data, Any Changes Between Before 2014 and After 2014 (GPE Data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF1: Improved learning outcomes at primary level</strong></td>
<td>Country-level data shows signs of mild deterioration from 2010-2014. There was a lack of GPE data on learning outcomes at the primary level in Burkina Faso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF2: More children under five years developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial wellbeing</strong></td>
<td>Lack of data in UNICEF Early Child Development Index.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RF3: Increased number of children in school supported by GPE</strong></td>
<td>166,559 children in school at the primary and lower secondary level were supported by GPE in 2015, and 165,139 children supported in 2016. 302,083 children were at the primary level during this two-year period, while 29,615 children were at the secondary level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **RF4: Improved primary and lower secondary completion rates, total and by gender (using Gross Intake Ration to the last grade of primary/secondary education as a proxy)** | Data shows a mild improvement for primary completion rates. The gross intake ratio to the last grade of primary education across genders was 60.53 percent (62 percent for girls and 59 percent for boys) in 2016, compared to 62 percent (63.56 percent for girls, and 60.56 percent for boys).  
For lower secondary education, the 2016 gross intake ratio was 24.7 percent (23 percent for girls and 26.4 percent for boys), compared to 27 percent in 2017 (25.66 percent for girls, and 28.31 percent for boys). |
| **RF5: Improved gender equity in primary and lower secondary completion rates (measured by Gender Parity Index of completion)** | Data shows a mild improvement for gender equity for lower secondary completion rates.  
In 2016 and 2017, the Gender Parity Index (GPI for primary level was 1.05. For lower secondary, the GPI was 0.87 in 2016 and 0.91 in 2017. |
| **RF6: Increased pre-primary gross enrollment**                            | Small deterioration in recent years.  
The pre-primary enrolment ratio was 4.17 percent in 2016, and decreased to 4.14 percent in 2017.                                                                                                                                                                   |
| **RF7: Reduced out-of-school rates, total and by gender, for children of primary school age, and children of lower secondary school age** | Improvement for girls, deterioration for boys (primary school), based on data that remains to be verified. No data for lower secondary education. The out-of-school rate for primary school-aged children across genders decreased from 2016 to 2017 (from 32 percent to 30 percent). The improvement is seen for both girls (from 33.8 percent to 31.25 percent) and boys (30.3 percent to 28.9 percent).  
In 2016, there was no data on out-of-school rates for children on lower secondary school age in Burkina Faso. The rate was 42 percent in 2017 (almost equal for boys and girls). |
Appendix XI  Strengthened Feedback Loop Mechanism

- **Sector planning**
  - Evidence-based and participatory

- **Implementation**
  - Strengthened capacities for identifying and addressing roadblocks that hinder implementation of the PDSEB
  - PDSEB results framework
    - Monitoring progress
  - Thematic groups
    - Proposing solutions
  - Feedback loop
  - JSR
    - Identifying roadblocks

- **System changes**
  - New law and guide on decentralizing school feeding
  - Plan to transfer funds and capacities to regional level for managing cantines and procurement of food

- **Impact**
  - Learning outcomes
  - Access (equity and inclusion)