### Indicator title

**Indicator (24)** Proportion of GPE program grant applications approved from 2015 onwards:

- (a) identifying targets in Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning;
- (b) achieving targets in Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency, and learning

### Result measured (from GPE Results Framework):

**Strategic Objective (3)** GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning

### Justification for Indicator

- **Background/context for indicator:**
  
  In its 26 February 2014 meeting in Washington DC, the Board of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) approved a new GPE funding model for 2015-2018, which aims to improve access to and quality of education in its Developing Partner Countries (DCPs) by promoting a results-based approach.

- **Sub-section 5.1 in GPE’s Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the Funding Model** explains the three dimensions of the Variable Part as follows:
  1. **Equity** refers to addressing disparities in education access, quality and learning outcomes, including gender, income, region-based- and other disparities.
  2. **Efficiency** is defined in relation to access, quality and learning outcomes, as the ratio of outcomes versus resources for these dimensions.
  3. **Learning outcomes** is understood as student learning (e.g. percentage of students achieving literacy or numeracy standards as defined by the country), or outputs linked with an evidence-based theory of change to improve learning serving as a proxy measure (e.g. number of instructional hours; availability of instructional materials; textbook ratios for reading and math; percentage of qualified teachers, etc.).

- **Sub-section 5.2.1 of the same document**, Developing
Country Partner (DCP) governments, in consultation with their Local Education Group (LEG) members, will identify key strategies or policies in the three areas of equity, efficiency and learning outcomes, deemed likely to lead to substantial progress in the medium-term, and hence to be transformational. Further, through these consultations, actions and indicators are to be chosen and defined\(^1\).

**Ex-post and Ex-ante**

As mentioned in section 5.3 of the same document, GPE prefers an ex-post approach to performance-based financing. An ex-post approach dictates that payments on the variable portion of a Program Implementation Grant allocation are made ‘after the fact’, based on verifiable results. These results could be in the form of processes, outputs or outcomes that are part of the Education Sector Plan (and not necessarily part of the actual program financed by the grant).

GPE also acknowledges that conditions may not always permit an ex-post approach, as there may be contextual circumstances that would limit it, for example, in post-crisis states. In such cases, an ex-ante approach should be considered. An ex-ante arrangement dictates that the variable allocation is not linked to actual attainment of results and that the approval of the total allocation (fixed and variable) occurs prior to implementation. However, an ex-ante approach reduces the incentivizing nature of the variable tranche and will only be accepted in exceptional cases (sub-section 5.3.2).

Whether ex-post or ex-ante, specific arrangements will be made in agreement with the DCP government and approved by the LEG with due consideration of GPE conditions for ex-post or ex-ante arrangements. Those are to be assessed through the Quality Assurance Review (QAR) process.

Additionally, information on conditions, arrangements and modalities of the ex-post and ex-ante approaches, including sample scenarios, can be found at: *Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the Funding Model* in the Library page at: [http://www.globalpartnership.org/library](http://www.globalpartnership.org/library)

**Rationale for indicator selection:**

In line with the result measured, mentioned above, this indicator is included to assess the extent to which countries take up the results-based approach and are successful in doing so.

As per GPE’s ESPIG application form (Section 4), DCPs are asked to describe their selected strategies / actions in the Education Sector Plan to address the issues of equity, efficiency and learning. In their summary, they explain how these proposed strategies / actions are reflected in a results’ chain and can be considered transformational for those three dimensions. In the application, DCPs are further asked to demonstrate that the proposed implementation strategies are robust, evidence-based and linked with indicators that have a stretch effect as opposed to a mere continuation of current trends.

Therefore, this indicator allows GPE to:

1. Monitor the extent to which DCPs decide to plan and carry out a results-based approach (part ‘a’);

A regular, critical review of the three dimensions and performance against targets will help mitigate thematic challenges facing the Partnership, and identify opportunities throughout implementation of its Strategy GPE 2020.

### DEFINITION

This indicator is defined by two key components:

- **a) Adoption rate of the Variable Part of the funding model for 2015-2018; and**
- **b) Variable Part performance rate.**

**Adoption rate** of the Variable Part is meant to address the first part of the indicator statement, on the proportion of ESPIGs that are: *(a) identifying targets in Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning.* It is calculated by dividing the number of ESPIGs that included the Variable Part by the number of the total ESPIG applications, and multiplying this by 100 to generate a percentage.

The **Variable Part performance rate** addresses the second part of the result statement on proportion of ESPIGs that are *(b) achieving targets in Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency, and learning.* **Variable Part performance rate** is calculated by dividing the number of ESPIGs that met targets by the total number of ESPIGs that included the Variable Part, and multiplying this by 100 to generate a percentage.

Countries that meet targets are defined as countries that are either ‘well performing’ or ‘highly performing’ according to the calculation method described in this sheet.

Please note that the two key components in the indicator do not necessarily refer to the same grants.

### Unit of measurement:

#### a) Variable Part Adoption Rate

“n out of N,” expressed as a percentage, where:

- **n** refers to the number of ESPIGs adopting the Variable Part efficiency, learning, and equity indicators; and
- **N** refers to the total number of ESPIGs approved in a given fiscal year.

#### b) Variable Part Performance

“n out of N,” expressed as a percentage, where:

- **n** refers to the number of ESPIGs in the performance categories “well performing” or “highly performing;”
- **N** refers to the total number of ESPIGs with Variable Part

---

### MONITORING SHEET FOR INDICATORS

Efficiency, learning, and equity indicators targets due for assessment in a given fiscal year.

**Disaggregation:** Fragile and conflict-affected countries (FCAC)

**Year for data reported (select only one and mark an “x”):**
- [x] Fiscal year
- [ ] Calendar year (years will vary based on the MICS/DHS rounds)

**Frequency of data collection:** Annually (based on GPE fiscal year - July 1 to June 30)

### DATA TREATMENT

**Source of information for collecting data:**
- ESPIG Application Form (part a of the indicator) and ESPIG Standard Reporting Template (part b of the indicator) - see templates in Annexes 1 and 2 of this document.
- Grant Agents

**Formula:**

#### a) Variable Part Adoption Rate

The adoption rate of the funding model Variable Part is calculated by dividing the total number of ESPIG applications that identified equity, efficiency, and learning indicators for the Variable Part, by the total number of ESPIG applications approved under the new funding model and multiplying this by 100.

\[
\text{Total # of ESPIG applications that identified equity, efficiency, and learning indicators} \times \frac{\text{total # of ESPIG applications approved from FY15}}{100}
\]

**Note:** According to ESPIG Guidelines (September 2015), at least one indicator should be selected for each of the areas of equity, efficiency and learning outcomes.

#### b) Variable Part Performance Rate

Step 1: Assigning a performance value per indicator, per ESPIG Attainment of targets is determined by whether targets were fully met or not met, for each indicator. Each indicator is assigned a performance value of either 1 (fully meeting targets) or 0 (not meeting targets). If there is a pre-determined agreement on the partial achievement of Variable Part indicators in the ESPIG application, meeting the partial target is also considered as “meeting targets.” Table 1 presents the two scenarios corresponding to performance values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Target Attainment Description, for each indicator</th>
<th>Performance Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is fully met, or the partial target is met as pre-determined in the ESPIG application</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target is not fully met, or target is not met at all</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, Nepal’s ESPIG application has an indicator on learning: “# of community schools where standardized classroom-based early grade reading assessments for grades 2 & 3 are conducted by teachers, observed by parent representatives, and results are shared and discussed with parents”. The indicator requires a “minimum of 51% achievement to be eligible for disbursement”. In other words, if target

---

3 Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey / Demographic and Health Surveys
reaches at least 51%, then it is considered that the partial target is met (for limitations, see the “data limitations” section in this document).

Step 2: Assigning a performance category per ESPIG
As shown in table 2 below, there are five performance categories. The process of determining the performance category of an ESPIG is as follows:

a. For each ESPIG, add the number of performance values that were determined in step 1 and divide it by the total number of indicators that were set for attainment this reporting period. Multiply the result by 100 to get the percentage rate.
b. Based on the result, identify the score range (table 2).
c. Based on the score range, determine the performance categories (table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Score range</th>
<th>Performance categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ \frac{\text{Sum of performance values}}{\text{total number of indicators across dimensions that achieved targets}} \times 100 ]</td>
<td>X= 0 &lt; 25%</td>
<td>Not performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 &lt; X &lt; 75%</td>
<td>Low performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% ≤ X &lt; 75%</td>
<td>Moderately performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% ≤ X &lt; 100%</td>
<td>Well performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = 100</td>
<td>Highly performing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achievement in the performance category ‘well performing’ and above is considered satisfactory.

Example

ESPIG A achieved targets in 3 out of 4 indicators in equity, 2 out of 3 in efficiency and 1 out of 2 in learning. The process of assigning a performance category to ESPIG A is shown in table 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Score range</th>
<th>Performance categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ \frac{3 + 2 + 1}{4 + 3 + 2} = \frac{6}{9} = 67% ]</td>
<td>X= 0 &lt; 25%</td>
<td>Not performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 &lt; X &lt; 75%</td>
<td>Low performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% ≤ X &lt; 75%</td>
<td>Moderately performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% ≤ X &lt; 100%</td>
<td>Well performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X = 100</td>
<td>Highly performing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the calculation in this example, ESPIG A achieved targets in 67% of its indicators, which places it in the ‘Moderately performing’ category. Therefore, it does not meet the required achievement level.

Step 3: Determining the proportion of ESPIGs that achieved targets
This step provides the corporate measurement as stated in the result statements, i.e. proportion of GPE program grant applications achieving targets in performance indicators on equity, efficiency, and learning.
a. Add the number of ESPIGs in each category.

b. Calculate the proportion of ESPIGs in each category out of the total number of ESPIGs in the portfolio.

Example

Table 4 presents the performance data for ESPIGs A-E:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESPIG</th>
<th>Proportions of indicators per dimension which met targets</th>
<th>Performance rate</th>
<th>Performance category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0/2</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>n/a*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the information in table 4, the following analysis can be made on the proportion of ESPIGs that achieved targets: out of the five adopted ESPIGs, one ESPIG (ESPIG A) is ‘not performing’, two ESPIGs (ESPIGs B, C) are ‘moderately performing’, one ESPIG (ESPIG D) is ‘well performing’ and one (ESPIG E) is ‘Highly performing’. The distribution of ESPIGs performance categories is presented in chart 1 below:

Chart 1: Performance category distribution by ESPIGs

We can thus conclude that 40% met the required achievement level. In this scenario, the reported corporate value would be 40%.

Further analysis: Dimension review

Additional analysis is recommended on each dimension (efficiency, equity, and learning) to complement the data on the portfolio level. The process of conducting a dimension review is as follows:

1. For each dimension, add the number of indicators that achieved targets and divide the sum by the total number of indicators per each dimension.
2. Based on the result, determine the performance range for each dimension.
3. Based on the performance range, assign a performance category in each dimension, following the same scale that was
used in the previous steps.

Table 5: Dimension Review Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESPIG</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance score/range
- 12/15 = 80%
- 7/14 = 50%
- 5/10 = 50%

Performance categories
- Well performing
- Moderately performing
- Moderately performing

Based on the information in table A, portfolio A-E is ‘well performing’ in Equity, ‘moderately performing’ in Efficiency, and ‘moderately performing’ in Learning, as presented in chart 2 below:

Chart 2: Performance category distribution by dimension

Aggregation formula:

a) Variable Part Adoption Rate

\[ AR_j = \frac{VP_{ESPIG_j}}{App_{ESPIG_j}} \times 100 \]

Where,

- \( i \) = type of ESPIG
- \( AR_j \) = Variable part adoption rate in country j
- \( App_{ESPIG_j} \) = number of ESPIG approved (a) in country j
- \( VP_{ESPIG_j} \) = number of ESPIG that identified equity, efficiency and learning (vp) in country j

b) Variable Part Performance Rate

Step 1: Assigning performance value per indicator
Indicator \( n \) meeting target = 1

Indicator \( n \) not meeting target = 0

Where,

Indicator \( n \) meeting target = indicator that met target numbers
Indicator \( n \) not meeting target = indicator that did not meet target numbers

Step 2: Assigning performance category for ESPIG that identified equity, efficiency and learning \( ESPIG_{j, vp} \)

\[
PS_{j, i} = \left( \frac{EQ_{j, i, a} + EF_{j, i, a} + LE_{j, i, a}}{EQ_{j, i} + EF_{j, i} + LE_{j, i}} \right) \times 100
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If</th>
<th>The Performance Category is</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( PS_{j, i} = 0 )</td>
<td>Not performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 0 &lt; PS_{j, i} &lt; 25% )</td>
<td>Low performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 25% \leq PS_{j, i} &lt; 75% )</td>
<td>Moderately performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( 75% \leq PS_{j, i} &lt; 100% )</td>
<td>Well Performing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( PS_{j, i} = 100% )</td>
<td>Highly performing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where,

\( i \) = Type of ESPIGs
\( PS_{j, i} \) = Performance score in ESPIG \( i \) in country \( j \)
\( EQ_{j, i, a} \) = number of equity indicators that achieved targets in ESPIG \( i \) in country \( j \)
\( EQ_{j, i} \) = total number of equity indicators in ESPIG \( i \) in country \( j \)
\( EF_{j, i, a} \) = number of efficiency indicators that achieved targets in ESPIG \( i \) in country \( j \)
\( EF_{j, i} \) = total number of efficiency indicators in ESPIG \( i \) in country \( j \)
\( LE_{j, i, a} \) = number of learning indicators that achieved targets in ESPIG \( i \) in country \( j \)
\( LE_{j, i} \) = total number of learning indicators in ESPIG \( i \) in country \( j \)

Step 3: Aggregation of ESPIGs reaching required achievement level

Step 1: For a given year, assess the number of ESPIGs that is equal or above 75% of their Variable Part targets (in categories ‘Well Performing’ and ‘Highly Performing’).

\[
MTESPIG_{j} = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if } PS_{j, i} \text{ is equal or above } 75\% \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Where,

\( MTESPIG_{j} \) (ESPIG Meeting Target) reflects whether the Variable Performance ratio for ESPIG in country \( j \) is equal or above the 75% threshold (≥75%) – 1 if yes, 0 otherwise.
Step 2: For a given year, calculate the proportion of ESPIGs with performance rate equal or above 75%, dividing the number of ESPIGs with performance equal or above 75% by the total number of ESPIGs:

\[
Prop(MTESPIG_j \geq 75\%)_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} MTESPIG_j}{N} \times 100
\]

Where,

\(Prop(MTESPIG_j \geq 75\%)_j\) reflects the proportion of ESPIGs with a performance rate of equal or above 75% in country \(j\)

\(N\) total number of ESPIGs in sample

Data limitations (if any known / anticipated):

1. Indicator 24 focuses on an overall Variable Part trend across the portfolio rather than target attainment per specific indicator or specific dimension. However, the data per specific indicator or specific dimension will be collected, and further analysis will be provided (see step 1: Assigning performance value per indicator in the Data Treatment section of this document).
2. Variable Part performance rate does not show the difference between “meeting targets” of the partial target and “meeting targets” of the full target (see above).
3. The absence of historical data does not allow an extensive assessment of this indicator’s limitations.

Interpretation

A high value of Part (a) suggests that the funding model is being implemented effectively. Such data should be complemented with an analysis of the applications that were approved and did not include a Variable Part, focusing on the reasons behind its exclusion. A high value of Part (b) indicates DCPs are meeting the required achievement levels with respect to the performance-based indicators linked to transformative strategies to improve equity, efficiency, and learning outcomes.
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ANNEXES

Annex 1- Data Collection tool

Data collection tool utilized for collecting the data, if any:

- **ESPIG Application Form** (part (a) of the indicator) and **ESPIG Standard Reporting Template** (part (b) of the indicator) - see templates in Annexes 1 and 2 of this document.

Annex 2- Standard Operating Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Name: Data Collection, Quality Assurance &amp; Storage for Indicator # 24 of the GPE Results Framework</th>
<th>Owner: R&amp;P Team</th>
<th>Updated:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function: Measuring GPE Impact</td>
<td>Version #: 1</td>
<td>Review:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material changes from prior version of SOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None; this is the first version.

### Summary
This SOP describes the process for data collection, quality assurance, and storage for indicator # 24 (Proportion of GPE program grant applications approved from 2015 onward: (a) identifying targets in Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning; (b) achieving targets in Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning) of the GPE results framework.

### Results / Outputs
This process should result in the results framework being updated with quality assured data on indicator # 24.

Interim outputs of the Secretariat: Completed data collection template

Final Output: Updated results framework database

### Scope

- **Begins:** The process begins with Senior M & E Specialist (MU) requesting Country Leads to collect data on the status of the variable part implementation of active ESPIGs
- **Ends:** The process ends with updated data being integrated into the results framework database by the Monitoring and Evaluation Data Manager.
- **Includes:** All procedural aspects
- **Excludes:** Methodological aspects of calculating the indicator value. These can be found in the methodology sheet.
- **Note:** Data will be collected annually based on GPE fiscal year

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

- **Policies:** GPE 2020, Monitoring Sheet for GPE Results Framework Indicator # 24
- **Deadlines:** M & E Data Manager updates results framework database with the Indicator #24 data by 30th October
- **Approval:** The completed data template is prepared by the Senior M & E Specialist (MU) and includes quality checks by the M & E Data Manager and final approval from the Head of M&E

### Issues / Risks:

- Relevant documents might not be available to the GPE Secretariat on time.

### Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Data Collection</th>
<th>Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data</th>
<th>Aggregating Data</th>
<th>Update results framework database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 15th September</td>
<td>By 30th September</td>
<td>By 30th October</td>
<td>By 15th November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Steps in the Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in the Process</th>
<th>Roles / Responsibilities</th>
<th>Outputs / Deliverables</th>
<th>Tools / Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Request Data Collection Typically by 15th September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request Country Leads to request Grant Agents to collect data on the status of the implementation the variable part of each active ESPIG</strong></td>
<td><strong>Senior M &amp; E Specialist (MU)</strong></td>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request Grant Agents to complete the ESPIG Standard Data Reporting Template</strong></td>
<td><strong>Country Leads</strong></td>
<td>ESPIG Standard Data Reporting Template</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data Typically by 30th September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in the Process</th>
<th>Roles / Responsibilities</th>
<th>Outputs / Deliverables</th>
<th>Tools / Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perform quality assurance checks on the completed ESPIG Standard Data Reporting templates</strong></td>
<td><strong>Country Leads</strong></td>
<td>Complete and quality assured ESPIG Standard Data Reporting Templates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Forward the quality assured ESPIG template to the MU
  • Country Leads

• Consolidate the data collected into a single database
  • Senior M & E Specialist (MU)
  • Quality assured and compiled data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Aggregate Data</th>
<th>Typically by 30th October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Enter data into the template provided by the M&amp;E Data Manager</td>
<td>• Senior M &amp; E Specialist (MU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compute indicator values using the completed data collection template, based on the latest available classification of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict and forward to M &amp; E data Manager.</td>
<td>• Senior M &amp; E Specialist (MU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review completed data collection template and send comments/queries to the Senior M &amp; E Specialist (MU)</td>
<td>• M &amp; E Data Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respond to the comments/queries, updates data collection template as necessary and forward to M &amp; E data Manager</td>
<td>• Senior M &amp; E Specialist (MU)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Update Results Framework Database</th>
<th>Typically by 15th November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Forward data collection template to the Head of M &amp; E for review and approval</td>
<td>• M &amp; E Data Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review and approve completed data collection template</td>
<td>• Head of M &amp; E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update results framework database using completed template submitted by the Senior M &amp; E Specialist (MU)</td>
<td>• M &amp; E Data Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notify the secretariat on the availability of data in the results framework database through the intranet</td>
<td>• M &amp; E Data Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 3- Additional Analysis

At the end of GPE fiscal year, CST reviews the distribution of Variable Part targets across dimensions and progress towards these targets. This data analysis should be informed by the two parts of this indicator:

**a) Adoption Rate of the funding model Variable Part**

The analysis should examine the applications and describe cases that were approved and did not include the Variable Part, focusing on the reason that the Variable Part was not included.

**b) Variable Part Performance Rate**

As presented in the sections above, data are collected through three steps (indicator, ESPIG, Aggregation). While the focus of the Variable Part performance rate is on indicator performance across ESPIGs, the staged
data collection provides the foundation for another performance analysis focusing on attainment by dimensions across the Partnership (see below). This facilitates understanding of where targets are not being met, so as to inform decisions and allow for course correction.

**Additional Analysis: Dimension Review**

\[
\text{Equity} = \frac{EQ_{j,i,a}}{EQ_{j,i}} \times 100
\]

\[
\text{Efficiency} = \frac{EF_{j,i,a}}{EF_{j,i}} \times 100
\]

\[
\text{Learning} = \frac{LE_{j,i,a}}{LE_{j,i}} \times 100
\]

Where,

*Equity*, *Efficiency* and *Learning* each reflect the extent to which targets are being met in these dimensions.

\[EQ_{j,i,a} = \text{number of equity indicators that achieved targets in ESPIG } i \text{ in country } j\]

\[EQ_{j,i} = \text{total number of equity indicators in ESPIG } i \text{ in country } j\]

\[EF_{j,i,a} = \text{number of efficiency indicators that achieved targets in ESPIG } i \text{ in country } j\]

\[EF_{j,i} = \text{total number of efficiency indicators in ESPIG } i \text{ in country } j\]

\[LE_{j,i,a} = \text{number of learning indicators that achieved targets in ESPIG } i \text{ in country } j\]

\[LE_{j,i} = \text{total number of learning indicators in ESPIG } i \text{ in country } j\]

---

**Annex 4- ESPIG Application Form: Section 4, Variable Part Information**

**Section 4: Variable Part Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Baseline (Year)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcomes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annex 5- ESPIG Standard Reporting Template (final version as of April 25, 2016)**

3-4. GPE Corporate Results Framework – ESPIG Variable Part Indicators

Note: 3-4 applies only to ESPIGs approved after 2014

Extract relevant information from the ESPIG Application, specifically Section 3: Program Financial Overview, Program Cost and Disbursement by Intervention/Component, Section 4: Variable Part Information, Means of Verification, Schedule for Disbursement - and report on progress made during the reporting period

The Variable Part indicators should meet incentive-based requirements that indicate transformative strategies to improve equity, efficiency and learning outcomes in basic education. Disbursement is in general conditional to the achievement of the targets. The GA in consultation with the LEG needs to verify that (some of the) indicators have been reached, how verification has been conducted, and that the Variable Part is being (partially) disbursed.

---

4 Define the selected indicators.

5 Include recent data for the indicators (where applicable).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of indicator</th>
<th>Indicator title</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Monthly/Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Disbursement (US$m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator(s) on Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>(insert actual title of indicator)</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Disbursement (US$m)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator(s) on Equity</td>
<td>(insert actual title of indicator)</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Disbursement (US$m)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator(s) on Efficiency</td>
<td>(insert actual title of indicator)</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Disbursement (US$m)</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annex 6 - Variable Part Tracking Tool (at the aggregate level – for all ESPIGs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Grants with Variable Part</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Board Approval Date</th>
<th>Variable Part (US$)</th>
<th>Grant Agent</th>
<th>Disb. Modality</th>
<th>Program Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Disbursement (US$m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variable Part Tracking Tool**

- **Indicators**: Month, Ind.
- **Target**: Month, Ind.
- **Disbursement (US$m)**: Month, Disb.