MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE | **BOD/2020/11/12 DOC 10 ANNEX** | **FOR INFORMATION**

MONITORING EVALUATION AND LEARNING FRAMEWORK: LIST OF ANNEXES

Please note: Board documents are deliberative in nature and, in accordance with the GPE Transparency Policy, are considered to be public documents only after their appraisal by the Board. It is understood that Board members will circulate Board documents among their constituency members prior to Board consideration for consultation purposes.

MEL Framework: List of Annexes

Annex A: ISE recommendations, Secretariat Review, and Stakeholder feedback

Annex B: Examples of Overarching MEL Questions by Stakeholders

Annex C: MEL Policy Outline

Annex D: Draft Results Framework

Annex A.1: GPE 2016 M&E Strategy: ISE Findings and Secretariat Review of Lessons Learned

The ISE notes that GPE should:

- Adapt the corporate theory of change (ToC) to reflect lessons from the past strategy period, including distinguishing planning from implementation, focusing on capacity, service delivery, and recognizing GPE's spheres of control and influence to better articulate what GPE itself is accountable for
- Develop a more "complex-aware" results framework aligned with the new ToC. This should be followed with a reduced number of key indicators
- Integrate gender equality ambitions at the output and outcome levels into the ToC and the RF
- Strengthen joint learning processes at the global and country levels

The Secretariat's own review of and experience with GPE's current M&E strategy shows that:

- <u>Ample evidence generated for new strategy</u>. The strategy was instrumental in amassing a significant evidence base regarding GPE's operational model and the performance of GPE grants, which has generated learning at the global level. The evidence has been used extensively by the Board and the Secretariat for designing new programs (e.g., EOL) and shaping the upcoming strategy. It has also been used for accountability by the Board.
- <u>Moderate institutionalization of M&E.</u> The strategy also made in-roads into institutionalization of monitoring and evaluation in the Secretariat and to some extent within the broader Partnership.
- <u>Moderate success with accountability and learning across the Partnership.</u> The strategy was only moderately successful in generating accountability and learning across the partnership, especially with country partners and grant agents. One key issue affecting learning was that the strategy did not generate strongly demand-driven, actionable information for country partners that they could utilize for policies and programs at the country level. Mechanisms at the country-level for disseminating and learning from M&E findings were inadequate, with primary responsibility for the M&E strategy located at the Secretariat.
- Evaluation portfolio insufficiently tailored to country needs. <u>The evaluation stream did not include an approach to addressing key sectoral issues of concern to country partners.</u> Although the evaluations did provide some important information on the Partnership and sectoral issues at the country level, they were not demand driven and customized to country needs; the evaluations were managed by the Secretariat, with standard questions rather than those tailored to the specific needs and interests at the country level.

- Limited opportunities for learning at the country level. Limited opportunities for learning, in part due to the first two factors, but also due to limited engagement of the global evaluation team for learning at the country level, which stemmed from the design and identified purpose of the evaluations.

-

- Opportunities for enhancing efficiency. There are opportunities to improve efficiencies in the way evidence is generated and used by leveraging Partnership assets and regular country and partnership processes, such as joint sector reviews and plan implementation.

The ISE is available online[1] and GPE's evaluation portfolio is also available on the GPE website[2].

Table A.1: Summary Table of Findings on Specific M&E Elements

Component of M&E	Secretariat's Review			Independent Summative Evaluation	High-level proposals reflected in MEL framework
	What worked	Areas of improvement- **Effectiveness**	Areas of improvement- **Efficiency**	Evidence	
Results monitoring	**Effectiveness:** The RF significantly strengthened accountability by expanding the evidence base available (through the Results Reports and data available on the GPE website) to the Partnership on progress towards its goals and objectives.	Potential for greater focus on the functioning of the operational model. This can be done by including indicators that focus on ESP implementation, grant monitoring, organizational performance, performance of the partnership.	Streamline the number of indicators based on opportunities and trade-offs identified through an ongoing qualitative cost-benefit analysis of RF indicators

Utilize existing data from DCP monitoring systems for the sector

More focus on use of data for monitoring of ESPIGs, | Practical considerations have constrained the relevance of the RF as complex issues like progress in ESPIG implementation, advocacy, or fiduciary oversight are each captured in a single but limited indicator, which leads to the risk that decision-making is informed by relatively narrow data[3]. | The updated Results Framework to reflect new GPE Strategy

Elevate the importance of the key links between planning and implementation and of mutual accountability, but with a small set of meaningful indicators.

Strengthen the monitoring of plan implementation |

[1] https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/independent-summative-evaluation-gpe-2020?audience-profile=gpe-secretariat&utm_source=Global+Partnership+For+Education&utm_campaign=2a0e1a10e9-English+Campaign+-+2020-07-03-02-15-30&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_90856a3035-2a0e1a10e9-173953353
[2] https://www.globalpartnership.org/results/monitoring-evaluation
[3] Page 30 of the final ISE report

Component of M&E	Secretariat's Review			Independent Summative Evaluation	High-level proposals reflected in MEL framework
	What worked	Areas of improvement- **Effectiveness**	Areas of improvement- **Efficiency**	Evidence	
	Efficiency: For some indicators, the RF made use of partners' existing processes/initiatives to obtain data, improving efficiency.	In addition, more focus on country context and a clearer division between development context within which GPE operates (e.g. aggregate impact and outcome indicators at the country level) and organizational performance (e.g. successful implementation of ESPs) Indicators that can help distinguish the added value of partnership at the country, regional and global level to help make a strong case for investment in the Partnership.	and global initiatives such as Education Out Loud (EOL) and Knowledge and Information Exchange (KIX)	In particular, in its current shape, the RF does not sufficiently address key questions related to GPE performance, related to the quality of cooperation and ESP implementation at the country level[4]. The ISE recommends that GPE should develop a more complex-aware RF aligned with a revised ToC once the GPE next strategy is finalized. It emphasizes that this is critical to capture important results such as the quality of cooperation at the country level, the quality and performance of grant agents, progress in mutual accountability and progress in ESP/TEP implementation[5].	and partnership functioning at the country level and have a country-level process for consolidating and reporting these data in the GPE results framework.
Grant monitoring	**Effectiveness:** The grant monitoring stream institutionalized	There is potential for a more systematic approach to identifying and analyzing lessons	There is significant variation across grant agents in the quality and comprehensiveness of grant	The ISE recognizes that the monitoring information reflected in portfolio and grant	Introduce a common but simple framework for monitoring, evaluation, and project/program

---

[4] Section 6.2.5 of the final ISE report

[5] Recommendation 4.2 on Page 139 on the final ISE report

Component of M&E	Secretariat's Review			Independent Summative Evaluation	High-level proposals reflected in MEL framework
	What worked	Areas of improvement-**Effectiveness**	Areas of improvement-**Efficiency**	Evidence	
	data collection and reporting on grant related indicators in the RF (on types of interventions supported, delivery of planned outputs, achievement of variable tranche indicators, and implementation status).	learned from grant monitoring data, particularly from implementation and completion reports	implementation and completion reports[6] Greater consistency in reporting by grant agents, utilizing their existing reporting mechanisms, will help to ensure that all grant data that is used for routine reporting is a part of implementation and completion reports.	performance reviews is of importance for the GPC and the CST. However, both have insufficient time to systematically reflect on and learn from this information given existing grant management-related workloads.	completion that allows grant agents and DCPs flexibility but also enables GPE as a partnership to be able to track and learn about key results. Furthermore, to improve access and use of grant level information by relevant stakeholders, a grant level dashboard may be developed to provide regularly update information on grant disbursement, implementation, and progress on key indicators.
Evaluation	The evaluations completed thus far have provided critical information on the functioning of GPE's operational model (CLEs and ESPDG)[7] identified lessons from CSEF and informed the design of Education Out Loud; and	Evidence generated by CLEs did not stimulate the level of learning desired at the country level. Innovative interventions at the country level were not evaluated for impact. This was a missed opportunity to contribute to the global evidence	Managing a large portfolio centrally at the Secretariat resulted in high transactions costs for the Secretariat and inefficiencies in information becoming available for learning at the partnership and at the country level.	The ISE[8] states that multiple Board documents include references to CLEs as 'objective' justifications and explanations for the need to debate and act on issues like mutual accountability, alignment, adaptability to the country context.	The new approach will comprise two streams: Country-led stream will be integrated into the operating model to elevate provide more contextualized and demand-driven evidence that supports learning and decision making at the country level

---

[6] Based on a review of completion reports from 2016- 2018
[7] Note: This information was available only 3 years into the implementation of the strategic plan
[8] Section 6.2.3

Component of M&E	Secretariat's Review			Independent Summative Evaluation	High-level proposals reflected in MEL framework
	What worked	Areas of improvement-**Effectiveness**	Areas of improvement-**Efficiency**	Evidence	
	helped provide relevant information for decision making for pre-Board meetings. These also served as a comprehensive base of studies for the Independent Summative Evaluation.	base on innovations in education		The ISE also notes that more work needs to be done to ensure that M&E information is more targeted in answering appropriate questions to perform better at the county level (e.g. level of ESP implementation, quality of LEG performance, and quality of the GA)	Secretariat-led: this will include systematic summaries and reviews of country-level evaluations to generate Partnership knowledge and learning, and a Secretariat-managed set of evaluations that are of strategic priority and importance for the Board and the partnership.
Dissemination and learning	The M&E strategy has created strong processes for sharing findings at the global level which led to discussions on the Portfolio Review at the GPC and the Results Report at the SIC, DCP pre-Board and Board meetings; There is evidence that these findings have been used for strategic learning at the global level[9].	Lack of relevant M&E evidence (for instance on progress towards country-level sectoral targets) and effective mechanisms for dissemination and learning at the country level

Potential to produce differentiated M&E products for a range of audiences including donors and DCPs, which report M&E information in a manner that is most effective in | Centralization of many M&E functions at the Secretariat constrained the development of a learning culture across the Partnership, at both the global and country levels. A more participatory approach to M&E could have promoted learning-by-doing for DCPs and other partners. | The ISE emphasizes the importance of decentralization of M&E to focus on answering questions related to ESP implementation, LEG effectiveness to support the partnership in performing better at the country level

The ISE also calls for developing a learning agenda that specifically focuses on improving the usefulness of M&E information and better targeting it to the right | Learning at the country level will be embedded in the operating model Learning at the partnership/global level will be done by creating opportunities across countries and partnerships through existing (KIX, EOL) GPE mechanisms or by creating some additional standalone learning opportunities such as a learning network established of high-level official from GPE partner countries |

---

[9] For instance, streams of work for the development of the next strategic plan have been identified, in part, in response to CLE and RF findings.

Component of M&E	Secretariat's Review			Independent Summative Evaluation	High-level proposals reflected in MEL framework
	What worked	Areas of improvement-**Effectiveness**	Areas of improvement-**Efficiency**	Evidence	
		communicating and use of information for these partners		audience for better decision making at different levels across the partnership	Learning at Board/Committee level by generating aggregated knowledge through the systematic reviews Learning at the Secretariat (staff) level would be done through stronger knowledge management and embedding it into the learning for staff, through GPE's People Strategy

Annex A.2: **Stakeholder Feedback on the First Draft of MEL Framework and How Feedback has been Addressed**

Category	Feedback Provider	How the feedback has been addressed or will be addressed through MEL or other strategy streams (operating model or financing framework)
Results Framework		
A table would be useful to understand the changes that are being proposed- indicators that were previously there and clarify why some are being dropped and others retained, and the rationale/criteria for their selection (utility, cost, reliability, among others)	SIC, NORAD	Information in Annex D, Table 2
Further spell out how the M&E strategy will help GPE better handle the issue of domestic financing. The indicator proposed on volume of financing is relatively unclear and weak.	SIC	Information in Annex D, Table 1. Also see paper on new operating model, which addresses domestic financing and how it will be measured and reported.
The proposal could be enhanced if it further explores root causes behind insufficient accountability, and layers of accountability (by whom, to whom?) as this would have implications for delivering MEL efficiently. For accountability purposes, there needs to be a balance between a few "prescriptive" outcome-level indicators and less prescriptive indicators	SIC	MEL proposes to use a results framework that integrates monitoring indicators with information from evaluations (less prescriptive and more focused on progress and understanding factors affecting results). See also information in Annex B.
A stronger emphasis on the alignment of GPE's monitoring framework with relevant SDG4 indicators	SIC	See Annex D, Table 1 (an initial results framework)
To assess alignment and harmonization of development partner support, do we need to "develop a methodology/guidance and tools", can it be achieved through monitoring indicator that measures how partners are aligned to support ESP implementation	SIC	Yes, the MEL proposes to develop a Partnership Effectiveness indicator that will incorporate alignment and harmonization. The methodology is being developed.
The are some concerns around the missing middle – i.e. there are process/input/output indicators, and high-level system-wide education indicators, but still uncertain there is enough at the 'impact of grants on outcomes' level at which GPE's results chain is weak.	DFAT	The MEL proposes several ways of addressing the impact of grants: a clearer framework for grant results frameworks; an evaluation stream that assesses grant-supported interventions; and measurement of grant achievements with respect to priority areas as they are selected and addressed at the country level.
Including broader, more distant system-wide indicators are a lower priority than what GPE grants specifically help achieve ("getting real on levers"). We support a facilitated discussion in which Board Members can follow through on intent to streamline the results framework, maintaining harmonized, simplified and required quality reporting.	DFAT	Thank you. The MEL strategy and the Results Framework distinguish between country/sector level processes and results and the results supported through GPE processes and grants.
Gender equality impact monitoring- the 'missing middle' of indicators is also a reality for gender equality indicators	DFAT	This area will be addressed through diagnostics/measurement of this complex concept. Work has begun on identifying ways to do so.
The Partnership-wide results framework needs indicators that are looking at the performance of GPE's grants - are they effective - and not just looking at the sector wide performance in a country.	Donor group 3&6	See Annex D, Table 1 (an initial results framework).
Disaggregation: GPE should be ambitious in pushing this agenda forward and we would like to propose an indicator (with corresponding targets) that measures the number/% of	NORAD	Noted and will be addressed as part of the OM and the result framework.

ESPIGs that provide disaggregated beneficiary data on one or more marginalized groups (such as ethnicity, CWD, economic status etc.).		
What is the timeline and process of finalizing the results framework?	NORAD	Draft to SIC in April 2021; Final to Board in June 2021
Given the increased focus on service delivery- is there a plan to include service delivery indicators (classrooms, textbooks, teachers trained etc.).	NORAD	The MEL proposed to look at two aspects: teaching quality and organizational capacity. The proposal is not simply to measure the number of classrooms, textbooks, and teachers trained, as these are inputs to grant-level objectives and the presumption is that if these are met, the objectives have been met, which may or may not be the case.
In order to elevate learning and to cultivate a culture of evidence-based learning across the Partnership, we encourage taking a more demand-based and context-specific approach to evidence, use of fewer corporate indicators, and an approach that allows generating actionable data throughout the operational processes	DCP Aide Memoire	Agree, and this is a fundamental principle on which the MEL framework is based.
GPE project-level M&E		
Useful to get feedback from GPC on the proposal of a common format for ESPIG reporting and understanding if the data we are collecting will trigger actions for countries that are off-track? Or how will this help countries course-correct and what role will Secretariat play in this?	SIC, Donor group 3&6	Agree. This will be slated for discussion with the GPC. From the MEL perspective, the embedded monitoring and evaluation design should take into account the learning from data and evidence needs of the stakeholders on the ground. The Secretariat's role will be to promote learning from evidence.
How will the proposed approach of consistency in reporting on progress and completion across all the Grant Agents affect the transaction costs of the Grant Agents.	SIC	We will be discussing this topic with the grant agents. On the other hand, the payoff to the partnership is enormous in being able to look at the portfolio performance in a strategic way and to be able to assess whether GPE funds are being utilized effectively and efficiently.
Where is regular grant reporting? There is a need to ensure that there is regular, adequate implementation grant progress and completion reporting, enabling timely feedback and course correction. If this is to be country-led – how can this be sustainably supported and ensured to be adequate and universally available across grants?	Donor group 3&6	This is addressed in section 3.2 and section 3.3. Grant funding will support monitoring and evaluation.
Country-level evaluations, diagnostics		
It would be useful to support national diagnostics as opposed to international diagnostics that may have some ideological baggage attached to them. This would ensure capacity building, differentiation and sustainability of such efforts at the country level.	SIC	Work on reviewing available methodologies is ongoing and will provide options based on criteria such as validity, reliability, and applicability to country context. See also Annex D, section 4.
The system diagnostics in individual countries should not be driven by the specific GPE goals and priority areas, but rather based on a holistic approach of system diagnostics.	SIC	This issue is being addressed through the operating model.
Evaluations of policies and interventions should be designed to address the country's priorities. While the document explains the process very well, it could be further substantiated by the methodologies for the analysis, priority setting- how will country needs be identified?	SIC	This work has commenced. The MEL policy will outline some of the methodological standards (see Annex C) and the priority setting regarding the diagnostic or evaluation questions to be addressed will be defined through the grant processes (to be developed as the next step).
How governments in a capacity-constrained environment will lead evaluations at the sector level? Even with the Systems Capacity Grant there remains an issue of operational model complexity and transaction burden while advancing EPR progress	SIC, DFAT	The operating model paper addresses the transaction cost issues. With respect to capacity, a MEL strategic partnership is proposed to provide support to governments in undertaking evaluations (and building capacity through a "learning by doing" model.

A critical examination of the additional workload these reviews and evaluations will require from countries, especially FCAC, would have been useful	NORAD	The reviews and evaluations will be part of the operating model (and demand-driven in some cases). The processes will be designed to be as much part of the operational process as possible to encourage learning from evidence. Thus, while it will require time, the benefit would be improved information and course-correction. Pilots will examine the workload and other issues. (It will be difficult to assess the additional workload without also assessing how it relates to the benefits gained from the work.)
The evaluation of system-wide capacity development effectiveness and policy impact needs time. When interventions are designed to strengthen the capacities of the education administration, assessing how these improved capacities are leading to improved performance and service delivery may take more time than 1-2 years. How will evaluations take these challenges into account and measure progress against certain milestones?	SIC	The specific evaluation designs will address these issues in detail. Each evaluation will have its own questions and therefore design. The MEL framework does not have a priori prescriptions of timelines or methodologies.
Worth considering making the development of a 'learning plan' mandatory for all reviews and evaluations that are commissioned. This to identify when and how the information collected should be used	NORAD	Agree, and the proposed MEL policy will include this as a standard in GPE supported evaluations.
How will GPE build on country systems instead of imposing new methodologies and tools for evaluation? How will GPE create a system that will support countries with different evaluation systems and modalities?	LAC	The country-led stream of the MEL framework will support the strengthening of country system through a "learning by doing" approach, ensuring that the evaluations are fit for purpose and useful for country stakeholders. The MEL policy will also articulate a standard on building/strengthening country systems through the MEL stream.
Strategic partnerships		
It would be useful to focus on multiple, national and close to the ground partners as opposed to one global entity	SIC	The strategic partnership for MEL will focus on how best to support countries on MEL and the capabilities required for it, including at the country level.
Who are the strategic partners, are they already a part of the partnership- it would be better to rely on partners who can deliver on specific MEL services to reduce transaction costs and undertake research that is more contextualized and will have more ownership and uptake at the country level.	SIC	UIS is already a partner. However, a partner or partners for other strategic capabilities in MEL will need to be identified, as outlined in section 4.
Other		
Consistently integrate gender and equity across different aspects of the framework	SIC	Done
It would be useful to offer examples beyond gender and focus on other priorities such as domestic financing, equity and inclusion	SIC	Done or reference to gender removed
More emphasis should be put on the need to strengthen national data systems and capacities in use of EMIS data, specifically the management aspect of EMIS. Further elaborate the plan to support strengthening EMISs, which will eventually contribute to improving the quality and reducing the time lag between submission of national data to the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) and publication of internationally comparable data	SIC	The focus on strengthening EMIS will be through the operating model, although MEL will reinforce it by using the data from the system.
Much emphasis is placed on the yet-to-be-created System Capacity Grant, which could place constraints on implementation at least in the early stages.	SIC	Agree. The operating model paper outlines the system capacity grant and requires Board approval.

How will the learning and knowledge approaches respond to DCP interest?	DFAT	In two ways: the country-led stream will be designed at the country level in collaboration with DCPs; the Secretariat-led stream on supporting a network of high-level GPE partner country officials with online and face-to-face knowledge-sharing and learning on specific topics, such as gender equality and inclusion, is yet to be designed but will take demand into account. See also section 3.4 in the MEL framework.
How and when will the capacity and financial implications of the new approach be determined?	DFAT	The capacity and financial implications for the country-led MEL (including sector and partnership monitoring) will be mainstreamed into the OM model, into the system capacity and transformation grants. The workprogram for the Secretariat-led MEL will outline the capacity and financial implications. See also sections 5 and 6 of the MEL framework
How will the proposed Strategic Plan approach balance action on the issues identified in the current results and learning approach while maintaining manageability, including within existing resources (not to mention potentially reduced resources in a COVID-world)	DFAT	The fundamental shift in the MEL framework is towards mainstreaming evidence into country-level processes and thus the shift is through the operating model, which highlights the trade-offs. The MEL framework will guide this work. The shifts in terms of the results framework and the Secretariat's workprogram imply using our current resources differently. We would welcome a further discussion on this topic.
It would be good to clarify what is continuing and adapted/what GPE will be doing less of	Donor group 3&6	The shifts are highlighted in the MEL framework. The Secretariat workprogram, to be produced by April 2021, will highlight what the Secretariat will do less of as well as what it will do differently.
Who will (in practice) lead the country led stream? Realism on roles and implications of a country-led approach: a 'country-led' MEL approach would need to recognize implementation burden risks and how support would be balanced with ownership and assurance of adequate results reporting on grants	Donor group 3&6	The country-led stream is mainstreamed into the operating model and the roles and responsibilities will be defined as part of this work going forward. Grant reporting will still be the responsibility of the grant agents. The Secretariat Results and Performance team will be responsible for synthesizing the MEL information. As noted in the MEL framework, the proposed MEL policy will outline roles and responsibilities (see Section 3.1 and Annex C)
Important to make sure next independent evaluation is timed to feed into next strategy development (or something separate for this)	Donor group 3&6	Agree. This timeline will be built into the Secretariat workprogram, which will be discussed by SIC in April and Board in June 2021.
Many DCPs do not currently produce annual plans and budgets or annual reports. Having these documents in place could perhaps be a requirement for receiving GPE funding?	NORAD	Requirement for GPE funding are outlined in the operating model.
How will GPE ensure country buy-in of MEL framework?	LAC	A consultation was held in July with the DCPs and ongoing consultations on the operating model also include relevant aspects of MEL.

Annex A.3: Overview of Key Elements of GPE 2020 Approach to MEL

Overview of GPE 2020 Monitoring: Monitoring for GPE 2020 comprises four key elements:

- Monitoring of implementation grants based their implementation status and completion reports, based on objectives addressed
- Monitoring of programs such as Education Out Loud and Knowledge and Innovation Exchange, based on their results frameworks
- An overall GPE Results Framework indicator database, which includes impact and outcome data on partner countries, data on country-level processes, and grant-level indicators
- Analytical monitoring reports:
    - Grant Portfolio Review report, which provides an analytic portfolio view of GPE grants, supplemented with information on GPE's financial performance
    - The annual Results Report, which provides an analytical view of the results framework data, supplemented with additional information from evaluations and operations

GPE 2020 Grant Monitoring

- A review of implementation grant completion reports[10] finds that grant monitoring currently does not allow GPE to assess effectiveness in areas of interest to the Partnership vis-à-vis gender, equity, and other priorities in a systematic way. Assessments of effectiveness in important topics and valuable lessons with respect to efficiency (both important dimensions of value for money) are therefore lost, as they are not regularly documented as part of the (progress and) completion reports. This is due to differences in grant agents' approach to grant results frameworks, progress monitoring, and completion reporting.
- In addition, while such information is typically available on a grant-by-grant basis, implementation grant monitoring information (both during implementation and at completion), as currently collected, cannot be aggregated at the Partnership level to understand how the portfolio is performing as a whole to inform strategic decisions. This too is mainly due to the lack of harmonization of the reporting fields or metrics (indicators or other), and varying reporting practices across grant agents. Metrics on implementation grant performance at completion are also not present in the current GPE 2020 results framework, although the Grant Performance Report documents outputs such as classrooms, textbooks, and teachers trained and notes overall implementation progress.
-
- **GPE 2020 Sector Processes and Partnership Monitoring**

---

[10] https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/review-completion-reports-gpes-implementation-grants-2016-2018

-
- GPE's results framework captures important sector-level outcomes but contains insufficient information on sector processes that would serve as leading indicators and signal whether outcomes are likely to be achieved. GPE's model is based on important country-level processes (such as plan implementation, Joint Sector Reviews, and stakeholder participation through Local Education Groups) that are either not monitored or monitored with partial data not as pertinent to or utilized by actors at the country level. Although the processes are intended to support partner countries achieve results, relevant data are neither generated nor effectively used at the country level. The ISE finds that:
- *The results framework in its current shape does not sufficiently address key questions related to GPE performance, in particular related to the quality of cooperation, mutual accountability and ESP implementation at the country level (ISE, pg. 130-131). Although the existing RF of the GPE 2020 strategy has enabled significant progress in GPE's accountability for results, important results are not sufficiently captured by the framework. These primarily concern qualitative results like the quality of cooperation at the country level, the quality and performance of grant agents, progress in mutual accountability and progress in ESP/TEP implementation, which are not easily measured by pre-set SMART indicators. (pg. 139)*
- GPE supports the development of sector plans, and data on the quality of the plans are monitored and reported in GPE's results framework and results reports. However, sector plan implementation is not tracked systematically, highlighting an area of insufficient knowledge regarding a main link in GPE's implicit country-level theory of change: the implementation of policy, program, processes and outputs that would yield the expected outcomes i.e. children's access to education and learning. Regular assessment of sector plan/policy implementation at the country level, with data reported at the Partnership level, would help both the country and the Partnership gauge whether the various policies and programs in the education system in GPE countries are on the right path towards achieving sector goals.
- Similarly, although some dimensions of the country-level partnership are monitored, such as the quality of the Joint Sector Reviews, the relevance of the data gathered, and how these reviews assist with improving implementation at the country level is currently largely a black box. Furthermore, the Local Education Group does not assess alignment and harmonization of development partner support which are key aspects of the Partnership expectations at the country level and key issues in the GPE model.

Annex B: Typology of *Learning for What and From What* by Stakeholder Groups

The following paragraphs outline the kinds of questions different GPE stakeholders would be interested in and the ways in which those answers could generated for learning, decision-making, and actions. In terms of learning by whom and for what:

- **Country-level partners** (governments, teacher associations, civil society, parent groups, Local Education Groups, and so forth) are likely to be interested in understanding and addressing key bottlenecks for systemic change through policies, programs, and interventions; whether programs represent value for money, are evidence-based, and will achieve results, such as learning for marginalized groups. These questions could be answered through the country-led evaluation stream, instituting evaluation approaches appropriate for answering questions for the stakeholders. Learning from the evaluations will be embedded within the operational model.

- **Regional/global stakeholders** (including country-level stakeholders who congregate at or participate in regional or global fora) are also likely to be interested in how to solve key bottlenecks for systemic change and how to use evidence from other countries or contexts for the design and implementation of their own policies, programs, and interventions. This demand could be fulfilled by the Secretariat synthesizing information from country-level and Secretariat-led evaluations. A second mechanism will include dissemination and sharing of country evidence using KIX and EOL and local platforms and organizations. Finally, the Secretariat-supported network of high-level country officials will benefit from face-to-face knowledge-sharing and learning on specific topics, such as gender equality and inclusion.

- **The Board and Committees** are likely to be interested in GPE's progress with respect to its results framework, the effectiveness of GPE's strategies and country programs and grants, GPE support in key priority areas, efficiency of Partnership processes, and the overall value for money proposition of GPE. Learning for GPE-level decisions will be facilitated through the Secretariat-led work program that generates aggregate knowledge (for example, through the systematic reviews of country-level evaluations). This information will be made available for specific uses by GPE Board and Committees. The Secretariat-led stream of MEL will be based on a Board-agreed work program that supports evidence-informed decision making.

- **Grant Agents** are likely to be interested in understanding operational issues around GPE grant design, monitoring implementation and understanding and addressing grant effectiveness and efficiency. This learning will be facilitated through a robust grant MEL framework and evaluations of key grant processes and components funded through GPE grants.

- **The Secretariat's** interest is in supporting the Partnership and the decisions of the Board and its Committees, and incorporating evidence in its day-to-day operations (reviewing grants, monitoring progress at the country level, reviewing evaluations, supporting policy dialog

and partnership at the country level, and so forth). Thus this need is likely to be fulfilled by utilizing all MEL information for different aspects of its work and managing its day-to-day operations (reviewing grants, monitoring progress at the country level, policy dialog with country partners, reviewing evaluations, supporting Board decisions, and so forth). To embed evidence-based learning in its operations and make it habitual, the Secretariat will integrate all MEL information in its internal knowledge management platform so that data and evidence are available to all staff. It will also establish a learning program for its staff to play a stronger role in supporting countries in adaptive learning. This program will be linked with the people strategy, currently being designed and be a part of the larger Secretariat-wide learning strategy that cuts across various teams and topics.

Annex C: Rationale for and High-Level Outline for GPE MEL Policy

Rationale for proposed GPE MEL Policy

GPE 2020 has a monitoring and evaluation strategy that encompasses:

- A Results framework with core indicators and reporting through an annual results report
- Secretariat-managed evaluations – country-level, thematic, and programmatic
- Grant monitoring for the results report indicators and substance of the grant portfolio report
- Budget for the above
- A minimal statement on implementation grant completion (using GA's own systems).

What the current M&E strategy does not address:

- Monitoring vs. Evaluation; clear distinction between M&E and how each will be addressed, including the types of evaluations, their purposes, their audiences, and uses.
- Standards/guidance for how GPE's various pieces of work/funding streams should be monitored for results and evaluated. For example, there is no specific policy for GPE ESPIG evaluations (major funding stream), other than to rely on GA standards. The result is lack of minimum quality standards (e.g., results framework and indicators) and criteria (e.g., effectiveness, reporting on key elements of GPE approach, such as LEG effectiveness or sector implementation)
- Fully articulated governance: Who is responsible for which aspects of evidence and its use. Although a SIC paper further detailed this issue under the current strategy, and can be used to further formulate roles/responsibilities.

Outline for Proposed MEL Policy

Background and Purpose of the Policy

- Background on GPE's new strategy and its key elements

- Purposes of the policy

    o   In the context of GPE's new approach: to support accountability, transparency, and agile learning, decision-making, and action across the partnership.

- Set out the principles and minimum standards that will guide the design and implementation of the monitoring, evaluation, learning workprogram across the Partnership. GPE's new strategy is designed as the COVID19 pandemic is unfolding across the world, with potentially devastating effects across the globe. The role of data and evidence to assess whether and how solutions are working is vitally important. The policy will therefore incorporate the principle of agility and in-time information to help guide learning and evidence-based decisions.

  - Set out roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis evidence generation and use across the Partnership

- The policy will be reviewed and updated periodically

Coverage: GPE financing instruments and Partnership agreements and processes

The policy will apply to GPE's financing instruments as well as key partnership processes that are fundamental to the functioning of the Partnership.

- Overview of the financing instruments
- Overview of the key partnership: governance, Secretariat Operations, country-level partnership engagement and coordination processes

Principles/standards

The policy will be operationalized through standards and minimum requirements. The policy addresses in terms of principles/minimum requirements, for example:

For monitoring:

- Use of data that is reliable, valid, and internationally accepted
- Data generated as a routine part of policy, program, or project processes
- Minimal number of indicators that are meaningful for strategic or operational guidance
- Indicators that capture key dimensions of gender, equity, and disability
- Indicators that are readily available from country or international sources

For evaluation:

- Clear focus on quality and a degree of independence of evaluation (governance and management of the evaluation)
- Use of standards (OECD DAC/other standards to be reviewed)
- Use of professionally accepted methodological approaches

- Principles of agility and in-time learning, with an explicit plan on learning and improvement objectives by specific stakeholders
- Disaggregation of effects by gender
- Disaggregation of effects on marginalized populations
- GPE's *additionality* in terms of financing but also in terms of leveraging/mobilizing partnership;
- Ethical principles in the treatment of stakeholders and information providers
- Transparency and public disclosure

Areas of Monitoring

The policy will define, at a high level, how key GPE processes and results will be monitored (such as the GPE results framework), data sources, and the responsibility for the provision of relevant data and analysis from all partners in GPE

Evaluation[11]

The policy will outline the different types of evaluations acceptable (or required) for GPE instruments (funding) and processes (non-funding but areas key for GPE's strategy), such as:

- Grant-funded program or project completion reports
- Country-level evaluations
- Strategic evaluations and reviews
- Process evaluations
- Periodic comprehensive review of GPE

Roles and Responsibilities

The policy will outline the roles and responsibilities of all GPE stakeholders to participate in and learn from monitoring and evaluation and to use the information to improve their contributions to GPE's work, whether it is through financing, policy design, program design and implementation, monitoring, or decisions regarding GPE. It will also define the commitment expected of all partners to provide relevant data and evidence.

 Roles and responsibilities in MEL defined for:

- The Board and its Committees
- Partner Governments

---

[11] Annex A outlines the criteria for determining the evaluation workprogram

- Local Education Groups
- Partner Organizations
- GPE management
- GPE staff
- GPE's Results and Performance Team

References: GEF, GAVI, Global Fund, UNICEF, International Organization for Migration; World Bank; other organizations to be consulted.

- GEF
- GAVI
- Global Fund
- UNICEF
- International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Annex D: Early Draft Results Framework

(For Reference Only)

Contents of Annex D:

1. **Background**
2. **Principles Guiding the Results Framework (RF) 2025**
3. **Early Draft Results Framework**
4. **Approach to Complex Areas of Measurement**
5. **Cross walk – GPE 2020 RF and rationale behind retaining, modifying, or dropping indicators**

1. **Background**

The Board in June 2020 agreed to GPE 2025 Goal, Objectives, and Priority Areas (BOD/2020/06-07— Strategic Plan**)**

> **Goal:** To accelerate access, learning outcomes and gender equality through equitable, inclusive and resilient education systems fit for the 21st century
>
> **Priority areas: PA1:** Learning and early learning; **PA2:** Access (12 years of basic education[12] + 1 year of pre-primary); **PA3:** Gender Equality and inclusion; **PA4:** Quality teaching; **PA5:** Strong organizational capacity; **PA6:** Equity, efficiency, and volume of domestic finance
>
> **Objectives: CLO1:** Strengthen gender-responsive planning, policy development for system-wide impact; **CLO2:** Mobilize coordinated action and financing to enable transformative change; **CLO3:** Strengthen capacity, adapt and learn, to implement and drive results at scale; **EO:** Mobilize global and national partners and resources for sustainable results

The Board requested the Secretariat to develop a measurement strategy (BOD/2020/06-07) – **"**develop a measurement strategy either through indicators or a set of evaluations to align with these (or other) priorities."

2. **Principles Guiding RF 2025**

---

[12] (a) primary education (b) lower-secondary education and (c) upper-secondary

In addition to the ISE recommendation to develop a more complex-aware results framework with fewer, more actionable indicators, the Secretariat's review of the efficiency of indicator data collection and reporting and the usefulness of the indicators also reveals the following issues that need to be addressed:

- Limited utility of some outcome and impact-level annual milestones. The UIS indicators are useful for monitoring of certain goal-level indicators in GPE countries, but the utility of the annual milestones is limited. The data tend to be lagged by two years, and movement on these indicators is generally subject to long-term country-level dynamics. Fluctuations around annual targets do not necessarily lead to useful decisions at the Partnership level, and country-by-country analysis is required to understand the dynamics of the sector and how outcomes and impacts, such as improved trained teacher ratios and student learning, can be addressed.
- Benefits of some indicators limited relative to their costs. The specific GPE-generated indicators can be useful for monitoring and guiding Board and Secretariat actions, as they generally pertain directly to actions the Partnership can take. However, the costs of collecting data for several indicators are high relative to their utility for decision-making and learning.   Several indicators are embedded within GPE processes, yet the data and information for these are neither generated nor used at the right levels.
- Indicators missing on key links in GPE's implicit country-level theory of change. The results framework is missing indicators on key aspects of GPE's country-level theory of change, such as progress on sector plan implementation, education service delivery (e.g., teachers and teaching quality), the functioning of Local Education Groups and donor alignment with education sector plans.
- Numerous indicators, some not strategically meaningful. The current GPE results framework includes 37 indicators, with some information that is duplicative and other that is Secretariat workprogram delivery oriented and not strategically meaningful for the Partnership for driving change

The Purposes of the RF going forward are for accountability and to support learning, decisions, and actions. The principles of the design noted below are based on the lessons of the GPE2020 results framework and a review of other agencies' approaches and are as follows:

- o **Accountability and Learning focus – in addition to accountability, reinforce the principle of usable data for decision-making and action**. The RF is, first, for Board and Committee-level decision making (with granular data/information generated used at different levels of the partnership for other stakeholders)

- o **Integration across monitoring and evaluation streams (through the operational model)** - An integrated results framework that draws on standard education sector indicators from UIS, GPE quantitative data, and more contextual analysis based on diagnostics and evaluations expected through GPE's new operational model and the Secretariat's workprogram. The RF thus will draw on review/diagnostic, and evaluation information for the complex areas of GPE priorities

- o **Indicators on GPE fund and processes vs. the sector/country**– Clearer delineation between monitoring results at sector/country level and monitoring results that are more directly influenced by or expected from GPE funds and processes.

- The proposed indicators identified for country-level objectives will fall into two categories. First, GPE lever indicators, which express the results achieved by GPE funding and non-funding direct support. Second, sector progress indicators, which are selected to show progress in the corresponding area for the sector as a whole.

- **Actionable and achievable milestones and targets** for direct outcomes and outputs of GPE funds-supported interventions and GPE partnership processes, but not for country- or sector-level outcomes that are subject to numerous factors intrinsic to each country. For the latter, the proposal is to monitor and analyze trends only. (See information on an internal review of other organizations' approaches to setting milestones and targets for outcome/impact level indicators.[13])

- **Distinguish RF indicators from Secretariat operations indicators.** The current set of indicators includes outputs of Secretariat's workprogram (e.g., production of technical products and number of events), which would be more usefully reported against an annual workprogram.

- **Menu of GPE project-level indicators:** The Secretariat will explore developing a menu of core indicators related to the priority areas at the GPE project level, for implementation grants to select into their results framework. The Secretariat will also explore efficient, meaningful ways to standardize corporate-level monitoring of grant performance

- **Capture the "missing middle"** – capture information on implementation progress and mutual accountability – both important country-level processes essential to achieve results

- **Parsimony –** The GPE 2025 RF will have fewer, more targeted and actionable indicators. GPE 2020 RF contained numerous indicators, some for internal accountability purposes only (e.g., number of events held and number of missions addressing domestic financing.) This created a reporting burden and inefficiencies in the use of the Secretariat's time.

- **Disaggregation -** Ensure data are disaggregated by sex and disability **(**and other disaggregations, as applicable and available), and that all reviews and evaluations incorporate a **gender and inclusion lens** to their approach (the operating model will incentivize and support data, if information on key variables is not available).

- **Secondary data** – Use of SDG indicators for goal-level sector monitoring

3. **Early Draft Results Framework**

Table 1 presents a preliminary list of indicators for the 2025 RF. This constitutes a long list, and indicator options are also sometimes presented. In the next few months, the Secretariat will sharpen and shorten the RF further. Table 2 (at the end of Annex D) shows a cross-walk between the 2020 RF and proposed 2025 RF, including a rationale for retaining, modifying, or dropping 2020 RF indicators.

---

[13] A review of benchmark and some other development organizations' results framework shows that no annual milestones are set for outcomes/impact indicators. Review available from the GPE Secretariat.

Table 1: Proposed indicators for the RF 2025

#	Priority Area	Indicator (all relevant indicators to be disaggregated by FCAC, sex, disability status, and other disaggregation as available/relevant)	Data Sources and Notes
Goal – To accelerate access, learning outcomes and gender equality through equitable, inclusive and resilient education systems fit for the 21st century			
1	PA1: Learning and early learning; PA3: Gender equality and inclusion (gender equality)	SDG 4.1.1: Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex OR Inverse of Learning Poverty (as this indicator takes into account children out of school).	Data source: UIS OR World Bank (for LPI inverse)
2	PA1: Learning and early learning; PA3 Gender equality	SDG 4.2.1: Proportion of children aged 24-59 months who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex	Data source: UIS
3	PA2 : Access; PA3: Gender equality and inclusion	SDG 4.2.2: Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex	Data source: UIS
4	PA2: Access; PA3: Gender equality and inclusion	SDG 4.1.2: Completion rate of: (a) primary education; (b) lower-secondary education; (c) upper-secondary education by sex, location, and wealth quintile	Data source: UIS
5	PA5: Strong organizational capacity; PA3: Gender Equality and inclusion	**Data** Proportion of countries with: (a) learning assessment systems; and (b) education management information systems that meet quality standards	Data source: GPE Secretariat compilation of existing assessments. Quality standards to include sex-disaggregated learning data and availability of disability-disaggregated data in EMIS
6	PA5: Strong organizational capacity	(i) (a) Cumulative number of countries that conduct system diagnostics of the quality of management practices in school; and (b) Proportion of countries that show improvement from baseline in the quality of management practices in schools OR	Data sources: Secretariat compilation based on Development World Management Survey (part of the WB education policy dashboard), or SABER Service Delivery Instrument's modules on "[School]

		(ii) Proportion of countries rated "satisfactory" or above on sector management capacity based on a self-administered assessment using a simplified SABER approach	Governance, management, finance", 'School information", 'Teacher and principal roster' etc. Secretariat compilation of countries' self-assessments
7	PA4: Quality teaching	SDG 4.c.2: Pupil-trained teacher ratio in: (a) primary education; (b) lower-secondary education; (c) upper-secondary education	Data source: UIS (three-year moving average to be used)
8	PA4: Quality teaching	Cumulative number of countries that: (a) conduct system diagnostics on teaching quality and classroom practice; (b) Proportion of countries show improvement from baseline in their system diagnostics on classroom practice	Data sources: Use/adapt existing system diagnostic (e.g., WB TEACH part of the WB education policy dashboard; 17 countries planned by end 2020 with sample expected to grow significantly in 2021—for follow up with WB team) Potential to complement this data with data from assessments of teacher policies (e.g. SABER) Assessment of other tools/approaches under consideration
**Country-level objective 1 (CLO1) – Strengthen gender-responsive planning, policy development for system-wide impact**
9	PA3: Gender equality and inclusion	**Sector progress indicator:** Proportion of countries that successfully implement strategies to address gender and inclusion barriers (as identified through gender and inclusion assessments) . . . . **GPE levers indicators** (i) Proportion of System Capacity Grant annual work plans successfully implemented – *"gender responsive planning " activities* (ii) Proportion of countries that implement [GPE allocation-linked] policy reforms in "gender responsive *sector planning and monitoring"* identified in their mutual accountability compact	Data sources: Secretariat compilation of country-led evaluations to assess implementation of gender equality and inclusion strategies Potential to use/adapt the AGEE indicator framework to develop minimum standards for country-led evaluations . . . . GPE Secretariat. Implementation of policy reform to be assessed based on whether corresponding allocation "top-up" is accessed
**Country-level objective 2 (CLO2) – Mobilize coordinated action and financing to enable transformative change**

10	PA5: Strong organizational capacity	**Sector progress indicator:** Proportion of countries where Partnership coordination is effective ・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ **GPE levers indicators:** (i) Proportion of System Capacity Grant annual work plans successfully implemented – *"mobilize coordinated action" activities* (ii) Proportion of countries that implement [GPE allocation-linked] policy reforms in *"sector capacity and coordination"* identified in their mutual accountability compact	Data sources: GPE Secretariat compilation based on country-led assessments of Partnership coordination [indicator used for self-assessment to be develop assessment standards] ・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ GPE Secretariat. Implementation of policy reform to be assessed based on whether corresponding allocation "top-up" is accessed
11	PA6: Equity, efficiency, and volume of domestic finance	**Sector progress indicators:** (i) *Volume of domestic finance:* Government expenditure on education as a percentage of total government expenditure (including debt service) (ii) *Equity of domestic finance:* Proportion of household income of the lowest wealth quintile spent on out-of-pocket expenditure on education (iii) *Efficiency of domestic public finance:* Proportion of countries achieving at least xx% efficiency in generating learning adjusted efficiency using domestic public finance [Note: based the frontier for efficiency in generating learning adjusted schooling using efficiency analysis] OR (iii) Ratio of number of children achieving minimum learning standards at (i) end of primary (ii) end of lower secondary to (i) number of children completing primary (ii) number of children completing lower secondary ・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ **GPE levers indicators:** (i) Proportion of System Capacity Grant annual work plans successfully implemented – *"mobilize coordinated financing" activities* (ii) Proportion of countries that implement [GPE allocation-linked] policy reforms in "*equity, efficiency, and volume of domestic finance"* identified in the Compact	Data sources: UIS Household surveys GPE Secretariat based on learning adjusted years of schooling data (World Bank) data on per-pupil public expenditure (UIS) ・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・・ GPE Secretariat. Implementation of policy reform to be assessed based on whether corresponding allocation "top-up" is accessed

12	PA6: Equity, efficiency, and volume of domestic finance	**Sector progress indicator:** Proportion of countries where at least 50% of donor funding is harmonized and aligned to national systems · **GPE levers indicator:** Proportion of GPE grant funding aligned to national systems	Data sources: GPE Secretariat compilation of self-reporting by countries (could also be included in the Compact – tbd). For non-GPE Fund donor funding, potential simple measures could include: (a) Harmonization: disbursed into a sector pooled fund or co-financed with other partners and (b) Alignment: provided as budget support GPE Secretariat
	Country-level Objective 3 (CLO3) – Strengthen capacity, adapt and learn, to implement and drive results at scale		
13	All priority areas	**Sector progress indicators:** Proportion of countries where sector plan/policy implementation is on-track to meet its objectives [The Secretariat will explore whether it is feasible to integrate the notion of system transformation and innovation at sector level in the RF.] · **GPE levers indicators:** (i) Proportion of System Capacity Grant annual work plans successfully implemented – *"strengthen capacity, adapt and learn for results at scale" activities and meet their objectives* (ii) Proportion of closed System Transformation Grants that met their objectives, disaggregated by priority areas: **PA1:** Learning and early learning **PA2:** Access **PA3:** Gender Equality and inclusion **PA4:** Quality teaching **PA5:** Strong organizational capacity **PA6:** Equity, efficiency, and volume of domestic finance	Data sources: GPE Secretariat compilation based on country-led assessments of plan/policy implementation Internal consultations TBC on 'on-track' vs. 'at completion' + whether to also include a measure of adequacy of sector monitoring/adaptive management. · GPE Secretariat
	Enabling objective (EO) – Mobilize global and national partners and resources for sustainable results		
14	All priority areas	Proportion of donor pledges fulfilled	Data source: GPE Secretariat
15	All priority areas	Proportion of (Secretariat-led) strategic evaluations of which findings and recommendations are discussed with governing bodies and agreed follow-up actions implemented on schedule	Data source: GPE Secretariat, per strategic evaluations planned in the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Framework

16	All priority areas	Proportion of GPE-funded strategic capabilities that meet their objectives (including KIX and EOL)	Data source: GPE Secretariat
17	PA1: Learning and early learning; PA3: Gender Equality and inclusion; PA4: Quality teaching	Number of countries where KIX supported knowledge sharing, and research was documented and used in plan/policy development and implementation	Data source: KIX grant agent (indicator extracted from KIX RF)
18	All priority areas	Number of countries where civil society in EOL funded projects has influenced education planning, policy dialogue and monitoring	Data source: EOL grant agent (indicator extracted from EOL RF)

4. Approach to complex areas of measurement

The complex areas of measurement in GPE's goals include:

PA3: Gender Equality and inclusion

PA4: Quality teaching

PA5: Strong organizational capacity

These areas do not currently have standard global indicators with readily available data. The measurement in these areas will therefore be based on the reviews and/or diagnostics which countries could conduct (or have available) as part of their system capacity or implementation grants. In addition, a variety of global assessment/diagnostic instruments already exist in these three areas, but vary greatly in their country coverage, periodicity, and technical focus. The following steps will help determine which review/diagnostic approaches could be used for the purposes of the GPE 2025 results framework and reporting:

1. Identify approaches and measurements that have been utilized across countries with established methodologies;

2. The cost of implementing the approach;

3. Whether information from the approaches has been used to establish baselines and assess progress;

4. Whether information from the approaches is used in countries' or development agencies results framework or otherwise reported for communicating countries' status in some comparable way;

5. The pros and cons of each approach, including for tracking improvements and results.

Since selection of the diagnostic approaches will be determined through the GPE operating model and the lens of the EPR principles, the determination of how the information will be used in the results framework and for results analysis and reporting will be based on factors 2 to 5.

Table 2: Cross Walk - GPE 2020 RF and GPE 2025: Rationale for Proposals for Retaining, Modifying, or Dropping indicators

GPE 2020		GPE 2025 - Proposed		
Indicator	Area of measurement	Indicator (kept/modified/removed)	Area of measurement	Notes (why kept/modified/removed)
Indicator 1[14]: Proportion of developing country partners (DCPs) showing improvement on learning outcomes (basic education)	**Goal 1 (Impact)**: Learning	**Modified:** SDG 4.1.1. Proportion of children and young people: (a) in grades 2/3; (b) at the end of primary; and (c) at the end of lower secondary achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex. OR Inverse of Learning Poverty (as this indicator takes into account children out of school).	**Goals:** Learning and early learning, Gender equality and inclusion	SDG 4.1.1 data published by UIS, were not available in 2015 when the current indicator was adopted. The new indicator can provide a more powerful message such as '(only) xx percent of children in GPE DCPs are learning at a level appropriate for their age group'
Indicator 2[15]: Percentage of children under five (5) years of age who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning, and psychosocial well-being	**Goal 1 (Impact)**: Learning	**Modified:** SDG 4.2.1: Proportion of children aged 24-59 months who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex.	**Goals:** Learning and early learning, Gender equality and inclusion	SDG 4.2.1 data published by UIS were not available in 2015 when the current indicator was adopted. SDG 4.2.1 indicator offers significantly expanded data coverage by drawing on data sources other than the MICS ECDI, including the UNICEF WCARO prototype, the East Asia and Pacific Child Development Scales, the Early Development Index, MELQO, IDELA, and the Early Human Capital Index.
Indicator 3[16]: Number of equivalent children in	**Goal 2 (Impact):**	**Removed**		Milestones and targets were calculated based on the annual

---

[14] The methodology sheet for indicator 1 can be found here. The review of indicator 1 can be found here.

[15] The methodology sheet for indicator 2 can be found here. The review of indicator 2 can be found here.

[16] The methodology sheet for indicator 3 can be found here. The review of indicator 3 can be found here.

basic education (primary and lower-secondary levels) supported annually by the Global Partnership	Equity, gender equality, and inclusion			grant (ESPIG) pipeline projections, which were based on the replenishment 2014 outcome, and the projected unit costs at the DCP level until 2018.
Indicator 4[17]: Proportion of children who complete: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	**Goal 2 (Impact):** Equity, gender equality, and inclusion	**Modified:** SDG 4.1.2: Completion rate of: (a) primary education; (b) lower-secondary education; and (c) upper-secondary education by sex, location, and wealth quintile.	**Goals:** Access , Gender equality and inclusion	Key priority areas for GPE 2025 include access (12 years plus at least 1 year of pre-primary education) hence the new indicator also includes upper secondary education.
Indicator 5[18]: Proportion of GPE DCPs within set thresholds for gender parity index of completion rates for: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	**Goal 2 (Impact):** Equity, gender equality, and inclusion	**Removed** or **Modified:** 1) Cumulative number of countries that conduct baseline system assessments on gender equality and inclusion and incorporate strategies to address gender barriers in their sector plans or policies 2) Results framework indicators disaggregated by gender	**Country-level Objective 1:** Strengthen gender-responsive planning, policy development for system-wide impact **Goal:** Gender equality, equity and inclusion	2020 Indicator conveys similar information as indicator 4.
Indicator 6[19]: Pre-primary gross enrolment ratio	**Goal 2 (Impact):** Equity, gender equality, and inclusion	**Modified:** SDG 4.2.2: Participation rate in organized learning (one year before the official primary entry age), by sex	**Goals:** Access , Gender equality and inclusion	Key priority areas for GPE 2025 include access (12 years plus at least 1 year of pre-primary education).

---

[17] The methodology sheet for indicator 4 can be found here. The review of indicator 4 can be found here.
[18] The methodology sheet for indicator 5 can be found here. The review of indicator 5 can be found here.
[19] The methodology sheet for indicator 6 can be found here. The review of indicator 6 can be found here.

Indicator 7[20]: Out-of-school rate for: (a) children of primary school age; (b) children of lower secondary school age	**Goal 2 (Impact):** Equity, gender equality, and inclusion	**Removed**		SDG 4.1.1 already takes into account out-of-school children.
Indicator 8[21]: Gender parity index of out-of-school rate for: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education	**Goal 2 (Impact):** Equity, gender equality, and inclusion	**Removed**		SDG 4.1.1 data are disaggregated by sex, and LPI already takes into account out-of-school children (disaggregated by sex)
Indicator 9[22]: Equity index	**Goal 2 (Impact):** Equity, gender equality, and inclusion	**Removed**		Annual changes in the indicator may not accurately reflect real changes in parity indices in DCPs. Limited data availability.
Indicator 10[23]: Proportion of DCPs that have (a) increased their public expenditure on education; or (b) maintained sector spending at 20% or above	**Goal 3 (Outcome):** Effective and efficient education systems	**Modified:** (i) Government expenditure on education as a percentage of total government expenditure (Including debt-service in total public expenditure.) (ii) Equity of financing: Proportion of household income of the lowest wealth quintile spent on out-of-pocket expenditure on education	**Country level objective 2:** Mobilize coordinated action and financing to enable transformative change	The indicator is a proxy for government commitment to education. The 1st proposed indicator will more directly express the volume of domestic finance devoted to education. The 2nd proposed indicator will capture the equity in financing.

---

[20] The methodology sheet for indicator 7 can be found here. The review of indicator 7 can be found here.

[21] The methodology sheet for indicator 8 can be found here. The review of indicator 8 can be found here.

[22] The methodology sheet for indicator 9 can be found here. The review of indicator 9 can be found here.

[23] The methodology sheet for indicator 10 can be found here. The review of indicator 10 can be found here.

Indicator 11[24]: Equitable allocation of teachers, as measured by the relationship (R2) between the number of teachers and the number of pupils per school in each DCP	**Goal 3 (Outcome):** Effective and efficient education systems	**Removed**		In the current indicator, the reference to 'equitable allocation of teachers' and the goodness of fit of a regression of the number of teachers on the number of pupils per school is not a valid measure of equitable allocation. In addition, small sample size and long data lags can lead to invalid interpretations of the indicator. Finally, the data availability cannot be aligned to GPE reporting cycle.
Indicator 12[25]: Proportion of DCPs with pupil/trained teacher ratio (PTTR) below threshold (<40) (at the primary level)	**Goal 3 (Outcome):** Effective and efficient education systems	**Modified** **Options**: Number of countries conducting diagnostic on teaching quality, Number of countries meeting or improving on teaching quality, Number of countries improving on PTTR SDG 4.c.2: Pupil-trained teacher ratio in (a) primary education; (b) lower-secondary education; (c) upper-secondary education Cumulative number of countries that: (a) conduct system diagnostics on classroom practice; (b) Proportion of countries show improvement from baseline in their system diagnostics on classroom practice	**Goal:** Quality teaching	Variations in the current indicator are dependent on differences in training standards – countries with lower training standards could have lower PTTRs. Further, progress (or deterioration) in a country's PTTR is not reflected unless it crosses the threshold. This indicator does not capture the quality of teaching or other dimensions of service delivery.

---

[24] The methodology sheet for indicator 11 can be found here. The review of indicator 11 can be found here.
[25] The methodology sheet for indicator 12 can be found here. The review of indicator 12 can be found here.

Indicator 13[26]: Reduction in repetition and dropout, as measured by the internal efficiency coefficient at the primary level in each DCP	**Goal 3 (Outcome):** Effective and efficient education systems	**Modified:** Efficiency of domestic public finance: Proportion of countries achieving at least xx% efficiency in generating learning adjusted efficiency using domestic public finance [Note: based the frontier for efficiency in generating learning adjusted schooling using efficiency analysis] **Options**: Proportion of countries that are doing better than expected in terms of quality education given the cost per child Ratio of number of children achieving minimum learning standards at (i) end of primary (ii) end of lower secondary to (i) number of children completing primary (iii) number of children completing lower secondary.	**Country-level objective 2:** Mobilize coordinated action and financing to enable transformative change	The current indicator is a limited measure of the internal efficiency of an education system. Drop out and repetition are key elements of the internal efficiency of the system in producing graduates, however, there may be other outputs that the system prioritizes. Countries that are above the trend line will be countries that are more efficient (they are doing higher than expected) and below will be countries that are doing less than expected.
Indicator 14[27]: Proportion of DCPs reporting at least 10 out of 12 key international education indicators to UIS (including key outcomes, service delivery, and financing indicators as identified by GPE)	**Goal 3 (Outcome):** Effective and efficient education systems	**Modified:** Proposed indicator to measure the quality of data systems/introduce measurement for gender equality, data systems (including data reporting to UIS), inclusiveness, and so forth (SABER-like assessments as part of diagnostics).	**Goal:** Strong organizational capacity	Since UIS data is based on self-reporting, the current RF indicator does not provide any information on whether the system has the capacity to generate accurate data and it does not measure the efficiency or effectiveness of DCPs' education data systems

---

[26] The methodology sheet for indicator 13 can be found here. The review of indicator 13 can be found here.
[27] The methodology sheet for indicator 14 can be found here. The review of indicator 14 can be found here.

Indicator 15[28]: Proportion of DCPs with a learning assessment system within the basic education cycle that meets quality standards	**Goal 3 (Outcome):** Effective and efficient education systems	**Modified:** Proportion of countries with: (a) learning assessment systems; and (b) education management information systems that meet quality standards	**Goal:** Strong organizational capacity, Gender equality and inclusion	There is a need to strengthen the current indicator to measure the use of learning assessment data to inform policy and practice in DCPs.
Indicator 16a[29]: Proportion of endorsed (a) education sector plans (ESP) or (b) transitional education plans (TEP) meeting quality standards (QSs) Indicator 16.b[30]: Proportion of ESPs/TEPs that have a teaching and learning strategy meeting quality standards Indicator 16.c: Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to respond to marginalized groups that meets quality standards (including gender, disability, and other context-relevant dimensions) Indicator 16.d: Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to improve	**Country level objective 1:** Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation	**Removed**		An ESP can qualify as credible if it meets any five QSs out of seven – implying equal of weight across QSs. There is a need to supplement the current indicator by an additional indicator which assesses the implementation and/or completion of the previous ESPs/TEPs. Avoid aggregating across ESPs and TEPs to compute an 'overall' value and report only the disaggregated values. The sample size for TEP is very small.

---

[28] The methodology sheet for indicator 15 can be found here. The review of indicator 15 can be found here.

[29] The methodology sheet for indicator 16a can be found here. The review of indicator 16a can be found here.

[30] The methodology sheet for indicator 16b-d can be found here (16b, 16c, and 16d). The review of indicator 16b-d can be found here.

efficiency that meets quality standards				
Indicator 17[31]: Proportion of DCPs or States with a data strategy that meets quality standards	**Country level objective 1:** Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation	**Removed**		The new OM will have data requirements captured under CLO 1 This indicator was constructed at the time when the current funding model started (the indicator value has consistently been 100%; therefore, the role this indicator played as a "proof of concept" measure for the funding model data requirement has been fulfilled).
Indicator 18[32]: Proportion of joint sector reviews (JSRs) meeting quality standards	**Country level objective 2:** Support mutual accountability	**Removed**		The current indicator's definition of categorization of JSR of quality has not been clear (some JSRs missed QSs because they missed a standard item) In particular, FCACs generally struggle with meeting three out of five QSs. A small sample of JSRs conducted and assessed.
Indicator 19[33]: Proportion of LEGs with (a) civil society and (b) teacher representation	**Country level objective 2:** Support mutual accountability	**Modified:** Proportion of countries where Partnership coordination is effective (self-assessment indicator to include LEG – methodology to be designed)	**Country-level objective 2:** Mobilize coordinated action and financing to enable	The current indicator's definition of representation is too broad and may be interpreted differently by different Secretariat country leads/education specialists. Improved measurement will be

---

[31] The methodology sheet for indicator 17 can be found here. The review of indicator 17 can be found here.

[32] The methodology sheet for indicator 18 can be found here. The review of indicator 18 can be found here.

[33] The methodology sheet for indicator 19 can be found here. The review of indicator 19 can be found here.

			transformative change	developed for partnership effectiveness.
Indicator 20[34]: Proportion of grants supporting EMIS/learning assessment systems	**Country level objective 3:** GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation	**Modified:** Proportion of countries with: (a) learning assessment systems; and (b) education management information systems that meet quality standards	**Goal:** Strong organizational capacity	Accuracy of coding was limited. Precision relied heavily on the quality of the documentation.
Indicator 21[35]: Proportion of textbooks purchased and distributed through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants	**Country level objective 3:** GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation	**Removed**		This indicator only provides information on whether the outputs produced by GPE grants meet certain pre-determined targets, rather than efficiency or effectiveness. The assessment will shift to assessing priority objectives.
Indicator 22[36]: Proportion of teachers trained through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants	**Country level objective 3:** GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation	**Removed**		This indicator only provides information on whether the outputs produced by GPE grants meet certain pre-determined targets, rather than efficiency or effectiveness. The emphasis will shift to assessing priority objectives.
Indicator 23[37]: Proportion of classrooms built or rehabilitated through GPE grants, out of the total planned by GPE grants	**Country level objective 3:** GPE financing efficiently and effectively	**Removed**		This indicator only provides information on whether the outputs produced by GPE grants meet certain pre-determined targets, rather than efficiency or

---

[34] The methodology sheet for indicator 20 can be found here. The review of indicator 20 can be found here.
[35] The methodology sheet for indicator 21 can be found here. The review of indicator 21 can be found here.
[36] The methodology sheet for indicator 21 can be found here. The review of indicator 21 can be found here.
[37] The methodology sheet for indicator 23 can be found here. The review of indicator 23 can be found here.

	supports the implementation			effectiveness. The emphasis will shift to assessing priority objectives. Insufficient information to assess self-reporting from GA on number of classrooms built or rehabilitated yearly
Indicator 24[38]: 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	**Country level objective 3:** GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation	**Removed**		The operational usefulness of indicator 24(a) proves to be limited, due to the implementation of the 2015 funding model and thus, by design, widespread use of VP indicators. The new MEL framework intends to shift the focus toward measuring grant accomplishments in priority areas.
Indicator 25[39]: Proportion of GPE program grants assessed as on-track with implementation	**Country level objective 3:** GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation	**Modified:** Proportion of countries where sector plan/policy implementation is on-track to meet its objectives Proportion of closed System Transformation Grants that met their objectives, disaggregated by priority areas	**Country-level objective 3:** Strengthen capacity, adapt and learn, to implement and drive results at scale	Currently there is no Indicator on achievement of grants objectives.
Indicator 26[40]: Funding to GPE from nontraditional	**Global level Objective 4:**	**Removed**		Indicator is no longer relevant.

---

[38] The methodology sheet for indicator 24 can be found here. The review of indicator 24 can be found here.
[39] The methodology sheet for indicator 25 can be found here. The review of indicator 25 can be found here.
[40] The methodology sheet for indicator 26 can be found here. The review of indicator 26 can be found here.

donors (private sector and those who are first-time donors to GPE)	Mobilize more and better financing			Data from this indicator suggests that donor categories are not mutually exclusive.
Indicator 27[41]: Percentage of donor pledges fulfilled	**Global level Objective 4:** Mobilize more and better financing	**Modified:** Proportion of donor pledges fulfilled	**Enabling objective:** Mobilize global and national partners and resources for sustainable results	Calculate the actual amount contributed against the amount pledged at replenishment before the contribution agreement. Previous indicator measured fulfillment of donor commitments made in contribution agreements – likely to be 100% always.
Indicator 28[42]: Proportion of GPE donors that have (a) increased their funding for education; or (b) maintained their funding	**Global level Objective 4:** Mobilize more and better financing	**Removed**		Indicator is no longer relevant. It measures the proportion of GPE donors that have increased or maintained their funding for all levels of education.
Indicator 29[43]: Proportion of GPE grants aligned to national systems	**Global level Objective 4:** Mobilize more and better financing	**Kept**	**Country-level objective 2:** Mobilize coordinated action and financing to enable transformative change	n/a
Indicator 30[44]: Proportion of GPE grants using: (a) co-financed project or (b)	**Global level Objective 4:** Mobilize more	**Modified:** Proportion of GPE grants aligned to national systems	**Country-level objective 2:** Mobilize	For non-GPE Fund donor funding, potential simple measures could include: (a) *Harmonization*:

[41] The methodology sheet for indicator 27 can be found here. The review of indicator 27 can be found here.

[42] The methodology sheet for indicator 28 can be found here. The review of indicator 28 can be found here.

[43] The methodology sheet for indicator 29 can be found here. The review of indicator 29 can be found here.

[44] The methodology sheet for indicator 30 can be found here. The review of indicator 30 can be found here.

sector pooled funding mechanisms	and better financing	Proportion of countries where at least 50% of donor funding is harmonized and aligned to national systems [Methodology TBD]	coordinated action and financing to enable transformative change	disbursed into a sector pooled fund or co-financed with other partners and (b) *Alignment*: provided as budget support.
Indicator 31[45]: Proportion of country missions addressing domestic financing issues	**Global level Objective 4:** Mobilize more and better financing	**Removed**		Cost-benefit trade-off unfeasible due to imprecision of the data obtained.
Indicator 32[46]: Proportion of (a) DCPs and (b) other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities in GPE country processes	**Global level Objective 5:** Build a stronger partnership	**Removed**		The sense of precision that the indicator imparts is not supported by the underlying data and methodology. Sample size has been very small.
Indicator 33[47]: Number of policy, technical and/or other knowledge products developed and disseminated with funding or support from GPE	**Global level Objective 5:** Build a stronger partnership	**Modified:** *From the KIX RF:* Number of countries where KIX supported knowledge sharing, and research was documented and used in ESP development and implementation.	**Enabling objective:** Mobilize global and national partners and resources for sustainable results	The current RF indicator only monitors the number of knowledge products disseminated and does not measure to what extent these products reach their potential audience and the utility of the products at the country level. Could be monitored as part of the GPE's workprogram.
Indicator 34[48]: Number of advocacy events	**Global level Objective 5:**	**Modified:** *From the EOL RF:* Number of countries where civil society in EOL	**Enabling objective:**	The utility of the current RF indicator data is limited as it only

---

[45] The methodology sheet for indicator 31 can be found here. The review of indicator 31 can be found here.
[46] The methodology sheet for indicator 32 can be found here. The review of indicator 32 can be found here.
[47] The methodology sheet for indicator 33 can be found here. The review of indicator 33 can be found here.
[48] The methodology sheet for indicator 34 can be found here. The review of indicator 34 can be found here.

undertaken with partners and other external stakeholders to support the achievement of GPE's strategic goals and objectives	Build a stronger partnership	funded projects has influenced education planning, policy dialogue and monitoring	Mobilize global and national partners and resources for sustainable results	tracks the number of events, not their quality or impact. Could be monitored as part of GPE's workprogram.
Indicator 35[49]: Proportion of significant issues identified through audit reviews satisfactorily addressed	**Global level Objective 5:** Build a stronger partnership	**Removed**		The usefulness of the indicator is limited as it does not directly measure the nature of the issue, and is operationally mechanistic. Such analysis of audit data could be instead reported to FRC.
Indicator 36[50]: Proportion of GPE Secretariat staff time spent on country facing functions	**Global level Objective 5:** Build a stronger partnership	**Removed**		Potential misclassifications of some organizational functions and potential inaccuracies in the way staff record their time.
Indicator 37[51]: Proportion of results reports, and evaluation reports published against set targets	**Global level Objective 5:** Build a stronger partnership	**Modified:** Proportion of strategic evaluations of which findings and recommendations are discussed with governing bodies and agreed follow-up actions implemented on schedule	**Enabling objective:** Mobilize global and national partners and resources for sustainable results	Building a stronger partnership must include learning from evidence and implementing changes based on evidence. The new indicator measures the uptake of recommendations from evaluation reports.

---

[49] The methodology sheet for indicator 35 can be found here. The review of indicator 35 can be found here.
[50] The methodology sheet for indicator 36 can be found here. The review of indicator 36 can be found here.
[51] The methodology sheet for indicator 37 can be found here. The review of indicator 37 can be found here.