



<p><b>14. Number of key education indicators reported to UIS (out of 12 key indicators):</b> Count of number of key indicators reported to UIS for at least one of the two most recent years with available data.</p> <p><i>Interpretation: A higher number of key education indicators reported to UIS reflects PC's commitments to improved availability, quality and timeliness of data production. Availability of data in the UIS database serves as a proxy to capture thematic coverage and the quality of the data collected at country level.</i></p> <p><b>Source:</b> UNESCO Institute for Statistics</p>	11 out of 12 key indicators reported to UIS  (2013/12)	9 out of 12 key indicators reported to UIS  (2017/18)	8 out of 12 key indicators reported to UIS  33 percent reported at least 10 key indicators  (N= 33, 2017/18)	7 out of 12 key indicators reported to UIS  33 percent reported at least 10 key indicators  (N= 61, 2017/18)	At least 10 key indicators reported to UIS
<p><b>15. Status of Learning Assessment System (LAS):</b> For a LAS to meet quality standards, it must have a national examination and a large-scale assessment classified as 'Established' using GPE quality standards.</p> <p><i>Interpretation: A value of 'Established' suggests that the PC has in place robust learning assessment systems to monitor progress in learning outcomes and promote evidence-based policy-making. Information on PCs with non-established learning assessment systems, on the other hand, helps identify areas where systemic change is essential for GPE to better support countries in the strengthening of such systems.</i></p> <p><b>Source:</b> UIS Learning Assessment Catalogue, UIS Central Data Catalogue, UNESCO, World Bank, Ministries of Education.</p>	LAS No Information  (2011-2015)	LAS Established  (2019- 2020)	56% have an established LAS  (N= 32, 2019-2020)	48% have an established LAS  (N= 60, 2019-2020)	Established
<p><b>16a. Quality of Education Sector Plan:</b> Number of quality standards met by Education Sector Plan (ESP) or transitional education plan (TEP).</p> <p><i>Interpretation: A high value suggests that the PC has developed quality evidence-based education sector plans that provide relevant and credible strategies to improve access and learning.</i></p> <p><b>Source:</b> ESP/TEP assessed using Quality Standards developed by UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning and GPE.</p>	n/a  (2014-2015)	6 out of 7 quality standards met  ESP  (2019-2020)	6 out of 7 quality standards met for 20 ESPs  18 out of 20 ESPs met at least 5 quality standards  (2019-2020)	5 out of 5 quality standards met for 2 TEPs / 6 out of 7 quality standards met 20 ESPs  20 out of 22 ESP/TEPs met the minimum quality standards  (2019-2020)	At least 5 quality standards met out 7 (ESP)  At least 3 quality standards met out 5 (TEP)
<p><b>16b. Quality of the teaching and learning strategy in the Education Sector Plan:</b> Number of quality standards met by a teaching and learning strategy in an ESP or TEP.</p> <p><i>Interpretation: A high value suggests that the PC has developed quality strategies aimed at improving teaching and learning. Strategies that meet quality standards increase the likeliness of their effective implementation, and their transformational effect in the education sector.</i></p> <p><b>Source:</b> ESP/TEP assessed using Quality Standards developed by UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning and GPE.</p>	n/a  (2014-2015)	5 out of 5 quality standards met  ESP  (2019-2020)	4 out of 5 quality standards met for 20 ESPs  16 out of 20 ESPs met at least 4 quality standards  (2019-2020)	4 out of 5 quality standards met for 2 TEPs / 4 out of 5 quality standards met for 20 ESPs  17 out of 22 ESP/TEPs met at least 4 quality standards  (2019-2020)	At least 4 quality standards met out of 5 (ESP/TEP)
<p><b>16c. Quality of the strategy to respond to marginalized groups in the Education Sector Plan:</b> Number of quality standards met by a strategy to respond to marginalized groups in an ESP or TEP.</p> <p><i>Interpretation: A high value suggests that the PC has developed quality strategies aimed at improving equity. Strategies that meet quality standards increase the likeliness of their effective implementation, and their transformational effect in the education sector.</i></p> <p><b>Source:</b> ESP/TEP assessed using Quality Standards developed by UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning and GPE.</p>	n/a  (2014-2015)	5 out of 5 quality standards met  ESP  (2019-2020)	4 out of 5 quality standards met for 20 ESPs  15 out of 20 ESPs met at least 4 quality standards  (2019-2020)	5 out of 5 quality standards met for 2 TEPs / 4 out of 5 quality standards met for 20 ESPs  17 out of 22 ESP/TEPs met at least 4 quality standards  (2019-2020)	At least 4 quality standards met out of 5 (ESP/TEP)
<p><b>16d. Quality of the strategy to improve efficiency in the Education Sector Plan:</b> Number of quality standards met by a strategy to improve efficiency in an ESP or TEP.</p> <p><i>Interpretation: A high value suggests that the PC has developed quality strategies aimed at improving system efficiency. Strategies that meet quality standards increase the likeliness of their effective implementation, and their transformational effect in the education sector.</i></p> <p><b>Source:</b> ESP/TEP assessed using Quality Standards developed by UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning and GPE.</p>	n/a  (2014-2015)	5 out of 5 quality standards met  ESP  (2019-2020)	4 out of 5 quality standards met for 20 ESPs  15 out of 20 ESPs met at least 4 quality standards  (2019-2020)	5 out of 5 quality standards met for 2 TEPs / 4 out of 5 quality standards met for 20 ESPs  17 out of 22 ESP/TEPs met at least 4 quality standards  (2019-2020)	At least 4 quality standards met out of 5 (ESP/TEP)

<p><b>17. PCs or States with a data strategy that meets quality standards: A “data strategy” to be qualified as “meeting quality standards” should be outlined in the form of an action plan to improve the data availability, quality, and utilization for strengthening evidence-based policy- making and sector monitoring in education.</b></p> <p><i>Interpretation: Results approaching 100% indicate that the PCs successfully applying for an education sector implementation program grant report and identified data gaps have in place a clear plan to address data deficiencies moving forward and be able to produce reliable education and financial data for improved education planning and management.</i></p> <p><i>Source: A desk-based assessment of Data/ EMIS diagnosis documents carried out by the GPE Secretariat.</i></p>	n/a	100%	100%	100%	n/a
<p><b>18. Number of quality standards met by the Joint Sector Review (JSR):</b> JSRs are defined as any joint periodic assessment of mutual progress in implementation performance through existing country-level mechanisms. Quality of JSRs are assessed by the five quality standards.</p> <p><i>Interpretation: A high value suggests the PC is conducting, an effective JSR which is participatory, evidence-based and comprehensive, and serves as monitoring tool and instrument for change.</i></p> <p><i>Source: A desk-based assessment of JSR documents carried out by the GPE Secretariat.</i></p>	n/a	n/a	3 quality standards met  3 out of 3 JSRs met at least 3 quality standards	4 quality standards met  7 out of 8 JSRs met at least 3 quality standards	At least 3 quality standards met out of 5
<p><b>19. Effective and inclusive sector dialogue as assessed by representation of (a) civil society and (b) teachers’ organizations in the Local Education Group (LEG)</b></p> <p><i>Interpretation: Representation of civil society and teacher organizations suggests that they are engaged in evidence-based policy dialogue and sector monitoring on equity and learning, leveraging social accountability to ultimately enhance the delivery of results. CSOs and TO are key education sector stakeholders.</i></p> <p><i>Source: GPE Secretariat.</i></p>	(CSO)  Represented	(CSO)  Represented	(CSO)  92%	(CSO)  94%	Both CSO and TO are represented
(TO)  Represented	(TO)  Represented	(TO)  67%	(TO)  68%		
<p><b>20. ESPIG support to EMIS/LAS:</b> An active ESPIG that supports either an Education Management Information System (EMIS) or a Learning Assessment System (LAS).</p> <p><i>Interpretation: Allocation of a part of a grant to components related to the strengthening of data management and monitoring data systems suggests a focus on increasing the availability of education sector data to monitor sector outcomes and progress, if such systems are not already in place or funded through an alternate source.</i></p> <p><i>Source: ESPIG Project document.</i></p>	EMIS  n/a	EMIS  n/a	68% of ESPIGs support EMIS	72% of ESPIGs support EMIS	ESPIG supports EMIS or LAS
LAS  n/a	LAS  n/a	86% of ESPIGs support LAS	83% of ESPIGs support LAS		
<p><b>21. Proportion of textbooks purchased and distributed through the ESPIG, out of the total planned by the ESPIG:</b> The proportion of textbooks distributed in the reference FY, out of the total planned to be distributed in that FY.</p> <p><i>Interpretation: Results approaching 100% indicate that textbook-related results are achieved as initially anticipated. This suggests that grants are being implemented in line with the plan for publishing and distributing textbooks, through the funds provided.</i></p> <p><i>Source: GPE Grant Agent.</i></p>	n/a	n/a	162%	108%	n/a
(2016)	(2020)	(N= 3, 2020)	(N= 9, 2020)		
<p><b>22. Proportion of teachers trained through the ESPIG, out of the total planned by the ESPIG:</b> The proportion of teachers trained in the reference FY, out of the total planned to be trained in that FY.</p> <p><i>Interpretation: Results approaching 100% indicate that results regarding the training of teachers are achieved as initially anticipated. This suggests that grants are being implemented in line with the plan for training teachers, through the funds provided.</i></p> <p><i>Source: GPE Grant Agent.</i></p>	0%	n/a	77%	77%	n/a
(2016)	(2020)	(N= 10, 2020)	(N= 25, 2020)		

