Results Framework data for Vanuatu

The table below contains country-level latest available data **(as of July 2021)** from GPE's Results Framework. The table provides data on all country-level indicators of the Results Framework that were produced or compiled by the GPE Secretariat and are not available from other sources such as the UNESCO Institute for Statistics. This data is being shared following a data sharing procedure developed and agreed to by GPE Partners Countries (PCs) through a data-sharing consultation process. The details of the procedure and the consultation process can be found here (https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-results-framework-country-level-data-disclosure).

How to read the data table:
Column 1: Brief definition and interpretation for each indicator.
Column 2: Relevant baseline indicator value as labeled; the year is presented in brackets.
Column 3: Achieved indicator value at target.
Column 4: Average of non- fragile and conflict-affected (Non- PCFC) partner countries
Column 5: Average of all PCs.
Column 6: Suggested threshold for the indicators for which the Secretariat has defined.

Results Summary					
Column 1 **Indicator**	*Column 2* **Baseline (year)**	*Column 3* **Achieved (target)**	*Column 4* **Non- PCFC average**	*Column 5* **Overall average**	*Column 6* **Suggested threshold**
9. Equity index: A composite index consisting of three equally weighted indices measuring parity in lower secondary completion: (1) Gender parity index, (2) Rural/Urban parity index, (3) Wealth (lowest income quintile/highest wealth quintile) parity index. ***Interpretation:*** *The equity index ranges between 0 and 1, 0 reflecting the highest disparities and 1 perfect equality in completion for all groups.* **Source:** *UNESCO Institute for Statistics/Household surveys (WIDE Database)*	no data available (2014)	no data available (2019)	0.62 (2019) 50 percent improved (N= 32, 2010-2019)	0.55 (2019) 53 percent improved (N= 59, 2010-2019)	n/a
10. Public expenditure on education as a percentage of total public expenditure: (i) increased public expenditure on education, as compared with a base year value, or (ii) maintained public expenditure on education at 20% or above. At country-level, total public education expenditure is computed as the sum of (i) expenditure on education by all ministries, (ii) expenditure on education by local government, (iii) employer's contribution to non-salary social benefits (if not charged directly to the education ministry's budget). Next, the share of education spending in total government spending is calculated by dividing total public education expenditure over total public expenditure (excluding debt service), and multiplying by 100. ***Interpretation:*** *This indicator reflects countries' financial commitment to education. The higher the percentage, the greater the progress towards meeting domestic financing objectives.* ***Source*** *: Ministries of Finances, Budget Departments or National Treasuries*	No data available (2015)	No data available (2019) No data available (2020)	20.9% 52 percent at or above 20 % 28 percent increased (N= 29, 2019) 19.7% 46 percent at or above 20 % 31 percent increased (N= 26, 2020)	19.9% 48 percent at or above 20% 28 percent increased (N= 50, 2019) 18.6% 38 percent at or above 20 % 30 percent increased (N= 47, 2020)	At least 20% of public expenditure on education on showing improvement
11. Equitable allocation of teachers, as measured by the relationship (R2) between the number of teachers and the number of pupils per school: The R2 is the statistical relationship between the number of pupils and the number of teachers per primary school. ***Interpretation:*** *The closer to 1 is the value of the R2 (which ranges between 0 and 1), the greater the relationship between the number of students and the number of teachers at the school level. This suggests that, generally, the allocation of teachers in public primary schools is more equitable according to the number of students in each school.* ***Source:*** *Pôle de Dakar database; Education Sector Analysis reports.*	No data available (2010-2014)	No data available (2010-2019)	insufficient data	insufficient data	At least R2 of 0.8 between the number of teachers and the number of pupils per school
13. Repetition and drop out impact on efficiency, as measured by the internal efficiency coefficient (IEC) at the primary level: The ratio between the theoretical number of pupil-years required to produce a number of graduates from a given school-cohort for primary (in the absence of repetition or dropout) and the actual number of pupil-years spent to produce the same number of graduates, where a pupil-year is defined as one year spent by one student in one grade (regardless of whether the pupil is a repeater or will later drop out of the system) ***Interpretation:*** *The IEC ranges from 0 (no students complete a full cycle at the relevant level) to 1 (all students who initially enroll graduate without any repetition or dropout – i.e. perfectly efficient system). Thus, an IEC above 0.7 reflects a high overall level of internal efficiency of the primary education system in producing graduates.* ***Source*** *: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, Education Sector Analysis Reports*	No data available (2010-2014)	No data available (2010-2019)	insufficient data	insufficient data	0.7

14. Number of key education indicators reported to UIS (out of 12 key indicators): Count of number of key indicators reported to UIS for at least one of the two most recent years with available data. ***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.* **Source:** *UNESCO Institute for Statistics*	No data available (2013/12)	No data available (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
15. Status of Learning Assessment System (LAS): 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. ***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.* ***Source:*** *UIS Learning Assessment Catalogue, UIS Central Data Catalogue, UNESCO, World Bank, Ministries of Education.*	No data available (2011-2015)	No data available (2019- 2020)	56% have an established LAS (N= 32, 2019-2020)	48% have an established LAS (N= 60, 2019-2020)	Established
16a. Quality of Education Sector Plan: Number of quality standards met by Education Sector Plan (ESP) or transitional education plan (TEP). ***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.* ***Source:*** *ESP/TEP assessed using Quality Standards developed by UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning and GPE.*	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)
16b. Quality of the teaching and learning strategy in the Education Sector Plan: Number of quality standards met by a teaching and learning strategy in an ESP or TEP. ***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.* ***Source:*** *ESP/TEP assessed using Quality Standards developed by UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning and GPE.*	n/a (2014-2015)	3 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)
16c. Quality of the strategy to respond to marginalized groups in the Education Sector Plan: Number of quality standards met by a strategy to respond to marginalized groups in an ESP or TEP. ***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.* ***Source:*** *ESP/TEP assessed using Quality Standards developed by UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning and GPE.*	n/a (2014-2015)	3 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)
16d. Quality of the strategy to improve efficiency in the Education Sector Plan: Number of quality standards met by a strategy to improve efficiency in an ESP or TEP. ***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.* ***Source:*** *ESP/TEP assessed using Quality Standards developed by UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning and GPE.*	n/a (2014-2015)	3 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)

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. ***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.* ***Source:*** *A desk-based assessment of Data/ EMIS diagnosis documents carried out by the GPE Secretariat.*	n/a (2018)	n/a (2020)	100% (N=3, 2020)	100% (N=5, 2020)	n/a
18. Number of quality standards met by the Joint Sector Review (JSR): 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. ***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.* ***Source:*** *A desk-based assessment of JSR documents carried out by the GPE Secretariat.*	n/a (2015)	n/a (2020)	3 quality standards met 3 out of 3 JSRs met at least 3 quality standards (2020)	4 quality standards met 7 out of 8 JSRs met at least 3 quality standards (2020)	At least 3 quality standards met out of 5
19. Effective and inclusive sector dialogue as assessed by representation of (a) civil society and (b) teachers' organizations in the Local Education Group (LEG) ***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.* ***Source:*** *GPE Secretariat.*	(CSO) n/a (TO) n/a (2016)	(CSO) Represented (TO) Unsure of representation (2020)	(CSO) 92% (TO) 67% (N= 36, 2020)	(CSO) 94% (TO) 68% (N= 71, 2020)	Both CSO and TO are represented
20. ESPIG support to EMIS/LAS: An active ESPIG that supports either an Education Management Information System (EMIS) or a Learning Assessment System (LAS). ***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.* ***Source:*** *ESPIG Project document.*	EMIS n/a LAS n/a (2015)	EMIS n/a LAS n/a (2020)	68% of ESPIGs support EMIS 86% of ESPIGs support LAS (N= 22, 2020)	72% of ESPIGs support EMIS 83% of ESPIGs support LAS (N= 46, 2020)	ESPIG supports EMIS or LAS
21. Proportion of textbooks purchased and distributed through the ESPIG, out of the total planned by the ESPIG: The proportion of textbooks distributed in the reference FY, out of the total planned to be distributed in that FY. ***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.* ***Source:*** *GPE Grant Agent.*	n/a (2016)	n/a (2020)	162% (N= 3, 2020)	108% (N= 9, 2020)	n/a
22. Proportion of teachers trained through the ESPIG, out of the total planned by the ESPIG: The proportion of teachers trained in the reference FY, out of the total planned to be trained in that FY. ***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.* ***Source:*** *GPE Grant Agent.*	n/a (2016)	n/a (2020)	77% (N= 10, 2020)	77% (N= 25, 2020)	n/a

23. Proportion of classrooms constructed through the ESPIG, out of the total planned by the ESPIG: The proportion of classrooms built or rehabilitated in the reference FY, out of the total planned to be built or rehabilitated in that FY. ***Interpretation:*** *Results approaching 100% indicate that classroom-related results are achieved as initially anticipated. This suggests that grants are being implemented in line with the plan for building/rehabilitating classrooms, through the funds provided.* ***Source:*** *GPE Grant Agent.*	n/a (2016)	n/a (2020)	110% (N= 7, 2020)	78% (N= 14, 2020)	n/a
24. Grant performance against Funding Model performance indicators (a) Did the ESPIG identify targets for Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning? (b) Percentage of targets achieved against Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning? ***Interpretation:*** *A high value of Part (b) indicates that the PC is meeting the required achievement levels with respect to the performance-based indicators linked to transformative strategies to improve equity, efficiency, and learning outcomes.* ***Source:*** *ESPIG Application form, GPE Grant Agent.*	(a) n/a (b) n/a (2018)	(a) n/a (b) n/a (2020)	(a) 100% (b) 50% (N= (a) 7 ; (b) 2, 2020)	(a) 100% (b) 67% (N= (a) 14 ; (b) 6, 2020)	n/a
25. ESPIG Implementation status: Active ESPIGs are classified as on track, slightly behind, or delayed based on the GPE Grant Agents' implementation rating. ***Interpretation:*** *A value of on-track suggests that the ESPIG is to a large extent being implemented in an efficient and timely manner. A value of slightly behind or delayed suggests the need to focus on more effective grant implementation.* ***Source:*** *GPE Grant Agent and GPE Secretariat.*	n/a (2017)	n/a (2020)	93% Grants on track or slightly behind (N= 15, 2020)	81% Grants on track or slightly behind (N= 31, 2020)	Grant on track or slightly behind
29. ESPIG alignment to national systems (number of criteria met out of 10): the number of elements of alignment, as defined by GPE, that are met by an active ESPIG. ***Interpretation:*** *A high degree of alignment indicates that support/funding modalities are aligned with PC's own operational systems, frameworks and procedures.* **Source:** *ESPIG Application form*	n/a (2015)	n/a (2020)	7 criteria aligned 14 out of 25 ESPIGs are aligned in at least 7 criteria (2020)	6 criteria aligned 22 out of 50 ESPIGs are aligned in at least 7 criteria (2020)	ESPIGs that are aligned in at least 7 criteria out of 10
30. ESPIG modality: Stand-alone funding refers to GPE grant funding that is not combined with funding from any other partner to support a common project. Co-financed project funding refers to funding coming from more than a single partner to support a common project. Sector pooled funding refers to a diverse group of grant or credit modalities with varying instruments and mechanisms to support implementation of an endorsed national education sector plan. ***Interpretation:*** *Harmonized funding (co-financed or sector-pooled) is typically recommended to create a space for dialogue and coordination amongst funding partners. However, funding modalities also vary based on different country needs, capacity and operating mechanisms of the entity supervising or managing the grant.* **Source:** *ESPIG Application form*	(co-financed project) n/a (sector pooled) n/a (stand-alone) n/a (2015)	(co-financed project) n/a (sector pooled) n/a (stand-alone) n/a (2020)	(co-financed project) 24% (sector pooled) 28% (standalone) 48% (N= 25, 2020)	(co-financed project) 18% (sector pooled) 18% (standalone) 64% (N= 50, 2020)	ESPIGs using a pooled modality (co-financed project or sector pooled mechanism)

Notes:

(i) Methodological notes (including a description of data sources) for all indicators can be found here; https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/results-framework-indicators-methodological-briefs

(ii) Indicator 16(16a-16d)- non-PCFC average values show either ESP or TEP average respective to country's modality;

(iii) n/a: not applicable