

## METHODOLOGY SHEET FOR GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION (GPE) INDICATORS

Indicator title	<b>Indicator (1)</b> Proportion of development country partners (DCPs) showing improvement on learning outcomes (basic education)
Result measured (from GPE Results Framework):	<b>Strategic Goal (1)</b> Improved and more equitable student learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning

### JUSTIFICATION FOR INDICATOR

Background/context for indicator:	<p>The world is facing a learning crisis. According to the Global Monitoring Report of UNESCO, 250 million children have not learned basic numeracy and literacy skills, even though half of them have spent at least four years in school<sup>1</sup>. As a result, there is a shift in emphasis at the global level from only access to education to access to education <i>and</i> learning as indicated in Sustainable Development Goal 4: “Ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning.” With SDG 4, the international community has pledged to support an ambitious education agenda that commits to providing quality education that improves learning outcomes around the world by 2030.</p> <p>The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Strategic Plan 2016–2020<sup>2</sup>, which was endorsed by the Board of Directors in December 2015, has aligned its vision and mission to the global Sustainable Development Goals and adopted the wording of SDG 4 to ensure equitable quality education for all. To realize this vision, GPE 2020 outlines three strategic goals, the first being improved and more equitable learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning.</p> <p>Measuring learning outcomes is essential to track GPE’s progress and drive results to meet the global education targets and improve learning. However, there are many challenges to measuring learning, including differences in curriculum, availability of funds and methodological harmonization. Many countries are still unable to sustain efforts that produce quality data with sufficient coverage on learning outcomes<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, in order to compare learning data internationally, there is a need to develop a framework that harmonizes standards for measuring learning across countries.</p> <p>To tackle these challenges, the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) has recently established an institutional platform known as the Global Alliance to Monitor Learning (GAML)<sup>4</sup>. The central objective of GAML is to ensure</p>
-----------------------------------	--

<sup>1</sup> EFA Global Monitoring Report Team, *2012 Education for All Global Monitoring Report: Youth and Skills: Putting Education to Work*. (Paris, France: UNESCO, 2012).

<sup>2</sup> Global Partnership for Education, *GPE 2020: Improving learning and equity through stronger education systems*, (GPE, 2016), retrieved from: <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2020-strategic-plan>

<sup>3</sup> UNESCO Institute for Statistics. *Global Alliance to Monitor Learning Concept Note* (2016), retrieved from: <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/gaml-uis-concept-note-may-2016.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> GAML held its first meeting on May 11, 2016, in Washington D.C.

<p>Rationale for indicator selection:</p>	<p>that countries have the high-quality data needed to monitor achievement of learning outcomes, as well as for UIS to track progress globally. One of the first tasks of GAML will be to find the most cost-effective way to link the different assessment initiatives already underway in order to develop a set of global metrics that can be used to monitor learning across countries. To this end, it will develop an internationally comparable measure of reading and mathematics to monitor learning outcomes at the end of primary and lower secondary education.</p> <p>As the development of these global learning indicators is ongoing, GPE has built on initial work of UNICEF to develop a learning indicator that could inform organizational progress in the meantime, despite the limitations of data availability and comparability. As a first step, learning assessment information from DCPs was centralized in a database. A methodology was then developed to capture improvements in learning outcomes within a country over time.</p> <p>While there is not a global metric for measuring learning, there are many initiatives that measure changes in learning levels, and that can therefore be used to track learning improvement. These initiatives include national and international large scale assessments, and EGRA/EGMA<sup>5</sup> assessments.</p> <p>The methodology to measure the GPE learning indicator builds on these initiatives, by using all the learning evidence available from different assessments in each DCP. The learning evidence refers to changes in scores over a given period of time. After checking if the assessment data meet some technical criteria, they are aggregated at the DCP level. This approach allows classifying each DCP as “improved” or “not improved”, and allows for computing the GPE learning indicator.</p> <p>The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Strategic Plan 2016-2020 identifies learning as one of the main goals over its five-year implementation period. The inclusion of this indicator in the results framework is intended to highlight the importance of learning for the Global Partnership for Education and within the global education agenda.</p>
---	---

## DEFINITION

<p>Indicator definition:</p>	<p>This indicator is defined as: the (a) proportion of Developing Country Partner (DCPs) of the Global Partnership for Education, expressed as a percentage; showing (b) improvement; on (c) learning outcomes; in (d) basic education.</p> <p><u>Explanation of key terms:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proportion of DCPs showing improvement is being computed as the percent of DCPs with increased learning scores, relative to the total number of DCPs with data available to compute the indicator.</li> <li>b. Improvement is defined as a positive and statistically significant difference between two paired learning scores (i.e., initial and final scores), where the most recent (final) score is the higher one. If the statistical significance of the difference is not reported or cannot be computed, improvement will be defined as a difference between two paired learning scores that is greater or equal to a standardized effect size of 0.1 standard deviations. Improvement will always refer to differences in scores within a country, and not to differences among countries.</li> </ol>
------------------------------	---

<sup>5</sup> Early Grade Reading Assessment/ Early Grade Math Assessment

	<p>c. Learning outcomes refers to the scores from a student assessment that meet the technical criteria described below (See “formula”, Step 1). Math and reading scores will be used to compute the indicator; scores from other subject areas (e.g., sciences, health, civics) may be used as well.</p> <p>d. Learning outcomes refers to the score of all students (male and female) taken together. Additionally, the learning improvement indicator will be computed for female students only when these data are available.</p> <p>Basic education refers to students enrolled in primary and lower secondary education (i.e., ISCED<sup>6</sup> levels 1 and 2).</p>
Unit of measurement:	Percentage (of DCPs that shows learning improvement)
Disaggregation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Male / Female</li> <li>- Fragile and conflict affected countries (FCAC) / non-FCAC</li> </ul>
Year for data reported (select only one and mark an “x”)	___ fiscal year _X_ calendar year
Frequency of data collection:	Annually.

## DATA TREATMENT

Source of information for collecting data:	Source document, template, etc.:	Official databases, reports, documents and websites with student assessments information from UIS, UNICEF, World Bank (EdStats <sup>7</sup> and SABER <sup>8</sup> -Student Assessment); IEA (TIMSS and PIRLS data) <sup>9</sup> , OECD (PISA data) <sup>10</sup> , CONFEMEN / PASEC <sup>11</sup> , USAID (EGRA/EGMA) <sup>12</sup> , SACMEQ <sup>13</sup> , LLECE <sup>14</sup> and national learning assessments <sup>15</sup> from the DCPs.
	Source agency:	UNICEF, UNESCO, CONFEMEN, SACMEQ, LLECE, IEA, OECD, RTI, agencies implementing EGRA and/or EGMA, national Ministries of Education or other national entities that may administer national-level assessments.
Formula:	<p><b><u>STEP 1: Select data source(s)</u></b></p> <p>For each DCP, identify the data source(s) that meet <i>all</i> of the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The data must come from a national learning assessment (census or sample survey), that was administered in the DCP. Excluded from this definition are examinations for certification (e.g., of primary or secondary education) or for selection purposes (e.g., into secondary education). Examinations are usually not designed to measure learning improvement, and may not represent the overall target population (e.g., bias related to self-selection). Also excluded are household surveys that sample students both inside and outside the school system (e.g., PASER, UWEZO). This is so because the aim of the Indicator is to track learning improvement within the school system (basic education).</li> <li>2. The assessment must measure learning in primary (ISCED 1) or</li> </ol>	

<sup>6</sup> The International Standard Classification of Education

<sup>7</sup> Education Statistics (EDSTATS) <http://datatopics.worldbank.org/education/>

<sup>8</sup> SABER-SA (Systems Approach for Better Education Results – Student Assessment): <http://saber.worldbank.org/index.cfm?indx=8&pd=5&sub=0>

<sup>9</sup> Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study, Progress in International Reading Literacy Study <http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/>

<sup>10</sup> Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Programme for International Student Assessment <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/>

<sup>11</sup> Conférence des Ministres de l’Éducation des pays africains et malgache d’expression française, Programme d’Analyse des Systèmes Éducatifs de la CONFEMEN <http://www.pasec.confemen.org/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.eddataglobal.org/reading/>

<sup>13</sup> The Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality <http://www.sacmeq.org/>

<sup>14</sup> Latin American Laboratory for Assessment of the Quality of Education <http://www.unesco.org/new/es/santiago/terce-study/>

<sup>15</sup> UIS Catalog of Learning Assessments: [http://www.uis.unesco.org/nada/en/index.php/catalogue/learning\\_assessments](http://www.uis.unesco.org/nada/en/index.php/catalogue/learning_assessments)

lower secondary education (ISCED 2). Assessment data that sample students both in basic education (ISCED 1 or 2) and beyond (e.g., PISA), still meets the criteria and should be included.

3. The data must be representative of the student population at either the national or sub-national (i.e. state, regional or provincial) level. Data with lower levels of representativeness (e.g., district level, program level) must be excluded.
4. The data must be representative of both male and female students taken together. Whenever data is disaggregated by gender, the learning improvement indicator will be computed for females only too.
5. The data must include learning level scores that are comparable across years (i.e. be in the same subjects, same scale and draw from equivalent samples<sup>16</sup> of students).
6. Each data-point must include at least one score measuring learning levels in mathematics (or any of its knowledge, content or cognitive domains) or reading comprehension (or any of its processes or skills) or another subject area whose learning assessment scores meet the defined criteria.
7. The data to compute the Learning Improvement indicator must come from the following periods:

\* Baseline period: 2000-2015. Data from this period will be used to compute the value of the Learning Indicator before the GPE Strategic plan.

\* Initial period: 2011-2015. Data from this period will provide the initial scores for computing the learning indicator.

\* Final period (strategic plan period):

- Milestone period: 2016-2017. Data from this period will provide the intermediate scores for computing the milestone value of the learning indicator.

- Target period: 2018-19. Data from this period will provide the final scores for computing the learning indicator.

### **STEP 2: Classify assessments into “Priority Groups”**

The assessments are classified in two groups, according to their priority:

*Priority 1 Group:* Assessments that are representative at the national level. For instance, this group may include International or regional assessments (i.e. LLECE, PASEC, PISA/PISA for Development, PIRLS, SACMEQ, and TIMSS); national learning assessments, or EGRA/EGMA assessments that are nationally representative.

*Priority 2 Group:* Assessments that are representative at the sub-national level, i.e., state, regional or provincial level. For instance, this group may include a national assessment that is representative of a region of the country. Assessments that are representative at the district or program level should be excluded.

For each DCP, identify the assessment(s) in Priority 1 Group that meet all criteria listed above. For example, if a DCP has one assessment from the Priority 1 Group that meets all the criteria, that assessment should be selected. If a DCP has three assessments from the Priority 1 Group that meet all the criteria, all three assessments must be selected. If a DCP has one assessment from the Priority 1 Group that meets all the criteria and one assessment from the Priority 2 group that meet all the criteria, only the assessment from the Priority 1 Group must be selected.

<sup>16</sup> Please note that equivalent does not mean the same. Instead, samples should be representative of essentially the equivalent reference population, for example, learners in 6<sup>th</sup> grade of primary education in a given geographical entity.

If a DCP does not have any assessment from the Priority 1 Group that meets all the criteria, assessments from the Priority 2 Group will be selected. For example, if a DCP has a national learning assessment and an EGRA that meet all the criteria and are representative at the provincial, both assessments should be selected.

**STEP 3: Select the assessment score(s) to be used to inform the learning indicator**

For each assessment from each DCP selected in Step 1, select the score(s) to be used to inform the learning indicator:

1. If there are several scores that can be used as an initial data point (i.e., several scores from different years in the initial period 2011-2015), the most recent score must be used. For example, if there are yearly scores from a national assessment available in the initial period 2011-2015, the 2015 score should be used. However, a minimum of 3 years between the initial and final scores should be observed.
2. If there are several scores that can be used as a final data point (i.e., several scores from different years in the target period 2018-2019), the 2019 score must be used. For example, if there are yearly scores from a national assessment available in the 2018-2019 period, the 2019 score should be used. However, a minimum of 3 years between the initial and final scores should be observed.
3. If there are several scores that can be used as a milestone, (i.e., several scores from different years in the milestone period 2016-2017), the score closest to the mid- point between the initial and final score years must be used. For example, if there are yearly scores from a national assessment available in the milestone period 2016-2017, and the initial score is from 2015 and the final score is from 2019, then the 2017 score must be used to compute the milestone.
4. If there are several scores (e.g., from different grades, ages, languages) that can be used as an initial, final, and milestone data point, all scores must be selected. For example, a DCP may have three scores that meet the selection criteria: one reading score from PIRLS at grade 4; one reading score from PISA from 15-year-old students; and one mathematics score from PISA from 15-year-old students.
5. If several pairs of scores are available within each subject area, the most comprehensive or indicative pair(s) of scores must be selected. For instance, since EGRA does not report one single reading score, one or two reading component scores will be selected. In the case of EGRA, this would be reading comprehension and reading fluency; in the case of EGMA, priority would be given to word problems, and addition and subtraction.

**STEP 4: For each paired scores, identify if there is learning improvement**

**STEP. 4.1. Identify if there is learning improvement between the initial and final scores**

Learning improvement is defined as a positive and statistically significant difference between two paired (initial and final) learning scores.

Across all DCPs and for each pair of learning scores (1 pair = 1 initial score and 1 final score), identify if there is a statistically significant difference between the final and initial scores. Classify the differences in scores (DIFF) as follows:

DIFF=1 if the difference is positive and statistically significant

DIFF=0 if the difference is not statistically significant  
DIFF=-1 if the difference is negative and statistically significant

This classification can be done by using already published information (e.g., from an international report) or by computing the differences in scores. For instance, a two-tailed independent sample t-test can be used for computing differences in mean scores from different samples of students. The specific statistical technique will have to be selected knowing the technical features of the data (e.g. type of score, sample).

If the significance level of the differences is not reported or cannot be computed, the standardized effect size must be used as follow to classify the differences in scores:

DIFF=1 Difference is greater or equal to 0.1 Standard Deviation (SD)

DIFF=0 Difference is less than 0.1 SD and greater than -0.1 SD

DIFF=-1 Difference is less or equal to -0.1 SD

For example, a country C may have 3 pairs of scores with the following DIFF values:

Pair 1: Difference is positive and statistically significant, therefore DIFF1 = 1

Pair 2: Difference is greater than 0.1 standardized effect size, therefore DIFF2 = 1

Pair 3: Difference is negative and statistically significant, therefore DIFF3 = -1

#### STEP. 4.2. Identify if there is learning improvement between the initial and milestone scores

Repeat the procedure described in Step 4.1, using the milestone score from the period 2016-2017 instead of the final score.

#### STEP. 4.3. Identify if there is learning improvement within the baseline period

Repeat the procedure described in Step 4.1, using an initial and a final score from the baseline period 2000-2015. The same selection criteria described in Step 3 apply.

#### **STEP 5. Classify each country (DCP) as 'improved' or 'not improved'**

Calculation of the sum of the differences between the final and initial scores (DIFF)

$$SCORE_j = \sum_{i=1}^t DIFF_{i,j}$$

Where:

*SCORE<sub>j</sub>*: sum of the differences between each pair of initial and final scores in the country j

*DIFF<sub>i,j</sub>*: differences between the pair i of initial and final scores in country j

Following the example, country j will have a

$$SCORE_j = 1 + 1 + (-1) = 1$$

For a given country j, assess whether there was an overall learning improvement

$$IMPROV_j = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } SCORE_j > 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Where:

*IMPROV<sub>j</sub> reflects if the sum of the DIFF values associated to each country j is Greater than zero (in which case IMPROV<sub>j</sub> = 1): meaning that there was an overall learning improvement in the country Equal or less than zero (in which case IMPROV<sub>j</sub> = 0): meaning that there was no overall learning improvement in the country*

Following the example,

Since  $SCORE_j = 1$  and  $1 > 0$ , then

$$IMPROV_j = 1$$

The following examples show how the countries (DCPs) would be classified under different score scenarios:

Example A

DCP has three paired scores, two of which show differences that are positive and statistically significant, and one that is negative and statistically significant.

SCORE = Sum of DIFF:  $1 + 1 + (-1) = 1$

DCP Improved? YES

Example B

DCP has two paired scores, one of which shows a difference that is not statistically significant and one where the difference is positive and statistically significant.

SCORE = Sum of DIFF:  $0 + 1 = 1$

DCP Improved? YES

Example C

DCP has six paired scores, five of which show a difference that is not statistically significant and one where the difference is positive and statistically significant.

SCORE = Sum of DIFF:  $0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 1 = 1$

DCP Improved? YES

Example D

DCP has three paired scores, one of which show a difference that is not statistically significant, one where the difference is positive and statistically significant, and one where the difference is negative and statistically significant.

Sum of DIFF scores:  $0 + 1 + (-1) = 0$

DCP Improved? NO

Example E

DCP has six paired scores, three of which show a difference that is positive and statistically significant and three where the difference is negative and statistically significant.

SCORE = Sum of DIFF:  $1 + 1 + 1 + (-1) + (-1) + (-1) = 0$

DCP Improved? NO

Example F

DCP has four paired scores, one of which shows a difference that is positive and statistically significant, one where the difference is not statistically significant, and two where the difference is negative and statistically significant.

SCORE = Sum of DIFF:  $1 + 0 + (-1) + (-1) = -1$

DCP Improved? NO

The same procedure described in Step 5 applies for classifying the DCPs

when computing the milestone (Step 4.2) and the baseline (Step 4.3) learning improvement indicator.

**STEP 6. Compute the corporate learning improvement indicator**

Compute the percentage of DCPs that show learning improvement using the following formula:

$$Prop(IMPROV = 1) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n IMPROV_j}{n} * 100$$

Where:

*Prop(IMPROV=1): Proportion of DCPs showing overall learning improvement*

*n = total number of DCPs with data available to compute the indicator*

The same procedure described in Step 6 applies for computing the milestone (Step 4.2) and the baseline (Step 4.3) learning improvement indicator.

**STEP 7. Compute the projected 2020 Target learning improvement indicator**

Follow the following sub-steps:

(i) Compute the difference between the final and initial scores within the baseline period.

(ii) Compute the annualized difference in scores by dividing the difference in scores by the number of years elapsed between the initial and final scores.

(iii) Compute the number of years between the final score and 2020.

(iv) Compute the projected difference in scores by multiplying the annualized difference in scores by the number of years between the final score and 2020.

(v) Standardize the projected difference in scores by dividing the projected difference in scores by 0.1 standard deviations of the score scale.

(vi) Classify the standardized projected differences as indicated in Step 4.1.

(vii) Classify each DCP as “improved” or not “improved”, as indicated in Step 5.

(viii) Compute the 2020 projected learning improvement indicator as indicated in Step 6.

Example:

A DCP has one pair of math scores to compute the baseline learning indicator:

PISA 2006 : 311 points

PISA 2009 : 321 points

Computations :

(i) Difference between the final and initial scores: 321 – 311 = 20 points

(ii) Annualized difference in scores: 20 / (2009 - 2006) = 20 / 3 = 6.67

(iii) Number of years between the final score and 2020: 2020 – 2009 = 11 years

(iv) Projected difference in scores by 2020: 6.67 \* 11 = 73.33

(v) Standardized projected difference in scores (given that the PISA scale has a standard deviation of 100): 73.33 / 100 = 0.73

(vi) Classification of the standardized projected difference: 0.73 ≥ 0.1 => DIFF=1

(vii) Classification of the DCP: IMPROVED.

**STEP 7.1. Compute the learning improvement indicator for FCAC only.**

Aggregation formula:

	<p>Apply the same procedures described in Steps 1-7, with the subset FCAC DCP.</p> <p><b>STEP 8. Compute the learning improvement indicator for females only</b> Apply the same procedures described in Steps 1-7, using the learning scores data that represent female students only.</p>
Data limitations (if any known / anticipated):	<p>There are several data limitations and challenges that need to be taken into account in the interpretation of the data from this indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited availability of learning improvement data allowing comparisons over time for each DCP.</li> <li>• The baseline learning improvement indicator is based on a limited number of countries (20), which limits (i) the relevance of the comparison, and (ii) the reliability of the baseline indicator.</li> <li>• Because of the lack of data, the baseline is calculated on a longer timeframe (2000-2015) rather than the than the initial GPE period (2011-2015).</li> <li>• The projected 2020 target value of the learning indicator was calculated assuming that (a) the observed changes in scores are constant in time, (b) a difference of 0.1 standardized deviations is statistically significant. Both assumptions could be questioned.</li> <li>• The projected 2020 target value of the learning indicator is based on a limited number of countries (20), which limits (i) the relevance of the comparison, and (ii) the reliability of the projected indicator.</li> </ul> <p>Timeliness of the availability of learning data: it is not usual for learning data to become available within a year of the implementation of an assessment.</p>
Interpretation	<p>A high percentage on this indicator suggests that DCPs are making progress in terms of learning achievement at the primary and lower secondary levels. This, in turn, suggests a more effective school system at these levels.</p>

## REFERENCES

- EFA Global Monitoring Report Team. *2012 Education For All Global Monitoring Report: Youth and Skills: Putting Education to Work*. Paris, France: UNESCO, 2012
- Global Partnership for Education. *GPE 2020: Improving learning and equity through stronger education systems*. GPE, 2016. Retrieved from: <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-2020-strategic-plan>
- UNESCO Institute for Statistics. *Global Alliance to Monitor Learning Concept Note*. 2016. Retrieved from: <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/gaml-uis-concept-note-may-2016.pdf>

## ANNEXES

### *Annex 1- Data Collection tool*

Data collection tool utilized for collecting the data, if any:	<p>For each DCP, the following student assessment information was documented:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Availability of data to compute the Learning Improvement indicator comparing the initial (2011-2015) and final (2016-2019) periods</li> <li>2. Availability of data to compute the Learning Improvement baseline within the baseline period (2000-2015), and estimated target value in 2020,</li> <li>3. Assessment that were excluded because they do not meet the technical criteria for the indicator.</li> </ol> <p>All this information is in the Excel document &lt;Indicator1_LearningImprovement_GPE.xls&gt;</p>
--	--

### Annex 2- Standard Operating Procedure

<b>Process Name:</b> Data Collection, Quality Assurance & Storage for Indicator # 1 of the GPE Results Framework		<b>Owner:</b> R&P Team	<b>Updated:</b>
<b>Function:</b> Measuring GPE Impact		<b>Version #:</b> 1	<b>Review:</b>
<b>Material changes from prior version of SOP</b> None; this is the first version.			
<b>Summary</b> This SOP describes the process for data collection, quality assurance, and storage for Indicator 1 (Proportion of developing country partners (DCPs) showing improvement on learning outcomes (basic education)) of the GPE results framework.			
<b>Results / Outputs</b> This process should result in the results framework being updated yearly with quality assured data on Indicator 1. Interim outputs of the Secretariat: Completed data collection template Final Output: Updated results framework database			
<b>Scope</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Begins: The process begins with the Head of M&amp;E recruiting an STC to carry out the data collection, quality assurance and analysis for Indicator 1 of the results framework.</li> <li>Ends: The process ends with updated data being integrated into the results framework database by the Monitoring and Evaluation Data Manager.</li> <li>Includes: All procedural aspects.</li> <li>Excludes: Methodological aspects of calculating the indicator value. These can be found in the methodology sheet.</li> <li>Note: Database will be updated on a yearly basis for the purpose of result framework reporting.</li> </ul>			
<b>Standards (Policies, Approvals, Deadlines, etc.):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policies: GPE 2020, M&amp; E strategy Monitoring Sheet for GPE Results Framework Indicator 1</li> <li>Deadlines: M &amp; E Data Manager updates results framework database with the Indicators 1 data by 15<sup>th</sup> March</li> <li>Approval: The completed data template is prepared by the STC (Learning Assessment Systems) and includes quality checks by the M &amp; E Data Manager and final approval from the Head of M &amp; E.</li> </ul>			
<b>Issues /Risks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant data might not be available in good time.</li> </ul>			
<b>Overview:</b>			
<pre> graph LR     A[Data Collection] --&gt; B[Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data]     B --&gt; C[Aggregating Data]     C --&gt; D[Update results framework database]     </pre>			
<b>Steps in the Process</b>		<b>Roles / Responsibilities</b>	<b>Outputs / Deliverables</b>
<b>Typically by 30<sup>th</sup> January</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruit an STC [hereafter STC (Learning Assessment Systems)] to carry out the data collection, quality assurance, and analysis for Indicator 1 of the results framework</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Head of M&amp;E</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request the country leads to provide data from national assessments, regional, and international</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC (Learning</li> </ul>	

assessments (including EGRA and EGMA) carried out in their respective countries in the period specified in the methodology sheet	Assessment Systems)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CL requests the data from in-country counterparts and submits it to the STC (Learning Assessment Systems)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CL</li> </ul>	Data from national assessments, regional, and international assessments (including EGRA and EGMA)	
<b>2. Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data</b>			<b>Typically by 15<sup>th</sup></b>
<b>February</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the completeness and quality of the data collected by Country Leads</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC (Learning Assessment Systems)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compile and consolidate the data received/obtained from various sources as specified in the methodology sheets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC (Learning Assessment Systems)</li> </ul>	Quality assured and compiled data	
<b>2. Aggregate Data</b>			<b>Typically by 15<sup>th</sup></b>
<b>March</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enter data into the template provided by the M&amp;E Data Manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC (Learning Assessment Systems)</li> </ul>		Data Collection Template
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compute indicator values using the completed data collection template, based on the latest available classification of countries affected by Fragile and Conflict and forward to M &amp; E Data Manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC (Learning Assessment Systems)</li> </ul>	Completed data collection template	List of countries affected by fragile and conflict from the GPE Intranet
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review completed data collection template and send comments/queries to the STC (Learning Assessment Systems)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M &amp; E Data Manager</li> </ul>	Approved data collection template	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respond to the comments/queries, updates data collection template as necessary and forward to M &amp; E data Manager</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC (Learning Assessment Systems)</li> </ul>	Updated data collection template	
<b>3. Update Results Framework Database</b>			<b>Typically by 30<sup>th</sup></b>
<b>March</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forward data collection template to the Head of M &amp; E for review and approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M &amp; E Data Manager</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review &amp; approve completed data collection template</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Head of M &amp; E</li> </ul>	Reviewed data collection template	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update results framework database using completed template submitted by the STC (Learning Assessment Systems)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M &amp; E Data Manager</li> </ul>	Updated results framework database	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notify the secretariat on the availability of data in the results framework database through the intranet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M &amp; E Data Manager</li> </ul>	Notification on GPE intranet	