

METHODOLOGY SHEET FOR GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION (GPE) INDICATORS

| | |
|---|---|
| Indicator title | Indicator (16c) Proportion of ESPs/TEPs that have a strategy to respond to marginalized groups meeting quality standards (including gender, disability and other context-relevant dimensions) |
| Result measured (from GPE Results Framework): | Strategic Objective (1) Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation (a) Support evidence-based, nationally-owned sector plans focused on equity, efficiency, and learning |
| JUSTIFICATION FOR INDICATOR | |
| Background/context for indicator: | In May 2014, the Global Partnership for Education Board of Directors decided to include, as a requirement for countries under the new funding model (GPE FM), to submit a credible and endorsed ESP “to ensure that education aid, including from the Global Partnership, (i) is based on a solid, nationally owned analysis of the challenges of delivering quality basic education to all boys and girls, including those from marginalized groups, and (ii) builds institutional capacity to deliver education services equitably and efficiently” ¹ . This requirement follows directly from the vision of the Education for All Fast-Track Initiative, which evolved into GPE, that no country with a credible education sector plan should be unable to implement this plan for lack of funds. |
| Rationale for indicator selection: | This indicator is included in the results framework to measure the credibility of sector plans with respect to their strategy for responding to marginalized groups, which has been recognized as a central element for the development of education systems. Inclusive and effective sector planning and policy dialogue processes are critical foundations for countries to provide equitable access to quality basic education. Supporting these processes is a core element of GPE’s work, which culminates in the production of a credible education sector plans (ESPs) or transitional plans (TEPs) that contain strategies for responding to marginalized groups, which meet quality standards. |
| DEFINITION | |
| Indicator definition: | Number of endorsed Education Sector Plans (ESPs) or Transitional Education Plans (TEPs) that have a strategy for marginalized populations meeting quality standards (that is, meeting at least 4 out of a possible total of 5 standards for ESPs, and at least 4 out of a possible total of 5 standards for TEPs) as defined by GPE, out of the total number of endorsed ESPs and TEPs included in the group sample, respectively. An Education Sector Plan (ESP) is by nature a national policy instrument, elaborated under the responsibility of Government, which provides a development vision for the education system, and outlines a coherent set of actionable strategies to implement reforms and reach development objectives ² . |

¹ Global Partnership for Education, *Report of the Country Grants and Performance Committee Part 1: Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the Funding Model of Global Partnership for Education and Results* (BOD/2014/05-DOC 03), Meeting of the Board of Directors (May 28, 2014).

² Global Partnership for Education & International Institute for Educational Planning-UNESCO, *Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Preparation* (Paris: IIEP-UNESCO, 2015), retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002337/233767e.pdf>

A **Transitional Education Plan** (TEP) is a national policy instrument, elaborated under the responsibility of Government, similar to an Education Sector Plan (ESP). But TEPs differ from ESPs in a number of specificities. They are (i) a shorter term (3 years in general), (ii) targeted to a limited number of sub-sectors and priorities, (iii) have stronger focus on system capacity. A TEP shall include a sound analysis of the current situation, using the best-available data. Implementation and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks must also be included in TEPs to assess whether the intended results are being achieved³.

A **strategy for marginalized populations** clearly specifies a long-term goal, medium-term objectives and targets, and a rough idea of key activities to reach the objectives and targets in order to provide equitable basic education for all, particularly those most marginalized⁴. The strategy should provide a relevant response to the challenges raised by the sector analysis and form a coherent corpus of action to achieve its long-term goal²

Quality standards for sector plans have first been defined in the Board Paper on the operationalization of the new funding model requirements¹ and later in the Plan Preparation Guidelines², which were devised on the basis of technical work and consultations with countries and global stakeholders in education. These guidelines have been disseminated through conferences, workshops, and ad hoc country support missions. The Plan Preparation Guidelines state that a plan must provide a relevant response to the challenges raised by the sector analysis, based on an understanding of underlying causes and determining factors, to determine possible actions. Strategies must also encompass a coherent and consistent corpus of action that takes into consideration the human, technical, and financial capacities required, accompanied by precise targets to measure performance.

For the purpose of this indicator 16-c, the following quality standards were identified for strategies to respond to marginalized:

- 1) **Evidence-based**- including identification of the underlying causes of the challenge;
- 2) **Relevant**- addressing the underlying causes of the challenge;
- 3) **Coherent**- aligning the action plan to the strategies;
- 4) **Measurable**- by including indicators with targets;
- 5) **Implementable**- identifying cost, funding source, responsible entity and timeframes for operationalization.

Unit of measurement:

Overall:

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

- n represents the number of ESPs and TEPs meeting at least the minimum number of quality standards for their strategy addressing marginalized groups as identified by GPE (that is, at least 4 for ESPs and 4 for TEPs), out of a possible total of 5 quality standards for ESPs and 5 quality standards for TEPs; and
- N represents the total number of ESPs and TEPs in the sample

ESPs:

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

- n represents the number of ESPs meeting at least 4 quality standards for their strategy addressing marginalized groups out of a possible total of 5 quality standards; and
- N represents the total number of ESPs in the sample.

³ Global Partnership for Education, *Draft Guidelines for the preparation of transitional education plans* (Washington, D.C. Version 9 October 2015).

⁴ UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning. *Strategic Planning: Concept and Rationale. Education Sector Planning Working Papers: Working Paper 1* (Paris: UNESCO IIEP, 2010), available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001897/189757e.pdf>

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>TEPs: “n out of N,” expressed as a percentage, where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> n represents the number of TEPs meeting at least 4 quality standards for their strategy addressing marginalized groups out of a possible total of 5 quality standards; and N represents the total number of TEPs in the sample. |
| Disaggregation: | <p>Corporate Indicator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disaggregation by type of planning products (TEP and ESP) <p>For analysis (see Analysis Section for details):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disaggregation by itemized quality standard Disaggregation by country Cumulative: samples and results added over years |
| Year for data reported (select only one and mark an “x”) | <p>__ fiscal year _X_ calendar year</p> |
| Frequency of data collection: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given that countries only develop plans every of 3 to 10 years approximately, the data collection for this indicator will occur every two years, in order to have a reasonable number of countries with endorsed plans in the sample to feed this indicator. However, the assessment of the ESPs/TEPs (actual data collection) will be conducted on a routine base each time a country submits a program implementation grant application. The QA team will conduct data check and validation The database of coded sector plans will be updated on a regular basis to incorporate the data as they are collected and validated. This indicator will thus be populated in the following way: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline established retroactively in 2016 (includes plans endorsed in CY2014 and 2015) Update in 2018 (will include plans endorsed in CY2016 and 2017; retroactive/routine data collection) Update in 2020 (will include plans endorsed in CY2018 and 2019; routine data collection) |

DATA TREATMENT

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Source of information for collecting data: | Source document, template, etc.: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Endorsed Education Sector Plans/Endorsed Transitional Sector Plans Multi-year Implementation Plans Annexes and related documents attached, such as costed Budgets, Results Framework, Statistical Yearbook, simulation models, etc. |
| | Source agency: | Local Education Groups (Coordination Agency or Government authority in charge of the preparation of a plan) |
| Formula: | <p>Assumptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment questionnaires (one for ESPs and one for TEPs) used for this indicator include 5 different quality standards. Each quality standard is composed of 1 to 3 questions (items), which are equally weighted to determine the overall score for individual quality standards. Each quality standard is then weighted the same to determine the overall quality of the strategy. Within each quality standard, items are coded on a scale from 0 to 2. Two is the maximum score that can be obtained per item, meaning that the information found in the sector plan is assessed as being fully satisfactory to meet the requirement stipulated in the question. There are two exceptions, where questions disaggregate the results for the benefit of further analysis: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> In one of the questions that addresses the Relevance of the strategy (Question # 7 in Annex 2a and 2b), a score of 4 is | |

equivalent to a score of 2, a score of 3 is equivalent to a score of 1, and a score of 2, 1, or 0 is equivalent to a score of 0.

- b. In the question that addresses the extent to which the strategy is **Implementable** (found in 16a, under standard 5.1), a score of 3 or 2 is equivalent to a score of 2, a score of 1 is equivalent to a score of 1, and a score of 0 is equivalent to a score of 0.
3. Quality standards are met separately, when all questions included under one given quality standard are given a score greater than 0. All quality standards must be met in order to meet the quality standard for the marginalized population strategy.

Step 1: At the question level, check whether the question obtains the minimum score for achieving a given quality standard

Based on the score assigned to each question (typically, scores are on a scale from 0 to 2, with exceptions, as noted under Assumption #2 above, which specifies the conversion of scores to 0-2 scale), assign a 0 or 1 to each question, as follows:

$$f(QMET_{i,qs,k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } Q_{i,qs,k,j,t} > 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } Q_{i,qs,k,j,t} = 0 \end{cases}$$

where:

Q = question

$QMET$

= question that obtains the minimum score needed to achieve the quality i =number or question

qs =quality standard (1,2,3,4,5)

k = country ESP/TEP 1, ..., country ESP/TEP K

j = DPC country

t = year of the evaluation

Steps 2: At the level of the quality standard, identify whether quality standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are met for each ESP/TEP

Identify whether individual quality standards are met per country plan:

$GOODCRIT_{1,k,j,t}$ for ESPs, and $GOODCRIT_{1,k,j,t}$ for TEPs, both referring to quality standard 1 in this example but they are similarly labelled for the 5 quality standards; $GOODCRIT_{2,k,j,t}$, $GOODCRIT_{3,k,j,t}$, etc.

To do so, sum the 0s and 1s assigned to each question at step 1, based on which questions pertain to a given quality standard. Note that there is no difference in approach when calculating ESPs and TEPs.

$$f(GOODCRIT_{1,k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^2 QMET_{i,1,k,j,t} = 2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$f(GOODCRIT_{2,k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } QMET_{i,2,k,j,t} = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$f(GOODCRIT_{3,k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } QMET_{i,3,k,j,t} = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$f(GOODCRIT_{4,k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^3 QMET_{i,4,k,j,t} = 3 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$f(GOODCRIT_{5,k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } QMET_{i,5,k,j,t} = 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where:

$i = 1, \dots, n$

k = country ESP / TEP 1, ..., country ESP/TEP *J*
*GOODCRIT*_{1,*k*,*j*}
 = country plan *k* meeting the quality standard 1 in country *j*
*GOODCRIT*_{2,*k*,*j*}
 = country plan *k* meeting the quality standard 2 in country *j*
 (*GOODCRIT*_{3,*k*,*j*})
 = country plan *k* meeting the quality standard 3 in country *j*
*GOODCRIT*_{4,*k*,*j*}
 = country plan *k* meeting the quality standard 4 in country *j*
*GOODCRIT*_{5,*k*,*j*}
 = country plan *k* meeting the quality standard 5 in country *j*
t= year of the evaluation

Steps 3: At the ESP/TEP level, identify the total number of quality standards met

$$TOTCRITMET_{k,j,t} = \sum_{qs=1}^5 GOODCRIT_{k,qs,j,t}$$

where:

qs = 1, ..., 5

k = country ESP/TEP 1, ..., country ESP/TEP *J*

GOODCRIT = country plan meeting the standards for any of
GOODCRIT1, GOODCRIT2, GOODCRIT3, GOODCRIT4, GOODCRIT5,
 (as defined in Step 2)

j= DPC country

t= year of the evaluation

Step 4: Identify if the ESP/TEP has an equity strategy meeting quality standards

- For ESPs: At least four out of five quality standards must be met for the strategy to meet quality standards
- For TEPs: At least four out of five quality standards must be met for the strategy to meet quality standards

$$QLTYEFFSTRAT_{k,j,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } TOTCRITMET_{k,j,t} \geq 4 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where:

k = country ESP/TEP 1, ..., country ESP/TEP *j*

t=year of the evaluation.

Calculate the percentage of sector plans that meet the threshold of quality standards:

-

Sum the number of ESPs/TEPs that are identified as having an equity strategy meeting quality standards (i.e. meeting at least four out of five quality standards) and divide that number by the total number of ESPs/TEPs in the sample. Last, multiply that quotient by 100 to obtain a percentage:

Aggregation formula:

$$IndicatorEFF_{j,t} = \left(\frac{\sum_{k=1}^K QLTYEFFSTRAT_{k,j,t}}{K_{j,t}} \right) * 100$$

where:

k = ESP/TEP 1, ..., ESP/TEP *j*

K = total number of ESP/TEPs included in the sample

t= year of the evaluation

Data limitations (if any known / anticipated):

The following limitations have been identified for this indicator:

- **Specifics of the strategy addressing marginalized groups:** This methodology focuses on quality elements necessary for a successful strategy, but does not go into the details of the programs proposed by the strategy to assess whether they are fit for purpose. It assumes that the ESP/TEP has identified the right challenge, the right underlying causes for that challenge, and that as long as the underlying causes are addressed that the strategy is good enough, although there could be other strategies that may be more cost-effective, easier to implement, or yield greater impact. Also, the degree to which the challenge and causes are understood and the solution has been thought through (including all intended and unintended consequences) will also influence the success of the strategy. However, it was not possible to do this level of analysis from the type of information available in an ESP/TEP.
- **Reliability and subjectivity of the coding:** The questions in the ESP/TEP assessments entail a certain level of subjectivity. To mitigate this issue, coders will be trained and scores will be examined by reviewers. Nevertheless, information in ESPs/TEPs is dense and coders/reviewers will not have been exposed to contextual elements of plan elaboration that could eventually change the perception of the scores assigned to the questions. Although ESPs/TEPs structures are relatively standardized, there is nevertheless normal variation in the display of some key information (in the body of the sector plans, annexes, attached notes, etc.) that may affect the score for a particular question.
- **Sample limitation:** Given that countries develop sector plans by policy cycles, ranging approximately from 3 to 10 years, the number of countries with new ESPs or TEPs per year is limited. As a consequence, and to keep an ESPs/TEPs sample of sufficient size and significance, data for the indicator will only be collected every two years.
- **No capture of the political credibility (national leadership, political buy-in) of the strategy addressing marginalized groups:** This methodology is naturally biased towards quality standards that are more easily objectively verifiable. Because the methodology is based on a desk review, it could not capture the level of national leadership and political buy-in for the strategy and defining reliable proxies for these measures proved too difficult of a task. These elements are nevertheless crucial to effective implementation and complementary to assess the quality of a strategy. However, assessing the *political* credibility of a planning product would take other methodological approaches of more qualitative nature such as opinion polls, focus groups, direct observations, etc. which were beyond the scope of this indicator.

Interpretation

A high value suggests that DCPs, by and large, have developed quality strategies aimed at improving equitable learning, equity and inclusion, and/or and system efficiency. Strategies that meet quality standards increase the likeliness of their effective implementation, transformational effect in the education sector, and of, ultimately.

REFERENCES

- Global Partnership for Education & International Institute for Educational Planning-UNESCO. Guidelines for Education Sector Plan Preparation. Paris: IIEP-UNESCO, 2015. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002337/233767e.pdf>
- Global Partnership for Education. *Draft Guidelines for the preparation of transitional education plans*. Washington, D.C. Version 9 October 2015.
- Global Partnership for Education. *Report of the Country Grants and Performance Committee Part 1:*

Operational Framework for Requirements and Incentives in the Funding Model of Global Partnership for Education and Results (BOD/2014/05-DOC 03), Meeting of the Board of Directors, May 28, 2014.

- UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning. *Strategic Planning: Concept and Rationale. Education Sector Planning Working Papers: Working Paper 1*. Paris: UNESCO IIEP, 2010. Available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001897/189757e.pdf>

ANNEXES

Annex 1- Data Collection tool

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

“ESP_datacollectiontemplate_countryname” is the Excel document that includes pre-defined fields with questions codes and guidelines for scoring each of the ESPs. Tab 16c contains the assessment of the thematic strategy for marginalized population.

“TEP_datacollectiontemplate_countryname” is the Excel document that includes pre-defined fields with questions codes and guidelines for scoring each of the TEPs. Tab 16c contains the assessment of the thematic strategy for marginalized population.

Annex 2- Standard Operating Procedure

| | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------------|
| Process Name: Data Collection, Quality Assurance & Storage for Indicator # 16b/c/d of the GPE Results Framework | Owner: R&P Team | Updated: |
| Function: Measuring GPE Impact | Version #: 1 | Review: |
| Material changes from prior version of SOP None; this is the first version. | | |
| Summary This SOP describes the process for data collection, quality assurance, and storage for indicator # 16b (Proportion of ESPs/TEPs that have a teaching and learning strategy meeting quality standards) /16c (Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to respond to marginalized groups that meets quality standards (including gender, disability, and other context-relevant dimensions) /16d (Proportion of ESPs/TEPs with a strategy to improve efficiency that meets quality standards) of the GPE results framework. | | |
| Results / Outputs This process should result in the results framework being updated with quality assured data on indicator# 16b/c/d. Interim outputs of the Secretariat: Completed final version of raw data collected/recorded using the ESP assessment methodology template The consolidated ESP results database containing item level scores Final Output: Updated results framework database | | |
| Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begins: The process begins with the Education Specialist (Quality Assurance) coding appraised and endorsed Education Sector Plan (ESP) or Transitional Education Plan (TEP) based on source documents collected through the program grant (ESPIG) application process, or in direct contact with LEG, by the CST MU • Coding of one ESP/TEP is carried out by one or two QA consultants who provide their coding/scoring to the Quality Assurance team. • A QA team member will then validate the coding and data in the data collection template and provide feedback to the consultant(s) who may need to update/finalize the file. • The finalized, validated file is then sent to R&P who process the data and calculate minimum standard level scores | | |

- Ends: The process ends with updated data being integrated into the results framework database by the Monitoring and Evaluation Data Manager.
- Includes: All procedural aspects
- Excludes: Methodological aspects of calculating the indicator value. These can be found in the methodology sheet.

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

- Policies: GPE 2020, Monitoring Sheet for GPE Results Framework Indicator # 16a
- Deadlines: M & E Data Manager updates results framework database with the Indicator # 16a data by 30th March
- Approval: The completed data template is prepared by the M&E Data Manager and includes quality checks by the M & E Data Manager and final approval from the Head of M & E

Issues /Risks:

- Complete ESP documentation might not be available in time.

Overview:



| Steps in the Process | Roles / Responsibilities | Outputs / Deliverables | Tools / Templates |
|--|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Compile Data Typically by 30 th January | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect the source documents through the program grant (ESPIG) application process or in direct contact with LEG, then store and classify the documents in appropriate N Drive or Box route. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring Unit (CST) (TBC) | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compile finalized and validated raw data templates for ESPs, coded by external coders under the supervision of the QA team, over the previous calendar year. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Specialist, QA | Coded ESPs | ESP data collection template |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classify the ESPs as meeting the minimal standards of credibility or not based on the methodology contained in the Methodology Sheets and processing through STATA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M & E Data Manager | | |
| 2. Aggregate Data Typically by 28 th February | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enter data into the consolidated ESP data collection template for indicator 16b/d/d | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M & E Data Manager | Completed data collection template | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compute indicator values using the completed data collection template | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M & E Data Manager | | |
| 3. Update Results Framework Database Typically by 30 th March | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|-----|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forward data collection template to the head of M & E for review and approval | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M & E Data Manager | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and approve completed data collection template | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of M & E | Approved data collection template | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update results framework database using completed template submitted by the Education Specialist QA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M & E Data Manager | Updated results framework database | N/A |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notify the secretariat on the availability of data in the results framework database through the intranet | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> M & E Data Manager | Notification on GPE intranet | |

Annex 3- Additional Analysis

Analysis based on different ranges of quality standards met

Sum the number of plans based on the number of standards met as per the following 4 options, then divide by number by the total number of plans in the sample:

- *INDICATORZERO_{ij}* Sum of ESP/TEPs that meet none of the 5 quality standards
- *INDICATORLOW_{ij}* Sum of ESP/TEPs that meets 1 to 3 quality standards, out of a possible total of 5
- *INDICATORMED_{ij}* Sum of ESP/TEPs that meets 4 quality standards, out of a possible total of 5
- *INDICATORHIGH_{ij}* Sum of ESP/TEPs that meets all 5 quality standards

a) Categorize the plans according to ranges of quality standards met

$$f(\text{NOGOODCRIT}_{k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{qs=1}^5 \text{GOODCRIT}_{qs,k,j,t} = 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$f(\text{GOODCRITLOW}_{k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{qs=1}^5 \text{GOODCRIT}_{k,qs,j,t} = (1, 3) \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$f(\text{GOODCRITMED}_{k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{qs=1}^5 \text{GOODCRIT}_{k,qs,j,t} = 4 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$f(\text{GOODCRITHIGH}_{k,j,t}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \sum_{qs=1}^5 \text{GOODCRIT}_{k,qs,j,t} = 5 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

b) Count the number of plans reaching the ranges identified in (a)

$$\text{INDICATORZERO}_{j,t} = \sum_{k=1}^K \text{NOGOODCRIT}_{k,j,t}$$

$$INDICATORLOW_{j,t} = \sum_{k=1}^K GOODCRITLOW_{k,j,t}$$

$$INDICATORMED_{j,t} = \sum_{k=1}^K GOODCRITMED_{k,j,t}$$

$$INDICATORHIGH_{j,t} = \sum_{k=1}^K GOODCRITHIGH_{k,j,t}$$

where:

j = DPC country

k = country ESP/TEP 1, ..., country ESP/TEP J

t = year of the evaluation

NOGOODCRIT = country plan meeting none of the minimum standards in any criteria

GOODCRIT = country plan meeting the minimum standards for any of *GOODCRIT1*, *GOODCRIT2*, *GOODCRIT3*, *GOODCRIT4*, *GOODCRIT5* (as defined in Step2b)

GOODCRITLOW = country plan meeting 1 to 3 quality standards (regardless of which standards)

GOODCRITMED = country plan meeting 4 quality standards (regardless of which standards)

GOODCRITHIGH = country plan meeting all the quality standards (5)

INDICATORZERO = number of country plans meeting none of the quality standards

INDICATORLOW = number of country plans meeting 1 to 3 quality standards (regardless of which standards)

INDICATORMED = number of country plans meeting 4 quality standards (regardless of which standards)

INDICATORHIGH = number of country plans meeting all the quality standards (5)

According to the above categorization (range of quality standards met) the indicator should be read as:

- Countries that developed a strategy to improve efficiency that **meets quality standards** are identified in *INDICATORHIGH*
- Countries that are **well on track** for developing an efficiency improvement strategy that meets quality standards are categorized in *INDICATORMED*
- Countries that are **far behind the target** of meeting quality standards for the efficiency improvement strategy are categorized in *INDICATORLOW* and *INDICATORZERO*

Various types of analyses could be run to complement the indicator as it stands for corporate purposes. Analysis at aggregated and country-unit levels shall provide insightful information for GPE (Secretariat and Partners) to dimension and tailor their technical support to a country's actual needs.

Analysis at the aggregate level: This analysis can provide a comparative basis by quality standards (see below formula), and by planning products (TEP or ESP). In a second step, this could help situating any given country among its peers (see below analysis at country-unit level).

The analysis per quality standard help identify specific areas where countries in majority had encountered problems. It is therefore expected that the Partnership pays closer attention to these areas to devise targeted and joint strategies to address the shortcomings as one. The Secretariat in its brokering role shall put partners together on identified areas. This is specifically pertinent for SPP work at global level.

Calculating the percentage of plans that meet the minimum standards per quality standard

$$IndicatorCRIT_{1,j,t} = \left(\frac{\sum_{v=1}^V GOODCRIT_{1,v,j,t} + \sum_{l=1}^L GOODCRIT_{1,l,j,t}}{V_{j,t} + L_{j,t}} \right) * 100$$

$$IndicatorCRIT_{2,j,t} = \left(\frac{\sum_{v=1}^V GOODCRIT_{2,v,j,t} + \sum_{l=1}^L GOODCRIT_{2,l,j,t}}{V_{j,t} + L_{j,t}} \right) * 100$$

$$IndicatorCRIT_{3,j,t} = \left(\frac{\sum_{v=1}^V GOODCRIT_{3,v,j,t} + \sum_{l=1}^L GOODCRIT_{3,l,j,t}}{V_{j,t} + L_{j,t}} \right) * 100$$

$$IndicatorCRIT_{4,j,t} = \left(\frac{\sum_{v=1}^V GOODCRIT_{4,v,j,t} + \sum_{l=1}^L GOODCRIT_{4,l,j,t}}{V_{j,t} + L_{j,t}} \right) * 100$$

$$IndicatorCRIT_{5,j,t} = \left(\frac{\sum_{v=1}^V GOODCRIT_{5,v,j,t} + \sum_{l=1}^L GOODCRIT_{5,l,j,t}}{V_{j,t} + L_{j,t}} \right) * 100$$

where:

v = country ESP 1, ..., country ESP V

l = country TEP 1, ..., country TEP L

V = total number of country ESPs included in the group sample

L = total number of country TEPs included in the group sample

t = year of the evaluation

$GOODCRIT_1$ = country plans meeting quality standard 1

$GOODCRIT_2$ = country plans meeting quality standard 2

$GOODCRIT_3$ = country plans meeting quality standard 3

$GOODCRIT_4$ = country plans meeting quality standard 4

$GOODCRIT_5$ = country plans meeting quality standard 5

$IndicatorCRIT_1$ = number of country plans meeting quality standard 1

$IndicatorCRIT_2$ = number of country plans meeting quality standard 2

$IndicatorCRIT_3$ = number of country plans meeting quality standard 3

$IndicatorCRIT_4$ = number of country plans meeting quality standard 4

$IndicatorCRIT_5$ = number of country plans meeting quality standard 5

Analysis at the country-unit level: This indicator shall be interpreted (and used) as a proxy for assessing the level of planning capacity⁵ within a given country to develop credible plans.

This analysis would allow the Secretariat and CST in particular to better identify the actual needs of the countries to fine-tune its direct technical support and reinforce its capacity of leveraging targeted assistance from among the Partnership.

Per each country, a report can be issued that identifies the number and type of quality standards met (see calculation method above) and provides a measurement of the country against the comparative basis of the other ESPs/TEPs (comparative benchmarking). Comparison will also be possible from a longitudinal perspective when countries submit ESPs or TEPs for a second or third time. The analysis of the combination of the quality standards met or not met is interesting to gauge the path that remains to develop core thematic strategies that meet quality standards.

Cumulative analysis: This analysis adds the various samples year after year to have a picture of the general efforts provided by the Partnership to significantly and globally increase the quality of ESPs and their strategies. This means that the group sample (denominator) of the 2014-15 baseline will be added to the 2016-17 sample, etc. Results will be aggregated the same way (numerator).

⁵ However, as stated in the data limitation section of this note, country leadership and ownership as well as political buy-in are not captured into this indicator. In that sense, interpretation of this indicator shall always be complemented by direct observation to refine the assessment of a country capacities to effectively plan.

Annex 4a - Full questionnaire for the assessment of the strategy on marginalized groups for ESPs

| Coder: | | Reviewer: | |
|--|---|-----------------|---|
| ESP Thematic Strategy- Equity | | Scoring | Comments and page numbers |
| Part 1: Marginalized groups in the ESP | | | |
| 1 | Which groups are mentioned by the ESP as being disadvantaged, marginalized, or excluded with regard to primary or lower secondary education? | 1: Yes 0: No | Specify page number. |
| a | Children from the poorest households | | |
| b | Girls | | |
| c | Boys | | |
| d | Children with disabilities | | |
| e | Ethnic and/or linguistic minorities | | |
| f | Religious minorities | | |
| g | Children in rural/hard-to-reach/remote areas | | |
| h | Low-demand populations (e.g. pastoralists) | | |
| i | Refugees and IDPs | | |
| j | Children affected by conflict and crisis | | |
| k | Orphans | | |
| l | Children affected by HIV/AIDS | | |
| m | Street children | | |
| n | Working children | | |
| o | Other (please specify) | | |
| Part 2: Evidence-base, relevance, monitorability of strategy addressing the most marginalized group | | | |
| 2 | Of the marginalized groups, please list the one that you consider to be the most important by the ESP (most mentioned or elaborated)? If you cannot decide between a few marginalized groups, as they seem to be equally important (mentioned/elaborated by the ESP), pick one that is evidence-based and has underlying causes identified. | | Specify the educational disadvantage faced: |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 3 | <p>Is the identification of educational disadvantage faced by the marginalized group based on data or evidence?</p> | <p>2: Yes, the disadvantage is identified through evidence 1: No, but an analysis is planned 0: No, it is not identified through evidence</p> | <p>Specify type of evidence:</p> |
| 4 | <p>Does the ESP clearly identify the underlying causes of educational disadvantage for this group?</p> <p>Causes should be sufficiently clear so they are explicit or strongly implied, but not inferred.</p> | <p>2: Yes, causes are clearly identified 1: Causes have not been identified but an analysis is planned 0: No, causes are not clearly identified and a study is not planned</p> | <p>Specify causes for the educational disadvantage:</p> |
| 5 | <p>Is there a strategy that addresses the main challenge and its underlying causes?</p> | <p>4: Yes, there is a strategy and it addresses ALL identified causes OR causes are not known but there is a strategy that will conduct this analysis 3: Yes, there is a strategy and it addresses SOME identified causes 2: Yes, there is a strategy but it DOES NOT address any identified causes 1: Yes, there is a strategy but causes were not clearly identified 0: No, there is no strategy</p> | <p>Specify the strategy:</p> |
| 6 | <p>Are the programs and activities found in the action plan aligned with the strategy?</p> <p>Check to see if the contents of the action plan are consistent with the strategy.</p> <p>Minor inconsistencies can be defined as a few small differences in some of the activities. Major inconsistencies can be defined as several differences in the activities/programs/objectives that lead to un clarity about what will be implemented.</p> | <p>2: Yes, the action plan is consistent with the strategy 1: No, there are minor inconsistencies 0: No, there are major inconsistencies</p> | <p>Describe any inconsistency observed:</p> |
| 7 | <p>Look at the results framework. Does the strategy have outcomes for most of its objectives and specific objectives?</p> | <p>2: Most (above 75%) objectives have corresponding outcomes 1: Some (between 74 -26%) objectives have corresponding outcomes 0: There are few or no outcomes</p> | <p>Justify your answer (include an example of one indicator and pg number):</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| 8 | Look at the results framework or action plan. Does the strategy have outputs for most of its activities? | 2: Most (above 75%) activities have corresponding outputs 1: Some (between 74 -26%) activities have corresponding outputs 0: There are few or no outputs | Justify your answer (include an example of one indicator and pg number): |
| 9 | Are the outcome and output indicators well-defined? (measurable and contain timeframe and targets) | 2: Most (above 75%) are well defined 1: Some (between 74 -26%)are well defined 0: There are no indicators | Justify your answer |

Annex 4b - Full questionnaire for the assessment of the strategy addressing marginalized groups for TEPs

| Coder: | | Reviewer: | | |
|--|---|-----------------|---------|---------------------------|
| TEP Thematic Strategy- Equity | | | Scoring | Comments and page numbers |
| Part 1: Marginalized groups in the TEP | | | | |
| 1 | Which groups are mentioned by the TEP as being disadvantaged, marginalized, or excluded with regard to primary or lower secondary education? | 1: Yes 0: No | | Specify page number. |
| a | Children from the poorest households | | | |
| b | Girls | | | |
| c | Boys | | | |
| d | Children with disabilities | | | |
| e | Ethnic and/or linguistic minorities | | | |
| f | Religious minorities | | | |
| g | Children in rural/hard-to-reach/remote areas | | | |
| h | Low-demand populations (e.g. pastoralists) | | | |
| i | Refugees and IDPs | | | |
| j | Children affected by conflict and crisis | | | |
| k | Orphans | | | |
| l | Children affected by HIV/AIDS | | | |
| m | Street children | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| n | Working children | | | |
| o | Other (please specify) | | | |
| Part 2: Evidence-base, relevance, monitorability of strategy addressing the most marginalized group | | | | |
| 2 | <p>Of the marginalized groups, please list the one that you consider to be the most important by the TEP (most mentioned or elaborated)?</p> <p>If you cannot decide between a few marginalized groups, as they seem to be equally important (mentioned/elaborated by the TEP), pick one that is evidence-based and has underlying causes identified.</p> | | | Specify the educational disadvantage faced: |
| 3 | <p>Is the identification of educational disadvantage faced by the marginalized group based on data or evidence?</p> | <p>2: Yes, the disadvantage is identified through evidence 1: No, but an analysis is planned 0: No, it is not identified through evidence</p> | | Specify type of evidence: |
| 4 | <p>Does the TEP clearly identify the underlying causes of educational disadvantage for this group?</p> <p>Causes should be sufficiently clear so they are explicit or strongly implied, but not inferred.</p> | <p>2: Yes, causes are clearly identified 1: Causes have not been identified but an analysis is planned 0: No, causes are not clearly identified and a study is not planned</p> | | Specify causes for the educational disadvantage: |
| 5 | <p>Is there a strategy that addresses the main challenge and its underlying causes?</p> | <p>4: Yes, there is a strategy and it addresses ALL identified causes OR causes are not known but there is a strategy that will conduct this analysis 3: Yes, there is a strategy and it addresses SOME identified causes 2: Yes, there is a strategy but it DOES NOT address any identified causes 1: Yes, there is a strategy but causes were not clearly identified 0: No, there is no strategy</p> | | Specify the strategy: |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 6 | <p>Is the content that addresses the equity challenges consistent throughout the TEP?</p> <p>Check to see if the contents of the strategies and operational elements (activity level) are consistent - are the activities aligned with the strategies?</p> <p>Minor inconsistencies can be defined as a few small differences in some of the activities. Major inconsistencies can be defined as several differences in the activities/programs/objectives that lead to unclarity about what will be implemented.</p> | <p>2: All content is consistent 1: Few minor inconsistencies 0: There are major or many inconsistencies</p> | <p>Describe any inconsistency observed:</p> |
| 7 | <p>Look at the results framework. Does the strategy have outcomes for most of its objectives and specific objectives?</p> | <p>2: Most (above 75%) objectives have corresponding outcomes 1: Some (between 74 -26%) objectives have corresponding outcomes 0: There are few or no outcomes</p> | <p>Justify your answer (include an example of one indicator and pg. number):</p> |
| 8 | <p>Look at the results framework or action plan. Does the strategy have outputs for most of its activities?</p> | <p>2: Most (above 75%) activities have corresponding outputs 1: Some (between 74 -26%) activities have corresponding outputs 0: There are few or no outputs</p> | <p>Justify your answer (include an example of one indicator and pg. number):</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---------------------|
| 9 | Does the TEP include a set of Key Performance Indicators that are well defined? | <p>2: KPI (KPI - see p.30 of TEP guidelines) are clearly identified and correspond to goals and objectives of the Plan AND They are well defined, i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Measurable (ii) contains a timeframe (iii) baseline and targets <p>1: KPI are clearly identified and correspond to goals and objectives of the Plan</p> <p>0: otherwise</p> | | Justify your answer |
|---|---|---|--|---------------------|