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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator title</th>
<th>Indicator (20)</th>
<th>Proportion of grants supporting EMIS/learning assessment systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result measured (from GPE Results Framework):</td>
<td><strong>Strategic objective (3)</strong></td>
<td>GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a)</td>
<td>GPE financing is used to improve national monitoring of outcomes, including learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## JUSTIFICATION FOR INDICATOR

### Background/context for indicator:

- Solid national-level systems to support the generation of sound education statistics data, as well as for the generation of learning assessment data, are crucial to building education systems able to monitor and evaluate progress towards their objectives in educational development and ultimately achieve equity and effectiveness.

- The Global Partnership for Education (GPE) Strategic Plan 2016–2020, 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.

- 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.

- A Learning Assessment System (LAS) generates information on student learning. Effective assessment systems are those that provide information of sufficient quality and quantity to meet stakeholder information and decision-making needs in support of improved education quality and learning outcomes.

- Similarly, the objective of a well-functioning education management information system (EMIS) is to not only collect and process information but also support in education policy-making by providing relevant and accessible information. Within this context, EMIS are perceived as an

---

indispensable tool and support system for the formulation of education policies. Looking forward, the GPE, through its Strategic Plan 2016-2020, is committed to continue its work with national governments and other country-level partners to build capacity and strengthen monitoring of outcomes and more effective and evidence-based policy dialogue. The GPE recognizes that relevant, reliable and timely data are crucial to build effective national education systems, monitor policy implementation and enable global monitoring.

This indicator is included in the results framework as it reflects the result statement: “GPE financing is used to improve national monitoring of outcomes, including learning”.

As articulated in the ESPIG application, section C, part I: The availability of critical data and evidence for planning, budgeting, managing, monitoring and accountability or alternatively, a strategy to develop capacity to produce and effectively use critical data, Grant Agents and DCPs are asked to provide information on the following:

1. **Education Sector Analysis**: information and dates, analytic elements (e.g. demographic analysis, analysis of existing policies, costs and financing, system performance and system capacity); degree of vulnerability and equity of marginalized groups.

2. **Data Requirement**: submission of data to UIS, gaps in national data (such as data quality issues, disaggregation by gender, availability of data on marginalized groups, financial data, etc.) strategies to address data gaps and whether they are part of the endorsed ESP.

3. **Systems of Mechanisms to Monitor Learning Outcomes**: a system for measuring learning outcomes; systems gaps and strategies to address these gaps.

As stipulated in the GPE Results Framework, GPE collects data on Education Management Information Systems (EMIS) and Learning Assessment Systems (LAS) from its Grant Agents to promote the monitoring of learning outcomes in DCPs at the grant level, and help GPE aggregate its data at the portfolio level.

This indicator is also a part of a cluster of indicators (see table below) in strategic objective number three, aiming to efficiently and effectively finance the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency, and learning through ESPIGs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3: GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning</th>
<th>Indicator 20</th>
<th>Grants support improved information management and learning assessment systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicators 21-23</td>
<td>Textbooks purchased, teachers trained and classrooms built or rehabilitated, as planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 24</td>
<td>Grants support achievement of targets for equity, efficiency and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 25</td>
<td>Grant implementation on track</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 Global Partnership for Education. *GPE portfolio review* (Washington, DC, 2015) [http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/annual-portfolio-review-2015](http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/annual-portfolio-review-2015)
DEFINITION

This indicator tracks GPE’s support to the development or improvement of either EMIS or LAS or both, through ESPIG grants.

GPE defines an “Education Management and Information System” (EMIS) as a system for the collection, integration, processing, maintenance and dissemination of data and information to support decision-making, policy-analysis and formulation, planning, monitoring and management at all levels of an education system. It is a system of people, technology, models, methods, processes, procedures, rules and regulations that function together to provide education leaders, decision-makers and managers at all levels with a comprehensive and integrated set of relevant, reliable, unambiguous and timely data and information to support them in fulfilling their responsibilities.  

GPE defines a learning assessment as: “the process of gathering and evaluating information on what students know, understand, and can do in order to make an informed decision about next steps in the educational process,” whereas an assessment system is “a group of policies, structures, practices, and tools for generating and using information on student learning and achievement.” It is the use of this information that is key for improving learning, and for that to be possible, learning data must be accompanied by contextual data so that factors that impact learning can be identified and action taken. When we talk about a national learning assessment system, what we are talking about is a functional apparatus, usually housed within a Ministry of Education, which gathers information on learning – together with contextual data – nationwide and feeds this information back to the policy, management, and classroom levels to improve learning.

“Support” means that a given ESPIG has provided funding in the reporting year to enhance/develop an EMIS and/or a LAS during the year in which EMIS/LAS were developed.

An ESPIG will be considered to have supported EMIS/LAS if it supported:
1. Only an EMIS
2. Only a LAS
3. Both an EMIS and a LAS
4. Either LAS or EMIS

All active ESPIGs at the end of the reference financial year will be considered for the purpose of this indicator.

Unit of measurement: Proportion (of ESPIGs, active at the end of the reference financial year) that supported EMIS/LAS.

Disaggregation: By Fragile/conflict-affected Country / Non-fragile/conflict-affected Country

Year for data reported (select only one and mark an “x”)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>X</em> fiscal year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>X</em> calendar year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of data collection: Every two years

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of information for collecting data:</th>
<th>Source document, template, etc.:</th>
<th>ESPIG Annual Implementation Status Reporting Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source agency:</td>
<td>Multilateral and bilateral agencies acting as Grant Agents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### At the ESPIG level.

1. **Assess whether a given ESPIG supported only EMIS during a given reporting period in country j:**
   \[ EMIS_{i,j,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the ESPIG i supported only EMIS in country } j \text{ in reporting period } t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]
   where:
   - \( EMIS_{i,j,t} \) reflects whether ESPIG \( i \) only supported EMIS during a given reporting period \( t \) in country \( j \)
   - \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \) (with \( N \) being the total number of ESPIGs in the sample)

2. **Assess whether a given ESPIG supported only LAS during a given reporting period:**
   \[ LAS_{i,j,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the ESPIG i supported only LAS in country } j \text{ in reporting period } t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]
   where:
   - \( LAS_{i,j,t} \) reflects whether ESPIG \( i \) only supported LAS during a given reporting period \( t \) in country \( j \)
   - \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \) (with \( N \) being the total number of ESPIGs in the sample)

3. **Assess whether a given ESPIG supported both EMIS and LAS during a given reporting period:**
   \[ EMIS&LAS_{i,j,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the ESPIG i supported both EMIS and LAS in country } j \text{ in reporting period } t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]
   where:
   - \( EMIS&LAS_{i,j,t} \) reflects whether ESPIG \( i \) supports both EMIS and LAS during a given reporting period \( t \) in country \( j \)
   - \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \) (with \( N \) being the total number of ESPIGs in the sample)

4. **Assess whether a given ESPIG supported either EMIS or LAS during a given reporting period:**
   \[ EMISORLAS_{i,j,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the ESPIG i supported EMIS or LAS in country } j \text{ in reporting period } t \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]
   Where:
   - \( EMISORLAS_{i,j,t} \) reflects whether ESPIG \( i \) supports either EMIS or LAS during a given reporting period \( t \) in country \( j \)
   - \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, N \) (with \( N \) being the total number of ESPIGs in the sample)

### Aggregation formula:

1. **Proportion of ESPIGs supporting the development/improvement of an EMIS only during the reporting period:**
   Add up the number of ESPIGs that supported the development or improvement of an EMIS only in a given reporting period, and divide that number by the total number of ESPIGs.
\[ EMIS_{j,t} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} EMIS_{j,i,t}}{N} \]

(2) Proportion of ESPIGs supporting the development/improvement of a LAS only during the reporting period:

Add up the number of ESPIGs that supported the development or improvement of a LAS only in a given reporting period, and divide that number by the total number of ESPIGs.

\[ LAS_{j,t} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} LAS_{j,i,t}}{N} \]

(3) Proportion of ESPIGs supporting the development/improvement of both an EMIS and a LAS during the reporting period:

Add up the number of ESPIGs that supported the development or improvement of both an EMIS and a LAS in a given reporting period, and divide that number by the total number of ESPIGs.

\[ EMIS&LAS_{j,t} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} EMIS&LAS_{j,i,t}}{N} \]

(4) Proportion of ESPIGs supporting the development/improvement of either an EMIS or LAS during the reporting period:

Add up the number of ESPIGs that supported the development or improvement of either an EMIS or a LAS in a given reporting period, and divide that number by the total number of ESPIGs.

\[ EMISORLAS_{j,t} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} EMISORLAS_{j,i,t}}{N} \]

Where,

\( N = \) total number of ESPIGs during a given reporting period

Data limitations (if any known / anticipated):

Data collected for this indicator only indicate whether or not an ESPIG supported EMIS/LAS in a given financial year. This indicator is not designed to measure EMIS/LAS functionality or any other information that would help assess levels of EMIS/LAS effectiveness, efficiency, or sustainability.

Interpretation

A high value indicates that DCPs are generally allocating part of their grants to components related to the strengthening of data management and monitoring data systems. This, in turn, suggests a commitment to increase the availability of education sector data to monitor sector outcomes and progress.
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## ANNEXES

### Annex 1 - Data Collection tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection tool utilized for collecting the data, if any:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG Annual Implementation Status Reporting Template</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 2 - Standard Operating Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Name: Data Collection, Quality Assurance &amp; Storage for Indicators # 20 of the GPE Results Framework</th>
<th>Owner: R&amp;P Team</th>
<th>Updated:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function: Measuring GPE Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material changes from prior version of SOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None; this is the first version.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

This SOP describes the process for data collection, quality assurance, and storage for indicator # 20 (Proportion of grants supporting EMIS/learning assessment systems) of the GPE results framework.

### Results / Outputs

This process should result in the results framework being updated with quality assured data on indicator # 20.

Interim outputs of the Secretariat:

- Completed data collection sheet

Final Output:

- Updated results framework database

### Scope

- Begins: The process begins with introducing the ESPIG Annual Implementation Status Reporting Template to the Grant Agents through online training sessions.
- 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 Indicators # 20
- Deadlines: M & E Data Manager updates results framework database with the Indicator # 20 data by 15th November
- Approval: The completed data template is prepared by the Monitoring Officer (MU) and includes quality checks by the M & E Data Manager and final approval by the Head of M&E

### Issues /Risks:
- Relevant documents might not be available to the Grant Agents on time.

### Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in the Process</th>
<th>Roles / Responsibilities</th>
<th>Outputs / Deliverables</th>
<th>Tools / Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Request Data Collection</td>
<td>2. Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data</td>
<td>3. Aggregating Data</td>
<td>Update results framework database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 15th September</td>
<td>By 30th September</td>
<td>By 30th October</td>
<td>By 15th November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Steps in the Process

1. **Request Data Collection**  
   Typically by 15th September

   - Introduce the ESPIG Annual Implementation Status Reporting Template to the Grant Agents through online training sessions.
     - Monitoring Officer (MU)
     - ESPIG Annual Implementation Status Reporting Template

   - Send out the template to Grant Agents along with instructions for completing the template
     - Monitoring Officer (MU)

   - Create a folder in box for each of the relevant indicators and create an email address for Grant Agents to submit their templates, as well as designated support person for issues with filling out the template
     - Monitoring Officer (MU)

   - Fill out and submit the template to the dedicated email address
     - Grant Agents

   - Create an excel sheet per indicator and a master sheet to aggregate the data from the template
     - Monitoring Officer (MU)

   - Create a tracker sheet to track submissions by grant/country and follow up with the submitter if required
     - Monitoring Officer (MU) and support from Country Leads

2. **Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data**  
   Typically by 30th September

   - Conduct a first review to identify and flag issues. Those issues may include but are not limited to missing target/actual numbers, discrepancies of performance target information between the template and PAD, significantly under or over performance numbers, etc.
     - Monitoring Officer (MU)

   - Compare the data entered through the template with the information provided
     - Monitoring Officer (MU)
in PADs, restructuring papers or any other relevant document.

- For each indicator that has data issues, summarize the issues and sets up a meeting with the relevant CLs
  - Monitoring Officer (MU)

- Once the issues are resolved, update the indicator and master sheets.
  - Monitoring Officer (MU)

- Once data quality verification is done, aggregate the data and generate a performance analysis of global indicators, based on the data template.
  - Monitoring Officer (MU)
  - Quality Assured data collection sheet

- Make note of any issues that have not been resolved and provides a summary of data limitations along with the analysis.
  - Monitoring Officer (MU)

### 2. Aggregate Data
Typically by 30th October

- Enter data into the template provided by the M&E Data Manager
  - Monitoring Officer (MU)
  - Data Collection Template

- Compute indicator values using the completed data collection template, based on the latest available classification of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict and forward to M & E Data Manager.
  - Monitoring Officer (MU)
  - Completed data collection template and indicator values
  - List of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict from the GPE Intranet

- Review completed data collection template and send comments/queries to the Monitoring Officer(MU)
  - M & E Data Manager

- Respond to the comments/queries, update data collection template as necessary and forward to M & E data Manager
  - Monitoring Officer (MU)
  - Updated data collection template

### 3. Update Results Framework Database
Typically by 15th November

- Forward data collection template to the Head of M & E for review and approval
  - M & E Data Manager
Annex 3 - Additional Analysis

Number of ESPIG supporting the development of EMIS/LAS at the DCP level
Determine for each ESPIG whether it support EMIS and/or LAS.

Number of ESPIGs supporting the development/improvement of EMIS/LAS at the portfolio level
Add up the number of ESPIGs that supported the development or improvement of EMIS/LAS and determine where which ESPIGs supported either EMIS or LAS. Divide the number of ESPIGs that supported either EMIS/LAS by the total number of ESPIGs.

Example: Table 1 below summarizes the data collected indicator #20 in a given reporting period. According to the data in this table:

(a) The proportion of ESPIGs supporting only EMIS is 2/8 = 25%  
(b) The proportion of ESPIGs supporting only LAS is 4/8 = 50%  
(c) The proportion of ESPIGs supporting both EMIS/LAS is 1/8 = 12.5%  
(d) The proportion of ESPIGs supporting either EMIS or LAS is 7/8 = 87.5%

Table 1: ESPIGs that supported EMIS/LAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESPIGs</th>
<th>Raw data from ESPIGs</th>
<th>Supported EMIS</th>
<th>Supported LAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPIG 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where:
1 = yes  
0 = no

Annex 4 - STANDARDIZED GRANT REPORTING TEMPLATE

Global Partnership for Education  
Education Sector Program Implementation Grant (ESPIG)  
– Annual Implementation Status Reporting Template –

3-2. ESPIG support to the development or improvement of an Education Management Information System (EMIS)

Note: 3-2. applies only to the ESPIG8

8 If the Program is a pooled program, please complete ONLY when the EMIS is financially supported by the ESPIG.
Baseline (July 2014-June 2015) | Current reporting period | Next reporting period
--- | --- | ---
a. Did the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of an EMIS during the reporting period?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No
b. Did the ESPIG support the development or improvement of an EMIS during the reporting period?
   - □ Yes
   - □ ECD
   - □ Primary
   - □ Lower Secondary (check all that apply)
   - □ No

does the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of an EMIS during the next reporting period?
   - □ Yes
   - □ ECD
   - □ Primary
   - □ Lower Secondary (mark all that apply)
   - □ No

Education Management Information System
A system for the collection, integration, processing, maintenance and dissemination of data and information to support decision-making, policy-analysis and formulation, planning, monitoring and management at all levels of an education system. It is a system of people, technology, models, methods, processes, procedures, rules and regulations that function together to provide education leaders, decision-makers and managers at all levels with a comprehensive and integrated set of relevant, reliable, unambiguous and timely data and information to support them in fulfilling their responsibilities.

3-3. ESPIG support to the development or improvement of a learning assessment system
Note: 3-3 applies only to the ESPIG.

Baseline (July 2014-June 2015) | Current reporting period | Next reporting period
--- | --- | ---
(a) Did the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of a learning assessment system during the reporting period?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No
(b) Did the ESPIG support the development or improvement of a learning assessment system during the reporting period?
   - □ Yes
   - □ ECD
   - □ Primary
   - □ Lower Secondary (check all that apply)
   - □ No
(c) If Yes to (b), was the learning assessment system implemented during the reporting period?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No
(d) If Yes to (c), is the updated data on learning available this reporting period?
   - □ Yes
   - □ No
(e) If Yes to (d), please attach to Annex 3 the updated data on learning.

Does the ESPIG plan to support the development or improvement of a learning assessment system during the next reporting period?
   - □ Yes
   - □ ECD
   - □ Primary
   - □ Lower Secondary (check all that apply)
   - □ No

If the Program is a pooled program, please complete ONLY when the learning assessment system is financially supported by ESPIG.
Learning assessment system

Please refer to the definitions for “assessment,” “assessment system,” and “learning assessment system” that follow:

Assessment is “the process of gathering and evaluating information on what students know, understand, and can do in order to make an informed decision about next steps in the educational process,” whereas an assessment system is “a group of policies, structures, practices, and tools for generating and using information on student learning and achievement.” It is the use of this information that is key for improving learning, and for that to be possible, learning data must be accompanied by contextual data so that factors that impact learning can be identified and action taken. When we talk about a national learning assessment system, then, what we are talking about is a functional apparatus, usually housed within a Ministry of Education, which gathers information on learning – together with contextual data – nationwide and feeds this information back to the policy, management, and classroom levels to improve learning. As Pedro Ravela and his colleagues point out: “Assessment in and of itself does not produce improvement. There must be stable links between the domains of assessment and those of curriculum development, teacher training, research, policy design, communications and outreach, among others.” In this way, a strong national learning assessment system closes the feedback loop to the rest of the education system to achieve meaningful improvement in learning.

---