

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

Indicator title **Indicator (32)** Proportion of (a) DCPs and (b) other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities in GPE country processes

Result measured (from GPE Results Framework):	<p><b>GLOBAL LEVEL OBJECTIVES - Strategic Objective (5)</b> Build a stronger partnership</p> <p>(a) Promote and coordinate consistent country-level roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities among governments, development partners, grant agents, civil society, teacher’s organizations, and the private sector through local education groups and a strengthened operational model</p>
---	---

### JUSTIFICATION FOR INDICATOR

Background/context for indicator:	<p>In addition to 16 substantive Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), among them SDG 4 on education (<i>Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all</i>), the SDGs include a final Goal (#17) to: “Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development”. A specific objective under this Goal (17.16) is to: “Enhance the global partnership for sustainable development, complemented by multi-stakeholder partnerships that mobilize and share knowledge, expertise, technology and financial resources, to support the achievement of the sustainable development goals in all countries, in particular developing countries”.</p> <p>In this context, it was recognized prior to the development of the SDGs that, to make Partnership work in development aid effective and efficient, a clear division of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities is crucial. For example, this recognized as a core element in the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the 2008 Accra Agenda for Action<sup>1</sup>. Its importance has been reiterated in the 2011 Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation<sup>2</sup>. Making the case for clear divisions of labor, the Paris Declaration recognized that “excessive fragmentation of aid at global, country or sector level impairs aid effectiveness. A pragmatic approach to the division of labor and burden sharing increases complementarity and can reduce transaction costs”.</p> <p>With regards to GPE specifically, country processes and the associated roles and responsibilities have evolved in recent years, as GPE transitioned from the Fast Track Initiative into a complex, multi-actor Partnership-based organization. With relevance to this, the GPE Country-level Process Guide states: “The Partnership is based on mutual accountability whereby all partners share in the responsibility of ensuring that all children achieve an education of good quality.</p>
-----------------------------------	---

<sup>1</sup> OECD, *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action*, Paris: OECD (2005 & 2008) retrieved May 24, 2016, from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/34428351.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Fourth High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, *Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness: Proceedings* (2011), retrieved March 2017 from <https://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/HLF4%20proceedings%20entire%20doc%20for%20web.pdf>

	<p>GPE promotes the alignment of development partner support behind government plans, assigning roles and responsibilities through mutually agreed processes”<sup>3</sup>.</p> <p>To know and understand, to a greater extent, which conceptions of roles and responsibilities exist among Partners at the Development Country Partner (DCP-) level, in 2013 and 2015 respectively, the GPE Secretariat administered questionnaires and focus group interviews, as well as a LEG Effectiveness Survey<sup>4</sup> and regional workshops to explore this topic. Anecdotal evidence and official feedback from these data collection efforts led to recommendations to the GPE Board of Directors to assess clarity regarding roles, responsibilities and accountabilities in greater detail as part of the new Operational Model and Results Framework, which was approved in 2015. Efforts are currently underway in pursuit of that purpose.</p>
Rationale for indicator selection:	<p>This indicator is included in the results framework to assess the extent to which there exists clarity of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities in respect of GPE-specific processes (see definition below) in DCPs, with a view to understanding to which extent GPE meets its Strategic Objective 5 to “build a stronger partnership”. The importance of this indicator is based on the understanding that clear communication, and an understanding of different Partners’ roles and responsibilities, are first steps to enable country-level Partners to effectively implement GPE processes centered on improved use of finance, sound sector planning and policy dialogue.</p> <p>An added value of this indicator is that it gives Partners at the country level a voice on how GPE can improve its involvement in the DCPs.</p>

## DEFINITION

Indicator definition:	<p>This indicator uses a standalone survey, which is administered yearly, to measure: (i) <b>strengthened clarity</b> of understanding of (ii) <b>DCPs’</b> and (iii) various <b>other partners’</b> (iv) <b>roles and responsibilities</b> related to (v) <b>GPE processes</b> at the country level.</p> <p>For the purpose of this indicator:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. “Strengthened clarity” (on roles and responsibilities at the country-level) refers to higher assessments from one year to another of respondents’ clarity. This is based on one question consisting of multiple items in a yearly online survey questionnaire, on the basis of which clarity index values are calculated.</li> <li>ii. “DCPs” refers to Developing Country Partners – all LEG members in a given DCP, including representatives of the partner government, typically the Ministry of Education.</li> <li>iii. “Other partners” refer to other LEG-members in a given DCP, for example: Coordinating Agencies; Grant Agents; civil society representatives; teacher union organizations; private sector foundations; or others excluding representatives of the partner government, typically the Ministry of Education.</li> </ol>
-----------------------	--

<sup>3</sup> Global Partnership for Education, *Country-level process guide*, (Washington, DC: GPE, 2015), retrieved May 25, 2016, from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/country-level-process-guide>

<sup>4</sup> Global Partnership for Education, *LEG effectiveness survey responses and regional workshop reports* [Data file] (2013), Materials accessed April 1, 2016.

- iv. “Roles and responsibilities” refer to the primary tasks or requirements of each category of partner as defined in GPE guiding documents (i.e. GPE Charter<sup>5</sup>, Country-Level Process Guide<sup>3</sup>, New Operational Platform proposal<sup>6</sup>). These are tied to GPE processes. *Note: the issue of accountabilities is not currently covered by this survey, but will be added once accountability mechanisms are clearly defined (planned for FY 2017).*
- v. “GPE processes” refer to GPE activities that occur at the national / state (as opposed to the regional or global) level, as indicated in the relevant guiding documents. Please note that, while the survey differentiates between GPE-specific and GPE-related processes, for this indicator, only responses regarding GPE-specific processes are considered.

To obtain the value for this indicator, a yearly survey is implemented in DCPs, using one main question, consisting of several items: “In the country in which you work, are the roles and responsibilities of key policy stakeholders clear in relation to the following GPE specific processes [etc.]”

On the basis of the response to this question, a clarity index score is calculated for each of the participating partners, grouped in (a) DCPs (b) other partners (see definitions above), such as the coordinating agency and grant agent. The score is calculated by converting to a percentage the proportion of positive responses across items, for each of the two categories (a) and (b), separately. It should be noted that all items address roles and responsibilities of Partners at country level in relation to GPE-specific processes, such as grants applications. There is a total of 24 items on the relevant question, and responses to each item are compulsory for the survey to be submitted.

The actual indicator value is generated by (1) comparing the index for each DCP or other Partner [aggregate score per country] in one reference year with that in the previous year, (2) deriving a negative (the index score decreased) or a positive (the index increased or was maintained) value from this comparison and finally (3) divide the number of positive values by the total number of instances and (4) multiplying this by 100. It is to be noted that data are reported separately for the two groups of reference, i.e. (a) DCPs and (b) other partners.

One advantage of this approach is that the indicator value, other conditions being met, provides a year-on-year comparable index score. However, a disadvantage is that, for the first year of measurement, no direct answer can be given to the question inherent in the indicator, as no comparator score for a previous year is available. Therefore, no baseline value is reported, and proportions of DCPs and other partners reporting increased clarity will be reported from FY 2017, when both a comparator score (for FY 2016) and an actual score (for FY 2017) will be available.

It is important to note that the survey is understood to reflect institutional, and not personal views (i.e. the respondents view should be generalizable to the institution on behalf of which they respond).

Unit of measurement:	Percentage
Disaggregation:	By FCAC / non-FCAC status

<sup>5</sup> Global Partnership for Education, *Charter of the Global Partnership for Education* (Washington, DC: GPE, 2013), retrieved May 25, 2016, from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/charter-global-partnership-education>

<sup>6</sup> Global Partnership for Education, *Global Partnership for Education proposal for a more effective operational platform* (2015) (BOD/2015/10 DOC 06).

Year for data reported (select only one and mark an "x")	_X_ fiscal year __ calendar year
Frequency of data collection:	Annually

## DATA TREATMENT

Source of information for collecting data:	Source document, template, etc.:	Online survey questionnaire
	Source agency:	Several in each DCP (LEG members); each DCP's Coordinating Agency will coordinate data collection at the country level but data will be submitted directly to GPE through the online survey tool.
Formula:	<p><b>Step 1:</b> For each <b>respondent r</b> in each <b>country j</b>, assign a value to their response for each <b>item i</b> of question 3 (<math>Q3item_{j,i,r,t}</math>), in a given year t:</p> $Q3item_{j,i,r,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the response to item } i \text{ of Question 3 is "Yes"} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ <p>Where:</p> <p>j= DPC countries 1,2,3...N i = items 1, 2, ..., 24 in Question 3 r = <math>\begin{cases} a &amp; \text{if the respondent is the Ministry of Education} \\ b &amp; \text{if otherwise} \end{cases}</math> t= year</p> <p><b>Step 3:</b> For each country <b>j</b>, by category <b>r</b>, in a given year <b>t</b>, calculate a clarity index by dividing the number of positive item responses in Question 3 by the total number of responses in the corresponding category, and then multiply this by 100.</p> <p>For category <b>a</b>:</p> $Clarity\ Index_{j,a,t}(Q3item_{j,i,a,t} = 1) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{24} Q3item_{j,i,a,t}}{24} * 100$ <p>For category <b>b</b>:</p> $Clarity\ Index_{j,b,t}(Q3item_{j,i,b,t} = 1) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{24} Q3item_{j,i,b,t}}{24} * 100$ <p>Where:</p> <p><math>Clarity\ Index_{j,a,t}</math> reflects the proportion of positive responses in Question 3 for DCP <b>j</b> in category <b>a</b> in time <b>t</b></p> <p><math>Clarity\ Index_{j,b,t}</math> reflects the proportion of positive responses in question 3 for DCP <b>j</b> in category <b>b</b> in time <b>t</b></p>	
Aggregation formula:	<p>To obtain the corporate indicator (i.e. proportion of <b>(a)</b> DCPs and <b>(b)</b> other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles and responsibilities in GPE country processes), is obtained by comparing the Clarity Index, for each category (a) and (b), in reference year (t) with that of the previous year (t-1) and calculating, for each category, the proportion of countries</p>	

with an equal or greater Clarity Index in year (t) (i.e. the Clarity Index increased or was maintained):

Step 1: For each country  $j$ , assess whether there was an improvement in the Clarity Index (CI) between two consecutive years,  $t$  and  $t-1$ :

For category a:

$$Improved\_CI_{j,a,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } Clarity\ Index_{j,a,t} - Clarity\ Index_{j,a,t-1} \geq 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

For category b:

$$Improved\_CI_{j,b,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } Clarity\ Index_{j,b,t} - Clarity\ Index_{j,b,t-1} \geq 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Step 2: Compute the percentage of countries that show an improvement in their Clarity Index (CI) in year  $t$

For category a:

$$Prop(Improved\_CI_{a,t} = 1)_a = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_a} Improved\_CI_{j,a,t}}{N_a}$$

For category b:

$$Prop(Improved\_CI_{b,t} = 1)_b = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_b} Improved\_CI_{j,b,t}}{N_b}$$

Where:

$Prop(Improved\_CI_{a,t})_a$  reflects the proportion of DCPs reporting strengthened clarity of roles and responsibilities in GPE country processes in year  $t$

$Prop(Improved\_CI_{b,t})_b$  reflects the proportion of other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles and responsibilities in GPE country processes

$N_{a,t}$  = total number of DCPs giving an answer in category a

$N_{b,t}$  = total number of DCPs giving an answer in category b

Data limitations (if any known / anticipated):

- **Construct validity:** Participants are asked to respond in a generic way in respect of clarity of roles and responsibilities. It may be that they find some aspects clear, while they find others unclear. While this is inevitable, given the inherent trade-off between precision and survey efficiency, it should be considered in the reading of the results.
- **Desirability bias:** Respondents may be reluctant to give feedback that indicates that they do not fully understand GPE processes for fear that it would jeopardize their funding in an increasingly results-based operational model. Similarly, they may hesitate to criticize the support given by GPE, if they see them as a link to financing. While the survey is anonymous on the individual level, responses can be retracted to categories of Partners in each country.
- **Sampling:** It might be difficult to obtain a representative sample of respondents from all relevant categories in each DCP. In addition, given the (small) sample size at country level, changes in respondents from year to year may impact on indices, yielding an imperfect view of change over time. This should be taken into account in the reading of any results.

- **Response rates:** due to the fact that the survey is forwarded, within each DCP, to all LEG members, by the Coordinating Agency, and as the LEG composition in several countries is not known, it is likely to be challenging to monitor response rates.

To obtain the corporate indicator (i.e. proportion of **(a)** DCPs and **(b)** other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles and responsibilities in GPE country processes), is obtained by comparing the Clarity Index, for each category (a) and (b), in reference year (t) with that of the previous year (t-1) and calculating, for each category, the proportion of countries with an equal or greater Clarity Index in year (t) (i.e. the Clarity Index increased or was maintained):

Step 1: For each country *j*, assess whether there was an improvement in the Clarity Index (CI) between two consecutive years, *t* and *t-1*

For category **a**:

$$Improved\_CI_{j,a,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } Clarity\ Index_{j,a,t} - Clarity\ Index_{j,a,t-1} \geq 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

For category **b**:

$$Improved\_CI_{j,b,t} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } Clarity\ Index_{j,b,t} - Clarity\ Index_{j,b,t-1} \geq 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Interpretation

Step 2: Compute the percentage of countries that show an improvement in their Clarity Index (CI) in year *t*

For category **a**:

$$Prop (Improved\_CI_{a,t} = 1)_a = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_a} Improved\_CI_{j,a,t}}{N_a}$$

For category **b**:

$$Prop (Improved\_CI_{b,t} = 1)_b = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_b} Improved\_CI_{j,b,t}}{N_b}$$

Where:

$Prop (Improved\_CI_{a,t})_a$  reflects the proportion of DCPs reporting strengthened clarity of roles and responsibilities in GPE country processes in year *t*

$Prop (Improved\_CI_{b,t})_b$  reflects the proportion of other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles and responsibilities in GPE country processes

$N_{a,t}$  = total number of DCPs giving an answer in category *a* in year *t*

$N_{b,t}$  = total number of DCPs giving an answer in category *b* in year *t*

## REFERENCES

- Fourth High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness. *Busan High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness: Proceedings*. 2011. Retrieved March 2017 from <https://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/HLF4%20proceedings%20entire%20doc%20for%20web.pdf>

- Global Partnership for Education. *Country-level process guide*. Washington, DC: GPE, 2015. Retrieved May 25, 2016, from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/country-level-process-guide>
- Global Partnership for Education. *Global Partnership for Education proposal for a more effective operational platform*. 2015. (BOD/2015/10 DOC 06).
- Global Partnership for Education. *Charter of the Global Partnership for Education*. Washington, DC: GPE, 2013. Retrieved May 25, 2016, from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/charter-global-partnership-education>
- Global Partnership for Education. *LEG effectiveness survey responses and regional workshop reports* [Data file]. 2013. Materials accessed April 1, 2016.
- OECD. *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the Accra Agenda for Action*. Paris: OECD, 2005 & 2008. Retrieved May 24, 2016, from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/effectiveness/34428351.pdf>

## ANNEXES

### Annex 1- Data Collection tool

Data collection tool utilized for collecting the data, if any:	Indicator 32 Survey, administered using Survey Monkey (see Annex 3)
--	---

### Annex 2- Standard Operating Procedure

<b>Process Name:</b> Data Collection, Quality Assurance, and Storage for Indicator # 32 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 # 32 (Proportion of (a) DCPs and (b) other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities in GPE country processes) of the GPE results framework.		
<b>Results / Outputs</b>  This process should result in the results framework being updated with quality assured data on indicator #32.  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 administer the survey on the clarity of roles and responsibilities at the country level.</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: Data is collected once a year</li> </ul>		
<b>Standards (Policies, Approvals, Deadlines, etc.):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies: GPE 2020, Methodology Sheet for GPE Results Framework Indicator #32.</li> <li>• Deadlines: M &amp; E Data Manager updates results framework database with the Indicator # 32 data by</li> </ul>		

<p>June 30<sup>th</sup>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approval: The completed data template is populated by the Indicator lead and includes quality checks by the M &amp; E Data Manager and final approval from the Head of M &amp; E</li> </ul>
<p><b>Issues /Risks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respondents may not fill out the questionnaires in time and this might affect or slow down some of the steps in the process.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Overview:</b></p>

Steps in the Process	Roles / Responsibilities	Outputs / Deliverables	Tools / Templates
<b>1. Administer Survey</b> Typically by 15 <sup>th</sup> May			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruit an STC (hereafter STC, I32) to administer the survey on the clarity of roles and responsibilities at the country level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Head of M&amp;E</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obtain a list of countries and CA contact persons to be surveyed from CST. Update the survey to coincide with this list, if necessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC, I32</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Send link of the survey via email to CAs and copy the CLs at <a href="mailto:survey32@globalpartnership.org">survey32@globalpartnership.org</a> (including an introductory message with instructions).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CST team</li> </ul>	Emails containing links to the survey	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Initiate data collection using Survey Monkey or any off-the-shelf survey tool.</li> </ul>	STC, I32		
<b>3. Tracking Survey Responses</b> Typically by 15 <sup>th</sup> June			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Track responses while the survey is active.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC, I32</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request country leads to follow up with CA's if survey response is low.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC, I32</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Send two reminders using Survey Monkey to increase the response rate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC, I32</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Close survey after two weeks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC, I32</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inform country leads about the status of the survey and response rates from their respective countries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC, I32</li> </ul>		
<b>Aggregate Data</b> <b>Typically by 15<sup>th</sup> June</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, I32</li> </ul>		Data collection template
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compute indicator values using the completed data collection template, disaggregated based on the latest available classification of countries affected by Fragile and Conflict, and forward to the M&amp;E Data Manager.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC, I32</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, I32.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M &amp; E Data Manager</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Respond to the comments/queries, update data collection template as necessary and forward to the M&amp;E Data Manager.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STC, I32</li> </ul>		
<b>Update Results Framework Database</b> <b>Typically by 30<sup>th</sup> June</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 and approve completed data collection template</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Head of M &amp; E</li> </ul>	Approved data collection template	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update results framework database using completed template submitted by the Indicator Lead.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M &amp; E Data Manager</li> </ul>	Updated database	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sent out a notification to the Secretariat that the data is available in the results framework database.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• M &amp; E Data Manager</li> </ul>		
--	--	--	--

### Annex 3 - Survey questionnaire

#### Indicator 32 Survey

*Clarity of roles and responsibilities in GPE processes at the country level*

#### Guidance notes

- In 2015, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) adopted a new Results Framework as part of its 2016-2020 Strategic Plan (GPE 2020). This survey corresponds to indicator 32\* of this Results Framework. It seeks to monitor partners' understanding of roles, responsibilities and accountabilities in GPE processes at the country level, with a view to improving guidance on this from the GPE Secretariat.
- This survey is institutional rather than personal. We therefore request you to respond on behalf of your organization. The data from this survey will be analyzed at GPE-wide level; country level; and in respect of respondent categories, but not at the level of individual organizations.
- This survey contains four (4) substantive questions and should take no more than 15 minutes of your time to complete.
- You must complete the survey in one sitting: it is not possible to save a partial response and restart it.
- Please direct questions/issues to: [TBC—R&P team]
- **Thank you in advance for your time and thoughtfulness in responding.**

\* Indicator 32 measures: *“Proportion of (a) DCPs and (b) other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities in GPE country processes”.*

#### Respondent characteristics

**[1]** For which country are you completing this survey questionnaire?

*[There is a complete list of GPE countries / states from which the respondent may select one.]*

**[2]** In what capacity do you respond to this survey?

*Select one:*

- On behalf of the Ministry of Education
- On behalf of the Coordinating Agency (CA)
- On behalf of the Grant Agent (GA) (formerly Supervising Entity or Managing Entity)
- On behalf of a bilateral development partner (other than CA or GA)
- On behalf of a multilateral development partner (other than CA or GA)
- On behalf of a **nongovernmental** organization (NGO)
- On behalf of a **teacher** organization
- On behalf of a **foundation**
- On behalf of an organization from the **private sector**
- Other – please explain: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Survey

3. In the country in which you work, are the roles and responsibilities of key policy stakeholders clear in relation to the following GPE specific processes? (yes / no)

Stakeholder/Process	(a) GPE Grant Application Process	(b) GPE Grant Implementation	(c) Grant Monitoring and Reporting
1. Local Education Group (or equivalent)	y/n		
2. Ministry of Education			
3. Coordinating Agency			
4. Grant Agent			
5. Development Partners			
6. Civil Society Partners			
7. Teacher Organizations			
8. Private Sector Partners			

4. In the country in which you work, how clear are the roles and responsibilities of key policy stakeholders clear in the following sector policy processes that are supported by GPE?

Stakeholder/Process	(a) Education Sector Planning	(b) ESP Appraisal and Endorsement	(c) Joint Sector Review/Sector Monitoring
1. Local Education Group (or equivalent)	y/n		
2. Ministry of Education			
3. Coordinating Agency			
4. Grant Agent			
5. Development Partners			
6. Civil Society Partners			
7. Teacher Organizations			
8. Private Sector Partners			

5. Has the clarity of roles and responsibilities improved over the last year?

Yes / no

6. What can the GPE Secretariat do to enhance the clarity of roles and responsibilities in these country level processes?

.....  
 .....