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+
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Basic content of Monitoring and Evaluation strategy

1. Results Framework
   • Specify goals clearly and numerically
   • Improve accountability for approved objectives

2. Accountability Matrix
   • Clearly define roles and responsibilities of partners for achieving the indicators

3. Impact Evaluation
   • “Prove” and “trace” total impact of Global Partnership
1. Results Framework

- Consistent with indicators used by country partners
- Information provided to Secretariat during the Joint Sector Reviews
- Sound information on quality achievements within the Global Partnership
- Provision on sex-disaggregated basis, especially outcome indicators
- Fragile and non-fragile states
- Aid effectiveness survey: every 3 years based on Secretariat questionnaire
2. Mutual Accountability Matrix

(Covered by Charles, noted here for completeness.)
3. Impact evaluation

Phase 1: Planning and coordination
- Independent Steering Committee
- Reconstruction of Global Partnership’s program theory
- Methodological Guidelines
- Extensive stakeholder consultation

Phase 2: Implementation of single studies
- Deep Country Case Studies
- Quality “rigorized” impact evaluations
- Secondary statistical analysis

Phase 3: Analysis, synopsis and interpretation
- Evaluation synthesis
- Additional field investigations
- Final report

Participation of developing country partners
Local-level Monitoring and Evaluation Issues

- Does country level monitoring deliver the information we need to monitor progress at the Partnership level?
- Is country level monitoring contributing towards better results for children?
Local-level Monitoring and Evaluation Issues

• Enrolment
• Attendance
• Girls/Boys
  • Learning outcomes?
  • Teacher absenteeism?
  • Time on task?

School

District/Region/Province

• Compiled and forwarded
• Feedback for planning and management?

Ministry of Education

• Compiled and forwarded
• Feedback for planning and management?

Joint Sector Review/LEG

• Access, quality, equity, management
• Progress towards targets?
• Learning outcomes?
• Quality of Service delivery?

Global Partnership for Education

• Results Framework:
  • Progress against targets by country
  • Progress against targets globally

UIS

- Country specific indicators
- Standard indicators with country specific values
Analysis of Joint Sector Reviews

• Assess how effective Joint Sector Reviews are as monitoring mechanisms at country level

• Highlight what elements need to be in place for this to be the case
## Overview of themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Sector Plan linkages</td>
<td>All indicate alignment with national/sector policies and address access, quality, equity and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards targets</td>
<td><strong>Most do not systematically and explicitly report against targets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector-wide</td>
<td>Few cover the full sector, though most include some other (than basic education) sub-sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed by studies</td>
<td>About half refer to studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>All cover finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Almost all cover inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Capacity</td>
<td>A big issue for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralization</td>
<td>Most cover, especially as an issue for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMIS</td>
<td><strong>Most make explicit references to problems with data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context specific</td>
<td>Most cover context specific issues (e.g. conflict, language)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Overview of themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes</td>
<td>Most refer to but very few have explicit data or means to measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Many have rhetorical references; few have substantial analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on school- and classroom level realities</td>
<td>Mostly addressed via field visits; few reports have explicit analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV and AIDS</td>
<td>Very few have substantial analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid harmonization</td>
<td>No more than a third(and this often mainly reference to funds-flow)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Overview of approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ToRs and Guidelines</td>
<td>Almost all cover (based on available record)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory work</td>
<td>Almost all (evaluations, annual reports, regional reviews, etc.) and varying forms of teams/committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation including civil society, private education providers</td>
<td>Only about half have participation beyond DPs, central/regional ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field visits</td>
<td>Most (affected by type of review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of recommendations</td>
<td>Some as high as 50-100+; many scattered/un-prioritized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking commitment to recommendations on agreed actions</td>
<td>Possibly less than a third, based on reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection on JSR process itself</td>
<td>Few reports assess the JSR itself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support to country-level monitoring

• Give weight to Monitoring and Evaluation in education plans and funding requests

• Support strengthened, locally owned monitoring systems and capacities

• Support local education groups to improve Joint Sector Reviews
  - Identify which countries effectively monitor
  - Facilitate dialogue and experience sharing
  - Develop guidelines
Organization

Secretariat monitoring and evaluation unit: responsible for monitoring elements of the Results Framework and the Accountability Matrix

An independent Steering Committee for the impact evaluation (to be established)
Next Steps

First Results Report next face-to-face Board meeting

Secretariat monitoring and evaluation unit fully functional by August 2012
Requested Decision

BOD/2011/11-XX – Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy: The Board of Directors approves the Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy presented in BOD/2011/11—DOC 05 and requests the Secretariat to establish a monitoring and evaluation unit that will be operational by August 2012. This unit will work with Coordinating Agencies to collect the information needed for the Results Framework and the Accountability Matrix in a timely and standardized manner.
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