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1. Introduction: What kind of Strategic Plan does the Global Partnership for Education need?

After a significant organizational transformation, the Global Partnership for Education (the "Global Partnership" or "GPE") is entering its second strategic planning cycle. This note explores some of the strategic questions and opportunities that will be considered at our December 2014 meeting. It is organized into four parts, focusing on:

- The evolution of the Global Partnership.
- Strengths and weaknesses in the Global Partnership’s current operational model.
- Challenges and opportunities emerging from changes in our wider environment.
- A suggested pathway for responding to the above as part of the strategic planning cycle.

Before turning to these substantive issues, it may be useful to start out by asking, “What kind of strategic plan does the Global Partnership need at this stage in its development?”

A host of literature suggests that different kinds of strategic plans are needed at different points in an organization’s life cycle. The Global Partnership’s current Strategic Plan was what strategists call an “umbrella” document. It admirably framed a wide set of aspirations, bringing together for the first time diverse partners around a common mandate. Yet my sense, based on conversations with many of you, is that our next Strategic Plan must be something quite different.

As a newcomer to the Global Partnership, I am struck by the fact that it still operates very much in “startup” mode. We can liken its developmental phase to the rapid brain growth that characterizes human adolescence. The Global Partnership is full of energy, ideas, and the desire to try new things. It faces at times a bewildering range of opportunities and demands for its attention, and it is also part of a global ecosystem for innovation and catalytic reform in education that is much stronger today than 15 years ago. It has a bit of an identity crisis - its purpose and operational model is understood quite differently both by internal stakeholders and external actors.

To realize the full potential of our partnership, the next Strategic Plan needs to be clearer about how the Global Partnership as an organization will achieve measurable outcomes for children. It must establish principles through which it can prioritize and support different pathways to these outcomes, demonstrating the Global Partnership’s comparative advantage within the wider ecosystem of development cooperation. It must also tackle the challenge of strengthening our partnership model and operational platform.
2. The Evolution of the Global Partnership and its Operational Model

The Global Partnership was formed as the Fast Track Initiative ("FTI") after the World Education Forum in Dakar 2000 and the Monterrey Development Finance meetings in 2002. It was not, in its initial formulation, intended to be an organization in its own right, but rather a multilateral framework for strengthening national education plans, improving aid effectiveness, coordinating donor support and galvanizing the financing required for achieving the Education for All goals. FTI endorsement of robust national plans was envisaged as having a catalytic effect in raising donor financing for basic education, while FTI pooled-funds were to be delivered by the World Bank’s education sector team and managed using World Bank technical expertise. From the very beginning, key stakeholders expressed competing visions of the primary purposes of the organization:

- As a mobilizer of external resources to fulfill the Dakar pledge that no country should be left behind for lack of finance;
- As a platform for ensuring better targeting of aid flows to countries most in need;
- As a mechanism for intensifying donor coordination at the country level, ensuring harmonization, alignment and country ownership;
- As a promising way to involve citizens and civil society in formulation and implementation of education policy, ensuring broad national ownership.

By 2009, considerable concern had emerged that the FTI did not live up to its promise in any of these areas (Winthrop and Steer 2014; Rose et al 2014). In 2010, prompted by an external evaluation, the FTI Board mandated a significant transformation of the FTI into a constituency-based Partnership with stronger representation from developing country partners and non-state actors, rebranded as the Global Partnership for Education. In 2012, the Global Partnership adopted its first Strategic Plan.

Following this reform, the Global Partnership’s operational platform continued to focus on the value of country-owned education sector plans, supported by key stakeholders at the country level (ideally in a Local Education Group). But the Global Partnership also expanded its direct technical support to country processes, through technical engagement, new guidelines, capacity development activities, and sharing of global best practices and innovations. The Global Partnership’s rationale and procedures for grant allocations were changed to allow for substantially greater support to fragile and conflict-affected countries, and diversification of Supervising and Managing Entities (“SE/MEs”). Funding was granted to support civil society engagement in educational policy processes and the Global Partnership began to more systematically explore collaboration with the private sector. First steps were taken towards developing greater capacity to monitor results on the ground. Fundraising and advocacy capacity was developed and used to support two successful replenishment conferences.

In 2014, the Board adopted a new funding model (“NFM”) for the organization. Reflecting the GPE Charter, which describes the Global Partnership as “a compact explicitly linking increased donor support for education to recipient countries’ policy performance and accountability for results,” the
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GPE Guiding Principles

- a) Country ownership;
- b) Benchmarking;
- c) Support linked to performance;
- d) Lower transaction costs;
- e) Transparency;
- f) Development results and value for money;
- g) Mutual accountability.

---
NFM sets stronger threshold criteria for initial funding and provides a variable tranche of funding to countries based on performance.

Today, the Global Partnership has a modest but improved operational platform, and has shown significant capacity to transform itself. The Global Partnership has emerged as the fourth largest funder of basic education in developing countries (GPE/R4L 2014). But perhaps most striking is the expansion in the number of developing countries who are GPE members, from 44 countries in 2010 to 59 in 2014 (28 of these fragile or conflict-affected). To join the Global Partnership, countries make domestic commitments to credible sector plans and to enhance domestic financing. And they are following through on these commitments: on average domestic spending on education, as a share of GDP, has increased faster in countries that join the partnership (GPE 2013, 2014).

3. **Strengths and Weaknesses in the Global Partnership’s current Operational Model**

Despite the major transformation of the Global Partnership since its inception, key questions about its operational model continue to be asked by external and internal stakeholders. As a starting point, this section begins with an overview of the Global Partnership’s operational model and value-add, which is presented in a stylized form below. It then examines weak links in the Global Partnership’s operational model.

**The Operational Model**

At its core, the Global Partnership is charged with mobilizing greater financial resources and greater political will at the global level. It uses membership in the Global Partnership and the promise of grants to leverage credible and costed national education sector plans, to which governments and international donors commit resources. By bringing donors and other national stakeholders to the table around the national plan, it in turn leverages donor alignment, enhances local ownership, and creates a platform for greater accountability. The Global Partnership then commits funds to programs that directly support improvements to educational systems as laid out in national plans, using supervising and managing entities as its intermediaries. It also provides modest levels of direct technical advice throughout implementation and through its Global and Regional Activities and other global initiatives that enhance innovation and evidence-based reform. It increasingly monitors outcomes and, with the introduction of the new funding model, is newly able to leverage results through a variable tranche of results-based funding.

The Global Partnership’s core strengths can be summarized as follows:

- Focus on country-led processes and systems strengthening.
- Ability to leverage the power of partnership – through convening, advocacy and accountability at both global and national levels.
- Ability to leverage knowledge, best practice and cross-national learning to strengthen the capacity of developing country partners to deliver on their plans.

**Challenges with the Operational Model**
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1 Developing country partners pledged $26 billion in domestic commitments to basic education at GPE’s 2014 replenishment.
Below is a list of “weak links” in the Global Partnership’s complicated delivery chain, based on consultations with internal and external stakeholders to date. While few would argue with the notion that the Global Partnership’s country-driven model and partnership approach are key sources of strength, there are, broadly, two main clusters of challenge evident in this list – those that imply a need for tighter oversight and more direct intervention by the Global Partnership in the national planning process; and those that suggest the need to develop more effective use of other levers – for example, through the creation of better platforms for accountability and use of performance data, or more focused approaches to cross-national learning, innovation and best practice.

Two main ways of strengthening these weak links in the GPE business model suggest themselves, which ideally would work in tandem with country-led and owned policies and plans:

- **Using incentives and stronger accountability mechanisms to drive a results focus in the Global Partnership’s delivery chain.** This would require a much different type of relationship with intermediary partners, LEGs and developing country partners, and it is complicated by our composition as a partnership, within which partners play both authorizing (Board), delivery, and client/grant recipient roles. While promising, incentive-based accountability approaches require stronger definition of principal/agent relationships, mutually agreed performance standards, and arms-length procedures for validation of performance.

- **Leveraging cross-partner commitment and effectiveness through joint problem solving, experimentation and stronger dissemination of technical knowledge and expertise.** The Global Partnership can learn much from other successful international partnership arrangements where peer review, cross-national problem solving, and benchmarking of best practice through cross-national comparison, are used to create significant momentum for policy change. One could imagine many ways in which the Global Partnership could support stronger national policy-making and dialogue in key areas of strategic interest (gender, learning, inclusion, effective teaching, strengthening of data and planning), for example, through the development of common goals and benchmarks, engagement in common technical efforts to explore policy solutions, or even through direct capacity development among partners.

Taken as a whole, these challenges suggest that the Global Partnership has had difficulty in locking together knowledge, innovation and objective external validation to leverage enhanced country processes and results. Yet several recent studies suggest that locking these three components together is the hallmark for successful global development partnerships and platforms (Isenman 2011; see also Sachs et al 2014). As highlighted in the Organizational Review, effectively locking these components together would require expanded capacity and more rigorous use of technical knowledge and external validation, which may cut against the foundational vision of the organization as a light touch partnership whose operational platform relies primarily on intermediaries to drive a focus on results through pre-existing systems and expertise.
**List of Weak Links in the Global Partnership's Operational Model**

1. Does not have a strong mechanism for vetting and ensuring national education sector plans are credible, costed, and focused on delivering the most cost effective interventions to achieve the core objectives in the GPE strategic plan (equity, learning, gender, teaching effectiveness). It relies heavily on Local Education Groups to quality assure, which have variable capacity and composition.

2. Has had limited success in leveraging overall increases in volume, predictability, alignment and harmonization of international financing for basic education. Aid to basic education remains highly fragmented and total external resources for basic education have declined – especially for fragile and conflict-affected states. It has had some success in leveraging greater harmonization at the country level.

3. Has limited control and uneven capacity to catalyze change at implementation stage. It relies on the SE and ME’s to oversee its grants. It uses their systems for monitoring, fiduciary oversight and technical support and requires limited reporting and accountability. Some Partners question the value added of using SE/ME’s – arguing for more fully aligned funding, using direct funding and monitoring.

4. Has not found the right recipe for crowding in cross-national knowledge sharing, innovation and best practice around sector plans and their implementation, particularly in key areas of strategic importance: gender, learning, equity, and teacher effectiveness.

5. Efforts to harness the power of partnership have been weak. There is limited line of sight between its country level model and its activities to strengthen civil society and engage with other partners on specific strategic objectives.

6. Has not adequately supported transparency and the availability of financial and other information in ways that can enhance broader accountability for outcomes. This is especially true in relation to monitoring domestic finance pledges, monitoring learning outcomes, and monitoring the volume and quality of donor commitments at the country level.

7. Does not have a sufficiently robust and independent mechanism for measuring results as laid out in its results based funding model. Should it continue to rely on LEGS, SE/MEs and a constituency-based committee to act as both initial endorsers of grant proposals and final arbiters of national results?

---

4. **Looking Up and Out: Drivers of Change as We Enter 2015**

Strategic planning typically starts with a scoping of the challenges and opportunities in the wider environment over the medium to longer term. For the Global Partnership, significant medium and long-term drivers of change include changes in the international development regime and the geopolitical environment; trends in development among low-income countries; and more specifically challenges and opportunities for education in the countries and populations we serve. Each of these is briefly addressed below, with some of the key implications for the Global Partnerships strategy going forward.
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Changes in Geopolitical Context and the International Development Regime

Dani Rodrik describes the current global geopolitical situation as one “leaderless globalization” (Rodrik, 2012). The G7 governments that have historically backed international development continue to face high debt and low growth (particularly in Europe). They are focused on complex security issues that threaten global stability and the global economy, including recent events in Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and the growth of violent fundamentalism. We can speculate that finance for global development is unlikely to emerge high on the policy agendas of G7 countries unless it is linked to areas that directly address these collective geopolitical challenges. Rising powers, such as China, India, Brazil, and countries in the Middle East (among others), are increasingly powerful on the global stage, and have become influential development actors: annual concessional flows from emerging economies to low-income countries was roughly estimated to be between US$12–15 billion by 2011, equivalent to about 10 percent and 15 percent of the aid provided by developed countries (World Bank, 2013). However, emerging economies tend to utilize their development aid to expand geopolitical influence on a bilateral basis, and this may in turn be reducing broader international appetite for multilateralism. In addition, rising powers share a limited appetite for international regimes that constrain national sovereignty, including in such putatively domestic spheres as education.

Recent OECD DAC reports highlight a downward trend in international aid flows since 2011, alongside a decline in the proportion of ODA channeled through multilateral mechanisms. As we gear up for a post-2015 development debate next September, there is broad recognition that we have reached the end of the Gleneagles era. The more expansive ambitions reflected in UN efforts to frame a post-2015 development agenda are unlikely to be met, at least in the shorter term, by a rising and more coordinated official development effort. This will put greater pressure on finding new sources of development finance and novel ways of increasing its efficiency and effectiveness.

At the same time, globalization has increased connectivity across societies, yielding the rise of a more activist global community demanding more effective global governance in social policy domains. It is in this context that nontraditional multi-stakeholder partnerships have become the “new black” for international development, because they lock together more traditional characteristics of multilateral effectiveness (lower transaction costs and better allocation), with expanded advocacy capacity, a focus on innovation, more inclusive sourcing of expertise, and nontraditional approaches to finance (Severino and Ray 2012; Sachs 2014; Kharas and Blomfield 2013).²

Underlying these trends is a broader shift in the global geography of poverty: today only 25% of the world’s poor live in low-income countries as compared to 90% twenty years ago. At the same time, the share of the global poor living in fragile states has doubled, from 21 percent to 42 percent since 1990 (Chandy and Kharas 2014). Among those countries enjoying strong economic growth, about half currently designated as “low-income” are expected to graduate to middle-income status by

² Multilateral aid instruments have been understood as offering four main advantages: lower transaction costs through enhanced coordination; a greater focus on poverty due to distance from concerns with economic or geopolitical advantage by the bilateral donor; economies of scale; and enhanced capacity to leverage norms and knowledge. As Kharas and Blomfield (2013) points out, the situation today is different because of the proliferation of multilateral institutions – there are now approximately 212 official multilateral bodies and 21 international multi-stakeholder development partnerships.
2025. In these countries, where inequality is typically rising and stubborn pockets of poverty persist, there is growing consensus that international finance can best be used to leverage greater domestic finance for programs that address poverty and inequality.

Countries projected to remain in the low-income (IDA-eligible) category will primarily be small, fragile and conflict-affected states, where extreme poverty will remain widespread (Severino and Moss 2012). For low-income countries, as well as newly graduated middle-income countries, both conflict and climate change will introduce additional risks and volatility that can lead to sudden reversals in human development trajectories. Tailored responses are needed to respond to these varied contexts.

Drivers of Education Change in Low - Income Countries

For this audience, there is no need to rehearse the outstanding challenges facing the education sector in low-income countries. After a decade of remarkable progress in expanding access to primary education, fuelled by rising domestic expenditure on schooling, about 58 million children are still out of school. Almost half of these out-of-school children worldwide live in fragile and conflict-affected states. While some forms of inequality have narrowed, the intersection of gender, poverty, geography and other factors continues to exclude large numbers of children. Low levels of learning lead to the silent exclusion of an additional estimated 250 million primary aged children. The outlook for universal completion of good quality basic education is thus still many years away, particularly for countries that have high population growth rates.

As highlighted in the 2014 Results for Learning Report, there is significant variation in the educational trajectories of low-income countries. A handful of high performing countries has already achieved near universal coverage of primary and lower secondary, with little dropout and fewer over-age children. But the majority of our developing country partners face much stiffer challenges: even where near universal entry to primary school has been achieved, significant rates of early drop out and repetition continue to characterize their educational systems. The low quality of schooling (combined with high opportunity costs) pushes many disadvantaged children out of school before completion of a full primary cycle. At the same time, there is growing pressure on governments to expand secondary level access, leading in some cases to a drop in the share of the education budget going to primary education.

We are much closer today than a decade ago to understanding the kinds of investments that can address these issues. A significant and growing body of research suggests that pedagogical reforms that better match teaching to student learning levels early in the school cycle are among the most cost-effective places to invest when addressing improvements in learning outcomes and enhanced rates of participation (Kremer et. al. 2013; Pritchett 2013; Hattie 2013; McEwan 2014).

Additionally, there is evidence that equity and learning can be galvanized through cross-sectoral investments. Thus early childhood education and targeted health related interventions in school (for example, eyeglasses, deworming, school lunches) have been proven to have strong, and in
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3 For example, in Sub-Saharan Africa the population of children between the ages of 5 and 14 is expected to grow by 45% between 2010 and 2030

4 This may sound simple, but it is far from that, since it includes getting well-trained teachers into all early grade classrooms (especially those that serve remote or marginalized populations), delivering an appropriate curriculum, backed by materials, a strong diagnostic and instructional toolkit, and a keen belief in the capacity of all children to learn.
some contexts, catalytic, impacts on both learning and inclusion (Glewwe and Kraft 2014). More speculatively, there is mounting interest in the use of low cost technologies, either to enhance pedagogy or provide direct content to children, with much experimentation underway in this area (Kremer 2013, Sachs 2014, Wagner 2014).

At the core of the Global Partnership model is the notion that good quality country plans form the foundation for tackling equity and quality issues. Critics like Lant Pritchett argue that centrally planned educational systems are unlikely to yield an acceptable pace of change for advancing children’s learning outcomes (Pritchett 2013). In contrast, others point to countries in Asia and elsewhere where rapid gains in access and learning for the poorest quintiles have been driven by strong, well-sequenced central government policies and standards, routine benchmarking of progress, and attention to teaching effectiveness (OECD 2011). The solution therefore seems to be more than the development of plans that have clear goals and targets – good plans need to focus on the most cost effective and catalytic investments for achieving equity and learning goals, be backed by costed implementation plans, enjoy strong domestic financing and aligned donor support. Crucially they must harness broad domestic ownership, opportunities for innovation, and accountability for results.

Yet recent reviews both by the Global Partnership and UNESCO’s GMR suggest that very few education sector plans meet these standards. Most plans are not costed, are not based on good quality analysis, and do not have specific equity targets or learning outcome measures early enough in the basic education cycle to provide for course correction. Tools for monitoring and providing feedback at implementation phase are weak. Thus there is much more to be done to support effective planning and implementation – including supporting the better collection and use of data in two crucial areas: equitable improvement in learning outcomes; and the allocation of public finance. Such data is not only important for planning but also for enhanced accountability – including direct accountability to parents and communities, as recent experiments by Pratham in India and UWEZO in East Africa have shown.

A Changing Architecture for International Aid to Education

Finally, it is worth turning to the wider architecture for international development in education. As Rose et. al. report, education remains a high priority in official donor statements and in surveys undertaken as part of the development of the post-2015 development goal. The draft education targets that have now been set by the Open Working Group and the UNESCO Muscat forum are even more ambitious than the current EFA and the MDG goals in education - they include a focus on early childhood education and universal secondary education (see Appendix A). There has been a remarkable growth in the diversity of actors engaged in EFA, including new philanthropies, think tanks, southern NGOs and citizen organizations – reflecting not only the broadening of public support but also the growth of innovation and stronger technical and analytic capacity in the field.

Yet while the broader ecosystem for education development is more thickly populated today than a decade ago, the overall picture for official aid to education has been softening (more so than in other
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5 Thus of 53 country plans reviewed, fewer than half had specific targets for gender equity; and only a handful targeted other markers of disadvantage, such as geographic disparity (rural/urban), household wealth, or ethnicity. Fewer than 1/3 of the plans reviewed mention monitoring of inequality in learning outcomes.

6 A forthcoming analysis from the UNESCO GMR estimates that NGOs alone deliver between US$2.6 and 5.2 billion per annum for educational development – much of which is concentrated in basic education.
sectors), with official flows declining since 2011, especially for basic education and for education in fragile and conflict-affected contexts. Education suffers from having a small base of significant donors, among whom there has been significant volatility since 2010; and remains highly fragmented with many partners engaged in some countries, and too few in others (Rose et. al, 2013). Flows of funding to support the education of children displaced by protracted crises have remained stubbornly low. Lower ODA will put pressure on all development organizations for greater geographic and thematic prioritization.

This context leads to competing views within the global EFA community. On the one hand are the realists, who argue for a greater focusing of efforts to gain better outcomes from limited funds. On the other, are increasing calls from luminaries such as Jeff Sachs and Gordon Brown, for a potentially new mechanism that links innovation, expertise, advocacy, ambition and new sources of finance. The Global Partnership is very much caught in middle of this larger debate.

5. Next Steps: Scope and Process for Strategic Planning

At the beginning of this discussion note, I suggested that to fully realize the promise of our partnership, the next Strategic Plan must be more focused on the question of how the Global Partnership as an organization will achieve identified outcomes for children. At the same time, this note has also canvassed opportunities and trends within the external environment to which the next Strategic Plan will need to respond. It raises important questions for the Board, highlighting areas where the Global partnership might more effectively mobilize the powerful assets available to it as a multi-stakeholder partnership.

Defining the scope and pathway for the further development of the Global Partnership’s platform will be a critical part of Board’s conversation about the next Strategic Plan during 2015. As a starting point, the GPE Secretariat has prepared a potential process timeline (See Appendix B). It has also prepared a timeline that places this Strategic Plan in relation the GPE replenishment and evaluation cycles (see Appendix C).

The process timeline in Appendix B highlights three potential decision points:

- **May 2015 Board meeting** - key initial decisions and review a Concept Note;
- **A proposed September 2015 Board meeting** (if the Board agrees) – Review and agree to a “zero” draft Strategic Plan, taking on board findings from external evaluation of the Global Partnership;
- **December 2015 Board meeting** - the Board would be asked to approve the final Strategic Plan, which would be accompanied by an implementation plan and a commonly agreed results framework.

The timeline also proposes two main work-streams for the first half of 2015 for consideration by the Board - with a third work-stream focused on development of an implementation plan and results framework coming online after September 2015:

**Work-stream 1: Strengthening the GPE operational model.** This work-stream would focus on strengthening the Global Partnership’s core operational platform (business model, theory of change). It would address questions about the efficacy of the model, in relation to the quality of national plans, the role of intermediary entities and LEGs, and our capacity for driving results through mutual accountability. It would also consider how the Global Partnership can better crowd
in expertise, innovation, and external validation into its country-led model. Questions to be addressed in this work-stream might include:

1. What is the Global Partnership’s operational model, and its unique value-add?
2. How can we better define roles and mutual accountabilities between the Secretariat, SE/MEs, LEGS, and developing country partners?
3. How can the Global Partnership most effectively crowd in alignment, expertise and innovation into its country-level work?

**Work-stream 2: Defining areas of ambition and reach.** In this work-stream, the focus will be on examining areas where the Global Partnership has unique comparative advantage in supporting our partner countries to address specific bottlenecks or challenges to educational progress. It will establish robust principals for prioritization among the many opportunities afforded to us as a multi-stakeholder partnership. It will also review whether further differentiation is needed in our programs to address needs in specific contexts. Questions in this work-stream might include:

1. What principles and criteria should be used to prioritize among various opportunities for increasing the Global Partnership’s catalytic impact?
2. How can the Global Partnership further enrich its efforts to strengthen systems and financing for equitable and good quality basic education?
3. Where does the Global Partnership have unique value to add in achieving stronger learning outcomes?
4. What more can/should the Global Partnership do to support education for children in fragile and conflict affected settings – including in humanitarian emergencies?
5. How should the Global Partnership respond to the need for more robust data and evidence?
6. Are there cross-sectoral issues, especially between health and education, and in early childhood development, that the Global Partnership is uniquely placed to address?


McEwan, P. 2014. Improving Learning in Primary Schools of Developing Countries: A Meta Analysis of Randomized Experiments.

Murnane, R. 2014. Improving Educational Outcomes in Developing Countries, Lesson from Rigorous Evaluations. NBER Working Paper Series No. 20284 Cambridge MA.


### Appendix A: Summary of Current Education Sustainable Development Goals in 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development Goals</th>
<th>Global Education Goals (UNESCO/Muscat Agreement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 4. Provide quality education and life-long learning opportunities for all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 by 2030 provide all children access to quality early childhood care and pre-primary education</td>
<td><strong>Target 1:</strong> All children participate in and complete a full cycle of free, compulsory and continuous quality basic education of at least 10 years, including 1 year of pre-primary education, leading to relevant and measurable learning outcomes based on national standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 by 2030, ensure all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes</td>
<td><strong>Target 2:</strong> Increase transition to and completion of quality upper secondary education by x %, with all graduates demonstrating relevant learning outcomes based on national standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 by 2030 ensure equal access for all to affordable quality tertiary education, including university</td>
<td><strong>Target 3:</strong> Tertiary education systems are expanded to allow qualified learners to access and complete studies leading to a certificate, diploma or degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 by 2030 promote life-long learning, provide employable skills especially to young women and men, and increase by at least x% adult literacy and basic numeracy</td>
<td><strong>Target 4:</strong> All youth and adults achieve literacy, numeracy and other basic skills at a proficiency level necessary to fully participate in a given society and for further learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 by 2030, eliminate gender disparities and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for people in vulnerable situations, including persons with disabilities</td>
<td><strong>Target 5:</strong> Increase by x% the proportion of youth (15-24 years) with relevant and recognized knowledge and skills, including professional, technical and vocational, to access decent work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 by 2030 integrate into education programs knowledge and skills necessary for sustainable development, human rights, gender equality, promoting a culture of peace and non-violence and culture’s contribution to sustainable development</td>
<td><strong>Target 6:</strong> Increase by x% participation in continuing adult education and training programmes, with recognition and validation of non-formal and informal learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.a by 2030 increase by x% the supply of qualified teachers, including through international cooperation for teacher training in developing countries</td>
<td><strong>Target 7:</strong> Close the teachers’ gap by recruiting adequate numbers of teachers who are well-trained, meet national standards and can effectively deliver relevant content, with emphasis on gender balance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.b by 2020 expand by x% globally the number of scholarships for students and government officials from developing countries in particular LDCs to enroll in higher education, including vocational</td>
<td><strong>Target 8:</strong> All young people and adults have opportunities to acquire – supported by safe, gender-responsive and inclusive learning environments – relevant knowledge and skills to ensure their personal fulfilment and contribute to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
training, programmes in developed countries and other developing countries.

4.c build and upgrade education facilities that are child and gender sensitive and provide safe and inclusive learning environments.

peace and the creation of an equitable and sustainable world.

**Target 9:** All countries progress towards allocating 6% of their Gross National Product (GNP) to education and 20% of their government budget to education, prioritizing groups most in need.

**Target 10:** All donors’ progress towards allocating at least 20% of their Official Development Assistance (ODA) or its equivalent to education, prioritizing countries and groups most in need.
# Appendix B: Proposed GPE Strategic Planning Timeline - 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retreat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Board Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Board Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Board Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Committee Consultations</td>
<td>• Partner Consultations</td>
<td>• Secretariat working groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Concept Note</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to External Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft for comment expected July 1, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strengthening our Operational Model</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discussion Paper</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identifying Areas of Reach and Ambition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stream 3</strong>: Results Framework and Implementation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Quality Education for All Children*
### Appendix C: Alignment of GPE Planning and Replenishment Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Replenishment Cycles</th>
<th>Strategic Plan (3 year cycle)</th>
<th>Strategic plan (5 year cycle)</th>
<th>Evaluation and Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Replenishment</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Strategic plan</td>
<td>Alternative term for 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; strategic plan</td>
<td>Independent Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid Term Review (Jan 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Impact Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Next Replenishment Cycle</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate date for impact evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>