Draft Theory of Change and Results Framework
GPE Strategic Plan 2016–2020

1. Introduction and Overview

This document presents a draft Theory of Change and Results Framework for the Global Partnership for Education (“Global Partnership” or “GPE”), based on the Strategic Plan Concept Note developed for consultation in May 2015. It is intended to kick off discussions at the October 2015 Board Retreat, illustrating how the Partnership will leverage its business model to produce results that will fulfill GPE strategic goals and objectives.

Theory of Change (ToC) is a methodology for planning and evaluation that is widely used in the international development community. The methodology is used to help organizations to visualize and define long-term goals, and to map backward from these goals to the building blocks (outcomes, outputs) that are required to achieve anticipated results and impact. A ToC diagram proposes the pathway an organization will follow to achieve its goals. It also identifies the key assumptions and risks that link each step in the change pathway. A ToC is normally accompanied by a Results Framework, which identifies how each step in the change pathway will be monitored.

This paper is organized as follows: it begins by presenting a draft ToC diagram, with a short narrative description and cross-cutting assumptions. This is followed by a draft Results Framework, which identifies indicators that might be used to monitor each step in the change pathway.

Please Note:

- The ToC and Results Framework are zero drafts. They will be modified to reflect key decisions and comments from the October Board Retreat. In particular, Board decisions on GPE scope and scale – on a strengthened platform, and on its global mandate – will need to be fully reflected through revisions to this document after the October Board Retreat.

- The Results Framework presented is based on both available indicators and indicators that require substantial development and investment. At the December Board meeting a one-year costed Monitoring and Evaluation Framework will be presented alongside the final ToC and Results Framework, mapping a timeline and the resources needed for introducing such indicators and the means through which periodic reporting will be conducted.

2. GPE Theory of Change

The Global Partnership for Education (‘the Global Partnership’ or ‘GPE’) is a multi-stakeholder partnership that supports the development of equitable, efficient, and high-quality education systems in low- and lower-middle-income countries so that all girls and boys learn and achieve their right to good-quality education. In alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Incheon Declaration, the Global Partnership supports the focus on the provision of twelve years of quality education for all children.
of free, publically funded, equitable, quality primary and secondary education (of which at least nine are compulsory); at least one year of free and compulsory quality pre-primary education; and second-chance learning opportunities for those excluded from the formal system.

In its [draft] Strategic Plan 2016–2020 the Global Partnership commits to contributing to impact on learning outcomes and equity and inclusion. According to the Partnership’s vision statement and its ToC, the Global Partnership has identified two main impacts:

1. Improved student learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning.
2. Increased equity and inclusion of all children, including the poorest and those marginalized or excluded by gender, disability, or conflict and protracted crisis.

As captured in the GPE Charter, partnership is at the heart of the Global Partnership’s ToC. At the country level, the Global Partnership is focused on supporting governments, with the help of local stakeholders, to deliver results in the areas of equity and learning. The GPE global-level work is designed to create the conditions for improved impact at the country level. Thus at the global level the Partnership promotes coordination and cooperation among bilateral and multilateral agencies, developing country governments, and key stakeholders from civil society and the private sector, in order to raise awareness and mobilize international resources to meet the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable, focusing primarily on the basic education sub-sector.

GPE capacity to achieve results comes from locking together sector coordination mechanisms, national sector planning cycles, along with financial and technical support from across the partnership. Four levers are at the core of its business model:

a) The Global Partnership funds and supports the development and implementation of credible sector-wide policies and plans, bringing partners together to support this plan in a harmonized manner.

b) The Global Partnership fosters inclusive and evidence-based sector policy dialogue, focused on addressing critical barriers to implementation and achieving results in equity and learning.

c) The Global Partnership provides financing to governments to support the implementation of efficient programs and activities that lead to the achievement of results in equity and learning in education.

d) The Global Partnership, working at the global level, convenes, advocates and works with its partners to provide improved technical advice, better monitoring of results, and knowledge sharing and exchange of good practice.

The ToC diagram presented in Figure 1 below presents each of these four areas as outputs that lead along a pathway of change to the Global Partnership’s intended impact. It shows how global level activities feed stronger planning and policy dialogue at the country level which, along with GPE direct financing for education sector plan implementation (as illustrated by the financing arrows), lead to stronger educational systems with the capacity, resources, and information/evidence needed to support a step change in equity and learning outcomes in developing partner countries.

**Figure 1: Global Partnership for Education: Theory of Change**
Quality education for all children
3. **Alignment Between the Theory of Change and the Strategic Plan Concept Note**

The Theory of Change is closely aligned to the Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives laid out in the Draft Concept Note, as described in the table below. Revisions made to the Goals and Objectives made at the October Board Retreat will be reflected in the final Theory of Change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory of Change Description</th>
<th>Strategic Plan Goals/Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact/Outcomes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goal 1</strong>: Increase the proportion of girls and boys in GPE Partner countries receiving a full cycle of quality education of at least 12 years, including at least 1 year of pre-primary education. <strong>Goal 2</strong>: Significantly improve teaching and learning in order to increase relevant learning outcomes. <strong>Goal 3</strong>: Significantly improve the capacity, effectiveness and efficiency of education systems to achieve gains in equity and learning for all children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Improved student learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning.</td>
<td><strong>Goal 1</strong>: Increase the proportion of girls and boys in GPE Partner countries receiving a full cycle of quality education of at least 12 years, including at least 1 year of pre-primary education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increased equity and inclusion of all children, including the poorest and those marginalized or excluded by gender, disability and conflict/fragility.</td>
<td><strong>Goal 2</strong>: Significantly improve teaching and learning in order to increase relevant learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stronger educational systems with the capacity, resources, and data to make tangible improvements in access for the poorest and most marginal, and to accelerate the quality of teaching and learning.</td>
<td><strong>Goal 3</strong>: Significantly improve the capacity, effectiveness and efficiency of education systems to achieve gains in equity and learning for all children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Country-Level Outputs | Strategic Objective 3  
**Stronger Sector Planning Leading to Improved Policy Implementation**  
- Provide funding for sector analysis and sector planning.  
- Monitor planning processes.  
- Support capacity for improved planning and policies on equity and learning. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Stronger Sector Planning Leading to Improved Policy Implementation**  
- Provide funding for sector analysis and sector planning.  
- Monitor planning processes.  
- Support capacity for improved planning and policies on equity and learning. |
| 1. **Stronger sector planning and policy implementation** |  
1.1 Sector analysis and planning leads to stronger country-owned plans focused on equity, efficiency and learning.  
1.2 Strengthened education management and information systems producing disaggregated data on equity, efficiency, and learning.  
1.3 Country-level partners, working through the local education groups (LEGs), support governments to produce credible and evidence-based sector plans focused on equity, efficiency and learning.  
1.4 Donor financing and support aligns behind sector plans. |
| 2. **Effective and inclusive national policy dialogue** |  
2.1 Joint Sector Reviews leverage inclusive and evidence-based policy dialogue to enhance implementation.  
2.2 Country-level stakeholders – including teachers and civil society organizations – effectively monitor sector plans and engage in policy dialogue.  
2.3 Governments create and utilize effective and inclusive mechanisms for monitoring implementation and problem solving. |
| **Strategic Objective 4** |  
**Effective and Inclusive Policy Dialogue Leading to Improved Implementation**  
- Support evidence-based and inclusive monitoring of implementation and results.  
- Promote stronger accountability. |
### 3. More and better financing

3.1 The Global Partnership promotes and supports transparent cross-national reporting of domestic education sector financing.

3.2 The Global Partnership promotes and supports improvements in domestic financing for education.

3.3 The Global Partnership promotes and supports improved alignment of international finance behind country sector plans and country systems.

3.4 The effectiveness of GPE finance is improved through the implementation of the Funding Model.

3.5 Additional international financing for the Global Partnership is mobilized from diversified sources.

#### Strategic Objective 1

**More and Better Financing**

- Mobilize and advocate for more and better quality international financing for education.
- Advocate for expanded, sustainable and equitable domestic financing for education.
- Promote improved alignment of international financing and harmonization of international support to the education.
- Increase the number and diversity of donors contributing to the Global Partnership.

### 4. Building a Stronger Partnership

4.1 The GPE platform is improved by promoting consistent country-level roles, responsibilities, and practices among partners.

4.2 Investments are made to strengthen cross-national monitoring and sharing of evidence and best practice across the Partnership.

4.3 The convening and advocacy roles of the Partnership and its members are leveraged.

4.4 The organizational effectiveness of the Secretariat improves: including through stronger systems for quality assurance, risk management, country support, fiduciary oversight, and monitoring and evaluation.

#### Strategic Objective 2

**Building a Stronger Partnership**

- Support consistent roles and accountabilities across the Partnership.
- Invest in cross-national learning and sharing of evidence about good policies and practice.
- Improve the effectiveness of the Secretariat.
- Invest in monitoring and evaluation.

### 4. Assumptions and Risks Associated with GPE Partnership Model

The realization of GPE impact at country level rests heavily upon actions taken by its partners along the chain from outputs to outcomes. Mutual accountability – at country level and at global level – are key principles outlined in the GPE Charter. Furthermore, enhanced monitoring of Partnership roles and responsibilities is a key recommendation of the Board Reference Group on Strengthening the GPE Operational Platform.

Therefore, it is important that in the GPE ToC, the mutual accountability and required efforts of
GPE Partners are highlighted as assumptions and risks. Furthermore, key indicators in the Results Framework have been selected to monitor the functioning of the Partnership at the country and global level.

Nine core assumptions are described below, working from the global-country-impact levels in the results chain. For each assumption key risks mitigation measures are described.¹

### 1. Assumptions at the Outcome and Impact Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption/Partnership Input Required</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1</strong> The GPE Partnership model is able to leverage outputs at each level of its ToC, leading to the achievement of identified results</td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong> Assumptions at any level of the ToC are not realized. <strong>Mitigation:</strong> Monitoring and evaluation provides opportunity for the Board to learn about what works or does not in its ToC, and to take corrective action that adjusts and improves the ToC at the country or the global levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption/Partnership Input Required</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2</strong> Improved planning, monitoring and inclusive policy dialogue, when combined with improved financing, lead to stronger educational systems focused on equity and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Assumptions at the Country-Level Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption/Partnership Input Required</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1</strong> GPE Partners work together effectively to achieve shared GPE goals</td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong> Partners fail to work collaboratively to support the government’s sector plan. <strong>Mitigation:</strong> Creation of minimum standards and clear roles and accountabilities; creation of conflict resolution mechanism; investments in the Secretariat country support function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption/Partnership Input Required</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong> Developing country partners create effective and inclusive mechanisms for policy dialogue, including participation of civil society and teachers</td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong> Developing Country Partner governments do not establish inclusive policy dialogue mechanisms. <strong>Mitigation:</strong> Creation of minimum standards for LEGs; monitoring of LEG composition and progress towards greater inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption/Partnership Input Required</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3</strong> Developing country partners increase domestic financing for education</td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong> Domestic financing is not reported; financing declines or does not increase. <strong>Mitigation:</strong> The Partnership enhances its capacity to monitor domestic financing; monitoring is used to sanction low levels of domestic financing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption/Partnership Input Required</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4</strong> Developing country partners prioritize the creation, use and sharing of reliable and disaggregated education sector data for evidence-based planning and monitoring</td>
<td><strong>Risk:</strong> Developing country partner countries underinvest or lack capacity to implement data strategies. <strong>Mitigation:</strong> Sector plans include a mapping of capacity gaps and clear approach to overcoming them. The GPE Funding Model requires good-quality data or a data strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Risks identified here are aligned to those identified in the GPE Risk Policy and Risk Management Matrix (BOD/2014/12 DOC 04).
3. Assumptions at the Global-Level Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption/Partnership Input Required</th>
<th>Risk &amp; Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3.1** All partners commit to the GPE Partnership model and participate in monitoring and reporting on areas of mutual accountability | **Risk:** Partners do not wish to report on areas of mutual accountability.  
**Mitigation:** Accountabilities outlined in the ToC are captured in the GPE Charter and are monitored in the GPE Results Framework |
| **3.2** Donor contributions to the Global Partnership and to the education sector in GPE Partner countries increase | **Risk:** Donor partners do not increase their funding.  
**Mitigation:** Donor financing is monitored and reported to the GPE Board. The GPE Secretariat increases advocacy and fundraising activities. Board takes steps to prioritize activities based on financing constraints. Steps are taken to improve the GPE operational platform in order to build the confidence of donors |
| **3.3** Board agrees to a common vision for the GPE Strategic Plan 2016–2020 with clear priorities, adopts a realistic and achievable implementation plan for the achievement of GPE strategic goals | **Risk:** Board does not develop shared vision and priorities; management does not develop achievable implementation framework.  
**Mitigation:** Board retreat and meetings structured to achieve consensus; Implementation Framework prioritized within Secretariat |

5. Draft GPE Results Framework

The following Results Framework provides a list of indicators for each step in the ToC; and highlights those indicators that are linked to GPE Partnership assumptions and areas of mutual accountability. This Results Framework will be reported upon annually, in a format to be agreed with the Board.

Please note:

1. At the impact level, there is no readily available measure of learning outcomes that can be used to monitor results in GPE Partner countries. In this Results Framework we propose utilizing the only learning outcome measure readily available – youth literacy. However, we also propose reporting on learning outcomes where countries have a robust learning assessment system in place.

2. At the outcome and output levels, many indicators require the Global Partnership to develop specific methodologies and an approach for monitoring. The Operational Model Paper prepared by the Board reference group for the retreat outlines a number of areas where the Global Partnership has or will establish minimum standards; for example, outlining what credible sector plan is; and defining what is meant by “effective” Joint Sector Reviews. However, more work must be done on feasibility – in terms of the costs of monitoring – before final selection of indicators.
3. We have highlighted in a second column areas where GPE Partners are developing additional methodologies to track outcomes and outputs in the topics of learning, equity, domestic financing, and service delivery. We propose adding in such indicators as data becomes available. The Board may also wish to make targeted investments, in concert with GPE technical partners, to advance work on indicator development in specific areas (such as learning outcomes).

4. In addition to the indicators in the Results Framework, the Global Partnership will utilize a standard reporting template for all education sector program implementation grants (ESPIGs) in order to capture data on the inputs its grants purchase. A suggested list of such inputs includes:

- % of grants spent by subsector (primary, secondary, etc.)
- % of grants spent on teacher development;
- # of teachers trained;
- % of grants spent on school construction or rehabilitation;
- # of schools built or renovated;
- % of grants spent on books and learning materials;
- # of textbooks per child;
- % of grants spent on education management information systems;
- % of grants spent on learning assessment systems.
**DRAFT INDICATORS BY RESULTS LEVEL**

*All GPE Indicators at impact and outcome level will be disaggregated by gender, and conflict/fragility.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPE Results by Level</th>
<th>Indicators with Existing Data or Proposed for GPE Development</th>
<th>Notes on Alternative Indicators and Data Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Improved student learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning</td>
<td>1.1 Increases in youth literacy rate in GPE-endorsed countries <em>(Source: UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS)/GPE calculation)</em></td>
<td>Notes: Lack of availability of learning data at primary or lower secondary level remains a key challenge in measuring the impact of GPE financing, partnership, and planning at the country level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Increases in <em>female</em> youth literacy rate in GPE-endorsed countries <em>(Source: UIS/GPE calculation)</em></td>
<td>Under development by GPE Partners:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Proportion of countries showing improvement on learning outcomes at the primary level (national,</td>
<td>• Percentage of children who achieve minimum proficiency standards in reading/mathematics at the end of (i) primary; and (ii) lower secondary school <em>(Source: TAG/UIS, available in 3–5 years)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regional, and cross-national levels) (no data/no improvement/improvement) <em>(Source: Learning Data identified by countries, GPE calculation to be developed)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Proportion of countries showing improvement on learning outcomes at the primary level <em>(for females)</em> (national, regional, and cross-national levels) (no data/no improvement/improvement) <em>(Source: Learning data identified by countries, GPE calculation to be developed)</em></td>
<td>Other data sources:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• EGRA and Citizen Assessment Data <em>(USAID, UWEZO, etc.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional and Cross-National Assessment Data <em>(PASEC, SACMEQ, TIMSS, etc.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Increased equity and inclusion of all children, including the poorest and those marginalized or excluded by gender, disability and conflict/fragility

| 2.1 | # of additional children completing lower secondary school – disaggregated. *(Source: UIS/GPE calculation)* |
| 2.2 | # of additional girls completing lower secondary school |
| 2.2 | % of children who do not complete lower secondary education *(Source: UIS/GPE calculation)* |
| 2.3 | % of girls who do not complete lower secondary education *(Source: UIS/GPE calculation)* |
| 2.4 | Out-of-school rate for children of lower secondary school age *(Source: UIS)* |
| 2.5 | Out-of-school rate for girls of lower secondary school age *(Source: UIS)* |

**All GPE impact indicators will be disaggregated by fragile/conflict-affected countries and other countries**

**All GPE impact indicators will also be disaggregated (as available) by:**
- rural/urban
- income quintile

### Notes:
A variety of equity indicators are not easily available and could be developed with GPE Partners:
- Indicators on incidence benefit of spending (especially for the lowest quintile)
- Routine reporting on rural/urban or other geographic groups and variation across ethnic/language groups
- Data on # of out-of-school children with disabilities

Some Partner efforts are under development; in others reporting is not frequent enough or has limited country coverage:
- Periodic data are being collected on characteristics of out-of-school children from household survey data more routinely.
- UNICEF is developing a new module on its MICS that will better capture the # of children excluded due to disability
- The Global Partnership has funded the out-of-school initiative with UIS, UNICEF
- DHS collects data on “Percent of the de-facto household population 6–24 years of age attending school by age group, sex, urban-rural residence, and region”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate Impact/Outcome</th>
<th>Capacity Indicators</th>
<th>Notes: Missing here are:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Stronger educational systems with the capacity, resources, and data to make tangible improvements in access for the poorest and most marginal, and to accelerate the quality of teaching and learning | 1.1 Percentage of GPE Partner countries with a credible learning assessment within the basic education cycle (i) in place; or (ii) under development *(Source: GPE, methodology under development)*  
1.2 Proportion of GPE countries with pupil/teacher ratio below threshold (<40) *(Source: UIS/GPE calculation)*  
1.3 Internal efficiency coefficient *(Source: UIS/GPE calculation)*  
** All intermediate impact/outcome indicators will be disaggregated by fragile/conflict-affected countries and other countries | 1. Strong indicators on service delivery outcomes. It may be possible to utilize data from the World Bank’s Education service delivery indicator initiative for a limited number of countries (supported by Hewlett Foundation)  
2. A strong indicator related to equity and inclusion. Some GPE Partners are developing methodologies to collect data:  
- UIS: Percentage of countries that have an explicit formula-based policy reallocating education resources to disadvantaged populations *(Source: UIS, proposed thematic indicator framework)*  
- UNICEF: Percentage of countries that have a policy on inclusion/disability *(Source: UNICEF Strategic Plan Indicator)*  
- UNICEF also collects qualitative data on “innovative approaches at scale to improve access and learning outcomes for excluded children” and “quality standards consistent with child-friendly schools” and “countries with functional school management committees” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Resourcing Indicators</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Number of GPE Partner countries that have (i) increased their public expenditure on education since joining the Partnership; or (ii) have maintained sector spending at 20% or above (cumulative) <em>(Source: UIS and/or Global Partnership for Education, methodology under development)</em></td>
<td><strong>Notes:</strong> Financing data are not reported routinely by many GPE countries to UIS; and will require in-country monitoring. The GPE Secretariat is exploring the potential for using domestic data sources collected at country level, including through the Joint Sector Review process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.5 Percentage of countries meeting their financial commitment as presented in their ESPs (a requirement of the Funding Model) *(Source: Global Partnership for Education, proposed for development)* | Possible indicators for GPE development:  
- Proportion of governments who meet ESP and Annual Plan financing commitments  
- Proportion of countries in which xx% of development partner ESP commitments are met |
|  | Other Partners are collecting data on domestic financing include:  
- World Bank’s Boost  
- National Education Accounts Project (UIS, World Bank, IIEP with GPE funding) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Data Indicator</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.6 Proportion of GPE Partner countries with education data on key international outcome indicators *(Source: UIS/Global Partnership for Education calculation)* | **Notes:** Possible indicator:  
- Indicator on number of countries with education management information system data used at local and regional level; or disaggregated to track benefit incidence (used by UNICEF in its education sector Results Framework) |
## Country-Level Output 1: Stronger Sector Planning and Policy Implementation

### 1.1 Sector analysis and planning leads to stronger country-owned plans focused on equity, efficiency and learning

1.1.1 Percentage of endorsed (i) Education Sector Plans or (ii) Transitional Plans meeting minimum standards for credibility as defined by an agreed GPE-endorsed methodology (Source: Global Partnership for Education, , methodology under development)

1.1.2 Percentage of GPE Partner countries with a sound strategy on teachers as part of the ESP (Source: Global Partnership for Education, , proposed for development)

1.1.3 Percentage of GPE Partner countries with a strategy to respond to marginalized groups (including gender and disability) as part of the ESP (Source: Global Partnership for Education, , proposed for development)

### 1.2 A national data strategy is included in the ESP and is implemented, producing disaggregated data on equity, efficiency, and learning

1.2 Percentage of GPE countries with data strategies in their ESPs (Source: Global Partnership for Education, , methodology under development)

### 1.3 Country-level partners, working through the LEGs, support governments to produce credible and evidence-based sector plans focused on equity, efficiency and learning

1.3.1 Measure of partner support to ESP development (Source: Global Partnership for Education, , as captured in the ESPIG application)

### Notes:
- Methodologies for some of these indicators are under development by the Secretariat.
- Routine collection has not been costed and methodologies are under development.
- Other indicators might be considered including:
  - National policies or legislations related to equity and inclusion, for example adequate policies on out-of-school children, disability, and gender, etc.

### Notes:
- GPE Secretariat is developing a methodology for doing gap analysis of data systems and data availability. All countries are required to have a data strategy under the Funding Model.

### Note:
- Requires in-country monitoring.
- Potential indicators:
  - Proportion of country-level partners providing feedback on the draft ESP.
### 1.4 Donor financing and support aligns behind sector plans

1.4 Measure of donor alignment to the ESP *(Source: Global Partnership for Education, , proposed for development)*

**Notes:** At present there is weak availability of national level data on alignment and harmonization of donor support to the education sector overall

---

#### Country-Level Output 2: More Effective and Inclusive National Policy Dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1 Joint Sector Review process leverages inclusive and evidence-based policy dialogue to enhance implementation</th>
<th>2.1.1 Percentage of GPE Partner countries organizing Joint Sector Reviews <em>(Source: Global Partnership for Education, )</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Percentage of Joint Sector Reviews meeting minimum standards for data availability <em>(Source: Global Partnership for Education, , proposed for development).</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 Percentage of Joint Sector Review reports with credible financial reporting <em>(Source: Global Partnership for Education, , methodology under development).</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Requires a baseline as well as a methodology for defining “effective” Joint Sector Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2 Country-level stakeholders – including teachers and civil society organizations – effectively monitor sector plans and policies and engage in policy dialogue</th>
<th>2.2.1 Number of GPE Partner countries with a) civil society and teacher representation on LEGs <em>(Source: Global Partnership for Education, , proposed for development).</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Number of GPE countries in which national civil society actors engage in monitoring of sector plans and policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Other possible indicators might be:
- Percentage of GPE Partner countries with CSO campaigns or budget tracking exercises used to leverage increased domestic financing for education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.3 Governments create and utilize effective and inclusive mechanisms for monitoring implementation and problem solving (e.g., existence of LEG effectiveness indicator)</th>
<th>2.3 LEG effectiveness indicator <em>(Source: Global Partnership for Education, , proposed for development).</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Notes:** One possible indicator might be:
- Percentage of GPE Partner countries where LEGs participate in the budget preparation process *(Source: Global Partnership for Education,)*
### Global and Cross-National Output 1: More and Better Financing

| 1.1 | The Global Partnership for Education promotes and supports transparent cross-national reporting of domestic education sector financing | 1.1 Percentage of GPE countries reporting regularly to international bodies on domestic financing. *(Source: UIS, GPE calculation)* | **Note:** This is a tentative indicator – it should be reviewed with the goal of finding a proximate indicator for GPE leverage at the global level. This indicator could be used above with country-level indicators 2.1.2 |
| 1.2 | The Global Partnership for Education promotes and supports improvements in domestic financing for education | 1.2 Number of GPE events, presentations, CEO/chair speeches, publications, or meetings that focus on the need for improved levels of domestic financing *(Source: Global Partnership for Education, proposed for development)* |
| 1.3 | The Global Partnership for Education promotes and supports improved alignment of international finance behind country sector plans and country systems | 1.3.1 Donor contributions to the GPE Fund for 2015–18 (cumulative) *(Source: Global Partnership for Education)* |
|       |                           | 1.3.2 Percentage of GPE grants in fragile and conflict-affected countries (FCACs) using pooled funding *(Source: Global Partnership for Education)* |
|       |                           | 1.3.3 Percentage of GPE grants in non-FCACs using budget support modality *(Source: Global Partnership for Education)* |
| 1.4 | The effectiveness of GPE finance is improved through the implementation of the Funding Model | 1.4 Percentage of GPE program grant applications approved from 2015 onwards achieving targets identified in Funding Model performance indicators on equity, efficiency and learning, cumulative *(Source: Global Partnership for Education)* | **Note:** This item will report only on countries with Funding Model-applicable grants. Results are not expected until 2017 at earliest |
| 1.5 | Additional international financing mobilized from diversified sources | 1.5 Amount of funding to GPE from non-traditional donors (private sector and those who are first time donors to the GPE) for 2015–2020 (cumulative) *(Source: Global Partnership for Education)* | |

**Global and Cross-national Output 2: Building a Stronger Partnership**

| 2.1 | The GPE platform is improved by promoting consistent country-level roles, responsibilities, and practices among country-level implementing partners | 2.1 Percentage of (i) developing country partners (ii) other partners reporting strengthened clarity of roles and responsibilities in GPE country processes *(Source: Global Partnership for Education, proposed for development)* | **Notes:** This indicator might be developed through a periodic survey of Partners but would not be ready until 2017. Other possible indicators might be:

- Percentage of grants reporting using standard suite of impact indicators
- A measure of country ownership |
| 2.2 | Investments are made to strengthen cross-national monitoring and sharing of evidence and best practice across the Partnership | 2.2.1 Percentage of GPE fund dedicated to strengthening cross-national data, evidence, and knowledge sharing among partners *(Source: Global Partnership for Education)* | **Notes:** A more detailed indicator might be developed through a periodic survey of Partners:

- Percentage of satisfaction with GPE Secretariat for a) south-south knowledge exchange b) events; c) knowledge products developed; d) best-practice and guidance materials; e) usage and application of knowledge gained *(Source: Global Partnership for Education, proposed for development)* |
| 2.2.2 | Number of evaluations and best practice reviews of investments and activities undertaken by the Partnership *(Source: Global Partnership for Education)* | | |
| 2.3.3 | Number of developing country partner (DCP) outreach events per year, including technical/thematic events to promote south-south learning, and DCP pre-board meetings (Source: Global Partnership for Education) |
| 2.4.4 | Number of policy, technical, or other knowledge products developed and disseminated with funding or support from the GPE Secretariat (Source: Global Partnership for Education) |

**Notes:** Other possible indicators might be:  
- Percentage of satisfaction of (i) DCPs; (ii) other partners about GPE convening and advocacy roles  
- Number of people reached through media engagement (proof that a GPE story has been picked up and disseminated)  
- Number of scientific/non-scientific publications citing the Global Partnership (citation index; this is more to assess the reach of your key publications)

**2.3** The convening and advocacy roles of the Partnership and its members are leveraged

2.3 Number of global or regional initiatives that the Global Partnership convenes or co-convenes with its partners to support the achievement of its goals and objectives (Source: Global Partnership for Education)

**Notes:** Other possible indicators might be:  
- Percentage of satisfaction of (i) DCPs; (ii) other partners about GPE convening and advocacy roles  
- Number of people reached through media engagement (proof that a GPE story has been picked up and disseminated)  
- Number of scientific/non-scientific publications citing the Global Partnership (citation index; this is more to assess the reach of your key publications)

**2.4** The organizational effectiveness of the Secretariat improves: including through stronger systems for: country support, quality assurance, risk management, fiduciary oversight, and monitoring and evaluation

| 2.4.1 | Percentage of GPE program grants assessed as on-track with implementation (Source: Global Partnership for Education) |
| 2.4.2 | Percentage of audit reports received and reviewed (Source: Global Partnership for Education) |
| 2.4.3 | Percentage of secretariat time spent on country-facing functions (Source: Global Partnership for Education) |

**Notes:**  
- These indicators utilize data already collected for the GPE Portfolio Review and to track progress on the GPE organizational reform.  
- Additional indicators on Grant Performance collected in the Portfolio Review:  
  - Average time to develop, approve and disburse GPE grant  
  - Number of country visits by mission objective
| 2.4.4 | Percentage of the Secretariat’s staff time spent on quality assurance, monitoring, and evaluation (Source: Global Partnership for Education) |
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