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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator title</th>
<th>Indicator (18) Proportion of joint sector reviews meeting quality standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result measured (from GPE Results Framework):</strong></td>
<td><strong>COUNTRY LEVEL OBJECTIVES - Strategic Objective (2) Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring</strong>&lt;br&gt;(a) Promote inclusive and evidence-based sector policy dialogue and sector monitoring, through government-led local education groups and the joint sector review process, with participation from civil society, teacher organizations, the private sector, and all development partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JUSTIFICATION FOR INDICATOR**

The Global Partnership of Education has engaged in the past years in supporting countries to conduct Joint Sector Reviews (JSR) that are useful and effective monitoring instruments, and a transparent forum that subscribe to the principle of mutual accountability, for the implementation of Education Sector Plans or Transitional Education Plans (ESP/TEP). This work can be summarized as follows:

1. In 2011, the GPE Secretariat commissioned an unpublished study analyzing Joint Education Sector Review reports in 21 countries. This report concluded that (i) in general, JSRs do not systematically monitor progress against ESP targets and indicators, (ii) half of them recorded an explicit analysis of data against key indicator and (iii) in some cases alternative and parallel sets of indicators have preeminence over those included in the ESPs. Among other key findings, the report stated that there is considerable variation from country to country in the way JSRs are conducted, their content, focus, and outcomes. Although almost all JSRs intend to use their ESP objectives for measuring progress, few do so systematically. It also pointed out that many JSRs generate long lists of recommendations that are difficult to implement or track. The report also concluded that only a few countries have generated annual sector performance result (ASPR) reports, which evaluate progress against set targets and key indicators, and that ASPRs arrive often too late for being used as an evidence base to conduct JSRs. It also highlighted capacity issues in data collection, synthesis, and analysis.

2. GPE conducted a study titled “2012 Monitoring Exercise on Aid Effectiveness in the Education Sector”, which found out that, in 2009, out of the 39 countries analyzed, 25 relied on a regular JSR process, and that 10 countries had no JSR process or did not conduct one in 2010. It also highlighted that the majority of JSRs involved the participation of national and international education stakeholders including ministries of finance and of planning. In the majority of countries, civil society representatives are also included.

---

The report however stated that the challenges associated with the JSRs varied across countries, including that JSRs frequently involved numerous presentations, studies, and discussions that were not always translated into actionable reforms or follow-up initiatives. A number of countries struggled to lever JSRs as a policy planning and decision-making mechanism because of the weakness of the planning and monitoring capacities. A number of JSR reports were hastily drafted and did not provide robust evidence on the sector challenges and performance. Other constraints included insufficient technical and organizational capacity to carry out JSRs effectively.

3. The Sector Monitoring Initiative (SMI) to improve the monitoring of the education sector was launched in February 2012 in response to requests from Local Education Groups (LEGs) for the Secretariat to strengthen its support to effective monitoring at country-level. As part of the initiative, the GPE Secretariat organized five regional workshops in 2013 and 2014, and one global workshop in Paris (June 2014) that brought together representatives from member countries, development partners, civil society organizations and the GPE Secretariat to discuss strategies for improving education sector plan monitoring systems and tools, and identifying what the Secretariat role should be in this area. The workshops were organized to allow participants to share their experiences in order to identify good practices in monitoring the Education Sector Plan (ESP) implementation. The workshops were not intended to provide training in the development and use of monitoring tools. The following recommendations for JSRs were discussed with SMI participants:

- Clarity on the purpose, desired outcomes and expectations of JSRs
- Clear link between sector action plan, annual sector performance report, indicators and budgets
- Agreed set of defined targets and indicators to monitor
- Use existing data, working group systems and sector performance reports to analyze and agree on strengths and weaknesses prior to JSR
- Select and focus JSR discussions on themes from this analysis
- Use a systematic approach to field visits and analysis of information from these
- Assess/evaluate JSR
- Joint writing process
- Summary matrix with key sector performance indicators, baselines, targets and progress
- Analysis of causal factors for strengths and weaknesses
- Negotiate agreement around key recommendations
- Limit the number of recommendations and identify responsibilities and resources for implementing them

3 In Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso (February 25-28, 2013) for French speaking countries; in Cape Town, South Africa (April 28 – May 2nd, 2013) for Anglophone African countries; in Bangkok, Thailand (August 15-18, 2013) for Asian and European countries; in Dakar, Senegal (August 22-25, 2013) for other Anglophone countries from Africa and South America; and in Antigua, Guatemala (March 31 to April 2, 2014) for Spanish speaking countries in Latin America.
On the basis of the above, analysis of the dataset collected for feeding the GPE Results Framework, further research for defining and measuring JSR effectiveness, and consultations within the Partnership, GPE Secretariat and its partners will issue guidelines for conducting robust JSRs. The objective will be two-pronged: setting commonly agreed quality standards among the Partnership of what constitute effective JSRs and developing capacities of the countries to prepare and conduct robust JSRs. The practical guide for effective joint sector reviews in the education sector is publicly available online⁵.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale for indicator selection:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As stated in the GPE Strategic Plan⁶, the Global Partnership fosters inclusive and evidence-based sector policy dialogue focused on addressing critical barriers for the implementation and achievement of results in equity and learning. In this sense, Joint Sector Reviews appear the core of GPE business model for enhancing inclusive and evidence-based policy dialogue in support to the implementation of sector plans. Effective JSRs would directly contribute to achieving the GPE Strategic Plan objective #1: Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation and #2 Support mutual accountability through inclusive policy dialogue and monitoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The centrality of the JSRs as a national mechanism that serves multiple purposes (monitoring mechanism, mutual accountability framework, effective planning cycle, platform of informed policy dialogue) is discussed in a number of GPE reference documents. As part of the operationalization of the GPE funding model at country level, it is expected that annual joint sector reviews are conducted in all countries receiving implementation program grants⁷. The Secretariat has committed to present information regarding sector and grant monitoring in its annual Portfolio Review⁴.

Countries are strongly encouraged to produce an annual sector progress report, and delivery on this will be monitored by the Secretariat through its annual Portfolio Review.

The updated Education Sector Program Implementation Grant (ESPIG) Guidelines⁷ and the revised Country-Level Process Guide⁸ outline the new GPE funding model. It is indicated that indicators selected at sector level that shall be met for disbursing the 30% of the Maximum Country Allocation (variable part) should be monitored through joint sector reviews. It puts JSRs at the core of the GPE monitoring system, not only for sector progress monitoring, but also in conjunction with GPE grants monitoring, as a case for investment.

In general, all the efforts conducted by the GPE Secretariat in collecting country data to inform the Results Framework will be, to the extent possible, building on existing country-level monitoring processes and systems of which JSRs are the cornerstone. For this corporate purpose along the long-term goal of achieving greater results in learning and equity, it is capital to reinforce and monitor Secretariat’s support in strengthening the effectiveness of JSRs as a venue of exchange and media to convening reliable, accurate and timely information on sector progress.

---


**DEFINITION**

Total number of Joint Sector Reviews in GPE member states with active program implementation grants which meet quality standards, that is, that meet at least three out of a total of five quality criteria, out of the total number of JSRs conducted:

"GPE member states with active program implementation grants": The Joint Sector Review is the unit of measurement for this indicator. While JSRs are typically conducted at country level, in some instances reviews may also be conducted within an alternatively defined geographic zone (e.g. under federal systems, this may happen at state- or province-level). In cases where such sub-national regional entities have autonomy to apply for independent GPE funding (Program Implementation Grants), the Secretariat takes the view that JSRs produced by such entities should be assessed as unique observations for the purposes of constructing this indicator. This is the case, for example, in the three semi-autonomous regions of Somalia (Central South, Puntland and Somaliland). Throughout this methodology, the generic term GPE states is therefore used interchangeably to describe any semi-autonomous regional unit, state/province, or country for which individual JSR assessment is appropriate.

"Joint Sector Reviews": There is no standard definition, handbooks or blueprints that exist for JSRs. On the basis of broad elements provided by the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and GPE model principles, Joint Sector Reviews could be described as a joint periodic assessment of mutual progress in implementation performance through existing country-level mechanisms in a specific sector. According to GPE compact principles, JSRs are led by Governments and engage all Local Education Group stakeholders involved in the education sector, including Government authorities, donor partners and technical agencies, local and international civil society organizations, parent associations, teacher unions, academic institutions, non-public educational providers, and the private sector in a review of the performance and progress of the education sector. There is considerable variation from country to country in the way JSRs are organized and held, in the use of instruments, documentary inputs, focus, and outcomes. In most cases, JSRs are organized either once or twice a year, look at the evidence for monitoring implementation progress of ESPs/TEPs, and conclude in a meeting gathering all stakeholders in which weaknesses and successes are discussed, and recommendations on remedial actions agreed for the following review cycle. The Aide-Memoire or JSR report is the main documentary output of JSRs.

The "quality standards" are as follows:

1. **Participatory and inclusive**: The JSR includes effective participation from all education sector stakeholders transparently. It sets the stage for a reinforced mutual accountability framework.

2. **Evidence-based**: The JSR is informed by evidence including reliable education and financial data from the year under review, assessments of program implementation, documentary inputs combining primary...
**3. Comprehensive:** The JSR should address and cover all the sub-sectors (early childhood, primary, secondary, Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET), and higher education) as well as non-formal education and adult literacy. It should also discuss all the sources of funding identified in the annual action plan (on/off budget, aligned, non-aligned, etc.)

**4. A monitoring instrument:** The JSR monitors sector performance and key indicators (including equity, efficiency and learning outcomes) to help better identify implementation issues and real achievements with respect to ESP/TEP implementation and overall sector progress.

**5. Anchored into an effective policy cycle:** Recommendations from the JSR effectively feed into addressing weaknesses in the ESP/TEP implementation so as to ensure it is being used as a planning instrument to influence future policy planning, design and the budget cycle. Dissemination of JSR recommendations incentivizes mutual accountability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of measurement:</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregation:</td>
<td>By fragile and conflict affected countries and non-fragile and conflict affected countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year for data reported (select only one and mark an “x”)</td>
<td>__ fiscal year <em>X</em> calendar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of data collection:</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA TREATMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of information for collecting data:</th>
<th>Source document, template, etc.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. JSR Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. JSR Agenda*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. JSR Participant List*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Annual Implementation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. JSR Report / aide-memoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Ministry of Education website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Note that these documents may be attached to item 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source agency: | States’ Local Education Groups, Ministries of Education, and Coordinating Agencies. |

**Categorization of questions to assess JSRs:**

The JSR Questionnaire requires to review JSR documentation from all states included in the sample. The JSRs will be assessed on five questions, directly mapped to the five JSR standards. Each question contains multiple items. As described below, only a selection of some of the question items, identified as “good items” need to be met in order for a JSR to meet a given standard.

The JSR Final Data Template requires to assess whether items for each question apply or not, based on the information presented in the key documents collected (see Source of Information for Collecting Data). Once this task is completed, one has to assess whether the JSRs met the standards following a four-value categorical scale:

- **Category 0** = JSR does not meet the standard in a given question
- **Category 1** = JSR meets the standard (does not meet all items, but does meet items bolded in the JSR Final Questionnaire) in a given question
- **Category 2** = JSR exceeds the standard in a given question. This means that the JSR meets all items for the question under consideration, and
therefore can be categorized as “good practice”.

- **Category 98** = Information obtained is insufficient to reach a conclusion or no information/documentation is available. This is an inconclusive case.

The standard is met if a JSR receives a code of 1 or 2. A coding of 2 means that the JSR exceeds expectations for quality standards, or meets good practice requirements. This may offer lessons on approaches that could eventually be replicated, taking into account the specificity of the country context, the political economy, etc. This also means that JSRs that are not categorized as 2 in a given question are not disqualified from meeting the standards. The approach aims to identify areas of improvement in order to better support countries and states.

**Calculation Method**

**Review of assumptions to calculate this indicator:**

1. The questionnaire includes 5 equally weighted questions corresponding to 5 standards. Each question contains multiple items. A defined subset called “good items” must be met in order for the standard to be met.
2. The standards are met or exceeded when the corresponding questions are coded as **Category 1 or 2**:
   - (Category 1) occurs when all good items are coded as 1.
   - (Category 2) occurs when all items (including good items and the additional ones) are coded as 1, except in question 4, in which good practices are achieved when more than the quality standards are met (at least one more).
3. Standards are not met when the corresponding questions are coded as **Category 0**.
   - (Category 0) occurs when: (i) at least one of the good items is rated as 0 (no), or (ii) 97 (partial coverage) in question 2.
4. A case is inconclusive when a question is coded as **Category 98**.
   - (Category 98) occurs when (i) at least one good item is rated as 98 (I don’t know), or (ii) when in question 2 the Annual Implementation Report could not be obtained, or respondent does not know whether the report exists or not. Provided that no other good item is rated as 0 or 97. In this case (combination of 98 AND 0 or 97) the question is coded as not meeting the standard.
5. In questions where a good item is rated as 99 (not applicable), the item does not count in the formula that assesses if the standard is met or not. The item is therefore removed, without penalizing for information that is not applicable in the context of a particular JSR.
   - This occurs when: (i) in questions 1 or 3, the item cannot apply in the context of the JSR, or (ii) when the item asks for comparing with the previous JSRs while it is the case of a first JSR.

The following steps are required to calculate the number of JSRs that meet the quality standards:

**Step 1 – (a) Categorize all response items, and (b) assess the questions to meet standards**

1.a For a given JSR, every question has multiple response items. **Each item** may be coded as 1 (yes), 0 (no), 97 (partial coverage), 98 (I don’t know), or 99 (not applicable), following these guidelines:
• Items may be **coded as 1** when the answer is completely fulfilled.
• Items may be **coded as 0** when the answer is not completely fulfilled.
• Items may be **coded as 97** in question 2, when the answer is only partially fulfilled. This is considered as 0 in the final standard formula, but it is important to make the distinction at the item-level.
• Items may be **coded as 98**, or I don’t know, for one of following reasons: (i) the respondent is unsure of his/her answer in questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (item response excluded in question 2); and (ii) the Annual Implementation Report could not be obtained, or respondent does not know whether the document exists or not.
• Items may be **coded as 99**, or not applicable, for one of the following reasons: (i) the item is not applicable in the context of the JSR under consideration in questions 1 or 3; and (ii) the item asks for comparing with the previous JSR, while it is the case of a first JSR.

An additional control question asks if certain JSR documentation was used to support the respondent’s answers. The possible responses are “Yes”, “No”, “No, document does not exist”, “No, document could not be obtained”, and “I do not know if document exists”. This question, as well as the general information on the JSR asked, does not inform the assessment on attaining or not the standards, except for the item asking for the existence of the Annual Implementation Report (see Annex 2 for details on additional control question and general information asked).

1.b Once coded, the answers for all the set of good items is analyzed for each question, to check if the standards have been met (Category 1 and Category 2), not (Category 0), or it is an inconclusive case (Category 98). Questions are categorized following these guidelines:

- **Standard met if assessed as Category 1 and Category 2 when all good items are coded as 1, are all items are coded as 1**
- **Standard is not met if assessed as Category 0 is reached when at least any good item is coded as 0**
- **Category 98 is reached when at least any good item is coded as 98, provided that no good item is coded as 0 (case in which question is automatically categorized as 0).**

The additional Category 2 indicates that a question/criterion has exceeded the quality standards, only for analysis purposes, and not reported as such in the Results Framework indicator.

**Results Framework (RF) Indicator:**

**Step 2 – (a) Count the number of JSRs meeting quality standards for a number of criteria, and (b) count the number of JSRs meeting quality standards by specific criteria**

2.a The first set of results for the RF indicator indicates the total number of JSRs meeting a certain number of standards (separately, for 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 questions). For this, it is necessary to indicate first for each JSR how many standards were met. Then, it is possible to sum the total number of JSRs meeting certain number of criteria.
This methodology is based on a **desk review** of key JSR documents, and excludes direct observations stemming from participation in JSR workshops. The rationale for conducting a desk review was to ensure that the assessment of the effectiveness of JSRs is based strictly on verifiable evidence. This means that some of the questions asked to assess the JSR attributes (standards) are limited to proxies capturing the underlying concept behind the attribute.

The desk review approach also allows GPE to build an archiving JSR records including Annual Implementation reports, JSR reports, Terms of reference, Agendas etc. for all active GPE grant-recipient states. This will enable a more systematic analysis of trends, and proactive sharing of effective practices among countries and across regions.

The set of elements agreed to define each of the above JSR attributes/standards can be found in the “JSR Questionnaire” attached to this methodology (Annex 2). It describes quality elements that JSRs should meet under each standard. It is understood that the process of developing quality standards should not be conducted in isolation from partners, and requires extensive consultations and a solid consensus among all GPE partners. Standards as developed in this methodology are expected to evolve over time.

The present methodology with the proposed set of quality standards for key JSR attributes lays the groundwork for setting the JSR guidelines that the Secretariat will develop further in collaboration with other GPE partners. The analysis produced from this preliminary methodology will inform future consultations on what can/should constitute an effective JSR. The assessment approach of the underlying questionnaire (binary answers for each question item) creates flexibility for GPE to adjust the standards as ongoing research and consultation processes highlight relevant improvements.

**Interpretation**

A high value suggests DCPs are conducting, by and large, robust JSRs so that policy dialogue and monitoring at the country level is focused on effective implementation of Education Sector Plans or Transitional Education Plans (ESP/TEP).

**REFERENCES**

- Global Partnership for Education. *An Analysis of Joint Sector Review Report* (unpublished study, conducted by consultant Terri Kelly in 2011)
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*. 

---

**Data limitations (if any known/anticipated):**

- **This methodology is based on a **desk review** of key JSR documents, and excludes direct observations stemming from participation in JSR workshops. The rationale for conducting a desk review was to ensure that the assessment of the effectiveness of JSRs is based strictly on verifiable evidence. This means that some of the questions asked to assess the JSR attributes (standards) are limited to proxies capturing the underlying concept behind the attribute.**
- **The desk review approach also allows GPE to build an archiving JSR records including Annual Implementation reports, JSR reports, Terms of reference, Agendas etc. for all active GPE grant-recipient states. This will enable a more systematic analysis of trends, and proactive sharing of effective practices among countries and across regions.**
- **The set of elements agreed to define each of the above JSR attributes/standards can be found in the “JSR Questionnaire” attached to this methodology (Annex 2). It describes quality elements that JSRs should meet under each standard. It is understood that the process of developing quality standards should not be conducted in isolation from partners, and requires extensive consultations and a solid consensus among all GPE partners. Standards as developed in this methodology are expected to evolve over time.**
- **The present methodology with the proposed set of quality standards for key JSR attributes lays the groundwork for setting the JSR guidelines that the Secretariat will develop further in collaboration with other GPE partners. The analysis produced from this preliminary methodology will inform future consultations on what can/should constitute an effective JSR. The assessment approach of the underlying questionnaire (binary answers for each question item) creates flexibility for GPE to adjust the standards as ongoing research and consultation processes highlight relevant improvements.**
- **A high value suggests DCPs are conducting, by and large, robust JSRs so that policy dialogue and monitoring at the country level is focused on effective implementation of Education Sector Plans or Transitional Education Plans (ESP/TEP).**

---

**REFERENCES**

- Global Partnership for Education. *An Analysis of Joint Sector Review Report* (unpublished study, conducted by consultant Terri Kelly in 2011)
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*. 

---
Annex 1 - Standard Operating Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Name</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection, Quality Assurance &amp; Storage for Indicators # 18 of the GPE Results Framework</td>
<td>R&amp;P Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Version #: 1</td>
<td>Review:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring GPE Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material changes from prior version of SOP
None; this is the first version.

Summary
This SOP describes the process for data collection, quality assurance, and storage for indicator # 18 (Proportion of joint sector reviews (JSRs) meeting quality standards) of the GPE results framework.

Results / Outputs
This process should result in the results framework being updated with quality assured data on indicator# 18.

Interim outputs of the Secretariat:
Completed data collection template

Final Output:
Updated results framework database

Scope
- Begins: The process begins with Operations Analyst (MU) requesting CLs/ESs to undertake assessment of JSRs through a desk-based review.
- Ends: The process ends with updated data being integrated into the results framework database by the Monitoring and Evaluation Data Manager.
- Includes: All procedural aspects
- Excludes: Methodological aspects of calculating the indicator value. These can be found in the methodology sheet.
- Note: Baseline data is already collected, and data will be collected annually.

Standards (Policies, Approvals, Deadlines, etc.):
- Policies: GPE 2020, Monitoring Sheet for GPE Results Framework Indicators # 18
- Deadlines: M & E Data Manager updates results framework database with the Indicators # 18 data by 15th of April
- Approval: The completed data template is prepared by the Operations Analyst (MU) and includes quality checks by the M & E Data Manager and final approval by the Head of M&E

Issues / Risks:
- Relevant documents might not be available on time.

Overview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Data Collection</th>
<th>Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data</th>
<th>Aggregating Data</th>
<th>Update results framework database</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 15th Jan</td>
<td>By 15th Feb</td>
<td>By 30th March</td>
<td>By 15th April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in the Process</th>
<th>Roles / Responsibilities</th>
<th>Outputs / Deliverables</th>
<th>Tools / Templates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Request Data Collection  
Typically by 15th Jan |  
- Request CIs to undertake assessment of JSRs through a desk-based review.  
- Undertake the JSR assessment requested and submit to the Operations Analyst (MU)  
- Gather all assessments, perform initial quality assurance checks and forward to the QA unit |  
- Operations Analyst (MU)  
- Country Leads  
- Operations Analyst (MU) |  
- JSR Terms of Reference  
- JSR Agenda  
- JSR Participant  
- Annual Implementation Report  
- JSR Report/aide memoire  
- Ministry of Education website |
| 2. Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data  
Typically by 15th Feb |  
- Complete quality assurance processes and send assessments back to Operations Analyst (MU)  
- Collate all assessments and conduct initial analysis |  
- Education Specialist (QA)  
- Operations Analyst (MU) |  
| 3. Aggregate Data  
Typically by 30th March |  
- Enter data into the template provided by the M&E Data Manager  
- Compute indicator values using the completed data collection template, based on the latest available classification of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict and forward to M & E data Manager.  
- Review completed data collection template and send comments/queries to the Operations Analyst (MU) |  
- Operations Analyst (MU)  
- Operations Analyst (MU)  
- M & E Data Manager |  
- Data collection template  
- Completed data collection template and indicator values  
- List of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict from the GPE Intranet |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annex 2 - FINAL Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Question</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Participatory & Inclusive: The JSR includes effective participation from all education sector stakeholders and is conducted transparently. It sets the stage for a reinforced mutual accountability framework.

1a. Ministry/Ministries in charge of education at the national level. If yes, please indicate below which of these ministries participated:
   an1a1 Basic Education
   an1a2 TVET
   an1a3 Higher Education
   an1a4 Social Affairs/Gender
   an1a5 Any other ministry(ies) related to education at the national level that participated. Please list in the comments column (H)

1b. Ministry of Education at the regional/district level and/or regional authorities in charge of education

1c. Ministry of Finance and/or Budget

1d. Other ministries: Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Civil service etc.

1e. Development Partners: multilateral, bilateral agencies

1f. International CSOs

1g. Local CSOs

1h. Parents associations

1i. Teacher unions

1j. Universities/ academic institutions

1k. Private sector: companies funding education, foundations

1l. Non-public educational providers (Private school networks)

2. Evidence-based: JSR is informed by

2a1. Brief situational analysis of review period with key

2. Did the Annual Implementation Report

2a2. What is the JSR? From which of the following categories was there participation during the JSR?

2a2a. List of JSR participants

2a2b. JSR Terms of Reference

2b. Exceeding Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to ALL items

2b1. Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to all bolded items a, b, c, e, f, g, h & i

2b2. Not Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “No” (code 0) to one or more of the bolded items a, b, c, e, f, g, h & i

98 - Inconclusive: Respondent answered, “I do not know” (code 98) to one or more of the bolded items a, b, c, e, f, g, h & i, and no “No” (code 0) in any of these same items

99 - Not Applicable: Items are excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas if respondent answered, “Not applicable” (code 99) to any item

Please ensure its compilation beforehand.
Evidence including reliable education and financial data from the year under review, assessments of programs implementation, feedback from beneficiaries, etc.

include the following?

**PLEASE NOTE** that control questions were added to increase the questionnaire reliability. Depending on your answers, some of the items are auto populated.

* Examples of financial information at trend / outcome level (ideally all indicators should be covered):
  - Execution % of total government budget
  - Execution % of education budget
  - Share of education expenditure over the total domestic expenditure disaggregated by capital and recurrent spending
  - Education recurrent expenditure disaggregated by wage and non-wage
  - Education expenditure disaggregated by major source:
    1. Regular Budget
    2. Off-budget aid, earmarked traceable
    3. Off-budget aid (major source of, i.e. ODA)
  - Share of external aid vs domestic allocation
  - Projected domestic allocations

**Expenditures at program / activity level**:

- Expenditures by programs and activities classified in the Annual Action Plan (which should be able to integrate a full budget perimeter, including wage, recurrent non-wage, and capital)

3. Did the JSR cover the full spectrum of the education sector? Which of the following items apply? These can be discussed during the JSR (as per in the JSR Agenda) or covered in the Annual Implementation Report.

**PLEASE NOTE** that control questions were added to increase the questionnaire reliability. Depending on your answers, some of the items are auto populated.

The spectrum should include all the sub-sector indicators at the outcome level of the year under review
2a: Brief situational analysis of review period with key financial information* of the year under review (see notes in question)
2b: Sector progress and results achieved through the implementation of the ESP/TEP action plans (review of programs/activities)
2c1: Expenditures at program/activity level** covered by domestic funding (see notes in question)
2c2: Expenditures at program/activity level** covered by external funding
2d: Follow up on previous JSR recommendations
2e: Any additional element(s) that the Annual Implementation Report includes that it is not listed above. Please list in the comments column (H)

2f: Beyond the Annual Implementation Report, other document(s) other documents demonstrating JSR is evidence-based. Please list in the comments column (H)

**Implementation Report**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to all bolded items b &amp; c (including c1 and c2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “No” (code 0) or “Partial coverage” (code 97) to one or more of the bolded items b &amp; c (including c1 and c2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>On control question regarding the use of the Annual Implementation Report, respondent answered “No, document could not be obtained”, or “I do not know if document exists”, and all items were then coded as 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Item 2d is automatically coded as 99 and excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas, if respondent answered “1st JSR” in control question (no other item can be “Not Applicable”).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3a: JSR (or Annual Implementation Report) systematically covers all sub-sectors, as reported in the ESP/TEP
3b: The JSR (or Annual Implementation Report) discusses activities/programs, as reported in the ESP/TEP, and those implemented and financed by external partners
3c: The JSR (or Annual Implementation Report) discusses externally funded activities/programs that are off-budget
3d: The JSR (or Annual Implementation Report) discusses externally funded activities/programs that are off-budget

2 - Exceeding Quality Standard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to ALL items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “No” (code 0) to one or more of the bolded items b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 - Not Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “No” (code 0) or “Partial coverage” (code 97) to one or more of the bolded items b & c (including c1 and c2) |

1 - Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to ALL items |

JSR Agenda

- JSR Report/Aide Memoire
- Annual Implementation Report

Additional sources include:

- ESP/TEP
- Annual Action Plan

**MONITORING SHEET FOR INDICATORS**
programs/activities, including those funded both by domestic and external sources, and addressed in the ESP/TEP.

activities/programs that are off-plan

98 - Inconclusive: Respondent answered, “I do not know” (code 98) to one or more of the bolded items and no “No” (code 0) in any of these same items

99 - Not Applicable: Items are excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas if respondent answered, “Not applicable” (code 99) to any item.

4. A monitoring instrument: The JSR monitors sector performance and key indicators (including equity, efficiency and learning outcomes) to help better identify implementation issues and real achievements with respect to ESP/TEP implementation and overall sector progress.

4. Was the JSR based on the following items?

PLEASE NOTE that control questions were added to improve the questionnaire reliability. Depending on your answers, some of the items are auto populated.

4a: Education data of the year under review. If yes, please indicate in the comments column (H) the year of the data used.
4b: Total budget expenditures (national budget)
4c: Sector trends (outcome-level indicators)
4d: Performance of program/activities (output-level indicators)
4e: Education expenditures at the budget level
4f: Education expenditures at the program level (as defined in the ESP/TEP)
4g: International aid commitments and actual disbursements to the education sector
4h: Implementation problem areas and weaknesses
4i: Implementation achievements and good practices
4j: Previous JSR recommendations
4k: Monitoring of the indicators selected for the GPE variable part
4l: Specific thematic session(s) during the JSR. If yes, please indicate below which ones:
   and4l1 Equity
   and4l2 Learning
   and4l3 Efficiency
   and4l4 Aid modalities
   and4l5 Aid effectiveness agenda
   and4l6 SDG4 and FFA
   and4l7 Any other thematic session(s). Please list in the comments column (H).
4m: Any other item(s) on which the JSR was based that was not listed above. Please list in the comments column (H).

2 - Exceeding Quality Standard:
   Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to more than the bolded items (all bolded items and at least one other)

1 - Meeting Quality Standard:
   Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to all bolded items c, d, e, f, h & i

0 - Not Meeting Quality Standard:
   Respondent answered “No” (code 0) to one or more of the bolded items c, d, e, f, h & i

98 - Inconclusive:
   Respondent answered, “I do not know” (code 98) to one or more of the bolded items c, d, e, f, h & i

99 - Not Applicable:
   Item 4j is automatically coded as 99 and excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas, if respondent answered “1st JSR” in control question (no other item can be “Not Applicable”).

5. Anchored into a policy cycle:
   Recommendations from the JSR effectively feed into addressing weaknesses in the

5. What form do the JSR recommendations take?

PLEASE NOTE that control questions were added to increase the questionnaire reliability. Depending on

5a: They are limited in number (judged as manageable by the CL)
5b: They are clearly linked to the components of the ESP/TEP Action Plan and results framework

2 - Exceeding Quality Standard:
   Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to ALL items

1 - Meeting Quality Standard

• JSR Agenda
• JSR Report/Aide Memoire
• Annual Implementation Report

Additional sources include:
• ESP/TEP
• Annual Action Plan
• Results Framework
ESP/TEP implementation so as to ensure it is being used as a planning instrument to influence future policy planning, design and the budget cycle. Dissemination of JSR recommendations incentivizes mutual accountability. 

Your answers, some of the items are auto populated.

5c: They are in the form of remedial actions to address the weaknesses in the ESP/TEP implementation
5d: They designate responsible parties for implementation or action
5e: They include a timeline for implementation and/or for leading to planning documents revision
5f: They replicate previous year recommendations

**Standard:**
- Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to **all bolded items** a, c & d
- 0 - Not Meeting Quality Standard:
  - Respondent answered “No” (code 0) to **one or more of the bolded items** a, c & d

**98 - Inconclusive:**
- Respondent answered, “I do not know” (code 98) to **one or more of the bolded items** a, c & d

**99 - Not Applicable:**
- **Item 5f** is automatically coded as 99 and excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas, if respondent answered “1st JSR” in control question (no other item can be “Not Applicable”).