

TECHNICAL REPORT



FISCAL YEAR 2015

Interim Results Report

Highlights

Published by:
Global Partnership for Education

This report is organized into two volumes. The first volume presents a synthesis of achievements against expected targets and the impact, outcomes, and outputs. Data appear in six chapters. Following this introduction and overview, Chapter 2 reviews progress at impact and outcome levels. Chapter 3 details findings for Output 1; Chapter 4 for Output 2; and so on to Chapter 7, on Output 5.

Volume II of this report includes supporting documentation, including the methodologies, baseline analysis, and related tools, guidelines, and templates. Volume II is available upon request.

Contents

1	Chapter 1: Introduction
3	Chapter 2: Impact and Outcomes (Chapter 2)
5	Chapter 3: Quality Sector Planning and Technical Support (Output 1, Chapter 3)
7	Chapter 4: More and Better Financing (Output 2, Chapter 4)
9	Chapter 5: Contributions to Improved Teaching, Learning, Equity, and Inclusion (Output 3, Chapter 5)
11	Chapter 6: Data and Support for Evidence-Based Sector Planning and Monitoring (Output 4, Chapter 6)
12	Chapter 7: Improving the Organizational Effectiveness of the Global Partnership (Output 5, Chapter 7)
14	Conclusion and Next Steps
16	Organization of the Report

I.

Introduction

In 2014, the Global Partnership for Education Secretariat adopted an interim results framework that it developed in partnership with the U.K. Department for International Development (see Appendix I).¹ The interim results framework will be replaced by a partnership-wide corporate results framework, which was approved by the Global Partnership Board alongside a new strategic plan in December 2015. The new corporate results framework will be used for results reporting beginning in 2016.

The following report documents 2015 achievements against the milestones set out in the interim results framework. It captures trends at the impact and outcome levels, where the Global Partnership aims to contribute to stronger learning outcomes and improved equity for all, primarily in the basic education sub-sector. The report also considers progress towards key outputs in at least four levels: among GPE developing country partners (DCPs); within partnership dialogue mechanisms at the country level; at the level of GPE grants; and in the organizational effectiveness of the Secretariat itself.

On balance, the report shows that the Global Partnership has achieved the vast majority of the output targets established for FY2015 in the interim results

framework. On a total of 15 output indicators, 11 were met in full; three others were met in substantial part; and one was not met. Of particular note, excellent progress has been made in improving the Global Partnership's organizational effectiveness (Output 5), and in producing tools, templates, and methodologies that establish minimum standards and can be used to improve quality assurance of education sector plans, grants, and country-level processes (Outputs 1, 3, 4, and 5). As a result of the organizational review and subsequent changes in the Secretariat organization, these developments have also been accompanied by increased capacity and consistency in the support provided to country-level partners in both grant processes and sector dialogue.

However, the report draws attention to the need for a redoubled effort at the impact and outcome levels. It suggests that progress toward improved equity and access across GPE partner countries has slowed between 2012 and 2013. The Global Partnership should monitor and assess these trends carefully. Milestones reported at the impact and outcome levels in this report utilize 2013 data. The report therefore does not capture the effects on country performance of significant improvements in the overall GPE business model between 2013 and 2015, including the introduction

¹ The Global Partnership for Education recognizes with appreciation the substantial support from DFID in the development of this interim results framework.

of the new GPE funding model in 2015. The launch of the GPE funding model, with clear requirements as to domestic financing for education and a results-based tranche, is expected to leverage stronger outcomes.

This report comes at an auspicious moment in the Global Partnership for Education's history. GPE 2020, the new strategic plan 2016–2020, sets out a shared

vision and mission and commits the GPE to the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals—particularly SDG 4, which focuses on education. The work that has gone into this report has served the strategic planning process well, laying the foundation for a new, partnership-wide multi-year results framework that was adopted alongside the strategic plan at the December 2015 Board meeting.

2.

Impact and Outcomes (Chapter 2)

The Global Partnership for Education aims to improve access, equity, and learning outcomes for all. More specifically, it seeks to contribute to improvements in the number of children completing primary and lower secondary levels of school in GPE partner countries; to lower the number of children out of school; and to improve education quality, as measured by the percentage of trained teachers at the primary level. Findings in this chapter on impact and outcome indicators suggest that, while there have been continued improvements at the impact level, a more mixed picture emerges at the level of outcomes.

At the impact level, as measured by youth literacy rates (the only readily available and internationally comparable indicator), the 2013 data provided in this report show a continuation of a positive trend in developing country partners (DCPs), with significant gains beyond planned outcomes—including for women.²

At the outcome level, primary and secondary completion rates have plateaued between 2012 and 2013 across DCPs, with a very small percentage decline at the aggregate level for primary completion. There was a slight aggregate improvement for lower-secondary-level completion. Although at the aggregate level numbers

remain within a few percentage points of the FY2015 milestone, there has been a worrying increase in the number of out-of-school children across DCPs. A surprising number of these children are in countries not affected by fragility or conflict. We also report a year-on-year decline of approximately 2 percent in the proportion of trained primary teachers across GPE partner countries (but note that, because of irregular reporting, this indicator should be treated with caution).

More positively, data presented in Chapter 2 suggest that some of the outcome indicators used in the interim results framework may underestimate national achievements and the Global Partnership's contributions to them. For example, we present additional analysis under Outcome Indicator 1 (Primary Completion Rate) to show that progress among DCPs still remains above the 10-year trend line for this indicator. Progress among DCPs is also greater than PCR progress in non-GPE partner countries. The Global Partnership anticipates that implementation of the financing requirement in the new GPE funding model, which requires that at least 45 percent of a country's education expenditures target primary education, may have an impact on primary and lower secondary completion rates going forward.

² Data used to monitor impact and outcomes (apart from imputed numbers of students supported) come from UIS and are for 2013, which is the most recent internationally comparable data available. These data therefore can only reflect Global Partnership actions undertaken before 2013. They do not capture the impact of activities implemented by the Global Partnership between 2013 and FY2015, in particular the implementation of the new GPE funding model.

The Global Partnership is also able to report positive achievements in the imputed number of children supported with grants across GPE partner countries. This number exceeded in aggregate the FY2015 milestone. However, while the imputed number of children the partnership supported in fragile and conflict-affected states increased between 2014 and 2015, total values were about 6 percent lower than targeted. This lower-than-anticipated outcome was in part due to political instability in Yemen and Burundi that led to lower disbursements. Imputed numbers, however, fail to capture the fact that in situations of conflict, GPE dollars are often used flexibly to reach children in particularly difficult circumstances. For example, in Yemen, funds have been reallocated from investments in training to providing school kits—a measure that arguably reaches more children directly in the short term.

The Global Partnership is taking strong action to support improvements in outcomes. The launch of the new GPE funding model, with clear requirements

regarding domestic financing and a results-based financing tranche, is expected to leverage stronger outcomes. However, as noted in the *2014 to 2015 Results for Learning Report*,³ the drop in the overall external financing available for basic education in low-income and fragile and conflict-affected states is a major threat to continued progress. In particular, the Global Partnership and its partners should continue to explore ways to improve support for education in situations of conflict, where conventional approaches to disbursement sometimes break down but overall needs remain high. This issue is a permanent focus for the Secretariat’s Conflict and Fragility Team.

Moving forward, the Global Partnership will adopt improved measures at the impact and outcome levels that are closely aligned with the SDG framework. The partnership will conduct further analysis of the barriers and bottlenecks that are contributing to mixed achievements in key outcomes and impact.

³ <http://www.globalpartnership.org/2014-2015-results-for-learning-report>.

3.

Quality Sector Planning and Technical Support (Output 1, Chapter 3)

The Global Partnership has made significant progress in meeting major milestones related to the monitoring of sector plan credibility and the quality of joint sector review (JSR) processes. The Secretariat has fully implemented the new GPE funding model and (as described in more detail in Chapter 7) ensured that robust guidelines and procedures are in place to support program grant applications. The Secretariat has also improved the technical support it provides for planning and plan implementation.

For 2015, the Global Partnership established five milestones under four indicators for Output Indicator 1. It fully met four of these milestones and partially met another, yielding in total three indicator targets achieved and one partially achieved.

In Chapter 3, we detail the following achievements:

- **Methodology for assessing and monitoring sector plan credibility** (Output Indicator 1.1). A methodology for monitoring sector plan credibility was developed, disseminated, and used by the Global Partnership to create an initial baseline. Overall, the baseline suggests that there is much room for improvement in the quality of sector plans; and yet, while few sector plans meet all of the minimum standards, the majority meet at least some of the minimum standards and there is a good foundation for further development. This new methodology will be

used for quality assurance purposes—including the monitoring of education sector plan (ESP) quality. Ongoing monitoring will also be used to improve upstream technical support from the Secretariat and other partners.

- **Methodology for assessing and monitoring joint sector reviews** (Output Indicator 1.2). The Secretariat has developed a methodology for assessing the extent to which joint sector reviews are focused on implementation of the sector plans and allow effective sector monitoring. This tool sets minimum standards for JSR effectiveness, building on the 2013–2014 Global Partnership sector monitoring initiative and on previous research work undertaken between 2011 and 2012. A total of 32 JSRs were conducted by GPE partner countries with an active grant; of these, 24 provided JSR reports to the Secretariat. Baseline data collection on the quality of the JSR processes was also completed using this new methodology. Overall, the baseline suggests that 6 percent of the JSRs are assessed as focusing effectively on implementation of the ESPs and TEPs (transitional education plans). An additional 16 percent of the JSRs are well on track to meet the full set of minimum standards, while 31 percent are not meeting any minimum standards.

- **Methodology for assessing grant implementation** (Output Indicator 1.3). The Global Partnership has

partially met this milestone. The Secretariat successfully developed a new tool to track whether grants are “on track with implementation,” following the revised Policy on ESPIG (May 2015). The baseline for this methodology will be set in FY2016, although interim reporting on implementation status using existing reporting formats from different grant agents appears in the 2015 portfolio review.⁴ The use of the new methodology will be facilitated by the Board’s decision that the operational model firmly establishes that grant agents must apply minimum reporting standards. This newly approved practice will be in place by January 2016, enabling the use of the methodology going forward.

- **Timely and predictable mechanisms for disbursing the variable tranche in program grants** (Output Indicator 1.4). This milestone was fully met. The Secretariat introduced the new GPE funding model in FY2015, updating all guidelines (see Chapter 7). Three of the four⁵ grant applications approved to date in 2015 included a request for a performance-based tranche of funding. The revised ESPIG policy approved in 2015 set out general guidelines for preparing and disbursing the variable tranche of the grant, with flexibility for adaptation to country contexts and capacity. The guidelines specify that the verification mechanism to assess whether DCPs have achieved agreed-upon targets to warrant disbursement must be spelled out in the grant application. The mechanism is quality assured and reviewed as part of the grant application, and grant agents are expected to follow a Board-approved mechanism when verifying progress on indicators. Moreover, the Secretariat has

established a process to assert, on a grant-by-grant basis, that agreed-upon verification mechanisms have been used before disbursement of the variable tranche, and to track disbursements at the global level.⁶

In summary, the Global Partnership now has the tools available for monitoring sector plan credibility, the implementation focus of joint sector reviews, and the status of grant implementation. The Secretariat has also developed mechanisms for ensuring predictable and timely disbursement of the performance-based tranche of its GPE funding model grants. Each of these contributions supports the improvement of the Global Partnership’s operational model: clarifying minimum standards and requirements; providing the tools for upstream quality assurance and for downstream monitoring of progress; and ensuring improved grant oversight.

Moving forward, the Secretariat will continue to build its capacity to support improved sector planning and technical policy advice—moving the partnership significantly beyond the milestones anticipated for 2015 and 2016. In particular, we highlight the improvement in the overall level of staff time spent on country-focused work, through enhanced capacity among country leads and the creation of a new Planning, Financing, and Systems Team within the Secretariat. This new team has piloted a collaborative cross-country approach to support improved sector planning and will be responsible for the development of key guidelines in the areas of domestic financing monitoring, joint sector reviews, and transitional education plans.

⁴ Previously, grant implementation progress has been tracked and reported in the annual portfolio review in two different ways. For World Bank-supervised grants, the rating system used by the Bank in the ISRs was used; for grants supervised or managed by other partners, progress reports were reviewed along with mission reports, and an assessment was made on a grant-by-grant basis. However, as reporting formats vary, it has been difficult to extract common elements that lend themselves to a common methodology. The portfolio reviews of FY2013, FY2014, and FY2015 therefore use a mixed methodology to assess implementation progress.

⁵ One of the applications, from Bangladesh, was submitted using the previous funding model, as per the Board’s decision to allow countries with allocations communicated for the previous replenishment period to do so up until the first round of applications in 2015.

⁶ In addition, a set of standard reporting templates for GPE grants has also been developed, as detailed in Chapter 7. These—along with the methodology to follow grants “on track”—will enable DCPs and the Secretariat to closely monitor progress toward achieving their anticipated results and respond adequately to any deviations from their plans.

4.

More and Better Financing (Output 2, Chapter 4)

The Global Partnership is committed to improving the level of domestic financing available for education—in particular for basic education—and to improving the level of financing available for its grants, including by diversifying the sources of this financing.

In FY2015, the Global Partnership met in full or in substantial part all of the milestones established in relation to improved domestic and international financing:

- ➊ The Secretariat has successfully developed a methodology for monitoring DCPs' domestic expenditures in education, using an approach that draws on domestic financing data.
- ➋ On an exchange-rate-adjusted basis, the Global Partnership is on track to meet the target for donor contributions to the GPE fund. In FY2015, the Global Partnership successfully raised additional contributions from Canada and small amounts from a number of other donors. However, due to both exchange-rate fluctuations and significant pressure on European donors related to the refugee crisis, the negative impact on the partnership's ability to finance all of its eligible countries has been considerable. Therefore, it is important to recognize that, although the target has been met, the Global Partnership faces significant financial pressures.

- ➌ The Global Partnership has exceeded the milestone for contributions from private and nontraditional donors, achieving in total \$27 million in nontraditional contributions against a target of \$7 million. This is due primarily to these donors' signing multi-year contribution agreements that cover the full replenishment period.

Moving forward, this chapter highlights ways in which the Secretariat is taking proactive steps to improve the Global Partnership's work in the areas of domestic financing and international financing.

For *domestic financing*, the Secretariat is working with the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) to map primary gaps in reporting on domestic financing and support improved reporting. It is also making greater use of the domestic financing requirement in the new GPE funding model to strengthen domestic policy dialogue on financing. To support this effort, the Global Partnership has established an education Planning, Financing, and Systems Team (see bios in Appendix IX), with support from four senior Secretariat staff with expertise in the area of education finance. The Global Partnership is also working with the World Bank and UIS to improve overall methodologies for tracking domestic financing, including through work sponsored via Global and Regional Activities (GRA) on national education accounts with UIS and IIEP.

For *international financing*, the Secretariat is finalizing resource mobilization strategies and implementation plans in three sectors:

1. **Traditional donors:** This sector is best suited to ongoing contributions to the single pooled GPE Fund. However, it is the sector facing the greatest pressures on resources, especially in Europe. The Global Partnership has historically seen small contributions from six members of the G7. That is beginning to change as the United States and Canada increase their support, but a G7 focus remains essential. Some traditional donors are also interested in options for innovative and leveraged financing.
2. **Emerging sovereign donors:** The Global Partnership has had success in attracting more than \$200 million from Qatar for direct co-financing of programs, but otherwise has seen only a modest contribution to the GPE Fund from Korea. The Secretariat has developed strategies for engaging emerging donors in both the Middle East and Asia. Good progress is being made on both fronts, though much will depend on Board decisions in the context of its new strategic plan. Emerging donors will, in the early stages of engagement, wish to restrict their contributions more geographically or thematically.

3. **Foundations, philanthropy, and the private sector:** This is the least developed sector for the Global Partnership, principally because few of these entities are willing to contribute to a single pooled fund without attribution. However, with some increased flexibility in GPE financing processes, there are distinct possibilities for both geographic and thematic support.

Two Board decisions made in October 2015 are important to improving the chances of securing additional financing for Global Partnership activities. The Board has asked for options on strategic financing mechanisms, with an initial discussion paper being prepared for its December meeting in Dakar and an options paper due in June 2016 (BOD/2015/10-06). This will potentially open up opportunities for some mechanisms of restricted financing, provided adequate safeguards are in place. The second decision was in relation to the Global Partnership's role in knowledge sharing and global activities (BOD/2015/10-04), which called for an options paper for the June 2016 Board meeting. This is a crucial area for the emerging donor sector (especially in Asia) and also for foundations, the private sector, and philanthropy.

5.

Contributions to Improved Teaching, Learning, Equity, and Inclusion (Output 3, Chapter 5)

Improved outcomes in the areas of equity and inclusion, teaching, and learning are central to the Global Partnership's theory of change and appear as the two high-level goals within the new strategic plan for 2016–2020. Under the new GPE funding model, countries are required to invest in learning assessment systems and can apply for a variable tranche of funding based on achievement of key indicators in the areas of learning and equity. It is also worth noting that among Global Partnership program grants for which there is available reporting, 30 include activities or components related to supporting children with disabilities; 24 include girls' education and gender-responsive interventions; and a majority include components related to teacher training, curriculum development, and supply of learning materials.⁷

Milestones for 2015 in the areas of teaching and learning and equity and inclusion were focused on improvements in the Secretariat's capacity to deliver improved technical advice to country-level partners and deliver better monitoring and knowledge sharing across the partnership. Two of the three milestones were met in whole or substantial part; another one was not met.

- The Secretariat has appointed the deputy chief technical officer to lead the Secretariat's work

on teaching and learning and created a technical team that includes five specialists with technical expertise in this area (Appendix IX). Two additional specialists will join this team in 2016. Meanwhile, the milestone of appointing a senior education specialist in learning was not met.

- The Secretariat appointed a senior adviser to lead its work on equity and inclusion and appointed a technical team with expertise on various aspects of equity and inclusion to guide Global Partnership work in this area (Appendix IX). The new equity and inclusion team will include a senior policy fellow on disability and inclusion who will join the Secretariat in January 2016. One additional specialist will join the team in early 2016. The related milestone for this year was thus met in substantial part.
- A methodology has been developed to monitor the number of GPE partner countries that have credible learning assessments within the basic education cycle. An initial baseline study is also complete. The related milestone for this year was thus achieved.

In 2015, the Global Partnership established two dedicated technical teams within the Secretariat comprising highly skilled experts in the areas of teaching

⁷ The Global Partnership is introducing improved grant-level tracking of grant components. This assessment is derived from a detailed report of grants for which the World Bank is the grant agent.

and learning and equity and inclusion. These new teams provide enhanced technical advisory and analytical support to partner countries, and also promote improved policies and practices and cross-national learning in these areas. Each team is led by a senior education specialist and comprises highly skilled experts from the Country Support Team and the Strategy, Policy, and Performance Team. In addition, the CST has created a peer-cluster system to ensure coherence in country support, as well as to facilitate dissemination and use of the products and knowledge brokered by the technical and thematic teams across each country portfolio.

Because of this enhanced capacity, the Global Partnership has made significant contributions beyond those anticipated in the current results framework:

- Working with the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI), the Global Partnership has prepared gender-responsive sector planning guidelines that will be published in 2016. The Global Partnership is also mapping gender components of education sector plans that will be ready for publication as a GPE working paper.
- Under the Global and Regional Activities (GRA) program, the Global Partnership has sponsored

the publication of a wide number of technical reports, guidelines, and tools, and is making them available across the partnership on a new knowledge-mobilization website. In FY2015, the GRA program also supported approximately 50 workshops with partner governments in areas related to equity and learning. (See the GRA status report in Appendix VIII.)

- The Secretariat worked closely with partners to improve knowledge exchange on improved approaches to teaching and learning and equity and inclusion. Such work has included active participation in international initiatives or networks such as the Learning Metric Task Force; the Global Reading Network; the Global Book Fund Initiative; the Teacher Task Force; the gender-sensitive planning initiative co-convened with UNGEI; the Out-of-School Children Initiative; and the School-based Gender-related Violence Initiative. The Global Partnership is also actively brokering knowledge exchange with the research community, through both Secretariat presentations and support for partner participation in technical policy dialogue in venues such as the Comparative and International Education Society (CIES) and The Education and Development Forum (UKFIET) conferences.

6.

Data and Support for Evidence-Based Sector Planning and Monitoring (Output 4, Chapter 6)

The Global Partnership supports evidence-based sector planning and monitoring of sector progress. Output Indicator 4 tracks outputs in two main areas. First, using the level of reporting to UNESCO as a proxy, this indicator tracks progress in national reporting on key outcome, service delivery, and financial data. Second, this indicator looks at the number of GPE partner countries that have a strategy to address data gaps, a requirement for all new Global Partnership program grants approved after January 2015.

The Global Partnership has met FY2015 milestones for data and support for country monitoring in full or in substantial part:

- ❶ On the three indicators related to level of DCP reporting to UNESCO, the Global Partnership met one of three milestones. Overall reporting has declined in the areas of key outcome and service delivery indicators. However, it has improved on indicators related to education sector financing.
- ❷ The milestone for partner country data strategies was to develop a methodology for assessing data

strategies and establish a baseline. This milestone was met: a new methodology was developed (see Appendix XI) and the baseline completed using this methodology.

Furthermore, there have been improvements in the absolute number of countries reporting on all key indicators for outcomes and financing, which have increased from 18 to 22 and from 11 to 14, respectively, between 2012 and 2013.

Nonetheless, these results suggest that there is a significant data challenge in GPE partner developing countries. The Secretariat is presently considering how it can better support DCP progress in this area, working collaboratively with the UIS (on national reporting) and through technical support to countries during the sector plan development process to ensure that a robust national data strategy is developed. The Global Partnership will closely follow the impact of the new GPE funding model requirement for a robust data strategy in 2016, when a large number of grant applications will be required to meet the minimum standards set out in the newly developed data strategy methodology.

7.

Improving the Organizational Effectiveness of the Global Partnership (Output 5, Chapter 7)

The Global Partnership is committed to improving its overall organizational effectiveness. In FY2015, it successfully implemented the new GPE funding model, and it is on track to complete all the major reforms to the operational platform approved at the October Board retreat in BOD2015/10-02 by June 2016.

Indicators for Output 5 track these improvements in the Global Partnership's organizational effectiveness. Milestones for 2015 include the delivery of a draft strategic plan, theory of change, results framework, and implementation plan; completion of key improvements to the business systems and control framework; and progress on annual reporting of GPE results.

The Global Partnership has achieved or exceeded the three milestones set for 2015 in these areas:

- The Global Partnership delivered a complete draft of its Strategic Plan 2016–2020 on November 23, 2015. The plan was accompanied by a theory of change, a results framework, and an implementation plan. The strategic plan and its components draw on partnership-wide consensus built through an extensive consultation process between May 2015 and September 2015. The plan was approved by the Board during its December 2015 meeting.
- The Secretariat has also completed key improvements to its business systems and control frameworks:
 - a. A risk management policy and matrix have been adopted and are routinely being used by the Secretariat, with regular oversight by the Governance, Ethics, Risk, and Finance Committee (GERF). All Board committees have reviewed their risks. The Board receives regular updates on risk, which is now a standing item on the Board agenda.
 - b. The Global Partnership adopted a fiduciary assurance map and presented it to the GERF in April 2015. Based on GERF input, it has now been incorporated into the Risk Register.
 - c. New guidelines, minimum standards, and quality assurance processes have been revised to support the implementation of the new GPE funding model, and a strengthened program oversight framework is in place.
- In the area of improving reporting, the Secretariat has developed standard reporting templates for three grants (Education Plan Development Grants,

Program Development Grants, and Education Plan Implementation Grants). Standard reporting templates for EPDGs and PDGs are presently being operationalized.

In 2015, the Secretariat developed and piloted two reporting templates for ESPIGs—one for annual reporting and one for grant completion—but their adoption by grant agents was uneven. The October 2015 Board decision BOD2015/10-02 to adopt standard reporting on all grants (which includes clear reporting on grant outputs) will likely provide the Secretariat with a stronger mandate to require standard reporting from all grant agents. Based on this decision, the Secretariat is presently working with grant agents to develop an agreed-upon, common approach to grant reporting. ESPIG reporting will include details about grant outputs and will be linked to achievement of results established in the new GPE corporate results framework. Standard reporting templates for ESPIGs will be fully operationalized by June 2016.

Moreover, following Board decision BOD/2014/12-04, the Secretariat has developed a cross-team grant management function and recruited a highly qualified head of grant management as deputy CST manager (bio available in Appendix IX). The cross-team further consists of an operational team of four from the CST, a newly recruited senior finance officer, and a newly recruited finance officer. A monitoring unit of three staff members has been established within the CST, which is also overseen by the deputy CST manager. This is a significant improvement upon the previous situation, where grant management and monitoring was the responsibility of individual country leads under the supervision of the CST manager, with support from the head of finance.

The Global Partnership is also implementing a number of additional revisions to its organizational effectiveness, based on the recommendations in Board decision BOD/2015/10-02 on strengthening the partnership's operational model. These revisions, to be implemented by June 2016, include a variety of improvements in grant management and oversight; introduction of a

mechanism for upstream independent technical review of education sector plans; and a strengthened monitoring and evaluation framework, among other items.

With the additional support from the finance team, all audit reports and implementation progress reports are now reviewed in a systematic manner, providing greater capacity to review fiduciary and risk management issues in addition to the existing focus on programmatic issues from the CST.

The Board's decision in October 2015 to apply the minimum standards currently in place for international NGOs to all grant agents will provide greater assurance that all organizations receiving funds directly from the Global Partnership meet the expected requirements in the following areas:

- *Financial Management and Accounting Systems*
- *External Financial Audit*
- *Control Frameworks*
- *Internal Audit*
- *Legal Status*
- *Project Appraisal*
- *Management and Organization*
- *Oversight of Sub-recipients*
- *Procurement Procedures*
- *Monitoring, Evaluation, and Project-at-Risk Systems*
- *Misuse of Funds*
- *Protection of Whistleblowers*

The review of existing organizations against these standards is expected to be completed in time for the next meeting of the GERP in April 2016.

Conclusion and Next Steps

On balance, this report demonstrates that the Global Partnership has achieved the vast majority of the output targets established for FY2015 in its interim results framework. In particular, excellent progress has been made to improve the Global Partnership's organizational effectiveness (Output 5), and to produce tools, guidelines, templates, and methodologies that establish minimum standards, which can be used to support national policy dialogue and enhance the quality assurance of education sector plans, grants, and country-level processes (Outputs 1, 3, 4, and 5).

The Global Partnership now has improved systems for monitoring and evaluation, for risk management, and for fiduciary oversight. As a result of the organizational review and subsequent changes in the Secretariat organization, these developments have been accompanied by an increased capacity and consistency in the support the Global Partnership provides to country-level partners in both grant processes and sector dialogue.

The report also stresses a need for increased attention and action in 2016:

- Findings on the quality of education sector plans, and on low levels of reporting on key education outcome and service delivery indicators, suggest that the Global Partnership should do more to support developing country partners in these areas. To

address these issues, the Secretariat has improved the level of direct support provided during sector planning processes. It is also exploring new opportunities for cross-national exchange of good practice and peer review. Strengthened capacity within the Country Support Team and in the Strategy and Policy Team (including the creation of an education Planning, Financing, and Systems Team) has been put in place to support work in these areas.

- In the area of financing, the Secretariat is actively pursuing new financing opportunities, including through a Board-mandated options paper on strategic financing that will be delivered in June 2016.
- The introduction of Standard Reporting Templates for Education Sector Plan Implementation Grants has been accelerated by the Board's decision to require standard reporting from all grant agents. The Secretariat will have fully operational reporting templates for ESPIGs by June 2016. These templates will include data on grant outputs linked to the Global Partnership's corporate results framework.

At the impact and outcome levels, the Global Partnership should carefully monitor progress in primary completion rates, numbers of out-of-school children, and access to lower secondary education. It should conduct further analysis of the factors contributing to lower-than-anticipated progress in these areas,

and then use this analysis to stimulate further policy dialogue and improved approaches to overcoming key barriers and bottlenecks to progress.

Finally, we note that work completed for this report—including the development of indicators, tools, and methodologies—has been usefully incorporated into common, partnership-wide frameworks for corporate

results and monitoring and evaluation, which will be launched alongside the new strategic plan. This interim results report has provided the Secretariat with a valuable opportunity to develop and pilot an annual results report that in many ways models the procedures and approach that will be taken in results reporting during the period of the partnership's new Strategic Plan 2016–2020.

Organization of the Report

This overview of the GPE Results Report document presents a synopsis of the key findings. The full report is organized into two volumes. The first volume presents a synthesis of achievements against expected targets and the impact, outcomes, and outputs. Data appear in six chapters. Following this introduction and

overview, Chapter 2 reviews progress at impact and outcome levels. Chapter 3 details findings for Output 1; Chapter 4 for Output 2; and so on to Chapter 7, on Output 5. Volume II of this report includes supporting documentation, including the methodologies, baseline analysis, and related tools, guidelines, and templates.

SUMMARY OF GPE RESULTS ON 2015 MILESTONES

Impact and Outcome Levels	Indicator Title	2015 Status
Impact Indicator 1	Youth (15–24) literacy rate in GPE-endorsed countries (%)	Milestone met
Outcome Indicator 1	Primary completion rate (PCR) in GPE partner countries (%)	Milestone partially met
Outcome Indicator 2	Number of out-of-school girls and boys of primary school age in GPE partner countries	Milestone partially met
Outcome Indicator 3	Lower secondary completion rate in GPE partner countries (%)	Milestone partially met
Outcome Indicator 4	Number of equivalent children supported in basic education (primary and lower secondary school) annually by GPE	Milestone partially met
Outcome Indicator 5	Percentage of primary teachers in DCPs trained according to national standards (%)	Milestone partially met
Output 1: Quality Sector Planning and Technical Support	Indicator Title	2015 Status
Output Indicator 1.1	Percentage of endorsed (i) education sector plans or (ii) transitional plans meeting minimum standards of the Secretariat assessment methodology (%)	Milestone met
Output Indicator 1.2	(i) Number of GPE partner countries providing joint sector review reports to Global Partnership; (ii) Number of joint sector reviews that focus on the implementation of education sector plans	Milestone met
Output Indicator 1.3	Number of GPE program grants assessed as on-track with implementation	Milestone partially met
Output Indicator 1.4	Number of GPE program grant applications approved from 2015 onward that include a variable part based on performance indicators on equity, efficiency, and learning	Milestone met
Output 2: More and Better Financing	Indicator Title	2015 Status
Output Indicator 2.1	Number of GPE partner countries that have (i) increased their public expenditure on education since joining the partnership, or (ii) maintained sector spending at 20% or above	Milestone met
Output Indicator 2.2	Donor contributions to the GPE Fund for 2015–2018	Milestone met (on an adjusted exchange rate basis)
Output Indicator 2.3	Amount of funding to GPE from non-traditional donors (private sector and those who are new to education) for 2015–18	Milestone met

continued

SUMMARY OF GPE RESULTS ON 2015 MILESTONES *CONTINUED*

Impact and Outcome Levels	Indicator Title	2015 Status
Output 3: Contributions to Improved Teaching, Learning, Equity, and Inclusion	Indicator Title	2015 Status
Output Indicator 3.1	Number of GPE developing country partners with a credible strategy to improve teacher quality and management	Milestone not met
Output indicator 3.2	Number of GPE developing country partners that have a credible learning assessment within the basic education cycle (i) in place or (ii) under development	Milestone met
Output Indicator 3.3	Number of GPE developing country partners with a credible strategy to respond to marginalized groups (including gender and disability)	Milestone partially met
Output 4: Data and Support for Evidence-Based Sector Planning and Monitoring	Indicator Title	2015 Status
Output Indicator 4.1	(i) Average proportion of key outcomes indicators not reported by GPE partner countries; (ii) Average proportion of key service delivery indicators not reported by GPE partner countries; (iii) Average proportion of key financing indicators not reported by GPE partner countries	Milestone partially met
Output Indicator 4.2	Number of countries with a clear data strategy addressing gaps around (i) outcome indicators, (ii) service delivery indicators, and (iii) financing indicators	Milestone met
Output 5: Improving the Organizational Effectiveness of the Global Partnership	Indicator Title	2015 Status
Output Indicator 5.1	Secretariat develops a vision and strategy for the GPE business model, including an implementation plan that enables the Global Partnership to deliver its new funding model (NFM)	Milestone mainly met
Output Indicator 5.2	Secretariat improves business systems and control frameworks and implements key reforms: (a) Risk management policy and matrix monitored and updated by GERF semiannually; (b) fiduciary assurance map developed and assessed; (c) guidelines, minimum standards, and QAR process for grants under NFM finalized; (d) program oversight framework finalized (including mechanisms to assess variable component of NFM)	Milestone met
Output Indicator 5.3	Progress with annual reporting to the Board on education outcomes based on GPE results framework: (a) Standard reporting template developed for SE/MEs; (b) GPE theory of change developed; (c) GPE results framework linked to Strategic Plan 2016–2020 developed for Board approval	Milestone met

TABLE 1. PROGRESS MADE TOWARD ACHIEVING GPE IMPACT AND OUTCOME: 2015 MILESTONES PLANNED AND ACHIEVED⁸

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: 2014 (2007–2012 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (2008–2014 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Impact Indicator 1	Youth (15–24) literacy rate in GPE endorsed countries (%)	Percentage of people aged 15 to 24 years who can both read and write with understanding a short simple statement on their everyday life. Population weighted average of available data from 2008 to 2014 is used.	Total:	74.2	Planned Total:	74.8	YES
					Achieved Total:	75.1	
			Females:	68.9	Planned for Females:	69.5	YES
					Achieved for Females:	69.5	
Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: 2014 (2012 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (2013 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Outcome Indicator 1	Primary completion rate (PCR) in GPE partner countries (%)	Approximated by Gross Intake Ratio (GIR) to last grade of primary. This represents the total number of new entrants in the last grade of primary education regardless of age, expressed as percentage of the total population of the theoretical entrance age to the last grade of primary.	Total:	72.6	Planned Total:	73.7	REASONABLE VARIANCE (-1.8%)
					Achieved Total:	72.4	
			Females:	68.7	Planned for Females:	70.1	REASONABLE VARIANCE (-1.9%)
					Achieved for Females:	68.8	
			FCAS:	68.0	Planned for FCAC:	69.2	REASONABLE VARIANCE (-1.3%)
					Achieved for FCAC:	68.3	
Outcome Indicator 2	Number of out-of-school girls and boys of primary school age in GPE partner countries	Number of children of the official primary school age range who are not enrolled in either primary or secondary schools.	Total (000):	40,790	Planned Total (000):	40,298	REASONABLE VARIANCE (2.4%)
					Achieved Total (000):	41,265	
			Females (000):	22,652	Planned for Females (000):	22,160	REASONABLE VARIANCE (3.1%)
					Achieved for Females (000):	22,854	
			FCAS (000):	33,977	Planned for FCAC (000):	33,485	REASONABLE VARIANCE (1.9%)
					Achieved for FCAC (000):	34,117	

⁸ UIS historical estimates for impact indicator 1 and outcome indicators 1 through 3 were revised in light of updated population estimates, subsequent to publication of the baseline report in 2014. In order to ensure that the reported milestones and the baseline are calculated on a comparable basis, baseline and milestone (target) figures have been updated to reflect changes in UIS data.

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: 2014 (2012 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (2013 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Outcome Indicator 3	Lower secondary completion rate in GPE partner countries (%)	Approximated by Gross Intake Ratio (GIR) to last grade of lower secondary. This represents the total number of new entrants in the last grade of lower secondary education regardless of age, expressed as percentage of the total population of the theoretical entrance age to the last grade of lower secondary.	Total:	42.4	Planned Total:	43.2	REASONABLE VARIANCE (-0.9%)
					Achieved Total:	42.8	
			Females:	38.4	Planned for Females:	39.3	REASONABLE VARIANCE (-1.0%)
					Achieved for Females:	38.9	
			FCAS:	38.4	Planned for FCAC:	39.4	YES
					Achieved for FCAC:	39.4	
Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014		Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (2015 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Outcome Indicator 4	Number of equivalent children supported in basic education (primary and lower secondary school) annually by the Global Partnership	Estimate of number of children the Global Partnership has funded based on country-level expenditure data. This is given by GPE disbursements for FY2015 divided by public expenditure per pupil in public school.	Total (000):	5,547	Planned Total (000):	5,749	YES
					Achieved Total (000):	5,936	
			Females (000):	2,615	Planned for Females (000):	2,716	YES
					Achieved for Females (000):	2,812	
			FCAS (000):	4,142	Planned for FCAC (000):	4,702	NO
					Achieved for FCAC (000):	4,405	
Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014 (2012 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (2013 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Outcome Indicator 5	Percentage of primary teachers in DCPs trained according to national standards	Number of teachers who have received the minimum organized teacher training (pre-service or in-service) required for teaching at the primary level in the given country, expressed as a percentage of the total number of teachers at the primary level.	Total:	80.0	Planned Total:	80.4	REASONABLE VARIANCE (-2.7%)
					Achieved Total:	78.2	
			Female Teachers:	82.0	Planned for Female Teachers:	82.4	REASONABLE VARIANCE (-2.5%)
					Achieved for Female Teachers:	80.3	

Data source: Global Partnership compilation of 59 countries (61 from November 2015) based on UIS data. Note that for all indicators apart from outcome indicator 4, FCACs are defined as per GPE definition (combining UNESCO GMR list of conflict-affected countries and World Bank list of fragile situations) as at year-end 2013 in order to correspond with UIS data availability. Since outcome indicator 4 is based on 2015 GPE disbursements, FCACs in this calculation are updated to reflect the most recently available lists. In both cases, 28 DCPs are defined as FCAC; however, Malawi is included in 2013 but not in 2015, while The Gambia appears in the most recent list but not in 2013.

TABLE 2. PROGRESS MADE TOWARD ACHIEVING GPE OUTPUT 1: 2015 MILESTONES PLANNED AND ACHIEVED⁹

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?	
Output Indicator 1.1	Percentage of endorsed (i) education sector plans (ESPs) or (ii) transitional plans (TEPs) meeting minimum standards of the Secretariat assessment methodology (cumulative)	Number of endorsed ESPs or TEPs meeting minimum standards as defined by the Global Partnership divided by the number of total endorsed ESPs included in the group sample.	Draft methodology for evaluation of ESP/TEP quality developed	<p>Planned: Baseline established and agreed-upon methodology disseminated.</p> <p>Achieved: (i) Methodology finalized. (ii) Baseline established. 0% of the ESPs/TEPs meet none of the minimum standards of credibility 47% of the ESPs/TEPs meet 4 or fewer minimum standards 50% of the ESPs/TEPs meet 5 or 6 minimum standards 3% of the ESPs/TEPs meet all minimum standards (7)</p>	YES	
Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Component	Indicator Definition	Baseline: CY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 1.2	(i) Number of GPE partner countries providing joint sector review reports; (ii) Number of joint sector reviews that focus on the implementation of education sector plans	(i) Number of GPE partner countries providing joint sector review reports	Number of reports provided to Secretariat following JSR meetings. JSR reports/ aide-memoire are the main documentary outputs of JSR meetings. Countries included in the sample meet the following criteria in the given fiscal year: (a) Must be GPE member; (b) must have an active grant; (c) must have conducted a JSR.	19 out of 28 (67%) (calendar year 2014 data)	<p>Planned: x out of ...</p> <p>Achieved: 25 out of 33 (75.8%)</p>	YES

⁹ UIS historical estimates for impact indicator 1 and outcome indicators 1 through 3 were revised in light of updated population estimates, subsequent to publication of the baseline report in 2014. In order to ensure that the reported milestones and the baseline are calculated on a comparable basis, baseline and milestone (target) figures have been updated to reflect changes in UIS data.

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Component	Indicator Definition	Baseline: CY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
		(ii) Number of joint sector reviews that focus on implementation of education sector plans	Number of GPE DCPs with active program implementation grants that conduct joint sector reviews focusing on the implementation of education sector plans or transitional sector plans, in a given fiscal year.	No methodology	<p>Planned: Methodology of sound reporting developed and baseline established.</p> <p>Achieved: (i) Methodology finalized. (ii) Baseline data collection is currently underway and baseline data will be available by the end of November 2015. Table will be updated accordingly.</p>	YES
Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?	
Output Indicator 1.3	Number of GPE program grants assessed as on-track with implementation	GPE ESPIG ¹⁰ active during the fiscal year and implementation status assessed a combination of three determinants: <i>disbursement, program components (activities/ inputs), and results (outputs) by indicator</i> . Each of the three determinants is assessed using a traffic light system to reflect the status. Once each determinant is assessed and assigned a rating, an overall assessment is made on the status of the grant.	No assessment	<p>Planned: Methodology developed and baseline established.</p> <p>Achieved: (i) Improved methodology developed. (ii) Baseline data provided are for the previously used methodology—not the revised methodology provided.</p>	PARTIALLY	

continued

10 Active grant: According to the revised Policy on ESPIG (May 2015), the grant becomes active from the “expected start date” indicated in the grant application package. The Board will approve the grant duration and the expected start date based on the application package. A request for a later start date will have to provide a strong rational justification.

TABLE 2. CONTINUED

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 1.4	Number of GPE program grant applications approved from 2015 onward that include variable part based on performance indicators on equity, efficiency, and learning (cumulative)	Number of GPE ESPIG applications approved by the Board since introduction of new funding model (NFM) in 2015.	No assessment	Planned: Timely and predictable mechanism for disbursing RBF payments established. Achieved: (i) Timely and predictable mechanism for disbursing RBF payments established, including a tracking tool. (ii) In FY2015, three such applications were approved out of three submitted.	YES
IMPACT WEIGHTING FOR OUTPUT 1: 20%					

Data sources: Education sector plans, Board and CGPC papers and decisions, Secretariat, joint sector reviews, portfolio review, Results for Learning Report.

TABLE 3. PROGRESS MADE TOWARD ACHIEVING GPE OUTPUT 2: 2015 MILESTONES PLANNED AND ACHIEVED

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 2.1	Number of GPE partner countries that have (i) increased their public expenditure on education since joining the partnership, or (ii) maintained sector spending at 20% or above (cumulative)	Number of DCPs that have, during a given year, either (i) increased their public expenditure (or sector spending) on education, as compared with the base-year value, or (ii) maintained public expenditure on education at 20% or above (cumulative) since joining the Global Partnership. Public expenditure on education (or education sector spending) includes both recurrent and capital expenditure from public institutions (national, local) at all levels of education.	(i) 29 out of 46 (ii) 7 out of 46 (countries that joined Global Partnership after 2012 have no data available yet)	Planned: Methodology for monitoring DCP expenditure on education developed Achieved: Methodology for monitoring DCP expenditure on education developed	YES
Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: CY2014	Milestone 1—CY2015: Planned and Achieved	Milestone 1—CY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 2.2	Donor contributions to GPE Fund for 2015–2018 (cumulative)	Cumulative value of contributions (in USD) received and balance on signed contribution agreements for the current replenishment period. Both the target and results are fixed using exchange rates in effect at the time of pledging.	\$0.1 billion	Planned: \$700 million Achieved: \$949 million	YES

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 2.3	Amount of funding to Global Partnership from nontraditional donors (private sector and those new to education) for 2015–2018 (cumulative)	Cumulative value of contributions (in USD) received and balance on signed contribution agreements from private sector/foundations and new donors to the Global Partnership.	\$5 million (from CIFF)	Planned: \$7 million Achieved: \$27 million	YES
IMPACT WEIGHTING FOR OUTPUT 2: 15%					

Data sources: Secretariat, GPE and trustee financial reports, UIS data portfolio review, Results for Learning Report.

TABLE 4. PROGRESS MADE TOWARD ACHIEVING GPE OUTPUT 3: 2015 MILESTONES PLANNED AND ACHIEVED

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 3.1	Number of GPE developing country partners with a credible strategy to improve teacher quality and management	Number of GPE developing country partners with a credible strategy to improve teacher quality and management, in a given fiscal year (to be refined at the time of methodology development).	No assessment	Planned: Recruitment of a learning and teacher specialist and start of the process to define a methodology Achieved: The Deputy Chief Technical Officer is the lead for learning and teachers. A Teaching and Learning cluster with dedicated support from 5 Secretariat staff is in place. In addition, another learning specialist is under recruitment and a thematic team of 5 is in place.	NO
Output Indicator 3.2	Number of GPE developing country partners that have a credible learning assessment within the basic education cycle (i) in place or (ii) under development	Number of GPE developing country partners that have a credible learning assessment within the basic education cycle (i) in place or (ii) under development.	No assessment	Planned: Methodology developed and baseline established Achieved: (i) Methodology developed. (ii) Baseline established (N = 60 DCPs): – 8 DCPs with “no information” on learning assessment – 35 DCPs with “nascent” learning assessment – 15 DCPs with learning assessment “under development” – 2 DCPs with “established” learning assessment	YES

continued

TABLE 4. CONTINUED

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 3.3	Number of GPE developing country partners with a credible strategy to respond to marginalized groups (including gender and disability)	Number of GPE developing country partners with a credible strategy to respond to marginalized groups, including gender and disability, in a given fiscal year (to be refined at the time of methodology development).	No assessment	Planned:	Recruitment of an equity specialist and start of the process to define a methodology	PARTIALLY
				Achieved:	A senior adviser has been appointed to lead the Secretariat's Equity and Inclusion Cluster. This cluster includes a full-time policy fellow in the area of disability and inclusion, and dedicated support from senior specialists from the CST. An additional equity and inclusion position is presently under recruitment.	
IMPACT WEIGHTING FOR OUTPUT 3: 15%						

Data sources: Education sector plans, program implementation grant applications, joint sector reviews, Secretariat, CGPC papers and meetings, national learning assessments.

TABLE 5. PROGRESS MADE TOWARD ACHIEVING GPE OUTPUT 4: 2015 MILESTONES PLANNED AND ACHIEVED

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014 (2012 data)	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (2013 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 4.1	(i) Average proportion of key outcomes indicators not reported by GPE partner countries	Average proportion of five key outcomes indicators not reported by GPE developing country partners. Countries are assigned a 1 for each relevant outcome indicator that is not recorded in the UIS database for 2013 (0 otherwise). The proportion of indicators missing is then calculated for each country by summing these scores and dividing by the total number of indicators identified (5). The final indicator represents the average of this proportion across all GPE partners. The five indicators considered are (1) pre-primary gross enrollment ratio, (2) primary gross intake rate, (3) primary gross enrollment ratio, (4) primary completion rate, and (5) lower secondary completion rate.	35	Planned:	35	NO
				Achieved:	42	

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014 (2012 data)	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (2013 data)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
	(ii) Average proportion of key service delivery indicators not reported by GPE partner countries	Average proportion of four key service delivery indicators not reported by GPE developing country partners. Countries are assigned a 1 for each relevant service delivery indicator that is not recorded in the UIS database for 2013 (0 otherwise). The proportion of indicators missing is then calculated for each country by summing these scores and dividing by the total number of indicators identified (4). The final indicator represents the average of this proportion across all GPE partners. The four indicators considered are (1) pupil-teacher ratio (primary and lower secondary) and (2) percentage of teachers trained according to national standard.	58	Planned:	58	NO
				Achieved:	63	
	(iii) Average proportion of key financing indicators not reported by GPE partner countries	Average proportion of three key financing indicators not reported by GPE developing country partners. Countries are assigned a 1 for each relevant financing indicator that is not recorded in the UIS database for 2013 (0 otherwise). The proportion of indicators missing is then calculated for each country by summing these scores and dividing by the total number of indicators identified (3). The final indicator represents the average of this proportion across all GPE partners. The three indicators considered are (1) public expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP, (2) public expenditure on education as a percentage of public expenditure, and (3) educational expenditure in primary as a percentage of total educational expenditure.	77	Planned:	77	YES
				Achieved:	73	

continued

TABLE 5. CONTINUED

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 4.2	Number of countries with a clear data strategy addressing gaps around (i) outcome indicators, (ii) service delivery indicators, and (iii) financing indicators	Number of GPE developing country partners applying for an education sector implementation program grant with a clear data strategy addressing data gaps in (i) outcome indicators, (ii) service delivery indicators, and (iii) financing indicators as assessed in the grant QAR process.	No methodology available	Planned:	Baseline established	YES
				Achieved:	(i) Methodology established. (ii) Baseline data collection is currently underway and baseline data will be provided by the end of November 2015.	
IMPACT WEIGHTING FOR OUTPUT 4: 10%						

Data sources: Country government websites, UIS data, joint sector reviews, Global Monitoring Report, education sector plans, Secretariat.

TABLE 6. PROGRESS MADE TOWARD ACHIEVING GPE OUTPUT 5: 2015 MILESTONES PLANNED AND ACHIEVED

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (linked to £20 million performance-based funding)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 5.1	Secretariat develops a vision and strategy for the GPE business model, including an implementation plan which enables the Global Partnership to deliver its new funding model (NFM)	Number of strategic plan documents developed. This organizational management document, which sets out critical goals and associated strategic objectives for a given time period and aims to drive the allocation and use of resources, guides the necessary organizational framework and results-driven management practices to fulfill these goals and objectives.	Board agreement for the Secretariat to develop a Strategic Plan for 2016–2020, accompanied by an implementation plan and results framework	Planned:	Draft final 2016–2020 strategic plan (setting out roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities), accompanied by implementation plan addressing key reforms and results framework, developed for Board approval.	YES
				Achieved:	Draft final 2016–2020 concept note and submit to Board. Implementation plan was delivered as part of the Board package in December 2015.	

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Component	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (linked to £20 million performance-based funding)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 5.2	Secretariat improves GPE business systems and control frameworks and implements key reforms	(A) Risk management policy and matrix monitored and updated semiannually by GERF	Number of risk management policy and matrix documents developed as well as number of associated reports based on this matrix that are produced and issued each year.	Board-approved risk policy and matrix	Planned:	Risk management policy and matrix monitored and updated semiannually by GERF.	YES
					Achieved:	(i) Risk management policy and matrix established in December 2014. (ii) Reports issued in April 2015 and November 2015.	
		(B) Fiduciary assurance map developed and assessed	Number of fiduciary assurance maps developed and assessed. This map tool outlines the key controls in place to manage key risks and rates the level of assurance provided by those controls.	No clear or agreed-upon control framework around fiduciary and delivery assurance	Planned:	Fiduciary assurance map developed and assessed.	YES
					Achieved:	Fiduciary assurance map developed by Secretariat in March 2015 and assessed by GERF in April 2015.	
		(C) Guidelines, minimum standards, and QAR process for grants under NFM finalized	Grant guidelines aligned with NFM. Assessment tool for requirements for fixed part now included in QAR Phase I. Assessment tool for variable part included in QAR Phase II, along with an assessment table for scoring eight minimum standards for program documents. Minimum standards will be used by the Secretariat to refine assessment of future applications.	No clear or agreed-upon control framework around program quality and design	Planned:	Guidelines, minimum standards, and QAR process for grants under NFM finalized.	YES
					Achieved:	Guidelines, minimum standards, and QAR process for grants under NFM finalized.	

continued

TABLE 6. CONTINUED

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Component	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (linked to £20 million performance-based funding)	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
		(D) Program oversight framework finalized (including mechanisms to assess the variable component of the NFM)	Number of program oversight frameworks finalized. This multicomponent framework is related to the Board decision on the GPE operational platform. It includes an upstream quality assurance mechanism; a grant agent oversight mechanism; a standard internal operating procedure for review of and feedback on progress and audit reports; an operational risk platform; and standard procedures for verifying justification for payout of NFM variable component.	No clear or agreed-upon control frameworks around portfolio performance or monitoring and evaluation in relation to NFM	<p>Planned: Program oversight framework finalized (including mechanisms to assess the variable component of the NFM).</p> <p>Achieved: Program oversight framework finalized (including mechanisms to assess the variable component of the NFM).</p>	YES
Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Component	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (linked to £10 million performance-based funding)	Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
Output Indicator 5.3	Progress with annual reporting to the Board on education outcomes based on GPE results framework	(A) Standard reporting template for SEs/MEs developed	Number of standard reporting templates for grant agents developed to capture aggregated results.	No GPE results framework for 2016–2020	<p>Planned: Standard reporting template for SEs/MEs developed.</p> <p>Achieved: Four standard reporting methodologies and associated templates for grant agents, formerly known as SMEs, developed (ESPDG completion report, PDG completion report, ESPIG annual implementation status report, ESPIG completion report templates).</p>	YES

Indicator Number	Indicator Title	Component	Indicator Definition	Baseline: FY2014	Milestone 1—FY2015: Planned and Achieved (linked to £20 million performance-based funding)		Milestone 1—FY2015 Met?
		(B) GPE theory of change developed	Number of GPE theories of change developed. This is a visual representation/ diagram and accompanying narrative that expresses the “big picture” of results pathways (i.e., varied ways to lead to long-term change), from the impact down to the outputs. A theory of change also displays the internal/ external dynamics between those results and critical assumptions that must be fulfilled to achieve the intended change.	No GPE results framework for 2016–2020	Planned:	GPE theory of change developed.	YES
					Achieved:	Draft of theory of change developed and presented to Board during October retreat; revised draft was delivered to the Board in December 2015.	
		(C) GPE results framework linked to 2016–2020 strategic plan developed for Board approval	Number of GPE results frameworks developed. A results framework clearly articulates different levels of results (short-term outputs and intermediate outcomes) expected from a given project or program as well as their linkages to longer-term objectives. Results frameworks also display suites of indicators that are used to periodically measure progress toward achieving the objectives.	No GPE results framework for 2016–2020	Planned:	GPE results framework linked to 2016–2020 strategic plan developed for Board approval.	YES
					Achieved:	GPE draft results framework linked to 2016–2020 strategic plan developed for Board approval.	
IMPACT WEIGHTING FOR OUTPUT 5: 40%							

Data sources: Secretariat internal reform plan, Alison Evans operational review assessment against indicators of success in 2016, Board and committee papers and decisions, Secretariat, risk management matrix, risk policy, fiduciary assurance map, reports from monitoring visits, DFID annual reviews, portfolio review, Results for Learning Report, 2016–2020 strategic plan, new funding model grant application guidelines, QAR reports, ESP quality reports, program oversight framework, M&E policy, VfM strategy, standard reporting template, results framework for 2016–2020, Global Partnership annual report.



Office Location:

1850 K Street N.W.
Suite 625
Washington D.C., 20006
USA

Mailing Address:

Global Partnership for Education
MSN IS6-600
1818 H Street NW
Washington D.C., 20433
USA

www.globalpartnership.org

 facebook.com/globalpartnership

 twitter.com/gpforeducation