Accelerated Funding grant

**cOMPLETION Report Template**

December 2022

|  |
| --- |
| **OVERVIEW** |
| Country: | Click to enter text. |
| Name of project this grant is contributing to: | Click to enter text. |
| Grant ID (if applicable):  | Click to enter text. |
| Grant agent: | Click to enter text. |
| Grant effectiveness/start date:[[1]](#endnote-2)1 | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| Grant closing date (actual date): | Click or tap to enter a date. |
| Grant amount:[[2]](#endnote-3) | Click to enter amount. |
| Date of report submission: | Click or tap to enter a date. |

|  |
| --- |
| **PURPOSE AND INSTRUCTIONS** |
| **Purpose** |
| This accelerated funding grant completion report is learning oriented and seeks to:* Evaluate and report on **overall performance** by providing a complete and systematic account of the performance and results of the project, issues related to implementation and measures taken to address them, in the context of crisis-affected beneficiaries and systems.
* Share **reflections** to improve the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future such projects and Global Partnership for Education (GPE) processes.
* Ensure **accountability** and **transparency** of the grant and its commitments.

By taking stock of what has worked or not, the process of writing this completion report should be forward-looking and serve as a basis for collaborative discussions around the future of GPE support in the country. |
| **Instructions** |
| This template is to be completed by the grant agent upon seeking inputs from the government, local education group and education cluster as applicable. As per [GPE’s Guidelines for Accelerated Funding](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-accelerated-support-emergency-and-early-recovery-situations), the project agent provides an implementation completion report covering the entire implementation period to the GPE Secretariat, following the end of implementation. The completion report should be submitted **within six months after the close of the grant**, separately from the last implementation progress report.The full completion report package consists of the following **deliverables**:* Completed template (present form, including relevant annexes)
* Results framework data
* Tangible outputs and knowledge products generated with accelerated funding grant support
* Evaluations or any other relevant studies that measure the project’s or related grant’s results (if any).

This report package may be supplemented with any other document, annex or information deemed useful by the grant agent and the country.For cofinanced grants, note that some sections in this template are about the entire project cofinanced by GPE and other donor(s) and other sections are about the portion of the project that is financed by GPE’s accelerated funding grant. The term *project* is used in the former case and *grant* is used in the latter case. Country-level monitoring in contexts of conflict/fragility shall adhere to the principle of **do-no-harm** and use **conflict-sensitive approaches**. It necessitates **quick feedback loop mechanisms** to maximize data usefulness for beneficiaries. Monitoring should be **participatory** among all levels of actors and sectors involved. Data collection should be **pragmatic** and **opportunistic** – some needed data may not be readily/easily accessible, while novel serendipitous information may become available and helpful for implementation. Present evidence and data **disaggregated** by varied subgroups (**at a minimum by sex**, and by any other groups as feasible). Include a **gender and equity lens** in the narratives, as much as feasible. Evidence and findings should be placed back into the **national/sub-national context** of the country at the time of the review, for better unpacking the information.Text should be concise and clear. It is encouraged to think of the questions as an interdependent whole to build the grant’s story line. Some questions are self-reflective in nature and will necessitate using judgement inferred from triangulated quantitative/qualitative information and logical explanations. Data should present a balance of **quantitative and qualitative** information from varied sources and stakeholders. The review should use **compare/contrast techniques** to explain any diverging pieces of evidence. **Substantiate assertions with data and evidence.** Explore the **‘how and how well’**, **‘why or why not’**, and **‘so what’** aspects of the evidence to understand its underlying causes, effects, and relative importance.The grant agent should submit the report through the [GPE reporting portal](https://fifsgpe.worldbank.org/GATool/#/). Please contact the grant operations officer for your country if you do not have credentials to access the portal. Following submission, grant agents may be contacted by the GPE Secretariat for additional information or clarification. The final completion report will be **publicly disclosed** after it is submitted by the grant agent and reviewed by the GPE Secretariat. Please reach out to your GPE Secretariat primary contact in case of questions. |

|  |
| --- |
| **LIST OF ACRONYMS** |

|  |
| --- |
| Please insert the list of acronyms used in this report, if any.Click here to add acronyms. |

|  |
| --- |
| **1. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: RELEVANCE** |
| **1.1 Overall relevance** |
| **RELEVANCE – Extent to which project activities responded to the needs and priorities related to the emergency and the affected beneficiaries, especially girls and the most marginalized/vulnerable children, and continued to do so throughout implementation.[[3]](#endnote-4) Please assess by ticking X in the answer that seems most relevant and qualify your answer in the textbox below.** Assess by ticking “**X**” in the answer that seems most relevant and qualify your answer in the textbox below. |
|[ ]  High | There were no shortcomings or at most minor shortcomings in the continued alignment between project activities and the needs of the beneficiaries, considering the evolution of the emergency. The project provided clear evidence of such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant.  |
|[ ]  Substantial  | There were moderate shortcomings in the continued alignment between project interventions and the needs of the beneficiaries, considering the evolution of the emergency. The project provided generally sufficient information on such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. |
|[ ]  Modest  | There were significant shortcomings in the continued alignment between project interventions and the needs of the beneficiaries, considering the evolution of the emergency. The project provided limited information on such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were not changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. |
|[ ]  Negligible  | There were severe shortcomings in the continued alignment between project interventions and the needs of the beneficiaries, considering the evolution of the emergency. The project differed from those current needs or did not provide information to assess such alignment. If circumstances changed, the objectives were not changed accordingly to keep objectives fully relevant. |
| Reflect briefly on the project’s **continued relevance** during its life cycle, especially in situations of uncertainty or rapidly changing context.[[4]](#endnote-5) How adaptive was the project/grant throughout its cycle, based on the changing internal and external circumstances? |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **1.2 Beneficiaries’ views on relevance**  |
| *[If a beneficiary/satisfaction survey and so on was conducted.]* Do project **beneficiaries** think that the activities and outputs were of quality and met their needs and priorities (children, teachers, caregivers, school leadership, education administrators and so on)? Why or why not? |
| Click here to enter text. **2. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: EFFICACY** |
| **2.1 Overall efficacy**  |
| **EFFICACY – Extent to which the project achieved its intended objectives (intended objectives or outcomes) at the time of closing.[[5]](#endnote-6)** Assess by ticking “**X**” in the answer that seems most relevant and qualify your answer in the textbox below. |
|[ ]  High | The project exceeded or fully achieved its objectives (intended outcomes) or is likely to do so.  |
|[ ]  Substantial  | The project almost fully achieved its objectives (intended outcomes) or is likely to do so. |
|[ ]  Modest  | The project partly achieved (or is expected to partly achieve) its objectives (intended outcomes). |
|[ ]  Negligible  | The project barely achieved or did not achieve (minimal achievement, if any) its objectives (intended outcomes). |
| Briefly qualify your answer below. Also focus on the overall relative success of the project, regarding both activities conducted and results, in:Reaching **crisis-affected populations**,especiallygirls and/or in terms of gender equality, and the hardest to reach children.**Ensuring** **continuity of education** to prevent learning loss/dropout and **building** **back** **better**. |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **2.2 Other effects** |
| If applicable, describe **any other project’s effects and impacts** (intended or unintended, positive or negative). Unintended effects should be shown to be causally linked to the intervention being assessed. |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **2.3 Conditions affecting the project** |
| Reflect on the internal/external **conditions that have facilitated or hindered project success**, (its design, implementation and the achievement of objectives), for example[[6]](#endnote-7):1. Status and evolution of the **crisis** over the implementation period.
2. Any other **external factors** beyond the grant agent’s or implementor’s control.
3. **Conditions internal to the grant** (for example, grant management or supervision; other factors related to the government and the country, such as management capacity, financial management or fiduciary capacity, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and partner coordination).
4. In hindsight, whether the **risks identified** at the project development stage were accurate and the **mitigating measures** sufficient; whether there were any other risks not foreseen at the time.
 |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **2.4 Standout practices, lessons, and recommendations, and products** |
| Briefly describe, if not reported previously:1. Any **successful practices, innovative interventions or lesson** in relation to the implementation of the project, especially when reaching girls and any vulnerable populations. Which **recommendations** could feed into future grant/project planning cycles for improved practices?
2. Any **stories of impact** of the project on beneficiaries that you would like to share with the GPE Secretariat Communications Team. These stories will be featured on our communications materials and platforms, with attribution to the provider.
3. Any **tangible outputs and knowledge products** (for example, evaluations, pilots, studies) generated through the support of the grant. Also, attach any **photos, videos, advocacy posters** and so on as relevant that can be showcased in GPE stories or blogs.
 |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **3. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: EFFICIENCY** |
| **3.1 Overall efficiency**  |
| **EFFICIENCY – Extent to which project interventions were implemented in a timely manner, and the costs were reasonable for the results achieved (that is, the resources were economically converted into outputs and outcomes).[[7]](#endnote-8)** Please assess by ticking “**X**” in the answer that seems most relevant and qualify your answer in the textbox below. |
|[ ]  High | Efficiency exceeded expectations. |
|[ ]  Substantial  | Efficiency was what would be expected. |
|[ ]  Modest  | Efficiency was below expectations.  |
|[ ]  Negligible  | Efficiency was very low.  |
| **3.2 Timeliness**  |
| Reflectonthe timeliness of the project, that is, whether the project experienced any **delays at project start or during implementation,** and why. |
| **At project start:** - What was the time between GPE approval date and actual start of activities? - If project start experienced delays, what were the main reasons for these delays? How well were they remediated? | **During implementation:**- To what extent were components/objectives delivered within the planned timeline? Did direct beneficiaries start receiving education services as scheduled?- If project implementation experienced delays, what were the main reasons for these delays? What was the effect of delays on direct beneficiaries receiving education services? How well were they remediated? |
| Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **3.3 Grant costs** |
| 1. What were the **unit costs of delivering key outputs** (for example, learning spaces/classroom construction, teacher training or compensation, textbooks)? Are there any **benchmarks** available for comparison?
2. Did the unit costs **change** between grant design and actual implementation? If so, why?
3. How did the **crisis context affect grant costs**, and what was the effect of this on grant implementation and results?
4. Were there any **exceeding costs or major savings** for the grant? If yes, please describe.
 |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **3.4 Coordination and partnerships** |
| If applicable – Reflect briefly on the following:1. How well did **coordination** work between grant stakeholders, the local education group, the education cluster, other humanitarian actors, other ministries, and other sectors’ actors besides education and so on? How has this affected grant implementation and results?
2. Were there any **collaborations or partnerships** (financial/in-kind/other) developed or leveraged—for example, with private sector, foundations, other sectors beyond education, research institutions—to support the grant? How have they affected grant implementation and results?
 |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **3.5 Use of data and evidence for improvement** |
| Reflect briefly on the following:1. How, and with what level of success, has the grant **used its monitoring data and research/evidence** throughout its life cycle to improve implementation and ensure that intended results would be achieved?
2. Have there been any **joint problem-solving** exercises, events, or opportunities with country-level partners, the GPE Secretariat, and other stakeholders? If so, were they useful? Are there any recommendations on how such mechanisms could be improved moving forward?
 |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **3.6 Use of GPE processes** |
| Reflect on the extent to which the **key GPE process features** have facilitated or impeded the design and implementation of the grant (in terms of the need for grant quality, timeliness, reasonable transaction costs, and so on).[[8]](#endnote-9) |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **4. RESILIENCE AND BUILDING BACK BETTER** |
| If information is available, reflect on how this grant’s benefits and lessons could be featured in **longer-term recovery and planning** in the education sector:1. Is there a **transition or exit strategy** to continue the benefits of this grant, such as tying them to longer-term recovery or resilience plans?
2. Are there any lessons that can be drawn from this grant in terms of **preparedness, mitigation/recovery, longer-term resilience planning and building back better** at the sector level?
 |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **5. GRANT MANAGEMENT AND USE OF FUNDS** |
| **5.1 Unspent funds** |
| If applicable, if there were any **unspent funds** by the end of the project, indicate (i) how much and (ii) why. |
| 1. Click to enter amount of funds that were not spent by project closing.
 |
| 1. Click here to enter text.
 |
| **5.2 Management performance** |
| Provide a rating to indicate the level of performance of the grant during implementation in terms of its **management** over the life cycle of the grant. This includes financial, procurement, social/environmental safeguards, implementation arrangements, monitoring and evaluation, and other fiduciary management or compliance duties. | Select a rating.[[9]](#endnote-10) |
| Explain below how these management arrangements/duties have affected, positively or negatively, the implementation of the grant and its achievement of results/outcomes by the end of the grant. |
| Click here to enter text. |
| **5.3 Co-financing** |
| Where relevant, include information on whether the project that the grant supported benefited from any **co-financing**, including the disbursement level of co-financing, information on whether any remaining funds will still be disbursed and within what timeline, and if disbursement has been less than originally budgeted, reasons for this downside. |
| Click here to enter text. |

|  |
| --- |
| **6. MONITORING DATA**  |
| **6.1 Results framework indicator data**  |
| Include the complete **results framework** in an annex or as an attachment. The results framework should include the following: * Milestone, end-target, and baseline indicator values
* Revised target values (if the original target value(s) were formally revised due to restructuring or changes during implementation)
* Status on the achievement against target values
* Reasons for any underachievement/overachievement by the end of the project/grant
 |
| **6.2 Global numbers data**  |
| Provide in annex 3 the data related to GPE’s **three global numbers**: * Textbooks purchased and distributed
* Teachers trained
* Classrooms built or rehabilitated
 |
| **6.3 Cumulative beneficiary children or other student data**  |
| Provide in annex 4 the **cumulative** number of children and other students who **directly participated in project activities, received project-supported incentives or services, or benefited from project interventions,** over the entire duration of the project. If such data are unavailable, please provide the reasons why in the comment section in annex 3. Also provide in the annex the relevant disaggregated values by subgroups, **at a minimum by sex.** If appropriate and available, provide disaggregated values by varied subgroups (children with a disability, refugee children, internally displaced children, out-of-school children and children from marginalized ethno-cultural/linguistic minorities) and by education level.  |

**Annex 1: Decision Trees for Overall Efficacy Rating and Component/Objective-level Efficacy Ratings**

**1. Overall efficacy rating**



**2. Component/objective-level efficacy ratings**



**Annex 2: Efficacy by Project Component/Objective**

|  |
| --- |
| Assess below **how successfully each component/objective was achieved by the end of the grant, focusing on outcome-level achievements.*** By selecting a rating[[10]](#endnote-11) from the drop-down menu.
* Then by reflecting in a short narrative on the achievement of the components/objectives, describing for example for each:
1. The **reliability of the results chain**: i.e., outcomes achieved, extent to which the component/objective’s activities/outputs contributed to its outcomes, whether outcome-level achievements are attributable to the grant activities, whether key activities/outputs were delivered as intended based on the inputs mobilized, the relative importance of the results achieved (or not), and reasons for non-achievement, etc.
2. Any **innovations** or **pilots** and their degree of success.
3. Any varying degrees of accomplishment across **groups of beneficiaries**.
4. Any **major challenges** experienced during implementation, their causes, and how well these were remediated, including any revisions/restructurings/adaptations.
5. If any of the Results Framework **indicator targets** were not met: the reasons for underachievement. And, if targets were surpassed, the reasons for overachievement.
6. Any **significant deviation** from the original or revised project objectives/component
 |
| Component/objective  | Level of achievement (outcome level) at end of grant: | Brief narrative: |
| Name of component/objective 1: Click here to enter text.  | Select a rating. | Click here to enter text. |
| Name of component/objective 2: Click here to enter text.  | Select a rating. | Click here to enter text. |
| Name of component/objective 3: Click here to enter text.  | Select a rating. | Click here to enter text. |
| Name of component/objective 4: Click here to enter text.  | Select a rating. | Click here to enter text. |

**(Add or remove components/objectives as needed.)**

**Annex 3: Global Numbers Reporting Template**

**General Instructions:**

1) Starting from FY2021, only the actual global numbers achieved during a reporting period are required; no annual targets will be requested onward.

2) If the implementation grant does not include any or all global number(s), insert “not applicable” in the appropriate text box(es).

3) If an indicator is measured as a percentage, please provide the **numeric values** that were used to calculate the percentage. If these numbers are not available, please provide the percentage and make a note of it in the comments box.

**GPE’s Definitions:**

**Textbooks purchased and distributed.** This indicator tracks the number of school textbooks that were purchased and distributed through GPE’s implementation grants during a reporting period. “Textbooks” are books designed for instructing pupils in specific subject areas, including books described as “learning material.” They exclude books in school libraries as well as novels and books for use by teachers (such as curriculum guides, syllabi and teacher guides/kits). In cases where books are designated both as books for use by teachers and as books designed for instructing pupils, the books will be considered textbooks for the purpose of this indicator. The data refer to textbooks that have been “distributed” to schools and have either been distributed to pupils on loan or kept in schools for use in the classroom. The data on textbooks can include textbooks in stock but not currently in use by pupils.

**Teachers trained.** This indicator tracks the number of teachers who received and completed formal training, according to national standards through GPE’s implementation grants during the reporting period. “Teachers” comprise professional teaching/instructional personnel who are directly involved in teaching students. They include classroom teachers, special education teachers and other teachers who work with students as a class in a classroom, in small groups in a resource room or in one-to-one teaching inside or outside a regular classroom. Teaching/instructional staff excludes nonprofessional personnel who support teachers in providing instruction to students, such as teachers’ aides and other paraprofessional personnel. “Training” refers to formal teacher training (pre- or in-service) designed to equip teachers with the knowledge, attitude, behavior and skills required for teaching at the relevant level and perform their tasks effectively.

**Classrooms built or rehabilitated.** This indicator tracks the number of classrooms that were built and/or rehabilitated through GPE’s implementation grants during the reporting period. In the context of this indicator, “classrooms” comprise rooms in which teaching and learning activities can take place. They are semipermanent or permanent physical structures and may or may not be located in a school. The term “rehabilitated” may be interpreted differently in different contexts and may be subject to different standards. Therefore, judgment will be exercised to ascertain whether a rehabilitated structure (class, school building and so on) is in accordance with national or other standards that are acceptable and to the satisfaction of the implementing entity. In general, this term means that the structure (class, building and so on) has been renovated, either fully or partially, implying that the structure is brought up to code.

**Note:** For cofinanced grants, please provide the proportion that can be attributed to GPE grant. For example, if the grant’s financial contribution accounts for 50 percent of a teacher training activity, the proportion that can be attributed to GPE grant for the number of teachers trained through that activity would be 50%. If the unit of analysis in the indicator is the number of schools and not classrooms, please enter an estimated number of classrooms and provide an explanation in the comments box.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GPE indicators** | **Indicator name(s) as in the program document and application form**  | **ACTUAL number achieved (during this reporting period)**  **• Please report the status in numbers,** not in percentages or ratios. **\* For a cofinanced project, please provide the number for the entire project. The GPE Secretariat will prorate it in accordance with the proportion attributed to this grant.**  | **% attributed to this grant (for cofinanced grants)**  | **Comments**  |
| **Textbooks purchased and distributed**  | 1)…  |    |   |    |
| 2)…  |    |   |    |
| 3)…  |    |   |    |
| **Teachers trained**  | 1)…  |    |   |    |
| 2)…  |    |   |    |
| 3)…  |    |   |    |
| **Classrooms built or rehabilitated**  | 1)…  |    |   |    |
| 2)…  |    |   |    |
| 3)…  |    |   |    |

**(Add or remove indicator rows as needed.)**

**Annex 4: Cumulative Beneficiary Children/Other Students Reporting Template**

|  |
| --- |
| **Cumulative data on beneficiary children/other students**  |
| Provide the **cumulative** number of children of pre-primary, primary and secondary school age (both in school and out of school) and other students (adolescents beyond secondary school age and adult learners participating in basic education programs), who **directly participated in project activities, received project-supported incentives or services, or benefited from project interventions over the entire duration of the grant. Also provide relevant disaggregated values by sex (applicable to all grants).** If appropriate and available, provide disaggregated values by varied subgroups and by education level. Reporting beneficiary data cumulatively means counting all beneficiaries as a running total, adding up all beneficiaries since the start of the grant. Data on beneficiaries are to be collected using the methods and tools proper to each project. It is understood that some disaggregated data will only be collected if a project expressly targets specific subgroups through their interventions and uses their own methods for counting beneficiary children/other students.[[11]](#endnote-12) **NOTE:** For cofinanced grants, please provide the numbers for the entire program and indicate the proportion that can be attributed to GPE grant. For example, if the grant’s financial contribution accounts for 40 percent of the program that is cofinanced by GPE and other donors, enter 40% in the “% attributed to this grant.   |
|   | Pre-primary (optional)  | Primary (optional)  | Secondary (optional)  | Other[[12]](#endnote-13)(optional)  | **Total** | % attributed to this grant   |  |
| **Number of children/other students who directly benefited from the project over the entire duration of the project:**  | Enter number.  | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |  |
| **Of which, female:**  | Enter number.  | Enter number.  | Enter number.  | Enter number.  | Enter number.  | Enter number. |  |
| Of which, children/other students with a disability (optional):  | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |  |
| Of which, refugee children/other students (optional):   | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |  |
| Of which, internally displaced children/other students (optional):   | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |  |
| Of which, out-of-school children (optional):  | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |  |
| Of which, children/other students from marginalized ethno-cultural/ linguistic minorities: specify which ones (optional):  | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |  |
| Provide any comments on beneficiary children/students, if needed. This could include, for example, the definition employed by the project for a particular subgroup (including a more granular description of these subgroups), the approach/tool used to calculate the number of beneficiaries overall or by subgroup, any limitation of the approach/tool employed for this calculation and reasons why data on beneficiary children/students are unavailable.  |  |
| Click here to enter text. |  |  |

**NOTES**

1. 1 “Effectiveness” (start) date is considered as the date when the project implementation has effectively started, marked by the occurrence of an event defined in the project application. [↑](#endnote-ref-2)
2. The project amount should be reported in the project approved currency. [↑](#endnote-ref-3)
3. **Relevance** assesses the extent to which project interventions continued to remain consistent with the needs of children, especially those most vulnerable/marginalized, in the context of the crisis. The relevance test requires that the interventions be judged by the priorities and circumstances prevailing at the grant closing date, not at the time of grant approval. It should consider whether the project’s objectives reflected proper diagnosis of a crisis-related priority that remains relevant, and whether the implementation support was responsive to changing needs in the country. If country circumstances changed significantly during implementation, the completion report should explain whether and how these changes were accommodated (that is, through formal restructuring or other means) to retain the relevance of the objectives. If the stated objectives are vague or not sufficiently monitorable, a relatively low rating is appropriate for the **relevance** criterion. [↑](#endnote-ref-4)
4. For example, you may reflect on the following: (i) Did the project design accurately (continue to) reflect **prioritized needs of beneficiaries and systems in light of the emergency**? In hindsight, were the project’s **objectives and the results pathway** **realistic**? (ii) Was the project design adequatelybased on **consultations** with various partners, **lessons** from previous grants/projects and findings from relevant **diagnostic/research studies**? Was evidence sufficiently available and of quality to ensure proper design? (iii) Did the project take into account **national legislation and regulations**, that is, examine whether relevant regulation, legislation and regulatory processes were in place for the project to be successful? (iv) How did the project ensure that **changing humanitarian circumstances and future recovery needs** were being fed back into design? (v) Did the project consider whether the necessary **national/local** **capacity conditions** were in place for the project to be successful? (vi) Did the project have a well-designed **results framework** (for example, appropriate indicators to monitor progress, realistic targets) and an appropriate **plan for monitoring**? [↑](#endnote-ref-5)
5. See in annex 1 a decision tree to help determine an overall efficacy rating. **Efficacy** is defined as the extent to which the project objectives were achieved at the time of grant closing (or are expected to be achieved) and can be plausibly attributed to the project’s activities. In projects with multiple objectives or outcomes, provide only a single overall **efficacy** rating covering all objectives/outcomes. To come up with the overall **efficacy** rating, each objective should be separately assessed. Accomplishment of each objective should be discussed in the narrative, and their relative importance described. The project’s results framework and outcome targets provide the grounds for judging achievements of the outcomes/objectives; however, other sources of information, including other relevant research and impact evaluations, can be used to measure achievement of outcomes. Even in cases where indicators defined in the results framework were excellent for assessing the outcomes, multiple sources of information help with “triangulation” of outcome data for more accurate assessment of achievement of objectives. For each objective/outcome, it is important to include evidence showing the key elements of the results chain supported by the project (evidence explaining the interpretation of plausible causal relationships between the project’s activities/outputs and achieved outcomes, as distinct from other non-project factors that may have affected the observed outcomes, such as other interventions, policy changes natural events, market factors, and so on). [↑](#endnote-ref-6)
6. Factors may include but are not limited to the following: **management** (management arrangements, roles, responsibilities), **supervision** (supervision provided during project implementation, including timely and proactive identification of issues and actions taken to address them), **capacity** (including institutional and organizational capacities, human resources–related capacities and other issues that impact capacity), **financial management/fiduciary** factors(including procurement, financing, budgeting and financial management mechanisms in place following the grant agent’s policies and procedures), **monitoring and evaluation (M&E)** (the quality of M&E arrangements, such as M&E design, implementation and utilization to inform project/grant management and decision making; issues related to data availability and so on), **coordination, partnership and participatory processes** (principal project partners, their roles and engagement, information on frequency and reasons for consultations with the local education group during the project/grant implementation, and so on), **other external factors (besides the crisis at hand), factors beyond the grant agent’s control and unforeseen circumstances** (macroeconomic changes, changes in government commitment and leadership, issues related to governance and politics, unforeseen technical and logistical difficulties, changes in scope and so on). [↑](#endnote-ref-7)
7. **Efficiency** is a measure of how economically resources and inputs are converted to results. This also includes the notion of timeliness of grant interventions. The assessment asks whether the costs involved in achieving project objectives were reasonable in comparison with both the benefits and with recognized norms (“value for money”). It may include (a) an economic analysis (for example, economic rate of return, net present value, cost-effectiveness, unit rate norms, service standards, least cost analysis and comparisons, and financial rate of return, if available) to determine whether the project represented the expected least-cost solution to attain identified and measurable benefits (cost per unit of input or cost per unit of output), and (b) aspects of design and implementation that either contributed to or reduced efficiency, including examples of delays in implementation of key activities, frequent staff turnover, procurement issues and delays, component and administrative costs estimated at appraisal compared to actual costs, cost overruns, and planned versus actual project time frame (recognizing that delays are not always inefficient, and can in some instances result in achievement of additional outcomes and net efficiency gains). Underlying assumptions about costs and benefits should be presented and defended. [↑](#endnote-ref-8)
8. For example, this may include (i) the grant application/approval process; (ii) the conditions and procedures for **allocating** and **releasing** funding; (iii) the strategic and operational interdependencies between the varied GPE instruments and grants, under the umbrella of the compact; and (iv) GPE processes/guidance related to country-level dialogue and stakeholder engagement. [↑](#endnote-ref-9)
9. **Highly Unsatisfactory** –Overall grant management performance prevented the achievement of one or more outputs. **Unsatisfactory** –Overall grant management performance limited or jeopardized the achievement of one or more outputs. **Moderately** **Unsatisfactory** – Overall grant management performance delayed the achievement of one or more outputs, but issues were resolved during the grant life cycle. **Moderately** **Satisfactory** – Overall grant management performance supported the grant t to achieve most of its major outputs efficiently with moderate shortcomings. **Satisfactory** – Overall grant management performance supported the grant to achieve almost all of its major outputs efficiently with only minor shortcomings. **Highly Satisfactory** – Overall grant management performance supported the grant to achieve or exceed all of the major outputs efficiently without significant shortcomings. [↑](#endnote-ref-10)
10. See in Annex 1 a decision tree to help determine component/objective-level efficacy ratings. Also the scale is as follows: **Negligible** - The component/objective barely achieved or did not achieve (minimal achievement, if any) its intended outcomes. **Modest** - The component/objective partly achieved (or is expected to partly achieve) its intended outcomes. **Substantial** - The component/objective almost fully achieved its intended outcomes or is likely to do so. **High** - The component/objective exceeded or fully achieved its intended outcomes or is likely to do so. [↑](#endnote-ref-11)
11. Widely accepted definitions of these subgroups are provided for reference only, as we acknowledge that descriptions and criteria for measuring subgroups are context-dependent: **Female**: School-age female children and adolescents, and other students. [**Children with a disability**](https://mcas-proxyweb.mcas.ms/certificate-checker?login=false&originalUrl=http%3A%2F%2Fglossary.uis.unesco.org.mcas.ms%2Fglossary%2Fmap%2Fterms%2F176%3FMcasTsid%3D20892&McasCSRF=3b21de0f0dfefac140b72b5bef4d8cc9e5bb35fb643936b01c98b49e2703e9c6): School-age children with impairments, activity limitations and participation restrictions. Impairment is a problem in body function or structure; an activity limitation is a difficulty encountered by an individual in executing a task or action, while a participation restriction is a problem experienced by an individual in involvement in life situations. [**Refugee**](https://mcas-proxyweb.mcas.ms/certificate-checker?login=false&originalUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.unhcr.org.mcas.ms%2Fwhat-is-a-refugee.html%3FMcasTsid%3D20892&McasCSRF=3b21de0f0dfefac140b72b5bef4d8cc9e5bb35fb643936b01c98b49e2703e9c6) **children**: School-age children who have fled war, violence, conflict or persecution and have crossed an international border to find safety in another country. [**Internally displaced**](https://mcas-proxyweb.mcas.ms/certificate-checker?login=false&originalUrl=https%3A%2F%2Femergency.unhcr.org.mcas.ms%2Fentry%2F250553%2Fidp-definition%3FMcasTsid%3D20892&McasCSRF=3b21de0f0dfefac140b72b5bef4d8cc9e5bb35fb643936b01c98b49e2703e9c6) **children**: School-age children who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border. [**Out-of-school**](https://mcas-proxyweb.mcas.ms/certificate-checker?login=false&originalUrl=http%3A%2F%2Fglossary.uis.unesco.org.mcas.ms%2Fglossary%2Fen%2Fhome%3FMcasTsid%3D20892&McasCSRF=3b21de0f0dfefac140b72b5bef4d8cc9e5bb35fb643936b01c98b49e2703e9c6) **children**: School-age children who are not enrolled in or attending schools. Out-of-school children encompass both dropouts and children who have never attended school. This second group can either be late entrants or children who will never attend school. **Children from marginalized ethno-cultural/linguistic** [**minorities**](https://mcas-proxyweb.mcas.ms/certificate-checker?login=false&originalUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ohchr.org.mcas.ms%2FEN%2FIssues%2FMinorities%2FPages%2Finternationallaw.aspx%3FMcasTsid%3D20892&McasCSRF=3b21de0f0dfefac140b72b5bef4d8cc9e5bb35fb643936b01c98b49e2703e9c6): School-age children from a group numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a state, in a nondominant position, whose members—being nationals of the state—possess linguistic characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population; from a group numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a state, in a nondominant position, whose members—being nationals of the state—possess ethnic characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population.  [↑](#endnote-ref-12)
12. Other includes students beyond the school age of pre-primary through secondary that are not already included (out-of-school adolescents and adult learners participating in nonformal education).  [↑](#endnote-ref-13)