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## Quick Start

**What is this document?**

Comprising a **questionnaire and analysis outline**, this document is designed to guide a partner country’s examination of the basic elements or what GPE calls the **“enabling factors”** of a functioning education system.

Drawing on this document, meaningful and inclusive discussions of the four enabling factors can highlight both the **foundations and gaps** within an education system.

The **enabling factors analysis** that results from this process is a crucial step in advancing a **priority reform** in the education sector that will be the basis for a country’s **partnership compact** and the focus of GPE support.

**What do I need to do?**

1. **Agree on the priority reform** the country intends to pursue to transform the education system and **include the minutes** of this discussion with this submission
2. **Complete the questionnaire** to identify obstacles to improvement as well as strengths that could be leveraged
3. Gather **supporting documentation**, using the checklist provided
4. **Review** the screening questionnaire with the **local education group**
5. **Complete the analysis** in the second section of this document in consultation with the local education group to highlight the main obstacles to achieving the chosen priority reform
6. **Prioritize the enabling factors** based on their importance in achieving the priority reform and briefly explain the rationale
7. **Complete the** [**Domestic Financing Matrix**](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/domestic-financing-matrix)
8. **Provide** the complete package to the local education group ahead of submission
9. **Submit** the final package to the GPE Secretariat

If needed, please refer to the [Partnership Compact Guidelines](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/partnership-compact-development-guidelines-draft).

**How do I submit my analysis and supporting documents?**

Submit the complete **analysis, Domestic Financing Matrix** and **supporting documents**, including minutes of the local education group meeting that agreed the priority reform, to the GPE Secretariat at: gpe\_grant\_submission@globalpartnership.org

**What happens next?**

GPE’s Secretariat reviews the submission to ensure it is complete before providing it to the **Independent Technical Advisory Panel** for assessment.

|  |
| --- |
| Screening Questionnaire |
| **How to complete this section**Simply **check the “YES” or “NO” boxes** **and briefly explain why** in the spaces provided. If the question is not applicable, type **“N/A”** in the response box and briefly explain. Answering **YES** to indicates that the **basic enabling condition** for system transformation being assessed **is in place**. The analysis that follows in the second section may still uncover underlying issues that hinder significant and sustainable progress to be addressed during discussions of the country’s partnership compact and possibly through GPE funding. Answering **NO** indicates that the **basic enabling condition is not in place** and that this element will likely have to be addressed during compact discussions and possibly through GPE, government or other partner funding. The analysis in the second part of this exercise may find that performance in an enabling factor area is adequate given the circumstances or that it does not prevent significant and sustainable progress. Use the **checklist** provided to track all supporting documents for submission. If a document is unavailable, please provide alternative supporting evidence or a brief explanation.  |
| **Helpful tips*** **Identify** one person who could access official documents and begin collating supporting evidence, even before establishing the task team
* **Make an early start on the** [**Domestic Financing Matrix**](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/domestic-financing-matrix) and discuss with GPE’s country team if any questions
* **Consider using a system capacity grant** to support the process. GPE can handle applications for this grant quickly and brief consultants, if needed
* **GPE** may be able to offer **input into a first draft** (recognizing that this would not substitute for government dialogue and verification)
* **Identify alternative documents** if suggested material is unavailable
* Consider using a **workshop** to conduct the analysis, as this can provide an opportunity for insights into delivery obstacles while saving time
* **Check in with the GPE country team lead** for suggestions on ways to advance, which might include making connections with other countries, if this would be useful
 |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **TYPE TO ENTER COUNTRY NAME HERE** |
| Data and Evidence |
| 1. **Has an annual statistical report been produced within the past 2 years?**

This question considers the capacity of the education authorities to collect, process and disseminate education statistics on students’ participation and trajectories, schools, learning environments and teachers, etc. |
| **YES** [ ] Specify the relevant document in the space below from the following: **statistical yearbook** or statistical bulletins. Please provide a link if one is available.  | **NO** [ ] Provide any policy or programmatic document that describes ongoing plans or actions to address this issue, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Have nationally representative, learning assessment report covering basic education outcomes been produced in the past 3 years?**

This question considers the capacity of the education authorities to produce data to monitor learning outcomes across the country. |
| **YES** [ ] Provide the two most recent learning assessment reports, or any summary of **large-scale learning data sets or other evidence** that is no more than 3 years old. You may provide several reports if different subjects or grade levels are covered.  | **NO** [ ] Provide any policy or programmatic document that describes ongoing plans or actions to address this issue, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words)  |
| 1. **Is the available administrative and learning data disaggregated by sex?**

This question considers the capacity of the education authorities to produce data disaggregated by sex to analyze the specific challenges that boys and girls may face. The question refers to the statistical yearbook and learning data identified in the previous two questions above. Even if no statistical yearbook or learning data are available, describe recent or ongoing efforts, if any, to address this issue. |
| **YES** [ ] Provide the two most recent **school censuses** available or any other evidence of **administrative and learning data that are sex disaggregated.** This might include the questionnaire used for the school census or completed by students undertaking learning assessments or data reports that are sex disaggregated. | **NO** [ ] Provide any policy or programmatic document that describes ongoing plans or interventions to address this issue, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Have key education statistics disaggregated by disability status been reported in the last 3 years?**

This question checks whether the education authorities and their partners are collecting data on disability status, and disaggregating statistics such as enrolment and completion rates, the out-of-school children rate and/or basic learning outcomes by disability status.  |
| **YES** [ ] Provide any report, no more than three years old, that includes education statistics disaggregated by **disability status** or alternatively provide the instrument used for data collection (e.g., **school census report**).  | **NO** [ ] Provide any policy or programmatic document that describes ongoing plans or interventions to address this issue, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Have sector-wide performance assessments or system diagnoses recently been produced using data that is no more than 3 years old?**

This question considers whether the education authorities and their partners are regularly producing or commissioning diagnoses of specific system obstacles or sector-wide assessments of performance like education sector analyses, sector plan implementation evaluations, etc. A diagnosis would go beyond descriptive data and performance analysis to examine the causes and reasons behind the identified dysfunctionalities. |
| **YES** [ ] Provide a recent **education sector analysis** or education sector plan mid-term report, evaluation (alternatively, system performance report) or **system diagnostics** published in the past 3 years. | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that an education sector analysis or system diagnostic is planned, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Has a gender analysis or diagnostic been undertaken at either the macro or sector level in the past 3 years?**

This question considers whether a gender lens—that includes harmful social norms—is adequately incorporated in the evidence base. |
| **YES** [ ] Provide a recent **gender analysis** **or system diagnostic** published in the past 3 years at the sector or macro level. Issue-specific reports (e.g., gender-based violence, impact of social/cultural norms on education outcomes, etc.) may be included.  | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that a gender analysis or diagnostic is being planned, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |

|  |
| --- |
| Gender-responsive Sector Planning, Policy and Monitoring  |
| 1. **Does the country apply a legislative framework assuring 12 years of free, quality, public primary and secondary education, of which at least 9 years are compulsory?**

This question assesses whether the country has passed into law a framework that assures the right to education in line with the Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action for the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4. This includes assuring the right to education in accordance with relevant international rights frameworks for marginalized groups such as refugees, internally displaced persons and ethnic minorities. Relevant rights frameworks include the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights the Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, the UNESCO Convention Against Discrimination in Education, and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. |
| **YES** [ ] Provide the current **legislative framework** or other document (e.g., an education sector plan) that describes legal rights to education for all children, and of the current **education sector plan** or transitional education plan or any other current policy framework that shows how activities and policy relate to the legal framework around the right to education. | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that a relevant legislative framework is under development, or there are plans to develop such a framework, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Does the country assure at least one year of free and compulsory quality pre-primary education for all children, without discrimination?**

As with question 7, the aim is to determine whether the country has recognized in law the right to early childhood learning in line with the international frameworks detailed above. |
| **YES** [ ] Documentation as for question 7. | **NO** [ ] As for question 7. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Is there a current government-endorsed education sector plan/policy framework?**

This question considers the availability of a strategic policy framework providing a medium- to long-term vision for the education system in the country. |
| **YES** [ ] Provide the current **education sector plan,** transitional education plan or any other policy framework that outlines policy priorities and associated outcomes for the sector in the medium to long term.  | **NO**  [ ]  Provide evidence that the development of an education sector plan or sector strategy is being planned, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **If the answer to question 9 is YES, does the education sector plan or policy framework propose strategies to address gender inequalities?**

This question assesses whether sector strategies are in place to address gender disparities and inequalities in education. |
| **YES** [ ] Please specify below where references to **gender strategies** can be found in the current **education sector plan**, transitional education plan or any other policy framework outlining gender equality priorities. If a separate gender equality strategy exists, it can be specified below.  | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that an update of the education sector plan or sector strategy is planned to include strategies to promote gender equality. Alternatively, provide evidence that the development of a gender equality or girls education strategy is being planned, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Does the country have preparedness plans for maintaining the provision of core educational services during crises, such as disasters or health emergencies and/or adapting the education system to longer-term changes such as climate change?**

The purpose of this question is to assess whether plans are in place in the education sector to prepare for, respond to and recover from crises and changing contexts. |
| **YES** [ ] Please specify below where references to **preparedness strategies** in the current **education sector plan**, transitional education plan or any other policy framework. If separate strategies exist, they can be included. | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that an update of the education sector plan or sector strategy is being planned to include strategies for preparedness. Alternatively, provide evidence that the development of separate preparedness plans or strategies is being planned, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Is there a current operational planning instrument?**

This question assesses whether policy priorities for the sector translate into a coherent set of activities for a specific period, with information on timing, roles, responsibilities and costs. |
| **YES** [ ] Provide the **operational or implementation plan** for the education sector. | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that the development of an operational planning instrument is being planned, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Are there education sector financial projections that cover the duration of the operational plan?**

This question assesses whether the education authorities and their partners produce financial and resource projections to inform operational planning, sector allocations and budget programming. |
| **YES** [ ] Provide the **financial simulation model** or any other financial projection document that projects costs and resource needs for the sector for the duration of the operational plan (e.g., **medium-term expenditure frameworks**). | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that a projected costing exercise to inform sector planning processes and resource allocation/budget programming is being planned, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Is reporting on sector performance conducted annually?**

This assesses whether the education authorities and their partners regularly assess progress and performance in the implementation of the national education sector plan or policy framework or operational plans using data and evidence. |
| **YES** [ ] Provide the two most recent **annual sector implementation reports** or joint sector review documents or equivalent monitoring documents. | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that actions are being taken to conduct annual review of progress in the sector or sector plan implementation, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |

|  |
| --- |
| Sector Coordination  |
| **INCLUSIVE SECTOR DIALOGUE AND COORDINATED ACTION** |
| 1. **Is there an established mechanism for education sector stakeholder coordination?**

This question checks whether a multi-stakeholder coordination body exists and provides the possibility for education stakeholders to engage in policy dialogue. |
| **YES:** [ ] Provide **the local education group terms of reference** (or equivalent multi-stakeholder coordination group) or any other relevant document that shows evidence of an established sector coordination mechanism. | **NO:** [ ] Provide evidence that actions are being taken to establish a multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **If the answer to question 15 is YES, is the sector coordination mechanism inclusive of ALL education stakeholders?**

Specifically, are domestic civil society organizations, teachers’ organizations and organizations working on gender equality active partners in sector dialogue with other stakeholders, such as national governments, donors, civil society, teachers, philanthropy, and the private sector? In crisis-affected countries, this also includes representatives of humanitarian education coordination mechanisms. |
| **YES:** [ ] Provide **minutes of the most two most recent sector coordination meetings** (local education group or equivalent multi-stakeholder coordination group) showing participationin the local education group.  | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that actions are being taken to include all education stakeholders in a multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **If the answer to question 15 is YES, has the sector coordination mechanism been assessed or reviewed within the past 3 years?**

This question checks whether the coordination body undertakes periodic reviews to assess and address its main efficiency challenges and to improve and adapt coordination practices accordingly. |
| **YES** [ ] If available, provide the assessment or review (external or self-assessment of local education group’s functioning) or any related documents or any evidence of resulting decisions and improvements. | **NO** [ ] Provide evidence that actions are being taken to continuously improve coordination mechanisms, if available. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |

|  |
| --- |
| **COORDINATED FINANCING AND FUNDING** |
| 1. **Is an aligned funding modality, such as budget support, currently used by a donor?**

This question serves to indicate the availability of a funding modality that can serve to implement external aid through national systems. We qualify an aligned modality as external support that is on appropriations by parliament, disbursed into the national treasury account and on the same accounting mechanism used for the expenses of the regular national budget. Refer to the [Partnership Compact Guidelines](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/partnership-compact-development-guidelines-draft) for more detail on alignment criteria, as well as examples of different types of aligned modalities adapted to varying contexts and levels of risk. It is strongly encouraged to involve relevant staff at the ministry of finance to answer this question. |
| **YES** [ ]  Is this aligned modality used for external financing that supports the education sector? Please provide any supporting document. | **NO** [ ] Is there intent to develop an aligned or joint financing modality over the medium or longer term? If so, provide a brief description of advancements to date, if any. If not, briefly describe the reasons why. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Is a joint financing mechanism (used by more than two donors) mechanism available in the education sector?**

This question considers the availability of a joint financing mechanism (or pooled fund) that can provide funding at scale and accommodate several fungible development partner resources (i.e., donor resources are comingled and not separately accounted in expenditure). **Note:** If an aligned modality has been identified in the previous question, indicate here if it is also jointly financed (i.e., more than two contributing donors). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **YES** [ ] Provide relevant program documents indicating active pooled donors or procedures to facilitate new donor participation (e.g., **joint financing arrangement, memorandum of understanding or pool fund operation manual**) and indicate whether this joint funding mechanism is also aligned with national public finance management systems. | **NO** [ ]  |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **Is there an established practice to regularly monitor the proportion of external aid for education that is aligned with national public finance management and accountability systems against that which is not?**

This question seeks to establish the level of information and dialogue around issues of aid effectiveness, with respect to the degree of alignment of aid with national systems as well as any incidence of aid fragmentation.  |
| **YES:** [ ] Provide the latest **report** that presents this information, indicating the nature and frequency of this reporting, as well as its comprehensiveness.  | **NO** [ ] Indicate the reasons for the absence of information or regular monitoring.  |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |

|  |
| --- |
| Volume, Equity and Efficiency of Domestic Public Expenditure on Education |
| 1. **Is the government committed to progressively increasing expenditures on education toward 20 percent of the national budget or maintaining levels of expenditure above 20 percent during the duration of the partnership compact?**

The purpose of this question is to assess whether the government is committed to mobilizing funding for education by progressively increasing the share of domestic resources to education toward 20 percent of the total budget, in line with the upper bound of the Incheon Declaration. |
| Click here to explain response (maximum 200 words) |
| 1. **If the answer to question 21 is NO, is the government committed to annually allocating at least 4 percent of the value of its gross domestic product (GDP) to education?**

Considered in the context of the Incheon Declaration, the purpose of this question is to examine the proportion of a country’s total resources committed to education, i.e., how much a government spends on education relative to the wealth or capacity of the country as a whole. | **YES** [ ]  **NO** [ ]  |
| **For both preceding questions (21 and 22),** please complete the [**Domestic Financing Matrix**](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/domestic-financing-matrix) to show the evolution of historical sector spending and sector budget projections. In addition, please include a copy of official government **budget documents** (the three most recent) that show government budget, revenue and financing for past and upcoming years, as well as allocated and executed budget for the education sector. This can include documents typically known as budget bills or budget laws, budget overviews, budget speeches and annexes, budget books, budget statements, citizen budgets, fiscal outturns, annual or quarterly expenditure reports, budget execution or performance reports. If estimates are made for projected sector expenditures, please also include source documents if not linked to national budget documents (e.g., an education sector plan or financial simulation model reflecting government domestic financing commitment for the duration of the country’s partnership compact). Other documentation with data or analysis of the equitable distribution and efficiency of domestic financing are also acceptable (e.g., public expenditure reviews). |

|  |
| --- |
| Document Checklist |
| You can use this checklist to track the documents to be included in the final package. There is space at the end of the checklist to explain the absence of any document. The package may include other important supporting documents the country wishes to submit.  |
| #  | Document | Description or alternatives | Question number |  |
| 1 | **Learning assessment report** (include two most recent) | Summary outputs from learning data sets, large-scale assessment reports or evidence analyzing learning data | Q2  |[ ]
| 2 | **Annual school census report** (include two most recent) | In absence of a census, provide other evidence of administrative and learning data disaggregated by sex and/or disability status | Q1Q3 Q4  |[ ]
| 3 | **Education sector analysis**  | Alternatives can include education sector plan mid-term reports or evaluations, system performance reports or system diagnostics | Q5  |[ ]
| 4 | **Gender analysis or system diagnostic** | This could be a separate diagnostic or part of an education sector analysis or plan. Alternatives can include issue-specific reports, such as gender-based violence, impacts of social or cultural norms on education outcomes, etc. | Q6  |[ ]
| 5 | **Education sector plan**  | Alternatively, include a transitional education sector plan or a policy framework that outlines medium- to long-term policy priorities and associated outcomes. It should describe gender strategies, legal rights to education for all children and preparedness strategies | Q7 Q9 Q10 Q11  |[ ]
| 6 | **Operational or implementation plan** |   | Q12  |[ ]
| 7 | **Financial simulation model** | Alternatives can include any other financial projections of sector costs and resources needs for the duration of the operational plan, such as medium-term expenditure frameworks | Q13  |[ ]
| 8 | **Annual sector implementation report or joint sector review** | Other monitoring documents can serve as alternatives | Q14  |[ ]
| 9 | **Local education group terms of reference** | Alternatively, include terms of reference or description of stakeholder coordination group | Q15  |[ ]
| 10 | **Minutes or summaries of recent local education group activities or meetings** (two most recent examples) | Documentation of activities showing participation in the local education group’s activities | Q16  |[ ]
| 11 | **Joint financing arrangement, memorandum of understanding or pool fund operation manual** | Documentation indicating active pooled donors or procedures to facilitate new donor participation | Q19  |[ ]
| 12 | **Domestic Financing Matrix** |  | Q21 Q22  |[ ]
| 13 | **Medium-term financial framework** |  | Q21 Q22 Q13  |[ ]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 14 | **Budget documents** (3 most recent years and projections for 3 years) | Government documents showing budget, revenue and financing for past and upcoming years, as well as allocated and executed budget for the education sector. This can include documents typically known as budget bills or laws, overviews, speeches and annexes, budget books, statements, citizen budgets, fiscal outturn, annual or quarterly expenditure reports, or budget execution or performance reports. If estimates are made for projected sector expenditures, please also include source documents if not linked to national budget documents (e.g., education sector plan or financial simulation model reflecting government domestic financing commitment for the duration of the partnership compact). | Q21 Q22  |[ ]
|  |
| **Unavailable Documentation**  |
| Please list the question numbers for which supporting evidence is not available, if any, and provide an explanation. |
| Type here to enter explanation |

##  Enabling Factors Analysis

**How to complete this section**

After completing the preceding questionnaire and discussing the priority reform that the local education group would like to prioritize, the task team next considers any obstacles within each enabling factor area that could **impede achievement of the selected reform.** This section seeks to **highlight and summarize those obstacles**.

Responses within the following analysis should be **concise** (e.g., bullet points) while clearly articulating the gaps and barriers that could be encountered in achieving the selected reform. The task team may seek input from other stakeholders in identifying gaps and barriers, as this helps develop the reform pathway in the partnership compact.

**Tables** to assist in analysis of the enabling factors by their components and guiding considerations are available after this section.

**Local education group’s initial agreement on the priority reform**

Include a short statement summarizing initial agreement around the priority reform with potential for system transformation, as determined by the local education group. Please note that the priority reform will be **fully articulated in the partnership compact**, and the description here might not reflect its final form. Also attach a summary or minutes of the meeting during which the selection of the priority reform took place.

|  |
| --- |
| Click here to summarize agreement on priority reform |

|  |
| --- |
| Discussion Summaries |
| **Data and Evidence**  |
| Summarize discussions around this enabling factor, including the following elements:* How the main issues identified hinder the achievement of the priority reform. Consider these issues by looking at the components of the enabling factor (education management and information systems, learning assessment systems, evidence) and paying attention to organizational capacities as relevant. Refer to the [Partnership Compact Guidelines](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/partnership-compact-development-guidelines-draft), if needed.
* Significant current and upcoming investments or opportunities to address issues.
* The gaps in programmatic support to address issues.
 |
| Click here to type (maximum 600 words) |
| **Gender-responsive Sector Planning, Policy and Monitoring** |
| Summarize discussions around this enabling factor, including the following elements:* How the main issues identified hinder the achievement of the priority reform: Consider these issues by looking at the components of the enabling factor (strategic planning, operational planning, budget programming and monitoring, sector monitoring) and paying attention to organizational capacities as relevant.
* Main current and upcoming investments or opportunities to address issues.
* Main gaps in terms of programmatic support to address issues.
 |
| Click here to type (maximum 600 words) |
| **Sector Coordination**  |
| **Inclusive Sector Dialogue and Coordinated Action** |
| Summarize discussions around this enabling factor, including the following elements:* How the main issues identified hinder the achievement of the priority reform: Consider these issues by looking at the components of the enabling factor (dialogue around policy formulation/sector planning; financing and resource mobilization; harmonization and alignment; monitoring and mutual accountability) and paying attention to organizational capacities as relevant.
* Include considerations on domestic civil society organizations and teachers’ organizations.
* Main current and upcoming investments or opportunities to address issues.
* Main gaps in terms of programmatic support to address issues
 |
| Click here to type (maximum 600 words) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Coordinated Financing and Funding** |
| Summarize discussions around this enabling factor, including the following elements:* How the main issues identified hinder the achievement of the priority reform: consider these issues by looking at the challenges in the coordination of external financing and alignment with the national budget and systems.
* Any steps that have been undertaken to address them.
 |
| Click here to type (maximum 600 words) |
| **Volume, Equity and Efficiency of Domestic Public Expenditure on Education** |
| Summarize discussions around this enabling factor, including the following elements:* How the main issues identified hinder the achievement of the priority reform: Consider these issues by looking at the components of the enabling factor (volume, equity, efficiency) and paying attention to organizational capacities as relevant.
* Main current and upcoming investments or opportunities to address issues.
* Main gaps in terms of programmatic support to address issues.
 |
| Click here to type (maximum 600 words) |

### Priority Categorization

Indicate the level of priority (high, medium, low) for each enabling factor:

* **HIGH PRIORITY:** Achieving progress in the identified priority reform is deemed **impossible or very unlikely** unless significant reforms are undertaken to unblock enabling factors. The education authorities or development partners are either not actively working in this area, or engagement is insufficient to make meaningful improvements.
* **MEDIUM PRIORITY:** Achieving progress in the priority reform will be **significantly delayed** (i.e., would extend beyond the duration of the partnership compact) unless issues to unlock enabling factors are addressed.
* **LOW PRIORITY:** Minor adjustment in the enabling factor would help **accelerate progress** in achieving the priority reform.

Briefly explain your selections in the spaces provided. If “high,” please specify how the ongoing investments are not sufficient.

|  |
| --- |
| **Data and Evidence** |
| **Select level of priority: High** [ ]  **Medium** [ ]  **Low** [ ]  |
| Click here to type (maximum 150 words) |
| **Gender-responsive Sector Planning, Policy and Monitoring** |
| **Select level of priority: High** [ ]  **Medium** [ ]  **Low** [ ]  |
| Click here to type (maximum 150 words) |
| **Sector Coordination** |
| **INCLUSIVE SECTOR DIALOGUE AND COORDINATED ACTION** |
| **Select level of priority: High** [ ]  **Medium** [ ]  **Low** [ ]  |
| Click here to type (maximum 150 words) |
| **COORDINATED FINANCING AND FUNDING** |
| **Select level of priority: High** [ ]  **Medium** [ ]  **Low** [ ]  |
| Click here to type (maximum 150 words) |
| **Volume, Equity and Efficiency of Domestic Public Expenditure on Education** |
| **Select level of priority: High** [ ]  **Medium** [ ]  **Low** [ ]  |
| Click here to type (maximum 150 words) |

|  |
| --- |
| Enabling Factors Analysis TablesThe following tables are intended to assist in the analysis of the enabling factor by outlining their components and guiding considerations. The **components** define the elements considered under each factor or the scope of the analysis that are **expected** in completing this template. The **guiding considerations** list specific elements that the analysis might investigate for deeper understanding. GPE does not expect that all guiding considerations will be addressed. Rather, these offer a way to look at a specific issue in detail. **Bolded** **text** indicates key information that **should** appear in the analysis. If supporting evidence is not available, the analysis should explain its absence. |
| 1. DATA **AND EVIDENCE**
 |
| Components | Guiding considerations |
| **Education Management and Information System (EMIS):** EMIS is defined as a [multifaceted structure](https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/543401468329077038/pdf/SABER-What-matters-for-most-education-management-information-systems-a-framework-paper.pdf) comprising both the technological and institutional arrangements for collecting, processing and disseminating education administrative statistics and information about education inputs, processes and outcomes within an education system. A well-performing EMIS reflects the interplay of appropriate policies, budget, human resources, organizational structure and institutions to produce robust education data for policy planning and monitoring and for the management of the education system. | * **Existence of functional EMIS**, with a consistent master list of schools OR individual learner IDs that can be used to compare data longitudinally for the same units; structure of data collection (web- vs. paper-based); coverage of existing EMIS (including whether information for nongovernment schools is available)
* **Existence of LAS** (focusing on presence and functioning of a nationally representative assessment of learning, but also considering other part of the system, i.e., classroom assessment, examinations), alignment of LAS to the system’s learning goals and curriculum
* Reliability, frequency, timeliness and level of **disaggregation** (**by sex, children with disabilities**, and other relevant groups of students) of data (LAS, EMIS, **household surveys**)
* **Comprehensiveness of evidence**: A repository of available evidence (household surveys, studies, diagnostics, etc.) is adequate to provide a functional overview and analysis of key issues. Specific kind of data/diagnostics to consider include:
	+ **Availability of an education sector analysis** building on recent data or any equivalent performance assessments
	+ Availability of data on quality of teaching (teacher qualification/training and teacher pedagogical/content knowledge, quality of instructional delivery, classroom climate, teacher motivation, teacher behaviors)
	+ **Availability of a gender analysis** which includes (i) data or evidence on gender considerations impacting access to education, including gender-based violence, safety, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH); (ii) data or evidence of intersectoral barriers (poverty, disability, location); (iii) gender inequality data and analyses to provide evidence of wider social/cultural norms and other intersectoral factors that impact on girls’ and boys’ access to, retention in and successful participation in education
	+ Diagnostics at either macro or sector level that analyze external/contextual risks to the education sector (e.g., climate change, disasters, public health emergencies, conflict)
	+ Assessment of the realization of education-related rights, acknowledging international human rights frameworks to which the country is a signatory
* **Use of data for policy planning, monitoring, system management**, determination of budget allocations, and mutual accountability, including accessibility/transparency of data
* Enabling environment for data production and use, including institutional, legal and organizational framework; existence of a data policy (either at macro or sector level); sustainable financing of data systems (source of funding: domestic vs. international aid)
* Existing capacities (human, administrative, IT) and capacity development strategies for data producers and users; abilities to undertake complex and multidimensional data analysis, including interacting elements like gender, income, geography, disability status
 |
| **Learning Assessment System (LAS):** An [LAS](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/toolkit-analysis-national-learning-assessment-systems-anlas) is broadly defined as a group of policies, practices, structures, organizations and tools for generating sound and high-quality data on learning and achievement that provide robust evidence for education policy and practice with the ultimate aim to improve education quality and learning outcomes. |
| **Evidence production and use:** Evidence is understood as any piece of information (stemming from empirical research, evaluations, statistical data, education stakeholders’ experiences) that has the potential to best explain a situation, explain options and inform policy and operational decisions. This component looks at the capacity of the education stakeholders to regularly produce and consistently mobilize and make use of evidence throughout the policy formulation and implementation continuum. This would entail the capacity of producing and using the following:1. System performance reports like education sector analyses or public education expenditure reviews
2. Discreet diagnostic studies to better apprehend the causes of identified system bottlenecks (e.g., gender equality diagnostics)
3. Global-level evidence based on rigorous evaluations of what works, robust global and contextualized evidence on what works
4. Country-level evaluations of innovation/programs/plan implementation
 |
| **Possible sources of evidence:** * EMIS - LAS diagnostics/audits: EMIS-SABER, ADEA EMIS peer review; Ed-Data Quality Assessment Framework (DQAF); Analysis of national learning assessment systems (ANLAS)
* Education sector analysis, system diagnoses
* Joint sector reviews
* Statistical reports collected through EMIS
* Ministry of education organizational structure and description of roles and responsibilities within the ministry/ministries
* Questionnaires for annual school census
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. GENDER-RESPONSIVE SECTOR PLANNING, POLICY AND MONITORING
 |
| Components | Guiding considerations |
| **Strategic planning frameworks and practices:** [Strategic planning](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-education-sector-plan-preparation) guides educational development by setting a common vision and shared priorities in a medium to longer time frame. It identifies the strategies for achieving the vision, including the human, technical and financial capacities required. Strategic planning would help recognize and address significant gender inequalities and other disparities between groups of students in participation and quality, and sources of vulnerability. It would acknowledge human rights frameworks related to education, use these to guide analysis and prioritization, and describe groups for which realization of rights may be challenging.  | * **Functioning of government education policy and planning system/apparatus**, considering actors, processes and products.
* Availability, soundness and use of policy and planning processes and guidance
* Capacity of relevant stakeholders to perform their roles
* Adequacy, relevance, feasibility of policies and plans being produced
* Soundness of the expenditure framework, including resource projections and strategies to overcome financial constraints
* **Attention to human rights and vulnerable groups**
* Policies/plans are sensitive to human rights instruments and gender equality commitments the country has agreed to, to identify challenges in the realization of education-related rights, and guide the prioritization of policies for the full range of marginalized groups such as persons with disabilities, rural and poor populations, ethnic and linguistic minorities, and refugees and internally displaced persons
* **Attention to collaboration with other sectors**/ministries; attention to external/contextual risks (i.e., natural disaster, climate change) and the gender-equality dimension
 |
| **Operational planning instruments and practices:** Shorter-term [operational planning](https://www.globalpartnership.org/sites/default/files/document/file/2020-GPE-guidelines-preparation-EN.pdf) instruments like multiyear implementation plans/annual action plans set out the policy framework into actionable and tractable elements for overcoming financial, technical and political constraints to effective implementation. They can also provide a framework for budget and management decisions based on a medium-term expenditure framework to feed into annual budget preparation and monitoring processes. Operational instruments outline detailed activities for a specific and usually short period of time (1 to 3 years) with information on timing, roles, responsibilities and costs. | * Functioning of operational planning system; coherence/continuation between the policy framework and the **operational planning tool** in terms of strategies-programs-activities and costing/financing
* Feasibility of the operational planning tool, including detailed programs/activities linked to accountability elements such as defined roles and responsibilities as well as accompanying gender-sensitive targets articulated in a results framework
 |
| **Budget programming and monitoring:** Linking sector planning process to the budget programming process is critical to ensure education policy priorities are adequately funded and can be implemented. Financial soundness, feasibility and sustainability of the sector policy instruments help [budget preparation, financial monitoring, budget tracking](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-monitoring-national-education-budgets), as well as engagement with all relevant stakeholders to both evaluate the financial performance and support upcoming budget programming exercises. Effective collaboration between the ministries of education and finance is required to reconcile budget technical inputs with the sector policy priorities and influence the budget allocation to education. | * Alignment/coherence of ministry of education modeling, costing, and budget programming with ministry of finance annual budgets and medium-term projections (i.e., medium-term expenditure framework or MTEF)
* **Alignment of ministry of education simulation/medium term costing with ministry of finance medium-term sector finance projections/MTEFs;** of ministry of education operational plan budgets with annual ministry of education budget produced by the ministry of finance
* Adequacy of volume of public financing resources and funding gaps, alignment between the cost of plan strategies/programs and available financial resources
* Alignment of ministries of education/finance approaches to budget monitoring/tracking
 |
| **Sector/ implementation monitoring mechanisms:** Regular [sector monitoring activities and reviews](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/practical-guide-effective-joint-sector-reviews-education-sector) against shared results frameworks included in policy frameworks allow education stakeholders to assess plan implementation achievements and shortcomings, monitor expenditure progress, and agree on ways to course correct and refine policies, interventions and activities. Sector monitoring is critical to ensure relevant, responsive action and mutual accountability across the education stakeholders. | * **Presence and use of sector plan (or policy) implementation monitoring frameworks and instruments at central and decentralized levels, specifically for monitoring and regular reporting on:**
* Plan implementation, including progress towards targets (and gender-disaggregated considerations) implementation challenges, course correction, and results (including externally financed programs)
* Dialogue and collaboration between ministry of education, ministry of finance and other line ministries
* Progress toward realization of education-related rights and distribution of benefits (technical, capacity, financial) to marginalized groups
* **Joint sector reviews, and other feedback mechanisms:**

Regularity and quality of joint sector reviews as a tool for monitoring and an instrument for change and forward-looking planning; and/or functioning of other feedback and learning mechanisms: e.g., the extent to which monitoring data/stocktaking events (i.e., mid-year reviews) inform planning and course correction  |
| **Gender Mainstreaming across policy, planning and monitoring processes:** [Gender-sensitive policies, plans](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidance-developing-gender-responsive-education-sector-plans) and learning environments support transforming the way education systems function to pave the way for equitable societies. Applying a gender lens to the policy continuum ensures that sector analyses, policies, strategies and interventions target specific groups of girls or boys and the challenges they face in a differentiated way. | * **Gender across the policy continuum**:
* Policy framework and operational instrument are adequately sensitive to gender issues
* Programs for strengthening gender equality are adequately costed and resourced
* Sector monitoring and reporting clearly consider progress against gender equality objectives
 |
| **Possible sources of evidence*** Education sector plan (ESP) and related costed operational plans
* Education sector plan appraisal report
* Education Sector Analysis (ESA)
* System diagnoses
* Available sector gender diagnostics
* Medium-term expenditure framework (MTEF)
* Financial simulation model
* Education sector implementation reports and joint sector review documentation

World Bank Public Expenditure Review (PER) |

|  |
| --- |
| 3. SECTOR COORDINATION |
| 3.1 INCLUSIVE SECTOR DIALOGUE AND COORDINATED ACTION |
| Components | Guiding considerations |
| **Coordination functions and practices:** The effectiveness of local education groups (or equivalent bodies) relate to their performance in realizing policy dialogue and coordination functions connected to national education goals and priorities across the whole policy cycle—from sector diagnosis, policy design, strategic and operational planning to joint monitoring including budget monitoring—thereby contributing to improved education results. This includes its success in fostering synergies and harmonization of partners’ support and mutual accountability, and in generating strategic value for government and its development partners. | Mechanisms in place with the mandate to facilitate inclusive sector dialogue and coordinated action, and the extent to which these are effective. **Consider core policy dialogue and coordination functions**that can drive priorities and joint action, and whether/how these are demonstrated in practice, for instance:* + - * Supporting policy formulation/sector planning– e.g., dialogue around sector analysis, diagnostics and other opportunities linked to data and evidence; policy and operational plan development, including prioritization and implications of reform measures; sharing of good practices and emergent needs
* Addressing financing and resource mobilization – e.g., dialogue and advocacy around (safeguarding) education financing, including domestic and external financing and new financing, as well as facilitating collaboration with the ministry of finance
* Promoting harmonization and alignment **–** e.g., dialogue around the harmonization of partner support for advancing agreed development goals and ensuring coherent approaches to investments in the sector to reduce stand-alone projects (including on cross-cutting issues such as gender-equality), fragmentation of aid, and transaction costs.
 |
| **Capacities for coordination:** Capacities for coordination comprise both ‘soft’ and tangible aspects: 1) Collaborative capacities such as commitments, behaviors and values which influence healthy partnership dynamics and engaged leadership, and a local education group’s success in creating a culture of productive relationships; and 2) Organizational capacities such as structures, processes and resources which help align partner interests, coordinate expertise, assets and capacities, periodically keep members updated, and review how the partnership works. These foundations are the bedrock of partnership success, underpinning the potential of actors to work purposefully together. | Consider the soft and tangible aspects of capacities that may affect relevance and quality of dialogue and overall effectiveness of coordination practices:* **Clear, formalized mandate and mutually agreed objectives,** functions, governance and working arrangements
* **Inclusion and representation** (key stakeholder categories; national, subnational)
* **Participation**, meaningful stakeholder engagement and partner support strategies – including representatives with expertise on gender equality and/or women and girls empowerment to ensure continuous dialogue on critical issues such as gender equality
* Roles and responsibilities leveraging partner strengths, knowledge, insights and resources
* Stakeholder ownership, motivation and commitment to agreed policy dialogue purposes
* **Leadership and resources for coordination** (human, financial, technical) including secretarial functions
* Working arrangements and whether these are fit-for-purpose to address core priorities
* Management of dialogue agenda around key priorities and meeting stakeholder interests and coordination needs
* **Arrangements** for inter-ministerial coordination, and coordination among development partners
* Links with the education cluster (if activated) regarding education programming in crisis and emergency situations
* Interface with other sectors regarding education programming (e.g., health, child protection, water)
* Regular reviews of coordination effectiveness ensuring continued improvements, buy-in of education sector stakeholders and their trust in the coordination mechanisms
 |
| **Possible sources of evidence*** Terms of reference (or the equivalent) of the local education group
* Minutes of local education group/coordination meetings (including education sector plan endorsement letter)
* Review/diagnostic/self-assessment of sector/subsector coordination bodies
* Joint sector review aide-mémoires
* Education sector implementation reports
* Education sector governance reviews
* Summary of GPE country-level evaluation
* Education Out Loud grantee progress reports for the country/publications from country
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 3.2 COORDINATED FINANCING AND FUNDING |
| Components | Guiding considerations |
| **Availability of aid alignment and joint financing mechanisms:** review the current existence of aligned modalities available for the education sector, as well as joint financing mechanisms. Their existence constitutes an enabling factor for the education sector and system transformation. In the absence of such a mechanism in education, the availability of such mechanisms in other sectors can be noted. [Alignment](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/country-level-guide) is defined as “using a partner country’s institutions, human resources, procedures, and tools as the mainstays for the implementation of aid to education.”This means aligning aid not only with national sector policies, strategies and planning, but also with the national systems that implement regular financing for education through the national budget process and public financial management (PFM) systems. Alignment of aid for education can take different forms, adaptable to the level of fiduciary risk and requirements for risk management. Lower risk environments can use full budget support (direct disbursements – triggered by agreed conditions and indicators – to the national treasury, with no ringfencing or earmarking) and higher risk environments can use aid-on-budget mechanisms (also known as ringfenced or earmarked budget support), which allows more targeted operational planning, oversight, ex-post controls (audits) and capacity supporting measures.  | * Identification of **existing aligned modalities, in education**, or examples from other sectors.
* Identification of **joint financing mechanisms in education**.

Seven dimensions of alignment are useful to consider in assessing the existence of an aligned modality:* ON PLAN: (i) Alignment with education sector planning and (ii) alignment with ministry of finance’s medium-term expenditure framework
* ON BUDGET: (i) Aid is reported in the annual national budget documentation and (ii) specific appropriations authorized by parliament
* ON TREASURY: (i) External aid disbursed into the main revenue accounts of government (treasury) and (ii) managed through the government’s standard public financial management system and human resources
* ON PROCUREMENT: Procurement of aid modality follows national procurement rules and systems
* ON ACCOUNTING: External aid is recorded and accounted for in the national accounting system (integrated public expenditure system), in line with the national chart of accounts
* ON AUDIT: External aid audited by the country’s independent auditor (national audit office or court of auditors)
* ON REPORT: External aid included in regular sector implementation, financial and monitoring reports prepared by ministry/ministries in charge of education (consolidated data and reporting on the implementation of annual sector operational plans)

Note: GPE has compiled and monitored the degree of alignment with national systems for the implementation of core GPE grants, since 2016. This information is available with the GPE Secretariat |
| **Accountability and dialogue around aid effectiveness**: what is the level of understanding, including data, and dialogue on aid effectiveness in the education sector (alignment vs. non-alignment, joint financing vs. fragmented aid)? | * Identification of data and information regularly reported on the state of aid effectiveness across the education sector: **What proportion of external aid** (by volume, by number of projects/programs) **is aligned and not aligned with national systems?** What is the degree of aid fragmentation (number of different projects/programs/financing modalities)?
* Review of current projects/programs. Are they providing absorption of financing and funding at scale? Are they structurally leveraging sustainable system capacity development and system transformation?
* Level of dialogue around aid effectiveness and its challenges for the education system. What are the consequences of the level of non-alignment and fragmentation?
 |
| **Commitment towards greater aid effectiveness practices:** review current plans or commitments in using or developing aligned funding mechanisms and joint financing arrangements for the future.Note: experience across the Partnership has shown that alignment is possible across a broad number of country contexts, as long as the type of alignment (cf. supra – budget support vs aid-on-budget) is adapted to the challenge, as well as the deployment of appropriate additional oversight, control and capacity supporting measures. Empirical evidence from the GPE grant portfolio has indicated that countries with a cluster average rating for “Public Sector Management and Institutions” of 2.6 or above can and have been able to successfully deploy aligned funding modalities, with the right risk management adaptations. On the other hand, there are currently no examples of aligned modalities in countries with scores at or below 2.5. Assessment of fiduciary risk can be garnered from various reports. For a broader level of international comparison, the World Bank’s publicly available annual Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) can be useful. It provides annual scores for more than 70 countries (IDA eligible countries). Among the most useful ratings: (i) the cluster average rating for “Public Sector Management and Institutions”; (ii) the rating for “Transparency, Accountability & Corruption in the Public Sector”. | * **Identification of expanded or improved use of existing aligned and joint financing mechanisms. This may include situations of underperformance of existing aligned/joint financing mechanisms** [absorption or fiduciary challenges, for example]
* Identification of plans to develop an aligned and/or joint financing mechanism in the future (short or medium term)
* Commitment towards exploring the development of an aligned and joint financing mechanism (medium or longer term)
* Are there development partners present with the capacity and experience to support an aligned and joint financing mechanism?
 |
| **Possible sources of evidence*** Joint Financing Arrangement or pooled fund MoU
* Education sector planning and implementation reports (data and information on aid effectiveness/fragmentation)
* Reviews or evaluations on aid effectiveness in the education sector
* National budget and Financial Management Information System (existence of aligned modalities)
* Operational manuals of existing aid-on-budget mechanisms (ringfenced/earmarked budget support)
* Public financial management (PFM) reviews or reports
* Implementation reports of current GPE-funded project/program (absorption and performance review)
* List of active education development partners (with potential to support an aligned aid modality)
* Data and information compiled by the GPE Secretariat on alignment of past/current GPE grants
* Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) rating for “Public Sector Management and Institutions”
 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. VOLUME, EQUITY AND EFFICIENCY OF DOMESTIC PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION
 |
| Components | Guiding considerations |
| **Volume:** Sufficient resources should be allocated to education to accelerate progress toward delivery of quality education for all. Governments have obligations, as part of their commitments to international rights instruments, to resource education adequately and to mobilize the maximum available resources in order to realize the right to education. Partner countries are expected to either (a.) demonstrate a commitment to spending at least 20 percent of the public budget (excluding debt service) on education, or (b.) commit to progressively increase levels of public finance towards 20 percent of the total public budget, or (c.) commit at least 4 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP) to education. It is critical that the funds allocated are both credible and sustainable for implementation of key education reforms. This means a focus on both the share of the budget allocated to education as well as a country’s overall fiscal space, or capacity of the country to generate (primarily) tax revenue. High levels of debt servicing across some also reduce the funding available for education and other social sector spending. High execution rates suggest credible commitments that translate into actual support to the education sector.  | * **Overall level of education expenditure vs. (i) total public spending and (ii) gross domestic product** (per Domestic Financing Matrix) and its trend over the past and future years
	+ Supporting documents including national budget are critical to demonstrate credibility of commitments
	+ decreasing trends of education expenditure can be accompanied by a brief overview of mitigation factors and reasons behind reprioritization of other sectors
* Macro factors that determine fiscal space, including tax: GDP ratio and levels of debt servicing
* Budget allocation vs. execution rates (especially for non-salary expenditures), distribution between recurrent and capital expenditure
 |
| **Equity:** Often the poorest households bear a disproportionate burden in funding education, and public education expenditure tends to favor wealthier, more powerful groups. Therefore, it is important that a gender and inclusion lens is applied to finances to ensure commitments to address inequalities are resources adequately. This is particularly significant given the ways in which improvements in access to education may mask low completion rates for vulnerable groups. Public financing for education should be focused on the most marginalized, ensuring not only access but also quality learning across a full cycle of education. This includes, for example, gender-responsive budgeting, but also budgeting for refugees and allocating additional resources to schools in the communities hosting refugees and internally displaced persons. The COVID-19 crisis has further exposed the impact of social disparities on learning. Disruptions to household livelihoods are likely to reinforce the importance of a gender lens. | * Levels of per capita expenditure and size of out-of-school children population for different subsectors (pre-primary/primary/lower and upper secondary)—Are levels adequate to achieve universal primary education?
* Equitable distribution of resources: Public expenditure by education level and/or income/wealth quintile and/or geographic region and/or learning outcome quintile. This may be reflected in differentials in teacher allocation, quality of schooling environment, learning materials, etc., across groups.
* Education as a share of total household expenditures (private expenditure) relative to income/wealth quintile and/or school type and/or geographic region and/or by education level (pre-primary/primary/upper and lower secondary) and/or level of education of household head
* **Presence of financing formulas for allocation of resources that explicitly incorporate equity considerations**, including:
	+ Mechanisms that allow for funding of programs for marginalized students/vulnerable populations, including refugees and internally displaced persons
	+ Presence and use of gender-responsive budgeting or other tools considering gender considerations for equitable allocation of resources
 |
| **Efficiency:** It is estimated that almost one-third of education spending is lost to inefficiencies. For the assessment of this factor GPE is primarily concerned with technical efficiency (using minimum resource levels to achieve best outcomes) and internal efficiency (minimizing dropout and repetition). Key efficiency concerns include low levels of learning, high repetition rates, waste in procurement and ensuring better allocation and more transparent payment of teachers. Tackling inefficiencies also includes improving monitoring and financial planning, using real-time data to track how resources are spent. Improved accountability for spending and demonstrating convincing results is also a key step toward stronger dialogue with ministry of finance. | * Efficient utilization of the teaching and non-teaching workforce, including teacher hiring and deployment, payment of salaries, controls on payroll and allowances, and accountability measures to reduce unauthorized teacher absenteeism
* Effective resource mobilization between tiers of government (most relevant in federal systems)
* Learning outcomes, e.g., WB Learning Adjusted School Years—i.e., is money spent resulting in learning, not just attendance?
* **Internal efficiency coefficient, or repetition and dropout rates as a proxy if not available**; extent of over- and underage enrollment
* Do expenditures reflect value for money in areas of significant spending (teachers, textbooks, classroom construction, etc.)?
* Broader system issues, including budgeting framework, procurement processes, controls on fraud and corruption and management of civil servants. This may also include considerations of transparency and accountability in financial reporting, with timely, complete data on executed expenditure.
 |
| **Possible sources of evidence*** National budget documents showing executed and projected expenditures, incl. national and/or sector medium-term expenditure framework
* Financial simulation model
* Macro projections from International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank
* Education sector analysis (ESA)
* World Bank Public Expenditure Reviews (PERs)
* Public expenditure and financial accountability (PEFA) reports
 |