DISCUSSION GUIDE

POLICY DIALOGUE ON REQUIREMENT AREAS
STEP 1

LEG inaugural discussion on policy priorities
**Overview**

**Task Team preparation work**
- Identify a comprehensive list of policy issues across the sector where there are persistent challenges.
- Propose up to three policy priorities that would ideally be further developed and discussed as part of Compact development.

**LEG inaugural discussion**
- Reach consensus on up to three policy priorities with potential for system transformation (including one on Gender Equality).
Guidance for Task Team Preparatory Work

- Review ESA and ESP for challenges and associated strategies; implementation reports/JSR aide-memoire; other sector documents

- From these, focus primarily on challenges that are significant in magnitude, chronic/persistent, and where attempts have been made to solve the problem unsuccessfully

- From this comprehensive list, identify no more than three persistent challenges that can be turned into priorities for systems transformation - see slide 5

  These priorities should be mapped against the GPE 2025 priority areas prior to discussion with the LEG (note that at least one priority must be selected that reflects gender equality) - see slide 6
Task team presents the policy priorities to the LEG using a contextualized rationale

**FORMULATION OF PRIORITIES** should be at the **outcome level** (results-oriented) and **specific**, i.e. measurable (for the purposes of this discussion it is not necessary to set targets)

**ELEMENTS FOR RATIONALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Timeframe</strong></th>
<th>expected to be achieved within the timeframe of the Partnership Compact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic</strong></td>
<td>achievement is expected to accelerate progress in multiple policy areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aligned with policy framework(s)</strong></td>
<td>grounded in the ESP, operational plan, JSR report or any other recent planning document. Alternatively, it can stem from a recommendation in an ESA or a diagnostic document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political will</strong></td>
<td>strong government ownership underpinned by a high level of accountability towards citizens for results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under-addressed</strong></td>
<td>does not currently receive adequate programmatic support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
<td>requires collective action from a cross-section of stakeholders to advance progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commonly agreed</strong></td>
<td>greater alignment of actors behind priorities increase chances of successful implementation and system transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPE2025 priority areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to education</strong></td>
<td>involves progressive realization of the right to a full cycle of education for all children, including on-schedule enrolment and progression at an appropriate age and regular attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td>is the process of acquiring new understanding, knowledge, behaviors, skills, values, attitudes, and preferences, as well as the result of that process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality teachers &amp; teaching</strong></td>
<td>focuses on the selection of teachers whose preparation and professional development facilitates quality teaching, by incentivizing enhanced professionalism and supporting them through enabling system factors and appropriate finance, planning and deployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender equality</strong></td>
<td>means equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for girls and boys. Equality means that women’s and men’s rights, responsibilities and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female. Equality between women and men is seen both as a human rights issue and as a precondition for, and indicator of, sustainable people-centered development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity and inclusion</strong></td>
<td>involves responding to marginalization, inequalities, unfair treatment or discrimination by redistributing resources; raising outcomes of disadvantaged groups such as children from poor households, children with disabilities and displaced children; and ensuring that all schools are safe, health-promoting and inclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Early childhood education</strong></td>
<td>includes services that support children’s cognitive, physical, social, and emotional development by introducing young children to organized instruction outside of the family context. Children who benefit from quality, equitable, and inclusive ECE are better prepared for primary school and build a solid foundation for lifelong learning and wellbeing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUIDANCE FOR LEG INAUGURAL DISCUSSION ON POLICY PRIORITIES

Core principles

- **Inclusive dialogue** engaging a wide cross-section of education stakeholders, to ensure buy-in and consensus on final decisions
- **Consensus-based** as a deliberate effort to identify the priorities where there is strong alignment across stakeholders

Objective

- **Establish consensus** around up to three policy priorities with potential for system transformation

Meeting overview

1. **Presentation** - Task Team introduces the proposed three policy priorities with potential for system transformation, while also sharing the background work that led to the proposal
2. **Discussion** - stakeholders reach common ground and agree on up to three policy priorities and map them to the GPE2025 priority areas
3. **Appointment of policy experts** in the identified priority areas to join the Task Team

Outputs

- **Minutes / summary** of the LEG discussion (agreeing policy priorities)
The LEG reflects on the full set of challenges presented by the Task Team and the (up to) three proposed priorities.

Using the following questions, they reach consensus on priorities:

- **Do the proposed priorities unlock progress in other areas?**
- **Do these priorities reflect the greatest challenges in the sector?**
  - If requested, a dashboard with comparative data can be provided to each country by the Secretariat, using the comparator group selected by the country in the initial requirement screening template
- **Are these priorities underserved?**

**Priority on Gender Equality**

*Gender equality is automatically selected*

**Priority B**

**Priority C**
STEP 2
Contextualized requirement analysis
OVERVIEW

For each requirement area:

Objective

1. Data & evidence

2. Gender responsive planning and monitoring

3. Sector coordination
   A. Inclusive sector dialogue and coordinated action
   B. Coordinated financing and funding

4. Volume, equity, and efficiency of domestic public expenditure on education

The Task Team undertakes initial contextualized analysis and presents findings to the LEG.
The Ministry(ies) of Education is able to produce robust data and make use of evidence for managing the education system, as well as for formulating and monitoring the implementation of sector strategies.
Synthesis of evidence to inform discussion

Possible sources:
- Summary of GPE country level evaluation
- EMIS – LAS diagnostics/ audits:
  - EMIS-SABER,
  - ADEA EMIS peer review,
  - Ed-DQAF
  - ANLAS
- Education sector analysis, system diagnoses
- Joint sector review reports
- Statistical reports collected through EMIS
- Ministry of Education organizational structure and description of roles and responsibilities within the ministry(ies)
- Questionnaires for annual school census

Possible indicators
- Indicators from GPE Results Framework (RF14) – for baseline
- UIS data portal
The task team reviews:

1. **Key issues in:**
   a. Education Management Information Systems
   b. Learning Assessment Systems
   c. Evidence Production and Use

   ... that inhibit progress towards achieving the policy priorities with potential for system transformation
   
   These may be related to technical issues, organizational capacities, or political will. If a diagnostic of data systems issues exists, please use this to inform your discussion.

2. **Opportunities to address the bottlenecks discussed above**

   Consider political will, current and upcoming investments, alignment of actors. Differentiate between opportunities where many actors are engaged vs. those where there are gaps/limited engagement.
2

GENDER RESPONSIVE PLANNING AND MONITORING

Strategic and operational practices and tools that support the formulation, implementation and monitoring of gender sensitive responses to sector issues
2 GENDER RESPONSIVE PLANNING AND MONITORING

Synthesis of evidence to inform discussion

Possible sources

- Summary of GPE country level evaluation
- Available sector gender diagnostics
- World Bank Public Expenditure Review (PER)
- Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) reports
- Financial simulation model
- ESP appraisal report
- Education Sector Analysis (ESA) and system diagnoses
- Education sector implementation reports

Possible indicators

- Indicators from GPE Results Framework (RF16 and RF18) – for baseline
GENDER RESPONSIVE PLANNING AND MONITORING: GUIDANCE FOR ANALYSIS

KEY reference: Annex 1 Guidance for analyzing and assessing requirement areas

The task team reviews:

1. Key issues in:
   a. strategic planning frameworks and practices and practices
   b. gender strategic planning frameworks and practices
   c. operational planning frameworks and practices
   d. budget programming and monitoring
   e. sector monitoring mechanisms and practices
   f. Gender mainstreaming and sensitivity across (a.) to (d.)

   ... that inhibit progress towards achieving the policy priorities with potential for system transformation
   These may be related to technical issues, organizational capacities, or political will. If a diagnostic of planning, budgeting, and/or monitoring issues exists, please use this to inform your discussion.

2. Opportunities to address the bottlenecks discussed above
   Consider political will, current and upcoming investments, alignment of actors. Differentiate between opportunities where many actors are engaged vs. those where there are gaps/limited engagement
Government-led and inclusive sector coordination mechanisms enable evidence-based policy dialogue and the planning, implementation and review of joint actions, around policy priorities.
Synthesis of evidence to inform discussion

Possible sources of evidence

- Summary of GPE country level evaluation
- Terms of reference (or the equivalent) of the local education group
- Minutes of LEG/coordination meetings (including education sector plan endorsement letter)
- Review/diagnostic/self-assessment of sector/sub-sector coordination bodies
- Education sector governance reviews
- Education sector implementation reports
- Joint sector review aide-mémoires
- EOL Grantee Progress Reports for the country
- EOL Grantee reports / publications from country

Possible indicators

- Indicators from GPE Results Framework (RF18 and RF19) – for baseline
- CSO participation in LEGs, EOL/CA
The task team reviews:

1. Key issues in sector dialogue and coordination functions and practices, such as:
   a. Supporting policy formulation/sector planning
   b. Addressing financing and resource mobilization
   c. Promoting harmonization and alignment
   d. Monitoring and fostering mutual accountability

   ... that inhibit progress towards achieving the policy priorities with potential for system transformation
   These may be related to technical issues, organizational capacities, or political will. If a review or diagnostic of sector coordination mechanisms exists, please use this to inform your discussion

2. Opportunities to address the bottlenecks discussed above
   Consider political will, current and upcoming investments, alignment of actors. Differentiate between opportunities where many actors are engaged vs. those where there are gaps/limited engagement
A sound mechanism exists for aid to be implemented through national systems, leading to greater accountability and coordination, reduced fragmentation, scaled-up financing and systems strengthening for sustainable education results.
Synthesis of evidence to inform discussion

Possible sources
- Education sector planning and implementation reports [review of aid effectiveness/fragmentation]
- Any reviews or evaluations on aid effectiveness in the education sector
- National Budget and Financial Management Information System [existence of aligned modalities]
- Implementation reports of current GPE-funded program [absorption and performance review]
- List of active education Development Partners [potential to support aligned aid modality]
- Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA) rating of Public Sector Management and Institutions
- Public Financial Management reviews or reports

Possible indicators
- Alignment data from GPE Results Framework (RF29)
- New or modified Indicators from MEL framework (….)
The task team reviews:

1. **Key issues:**
   a. The availability of an aligned funding mechanism to pool donor resources
   b. Fragmented aid practices operating on the margins of the national budget & systems
   c. The ability to offer aligned aid with sound risk management practices
   d. Absorption of aid and leverage on budget & systems’ strengthening
   e. Operational planning/reporting frameworks for improved transparency of on-Budget and off-Budget resources

2. **Opportunities to address the bottlenecks discussed above**
   Consider political will, current and upcoming investments, alignment of actors. Differentiate between opportunities where many actors are engaged vs. those where there are gaps/limited engagement
The volume of public finance for education is sufficient to accelerate progress towards quality education for all, is equitably allocated, and achieves best outcomes at least cost.
Synthesis of evidence to inform discussion

Possible sources
- Summary of GPE country level evaluation
- World Bank Public Expenditure Review (PER)
- Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) reports
- Financial simulation model
- Education Sector Analysis (ESA)
- National budget documents showing executed and projected expenditures, including national and/or sector MTEF
- Macro projections from IMF and World Bank

Possible indicators
- Levels of public expenditure, per domestic financing matrix (completed during screening)
- Indicators from GPE Results Framework (RF10) – for baseline
VOLUME, EQUITY, AND EFFICIENCY OF DOMESTIC PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION: GUIDANCE FOR ANALYSIS

The task team reviews:

1. Consider if public expenditure is
   a. adequate (volume)
   b. equitably allocated (equity)
   c. efficiently utilized (efficiency)

...in order to support progress towards the policy priorities with potential for system transformation
Identify key challenges in each requirement sub-component. If a diagnostic of financing issues exists (e.g. Public Expenditure Review), please use this to inform your discussion.

2. Opportunities to address the bottlenecks discussed above
Consider political will, current and upcoming investments, alignment of actors. Differentiate between opportunities where many actors are engaged vs. those where there are gaps/limited engagement
Following systematic review of each requirement area, two tasks remain:

1. Requirement interdependencies
   
   Thus far, discussion has focused on how requirement areas inhibit or enable progress in policy priorities. However, requirement areas are interconnected. Therefore:
   
   › Briefly discuss the extent to which in each requirement area impacts performance in the remaining areas.

2. Final categorization of requirement areas by level of priority

   › Prioritize the requirement areas on the basis of the significance/magnitude of the issues identified and the gaps in terms of support to address them – see next slide.

A rapporteur should summarize the discussion by preparing a draft of the Requirement Analysis: Country Template
[AT COUNTRY-LEVEL]

GUIDANCE FOR CATEGORIZING REQUIREMENT PRIORITY LEVEL

**HIGH PRIORITY**

Achieving progress in one or more of the policy priorities is deemed impossible or extremely unlikely, unless significant reforms are undertaken in the requirement area. The ministry(ies) of education and/or development partners are either not actively working in this requirement area or engagement is insufficient to make meaningful improvements.

**MEDIUM PRIORITY**

Achieving progress in one or more of the policy priorities will be significantly delayed unless issues in the requirement area are addressed (would extend beyond the duration of the Compact).

**LOW PRIORITY**

The requirement area could benefit from minor tweaks to help accelerate progress in one or more of the policy priorities.
GUIDANCE FOR LEG DISCUSSION ON REQUIREMENTS

Core principles

- **Inclusive dialogue** engaging a wide cross-section of education stakeholders, to ensure buy-in/ownership and consensus on requirement analysis

- **Consensus-based** as a deliberate effort to ensure strong alignment across education stakeholders

Objective

To finalize a nuanced, context-sensitive analysis of the country status in all requirement areas, with a view to submitting the analysis for independent assessment

Meeting overview

1. **Presentation** – Task Team introduces the LEG to the proposed requirement analysis – including screening tool, summarized contextualized discussions, requirement interdependencies and final categorization of requirement areas by level of priority

2. **Discussion** – stakeholders reach common ground and agree final requirement analysis

Outputs

- Minutes or summary of the LEG discussion (agreeing any changes to draft requirements analysis)