**System Transformation Grant**

**Completion Report Template for Projects[[1]](#footnote-2)**

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

|  |
| --- |
| **PURPOSE AND INSTRUCTIONS** |
| **Purpose** |
| This system transformation grant (STG) 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. * Share **reflections** to improve the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of future such projects and 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 and local education group. As per GPE’s [STG policy and guidelines](https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/guidelines-education-sector-program-implementation-grants), the grant agent provides an implementation completion report covering the entire implementation period to the 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 and variable part data * Documentation of the explicit confirmation that variable part targets have been reached (if not previously shared) * Tangible outputs and knowledge products generated with STG support, or stories of impact (if not already shared in previous progress reports) * Evaluations or any other relevant studies that measure the grant’s or related project’s results (if any) * Efficiency analysis (if any)   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 STG. The term “project” is used in the former case and “grant” is used in the latter case.  Text should be concise and clear. You may add annexes if you wish to display only key text in the report. Overlapping contents may be referenced cross-sectionally to avoid repetitions. It is encouraged to think of the questions as an interdependent whole to build the project’s story line. Some questions are self-reflective in nature and will necessitate using judgment inferred from triangulated quantitative/qualitative information and logical explanations.  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/subnational context** of the country at the time of the review, for better unpacking the information.  Data should be **triangulated**, presenting 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**. Explorethe “**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 report should be submitted via email to [**gpe\_grant\_submission@globalpartnership.org**](mailto:gpe_grant_submission@globalpartnership.org), copying the coordinating agency and the GPE Secretariat country team lead. 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. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **I. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: RELEVANCE** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **I.1 Overall relevance** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **RELEVANCE – Extent to which project activities responded to the needs and priorities of the sector, country partners and the beneficiaries, especially girls and the most marginalized/vulnerable children, and continued to do so throughout implementation.[[3]](#footnote-4)** Please 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, partners and the sector. 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, partners and the sector. 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, partners and the sector. 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, partners and the sector. 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 on project’s **continued relevance** during its life cycle.[[4]](#footnote-5) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **I.2 Beneficiaries’ views on relevance** | | | | | | | | | | |
| *[If a beneficiary/satisfaction survey, and so on was conducted]*Doproject **beneficiaries** think that the activities and outputs were of quality and met their needs and priorities (for example, children, teachers, caregivers, school leadership, education administrators, etc.)? Why or why not? | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: EFFICACY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II.1 Overall efficacy** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **EFFICACY – Extent to which the project achieved its intended objectives (intended objectives or outcomes) at the time of closing.[[5]](#footnote-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 extent to which and how well the project reduced specific barriers to access and learning faced by (a) **girls and/or in terms of gender equality** and (b) **most vulnerable/marginalized children, as defined in the country’s context**. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II.2 Efficacy by component/objective** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Provide in Annex 2 information on the **level of achievement for each component/objective** by the end of the project:   * Efficacy ratings by component/objective, by focusing on outcome-level achievements[[6]](#footnote-7) * Brief narrative on key achievements and challenges, by component/objective | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II.3 Contribution to system transformation (incl. the variable part)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reflect below on:   1. The extent to which the project contributedto **sector-level progress** in a scaled, coherent manner, in terms of key transformative sector reforms, system capacity and ability to address disruptive events.[[7]](#footnote-8) 2. How well the **variable part** (VP) strategy facilitated sector-level improvements, and whether the VP indicator targets were reached and thus led to disbursement. Also, please summarize the VP achievements for the entire project period in Annex 3. You may also submit the **results framework for the VP**, if there is one. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II.4 Other effects** | | | | | | | | | | |
| If applicable, describe **any other project’s effects and impacts** (intended or unintended, positive or negative). Unintended outcomes should be shown to be causally linked to the intervention being assessed. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II.5 Conditions affecting the project** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reflect on the internal/external **conditions that have facilitated or hindered project success**, for example:   1. The **conditions that have inhibited or facilitated** project design, implementation and the achievement of objectives(for example, internal factors such as project management or supervision; and/or other factors related to the country, such as management capacity, financial management or fiduciary capacity, monitoring and evaluation [M&E], partner coordination, and so on; external factors beyond the grant agent’s or implementor’s control)[[8]](#footnote-9) 2. In hindsight, whether the **risks identified** at the project development stage were accurate and the **mitigating measures** sufficient; whether there were any other risks unforeseen at the time | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II.6 Lessons and recommendations, successful practices and innovative interventions** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Briefly describe **major lessons[[9]](#footnote-10)** (positive or negative) related to the implementation of the grant/project. Also, share **key recommendations[[10]](#footnote-11)** that could feed into future grant/project planning cycles for improved practices.  Mentionany **successful practices** or **innovative interventions** in relation to the grant/project (if not already shared in previous progress reports). | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II.7 Impact stories** | | | | | | | | | | |
| If applicable and not shared in previous progress reports:  Have you identified any **stories of impact** of the project on beneficiaries that you would like to share with the GPE Secretariat Communications Team? If so, provide below or as an attachment. These stories will be featured on GPE communications materials and platforms, with attribution to the provider. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II.8 Tangible outputs and knowledge products** | | | | | | | | | | |
| If applicable and not shared in previous progress reports:  Attach the **tangible outputs and knowledge products** (for example, evaluations, pilots, studies) generated through the support of the project/grant. Also, attach any **photos, videos, advocacy posters**, and so on, as relevant, that can be showcased in GPE stories or blogs. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **II.9 Reporting for specific types of grants, as applicable** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **For Multiplier grants** (if applicable): Indicate the amount (in US$/€) of planned cofinancing that was expected to be mobilized at design and the amount of actual cofinancing mobilized by the grant closing date. If the planned amount was not fully mobilized, please explain the reasons why. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cofinancing (in US$/€) expected to be mobilized at design | | | | | | Cofinancing (in US$/€) actually mobilized | | | If the cofinancing wasn’t mobilized fully, provide reasons why. |
| Click here to enter number. | | | | | | Click here to enter number. | | | Click here to enter text. |
| **For the Girls’ Education Accelerator** (if applicable): Assess the extent to which the **Girls’ Education Accelerator** achieved its intended objectives (intended objectives or outcomes) at the time of grant closing, by selecting a rating from the drop-down menu. | | | | | | | | | | |
| ***Level of achievement:*** Select a rating from drop-down menu. | | | | | | | | | |
| Briefly qualify your rating. Also, how successfully did the Girls’ Education Accelerator alleviate gender-related barriers faced by girls? How well did its activities interlock with the system transformation grant interventions? Why or why not? | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **III. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION: EFFICIENCY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **III.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, resources were economically converted into outputs and outcomes).[[11]](#footnote-12)** 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 in the sector. | | | | | | |
|  | | Modest | | Efficiency was below expectations in the sector. | | | | | | |
|  | | Negligible | | Efficiency was very low compared to both the benefits (if any) and with recognized norms in the sector. | | | | | | |
| **III.2 Timeliness** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reflectonthe timeliness of the project, that is, whether the project experienced any **delays at 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. | | | |
| **III.3 Grant costs** | | | | | | | | | | |
| What were the **unit costs of delivering key outputs** (for example, school construction, teacher training, textbooks)? Are there any **benchmarks** available for comparison? Did the unit costs **change** between grant design and actual implementation? If so, why?  Were there any **exceeding costs or major savings** for the grant? If yes, please describe. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **III.4 Alignment and harmonization** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reflect on the grant’s experience in using the following:[[12]](#footnote-13)   1. **Aligned modalities**, if any(alignment with national systems is understood as the use of national institutions, human resources and procedures for the execution of external aid) 2. **Coordinated/harmonized mechanisms** (synchronized actions between country actors, for example, through the local education group)   Also reflect on how project has translated into better **government capacity to use more aligned or coordinated/harmonized modalities** in the future. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **III.5 Partnerships** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Were there any **partnerships** (financial/in-kind/other) developed or leveraged, for example, with the private sector, foundations, other sectors beyond education, research institutions, and so on, to support the project? If yes, describe these partnerships and explain their level of success, any challenges and lessons. | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **III.6 Use of data and evidence for improvement** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Explain how, and with which level of success, the project has **used its project monitoring data and research/evidence** throughout its life cycle to improve implementation and ensure that intended results would be achieved.  Provide any details related to **joint problem-solving** exercises, events or opportunities with country-level partners, the GPE Secretariat and other stakeholders, and their relative level of usefulness, as well as any recommendations on how such mechanisms could be improved moving forward. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **III.7 Use of GPE processes** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reflect on the extent to which the **key STG processes and mechanisms** have facilitated or impeded the design and implementation of the project (in terms of the need for grant quality, timeliness, reasonable transaction costs, and so on).[[13]](#footnote-14) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **IV. SUSTAINABILITY** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Reflect on the **potential for continuity** beyond the closing date:   1. Which project results and services, initiatives or reforms established have a potential to be continued or scaled, or if there are no tangible areas for continuity. 2. The conditions in place or lacking for continuity, and any potential risks that may jeopardize continuity. Also, whether there is sufficient budget and other resources allocated to these elements that are sought to be continued. 3. Any sustainability plans or exit strategies developed to ensure the continuity of (some of) the benefits. 4. Any measures for scaling up pilots or promising practices. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **V. GRANT MANAGEMENT AND USE OF FUNDS** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **V.1 Unspent funds** | | | | | | | | | | |
| If applicable, if there were any **unspent funds** by the end of the grant, indicate (i) how much and (ii) why. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Click to enter amount of funds that were not spent by grant closing. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **V.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.[[14]](#footnote-15) | |
| Explain 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. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **V.3 Cofinancing (not related to the Multiplier)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Where relevant, include information on whether the project that the grant supported benefited from any **cofinancing**, including the disbursement level of cofinancing, 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. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **VI. MONITORING DATA** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **VI.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 grant/project | | | | | | | | | | |
| **VI.2 Global numbers data** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Provide in Annex 4 the data related to GPE’s **three global numbers**:   * Textbooks purchased and distributed * Teachers trained * Classrooms built or rehabilitated | | | | | | | | | | |
| **VI.3 Cumulative beneficiary children data** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Provide in Annex 5 the cumulative number of children 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 5.  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**

***(i) Overall efficacy rating***



***(ii) Component/objective-level efficacy ratings*** 

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **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.**   * Select a rating[[15]](#footnote-16) from the drop-down menu. * Then, reflect in a short narrative on the achievement of the components/objectives, describing, for example, for each:  1. The **reliability of the results chain**: that is, 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), reasons for nonachievement, and so on. 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/components or indicators during implementation, and their implications on the grant/project’s budget, results, theory of change, and so on. | | |
| 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. |

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

**Annex 3: Variable Part Reporting Template (at Completion)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Baseline | At completion | | | | If the achievement reported in the past progress report(s) has been retrospectively revised, please indicate against which target the achievement has been revised, the revised value, the reason for revision and the actual amount disbursed. | If the achievement was retrospectively revised or if any of the evidence of the achievement hasn’t been submitted, please note the name of the evidence here and attach actual document. |
| Target for the entire project period | Actual achievement | Projected disbursement at design **(in US$/€)** | Actual disbursement  **(in US$/€)** |
| Select a dimension. Level of overall achievement: Select a rating.[[16]](#footnote-17) | | | | | | | |
| 1)… |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2)… |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3)… |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Select a dimension. Level of overall achievement: Select a rating. | | | | | | | |
| 1)… |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2)… |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3)…. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Select a dimension. Level of overall achievement: Select a rating. | | | | | | | |
| 1)… |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2)… |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3)… |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

**Annex 4: Global Numbers Reporting Template[[17]](#footnote-18)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GPE indicators** | **Indicator name(s) as in the program document and application form** | **ACTUAL number achieved (for entire project period)**  **• Please report the status in numbers,** not in percentages or ratios.  **• For cofinanced project, please provide the number for the entire project. GPE Secretariat will prorate it in accordance with the proportion of GPE contribution to the entire project amount.** | **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 5: Cumulative Beneficiary Children Reporting Template**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cumulative beneficiary children data** | | | | |
| Provide the cumulative number of children (both in school and out of school) 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 cumulative disaggregated values bysubgroups(**at a minimum by sex**, and by any other groups as feasible). 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 deploys their own approaches for counting beneficiary children.[[18]](#footnote-19)  **NOTE:** If the system transformation grant is cofinanced, enter the numbers for the entire project. | | | | | |
|  | | Pre-primary (optional) | Primary (optional) | Secondary (optional) | **Total** |
| **Number of children who directly benefited from the project over the entire duration of the project:** | | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |
| **Of which, girls:** | | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |
| Of which, children with a disability (optional): | | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |
| Of which, refugee children (optional): | | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |
| Of which, internally displaced children (optional): | | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |
| Of which, out-of-school children (optional): | | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |
| Of which, children from marginalized ethno-cultural/ linguistic minorities: specify which ones (optional): | | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. | Enter number. |
| Provide any comments on beneficiaries, 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 are unavailable. | | | | |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | |

1. This template is for grants that employ project-type modalities, such as those categorized as “standalone” (funding is solely from GPE) or “project-pooled” (funding comes from GPE and other donor(s) to support a common project). For sector-pooled or budget support grants, please use another template (link to be added). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. “Effectiveness” (start) date is considered as the date when the grant implementation has effectively started, marked by the occurrence of an event defined in the grant application. [↑](#footnote-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, and the sector. The **relevance** test requires that the interventions be judged by the development priorities and circumstances prevailing at the grant closing date, not at the time of grant approval. It should take into account whether the project’s objectives reflected proper diagnosis of a development 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. For example, you may reflect on the following: (a) Did the project design accurately (continue to) reflect **prioritized sector needs**, in line with the sector plan and the compact priorities (both in terms of capacity strengthening and transformative projects)? In hindsight, were the project’s **objectives and the results pathway** **realistic**? (b) 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? (c) 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? (d) How did the project ensure that **changing circumstances** were being fed back into design? (e) Did the project take into account whether the necessary **national/local** **capacity conditions** were in place for the project to be successful? (f) Did the project have a well-designed **results framework** (for example, appropriate indicators to monitor progress, realistic targets) and an appropriate **plan for monitoring**? [↑](#footnote-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). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. See in Annex 1 a decision tree to help determine component/objective-level efficacy ratings. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. For example, you may reflect on: (a) **Transformative change** – How well did the project contribute to sector-level transformation (that is, contribution to country’s progress in terms of education outcomes; support to key reforms/initiatives and full array of interventions needed to fulfill them)? In hindsight and based on evidence, were the reforms undertaken truly transformative? (b) **Fitness of the project’s transformative projects within the broader sector** – Did the project complement, duplicate or undermine other interventions/projects addressing similar systemic issues in the sector and prioritized by the compact? Also indicate, when combined, whether these sets of interventions led to, and were sufficient for reaching, actual systemic results to tackle the issue at hand (as information is available). (c) **System resilience** – Did the project help strengthen the system’s ability and mechanisms to be protected from, adapt to and bounce back from disruptive events? If so, how successfully? (d) **Capacity strengthening** –Were the STG’s capacity areas that were identified as deficient in the top-up portion of the grant successfully remediated with support from the system capacity grant? [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. **Management** factors may includeproject/grantmanagement arrangements, roles, responsibilities, and so on. **Supervision** factors may includesupervision provided during project implementation, including timely and proactive identification of issues and actions taken to address them, and so on. Factors related to **capacity** may include institutional and organizational capacities, human resources–related capacities and other issues that impact capacity. **Financial management/fiduciary** factorsmay include procurement, financing, budgeting and financial management mechanisms in place following the grant agent’s policies and procedures. **M&E**-related factors may include 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. Factors related to **coordination, partnership and participatory processes** may include 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. **External factors, factors beyond the grant agent’s control and unforeseen circumstances** may include macroeconomic changes, conflict and instability, natural disasters, changes in government commitment and leadership, issues related to governance and politics, unforeseen technical and logistical difficulties, changes in scope, and so on. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. **Lessons** are different from facts, findings or circumstances. Instead, they express the broader significance to be taken away from a given experience. A lesson is typically stated as a conclusion that has a certain degree of generalizability beyond the project/grant, country or period considered. It is also helpful to explain how/why a given context played a role in whether the experience unfolded successfully or not—a similar intervention/factor may have played out differently under different country or project/grant contexts. Lessons may draw from (a) key enabling/hindering circumstances or events (internal or external to the project/grant); (b) best practices, innovations or critical events experienced by the project/grant; and (c) assessment of which interventions/activities were comparatively more/less effective and why. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. **Recommendations** should be forward-looking and provide actionable suggestions on how to proceed (strategically or operationally) in the future should a similar experience arise. Recommendations tend to have general applicability beyond the project/grant under review. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. **Efficiency** is a measure of how economically resources and inputs are converted to results. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. For example: Were the project/grant’s activities/achievements featured in the sector’s annual action plans/budgets and progress reports? Did the grant agent, local education group and other sector actors conduct joint monitoring sessions or events, site visits or diagnostics? Did the grant agent, government and other sector actors work together to coordinate their processes and interventions? [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. For example, this may include (a) the streamlined grant application/approval process at development stage, (b) the conditions and procedures for allocating and releasing funding for the minimum allocation (fixed and variable part) portion and the top-up portion, (c) the strategic and operational interdependencies between the varied GPE instruments and grants, under the umbrella of the compact and (d) The GPE process for reporting grant revisions. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. ***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 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. See in Annex 1 a decision tree to help determine component/objective-level efficacy ratings. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. For definitions of each scale, see section II.1, “Overall efficacy.” [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. **General Instructions:**

    1) Starting from FY21, only the actual global numbers achieved during a reporting period are required; no annual targets will be requested onward.

    2) If the education sector program 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 education sector program 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 education sector program 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 performing their tasks effectively.

    **Classrooms built or rehabilitated.** This indicator tracks the number of classrooms that were built and/or rehabilitated through GPE’s education sector program 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, etc.) 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, etc.) has been renovated, either fully or partially, implying that the structure is brought up to code.

    **Note:** 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Widely accepted definitions of these subgroups are provided for reference only, as we acknowledge that descriptions and criteria for measuring subgroups are context-dependent: **Girls**: School-age female child and adolescents. [**Children with a disability**](http://glossary.uis.unesco.org/glossary/map/terms/176): 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://www.unhcr.org/what-is-a-refugee.html) **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://emergency.unhcr.org/entry/250553/idp-definition) **children**: 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**](http://glossary.uis.unesco.org/glossary/en/home) **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://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Minorities/Pages/internationallaw.aspx): 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)