

METHODOLOGY SHEET FOR GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATION (GPE) INDICATORS

Indicator title	Indicator (18) Proportion of joint sector reviews meeting quality standards
Result measured (from GPE Results Framework):	<p>COUNTRY LEVEL OBJECTIVES - Strategic Objective (2) Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring</p> <p>(a) Promote inclusive and evidence-based sector policy dialogue and sector monitoring, through government-led local education groups and the joint sector review process, with participation from civil society, teacher organizations, the private sector, and all development partners</p>

JUSTIFICATION FOR INDICATOR

Background/context for indicator:	<p>The Global Partnership of Education has engaged in the past years in supporting countries to conduct Joint Sector Reviews (JSR) that are useful and effective monitoring instruments, and a transparent forum that subscribe to the principle of mutual accountability, for the implementation of Education Sector Plans or Transitional Education Plans (ESP/TEP). This work can be summarized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2011, the GPE Secretariat commissioned an unpublished study analyzing Joint Education Sector Review reports in 21 countries. This report concluded that (i) in general, JSRs do not systematically monitor progress against ESP targets and indicators, (ii) half of them recorded an explicit analysis of data against key indicator and (iii) in some cases alternative and parallel sets of indicators have preeminence over those included in the ESPs. Among other key findings, the report stated that there is considerable variation from country to country in the way JSRs are conducted, their content, focus, and outcomes. Although almost all JSRs intend to use their ESP objectives for measuring progress, few do so systematically. It also pointed out that many JSRs generate long lists of recommendations that are difficult to implement or track. The report also concluded that only a few countries have generated annual sector performance result (ASPR) reports, which evaluate progress against set targets and key indicators, and that ASPRs arrive often too late for being used as an evidence base to conduct JSRs. It also highlighted capacity issues in data collection, synthesis, and analysis¹. 2. GPE conducted a study titled “2012 Monitoring Exercise on Aid Effectiveness in the Education Sector”, which found out that, in 2009, out of the 39 countries analyzed, 25 relied on a regular JSR process, and that 10 countries had no JSR process or did not conduct one in 2010. It also highlighted that the majority of JSRs involved the participation of national and international education stakeholders including ministries of finance and of planning. In the majority of countries, civil society representatives are also included.
-----------------------------------	--

¹ Global Partnership for Education, *An Analysis of Joint Sector Review Report* (unpublished study, conducted by consultant Terri Kelly in 2011), 6.

The report however stated that the challenges associated with the JSRs varied across countries, including that JSRs frequently involved numerous presentations, studies, and discussions that were not always translated into actionable reforms or follow-up initiatives. A number of countries struggled to lever JSRs as a policy planning and decision-making mechanism Because of the weakness of the planning and monitoring capacities. A number of JSR reports were hastily drafted and did not provide robust evidence on the sector challenges and performance. Other constraints included insufficient technical and organizational capacity to carry out JSRs effectively².

3. The Sector Monitoring Initiative (SMI) to improve the monitoring of the education sector was launched in February 2012 in response to requests from Local Education Groups (LEGs) for the Secretariat to strengthen its support to effective monitoring at country-level. As part of the initiative, the GPE Secretariat organized five regional workshops in 2013 and 2014³, and one global workshop in Paris (June 2014) that brought together representatives from member countries, development partners, civil society organizations and the GPE Secretariat to discuss strategies for improving education sector plan monitoring systems and tools, and identifying what the Secretariat role should be in this area. The workshops were organized to allow participants to share their experiences in order to identify good practices in monitoring the Education Sector Plan (ESP) implementation. The workshops were not intended to provide training in the development and use of monitoring tools. The following recommendations for JSRs were discussed with SMI participants⁴:

- Clarity on the purpose, desired outcomes and expectations of JSRs
- Clear link between sector action plan, annual sector performance report, indicators and budgets
- Agreed set of defined targets and indicators to monitor
- Use existing data, working group systems and sector performance reports to analyze and agree on strengths and weaknesses prior to JSR
- Select and focus JSR discussions on themes from this analysis
- Use a systematic approach to field visits and analysis of information from these
- Assess/evaluate JSR
- Joint writing process
- Summary matrix with key sector performance indicators, baselines, targets and progress
- Analysis of causal factors for strengths and weaknesses
- Negotiate agreement around key recommendations
- Limit the number of recommendations and identify responsibilities and resources for implementing them

² Global Partnership for Education, *2012 Monitoring Exercise on Aid Effectiveness in the Education Sector* (Washington, D.C.: Global Partnership for Education, 2012), 67, retrieved from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/making-education-aid-more-effective>

³ in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso (February 25-28, 2013) for French speaking countries; in Cape Town, South Africa (April 28 - May 2nd, 2013) for Anglophone African countries; in Bangkok, Thailand (August 15-18, 2013) for Asian and European countries; in Dakar, Senegal (August 22-25, 2013) for other Anglophone countries from Africa and South America; and in Antigua, Guatemala (March 31 to April 2, 2014) for Spanish speaking countries in Latin America.

⁴ Global Partnership for Education. *Proposal for a More Effective Operational Platform*.(Washington, D.C., October 2015), 38. Retrieved April 2017 from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-proposal-more-effective-operational-platform>

	<p>On the basis of the above, analysis of the dataset collected for feeding the GPE Results Framework, further research for defining and measuring JSR effectiveness, and consultations within the Partnership, GPE Secretariat and its partners will issue guidelines for conducting robust JSRs. The objective will be two-pronged: setting commonly agreed quality standards among the Partnership of what constitute effective JSRs and developing capacities of the countries to prepare and conduct robust JSRs. The practical guide for effective joint sector reviews in the education sector is publicly available online⁵.</p>
<p>Rationale for indicator selection:</p>	<p>As stated in the GPE Strategic Plan⁶, the Global Partnership fosters inclusive and evidence-based sector policy dialogue focused on addressing critical barriers for the implementation and achievement of results in equity and learning. In this sense, Joint Sector Reviews appear the core of GPE business model for enhancing inclusive and evidence-based policy dialogue in support to the implementation of sector plans. Effective JSRs would directly contribute to achieving the GPE Strategic Plan objective #1: Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation and #2 Support mutual accountability through inclusive policy dialogue and monitoring</p> <p>The centrality of the JSRs as a national mechanism that serves multiple purposes (monitoring mechanism, mutual accountability framework, effective planning cycle, platform of informed policy dialogue) is discussed in a number of GPE reference documents. As part of the operationalization of the GPE funding model at country level, it is expected that annual joint sector reviews are conducted in all countries receiving implementation program grants⁷. The Secretariat has committed to present information regarding sector and grant monitoring in its annual Portfolio Review⁴: Countries are strongly encouraged to produce an annual sector progress report, and delivery on this will be monitored by the Secretariat through its annual Portfolio Review.</p> <p>The updated Education Sector Program Implementation Grant (ESPIG) Guidelines⁷ and the revised Country-Level Process Guide⁸ outline the new GPE funding model. It is indicated that indicators selected at sector level that shall be met for disbursing the 30% of the Maximum Country Allocation (variable part) should be monitored through joint sector reviews. It puts JSRs at the core of the GPE monitoring system, not only for sector progress monitoring, but also in conjunction with GPE grants monitoring, as a case for investment.</p> <p>In general, all the efforts conducted by the GPE Secretariat in collecting country data to inform the Results Framework will be, to the extent possible, building on existing country-level monitoring processes and systems of which JSRs are the cornerstone. For this corporate purpose along the long-term goal of achieving greater results in learning and equity, it is capital to reinforce and monitor Secretariat's support in strengthening the effectiveness of JSRs as a venue of exchange and media to convening reliable, accurate and timely information on sector</p>

⁵ Global Partnership for Education, *A practical guide for organizing effective JSRs* (Washington, D.C.: Global Partnership for Education, 2018), retrieved from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/practical-guide-effective-joint-sector-reviews-education-sector>

⁶ Global Partnership for Education. *Improving learning and equity through stronger education systems* (Washington, D.C., May 2016).

⁷ Global Partnership for Education, *Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants* (Washington, D.C.: Global Partnership for Education, 2014), retrieved from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/useful-resources-for-gpe-grants>

⁸ Global Partnership for Education, *Country Level-Process Guide* (Washington, D.C.: Global Partnership for Education, 2015), retrieved from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/useful-resources-for-gpe-grants>

performance and progress.

DEFINITION

Indicator definition:

Total number of *Joint Sector Reviews* in *GPE member states with active program implementation grants* which meet quality standards, that is, that meet at least three out of a total of five quality criteria, out of the total number of JSRs conducted

“GPE member states with active program implementation grants”: The Joint Sector Review is the unit of measurement for this indicator. While JSRs are typically conducted at country level, in some instances reviews may also be conducted within an alternatively defined geographic zone (e.g. under federal systems, this may happen at state- or province-level). In cases where such sub-national regional entities have autonomy to apply for independent GPE funding (Program Implementation Grants), the Secretariat takes the view that JSRs produced by such entities should be assessed as unique observations for the purposes of constructing this indicator. This is the case, for example, in the three semi-autonomous regions of Somalia (Central South, Puntland and Somaliland). Throughout this methodology, the generic term *GPE states* is therefore used interchangeably to describe any semi-autonomous regional unit, state/province, or country for which individual JSR assessment is appropriate.

“Joint Sector Reviews”: There is no standard definition, handbooks or blueprints that exist for JSRs⁹. On the basis of broad elements provided by the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness¹⁰ and GPE model principles, Joint Sector Reviews could be described as a joint periodic assessment of mutual progress in implementation performance through existing country-level mechanisms in a specific sector. According to GPE compact principles, JSRs are led by Governments and engage all Local Education Group stakeholders involved in the education sector, including Government authorities, donor partners and technical agencies, local and international civil society organizations, parent associations, teacher unions, academic institutions, non-public educational providers, and the private sector in a review of the performance and progress of the education sector. There is considerable variation from country to country in the way JSRs are organized and held, in the use of instruments, documentary inputs, focus, and outcomes. In most cases, JSRs are organized either once or twice a year, look at the evidence for monitoring implementation progress of ESPs/TEPs, and conclude in a meeting gathering all stakeholders in which weaknesses and successes are discussed, and recommendations on remedial actions agreed for the following review cycle. The Aide-Memoire or JSR report is the main documentary output of JSRs.

The **“quality standards”** are as follows:

1. **Participatory and inclusive:** The JSR includes effective participation from all education sector stakeholders transparently. It sets the stage for a reinforced mutual accountability framework.
2. **Evidence-based:** The JSR is informed by evidence including reliable education and financial data from the year under review, assessments of program implementation, documentary inputs combining primary

⁹ N Holvoet and L Inberg. *Joint Sector Reviews – M&E experiments in an era of changing aid modalities: experiences from JSR in the education sectors of Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger*. *Public Administration and Development*. 29:204-217. DOI: 10.1002/pad.538, 2009, 205.

¹⁰ Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness* (Paris: Development Assistance Committee, OECD, 2005)

	<p>and secondary data sources, feedback from beneficiaries, etc.</p> <p>3. Comprehensive: The JSR should address and cover all the sub-sectors (early childhood, primary, secondary, Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET), and higher education) as well as non-formal education and adult literacy. It should also discuss all the sources of funding identified in the annual action plan (on/off budget, aligned, non-aligned, etc.)</p> <p>4. A monitoring instrument: The JSR monitors sector performance and key indicators (including equity, efficiency and learning outcomes) to help better identify implementation issues and real achievements with respect to ESP/TEP implementation and overall sector progress.</p> <p>5. Anchored into an effective policy cycle: Recommendations from the JSR effectively feed into addressing weaknesses in the ESP/TEP implementation so as to ensure it is being used as a planning instrument to influence future policy planning, design and the budget cycle. Dissemination of JSR recommendations incentivizes mutual accountability.</p>
Unit of measurement:	Proportion
Disaggregation:	By fragile and conflict affected countries and non-fragile and conflict affected countries.
Year for data reported (select only one and mark an "x")	__ fiscal year _X_ calendar year
Frequency of data collection:	Annually

DATA TREATMENT

Source of information for collecting data:	Source document, template, etc.:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. JSR Terms of Reference 2. JSR Agenda* 3. JSR Participant List* 4. Annual Implementation Report 5. JSR Report / aide-memoire 6. Ministry of Education website <p><i>* Note that these documents may be attached to item 4.</i></p>
	Source agency:	States' Local Education Groups, Ministries of Education, and Coordinating Agencies.
Formula:	<p><u>Categorization of questions to assess JSRs:</u></p> <p>The JSR Questionnaire requires to review JSR documentation from all states included in the sample. The JSRs will be assessed on five questions, directly mapped to the five JSR standards. Each question contains multiple items. As described below, only a selection of some of the question items, identified as "good items" need to be met in order for a JSR to meet a given standard.</p> <p>The JSR Final Data Template requires to assess whether items for each question apply or not, based on the information presented in the key documents collected (see Source of Information for Collecting Data). Once this task is completed, one has to assess whether the JSRs met the standards following a four-value categorical scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Category 0 = JSR does not meet the standard in a given question • Category 1 = JSR meets the standard (does not meet all items, but does meet items bolded in the JSR Final Questionnaire) in a given question • Category 2 = JSR exceeds the standard in a given question. This means that the JSR meets all items for the question under consideration, and 	

therefore can be categorized as “good practice”.

- **Category 98** = Information obtained is insufficient to reach a conclusion or no information/documentation is available. This is an inconclusive case.

The standard is met if a JSR receives a code of 1 or 2. A coding of 2 means that the JSR exceeds expectations for quality standards, or meets good practice requirements. This may offer lessons on approaches that could eventually be replicated, taking into account the specificity of the country context, the political economy, etc. This also means that JSRs that are not categorized as 2 in a given question are not disqualified from meeting the standards. The approach aims to identify areas of improvement in order to better support countries and states.

Calculation Method

Review of assumptions to calculate this indicator:

1. The questionnaire includes 5 equally weighted questions corresponding to 5 standards. Each question contains multiple items. A defined subset called “good items” must be met in order for the standard to be met.
2. The standards are met or exceeded when the corresponding questions are coded as Category 1 or 2:
 - (Category 1) occurs when all *good* items are coded as 1.
 - (Category 2) occurs when all items (including good items and the additional ones) are coded as 1, except in question 4, in which good practices are achieved when more than the quality standards are met (at least one more).
3. Standards are not met when the corresponding questions are coded as Category 0.
 - (Category 0) occurs when: (i) at least one of the *good* items is rated as 0 (no), or (ii) 97 (partial coverage) in question 2.
4. A case is inconclusive when a question is coded as Category 98.
 - (Category 98) occurs when (i) at least one *good* item is rated as 98 (I don’t know), or (ii) when in question 2 the Annual Implementation Report could not be obtained, or respondent does not know whether the report exists or not. Provided that no other *good* item is rated as 0 or 97. In this case (combination of 98 AND 0 or 97) the question is coded as not meeting the standard.
5. In questions where a good item is rated as 99 (not applicable), the item does not count in the formula that assesses if the standard is met or not. The item is therefore removed, without penalizing for information that is not applicable in the context of a particular JSR.
 - This occurs when: (i) in questions 1 or 3, the item cannot apply in the context of the JSR, or (ii) when the item asks for comparing with the previous JSRs while it is the case of a first JSR.

The following steps are required to calculate the number of JSRs that meet the quality standards:

Step 1 – (a) Categorize all response items, and (b) assess the questions to meet standards

1.a For a given JSR, every question has multiple response items. *Each item* may be coded as 1 (yes), 0 (no), 97 (partial coverage), 98 (I don’t know), or 99 (not applicable), following these guidelines:

- Items may be coded as 1 when the answer is completely fulfilled.
- Items may be coded as 0 when the answer is not completely fulfilled.
- Items may be coded as 97 in question 2, when the answer is only partially fulfilled. This is considered as 0 in the final standard formula, but it is important to make the distinction at the item-level
- Items may be coded as 98, or I don't know, for one of following reasons: (i) the respondent is unsure of his/her answer in questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (item response excluded in question 2); and (ii) the Annual Implementation Report could not be obtained, or respondent does not know whether the document exists or not
- Items may be coded as 99, or not applicable, for one of the following reasons: (i) the item is not applicable in the context of the JSR under consideration in questions 1 or 3; and (ii) the item asks for comparing with the previous JSR, while it is the case of a first JSR

An additional control question asks if certain JSR documentation was used to support the respondent's answers. The possible responses are "Yes", "No", "No, document does not exist", "No, document could not be obtained", and "I do not know if document exists". This question, as well as the general information on the JSR asked, does not inform the assessment on attaining or not the standards, except for the item asking for the existence of the Annual Implementation Report (see Annex 2 for details on additional control question and general information asked).

1.b Once coded, the answers for all the set of good items is analyzed for each question, to check if the standards have been met (Category 1 and Category 2), not (Category 0), or it is an inconclusive case (Category 98). Questions are categorized following these guidelines:

- Standard met if assessed as Category 1 and Category 2 when *all* good items are coded as 1, are all items are coded as 1
- Standard is not met if assessed as Category 0 is reached when *at least any* good item is coded as 0
- Category 98 is reached when *at least any* good item is coded as 98, provided that no good item is coded as 0 (case in which question is automatically categorized as 0).

The additional Category 2 indicates that a question/criterion has exceeded the quality standards, only for analysis purposes, and not reported as such in the Results Framework indicator.

Results Framework (RF) Indicator:

Step 2 – (a) Count the number of JSRs meeting quality standards for a number of criteria, and (b) count the number of JSRs meeting quality standards by specific criteria

2.a The first set of results for the RF indicator indicates the total number of JSRs meeting a certain number of standards (separately, for 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 questions). For this, it is necessary to indicate first for each JSR how many standards were met. Then, it is possible to sum the total number of JSRs meeting certain number of criteria.

<p>Data limitations (if any known / anticipated):</p>	<p>This methodology is based on a desk review of key JSR documents, and excludes direct observations stemming from participation in JSR workshops. The rationale for conducting a desk review was to ensure that the assessment of the effectiveness of JSRs is based strictly on verifiable evidence. This means that some of the questions asked to assess the JSR attributes (standards) are limited to proxies capturing the underlying concept behind the attribute.</p> <p>The desk review approach also allows GPE to build an archive of JSR records including Annual Implementation reports, JSR reports, Terms of reference, Agendas etc. for all active GPE grant-recipient states. This will enable a more systematic analysis of trends, and proactive sharing of effective practices among countries and across regions.</p> <p>The set of elements agreed to define each of the above JSR attributes/standards can be found in the “JSR Questionnaire” attached to this methodology (Annex 2). It describes quality elements that JSRs should meet under each standard. It is understood that the process of developing quality standards should not be conducted in isolation from partners, and requires extensive consultations and a solid consensus among all GPE partners. Standards as developed in this methodology are expected to evolve over time.</p> <p>The present methodology with the proposed set of quality standards for key JSR attributes lays the groundwork for setting the JSR guidelines that the Secretariat will develop further in collaboration with other GPE partners. The analysis produced from this preliminary methodology will inform future consultations on what can/should constitute an effective JSR. The assessment approach of the underlying questionnaire (binary answers for each question item) creates flexibility for GPE to adjust the standards as ongoing research and consultation processes highlight relevant improvements.</p>
<p>Interpretation</p>	<p>A high value suggests DCPs are conducting, by and large, robust JSRs so that policy dialogue and monitoring at the country level is focused on effective implementation of Education Sector Plans or Transitional Education Plans (ESP/TEP).</p>

REFERENCES

- Global Partnership for Education. *2012 Monitoring Exercise on Aid Effectiveness in the Education Sector*. Washington, D.C.: Global Partnership for Education, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/making-education-aid-more-effective>
- Global Partnership for Education. *An Analysis of Joint Sector Review Report* (unpublished study, conducted by consultant Terri Kelly in 2011)
- Global Partnership for Education. *Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants*. Washington, D.C.: Global Partnership for Education, 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/useful-resources-for-gpe-grants>
- Global Partnership for Education. *Country Level-Process Guide*. Washington, D.C.: Global Partnership for Education, 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/useful-resources-for-gpe-grants>
- Global Partnership for Education. *Proposal for a More Effective Operational Platform*. Washington, D.C., October 2015. Retrieved April 2017 from <http://www.globalpartnership.org/content/gpe-proposal-more-effective-operational-platform>
- Global Partnership for Education. *Improving learning and equity through stronger education systems*. Washington, D.C., May 2016.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*.

Paris: Development Assistance Committee, OECD, 2005.

- Holvoet, N. and Inberg, L.. *Joint Sector Reviews – M&E experiments in an era of changing aid modalities: experiences from JSR in the education sectors of Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger. Public Administration and Development. 29: 204-217. DOI: 10.1002/pad.538. 2009.*

ANNEXES

Annex 1- Standard Operating Procedure

Process Name: Data Collection, Quality Assurance & Storage for Indicators # 18 of the GPE Results Framework	Owner: R&P Team	Updated:
Function: Measuring GPE Impact	Version #: 1	Review:
Material changes from prior version of SOP None; this is the first version.		
Summary This SOP describes the process for data collection, quality assurance, and storage for indicator # 18 (Proportion of joint sector reviews (JSRs) meeting quality standards) of the GPE results framework.		
Results / Outputs This process should result in the results framework being updated with quality assured data on indicator# 18. Interim outputs of the Secretariat: Completed data collection template Final Output: Updated results framework database		
Scope <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begins: The process begins with Operations Analyst (MU) requesting CLs/ESs to undertake assessment of JSRs through a desk-based review. • Ends: The process ends with updated data being integrated into the results framework database by the Monitoring and Evaluation Data Manager. • Includes: All procedural aspects • Excludes: Methodological aspects of calculating the indicator value. These can be found in the methodology sheet. • Note: Baseline data is already collected, and data will be collected annually. 		
Standards (Policies, Approvals, Deadlines, etc.): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies: GPE 2020, Monitoring Sheet for GPE Results Framework Indicators # 18 • Deadlines: M & E Data Manager updates results framework database with the Indicators # 18 data by 15th of April • Approval: The completed data template is prepared by the Operations Analyst (MU) and includes quality checks by the M & E Data Manager and final approval by the Head of M&E 		
Issues /Risks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant documents might not be available on time. 		
Overview:		
Request Data Collection	Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data	Aggregating Data
By 15 th Jan	By 15 th Feb	By 30 th March
		Update results framework database
		By 15 th April

Steps in the Process	Roles / Responsibilities	Outputs / Deliverables	Tools / Templates
1. Request Data Collection Typically by 15 th Jan			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request CLs to undertake assessment of JSRs through a desk-based review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations Analyst (MU) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JSR Terms of Reference JSR Agenda JSR Participant Annual Implementation Report JSR Report/aide memoire Ministry of Education website
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake the JSR assessment requested and submit to the Operations Analyst (MU) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Leads 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gather all assessments, perform initial quality assurance checks and forward to the QA unit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations Analyst (MU) 		
2. Quality Assurance and Compilation of Data Typically by 15 th Feb			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete quality assurance processes and send assessments back to Operations Analyst (MU) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education Specialist (QA) 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collate all assessments and conduct initial analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations Analyst (MU) 		
2. Aggregate Data Typically by 30 th March			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enter data into the template provided by the M&E Data Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations Analyst (MU) 		Data collection template
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compute indicator values using the completed data collection template, based on the latest available classification of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict and forward to M & E data Manager. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations Analyst (MU) 	Completed data collection template and indicator values	List of Countries Affected by Fragility and Conflict from the GPE Intranet
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review completed data collection template and send comments/queries to the Operations Analyst (MU) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M & E Data Manager 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond to the comments/queries, update data collection template as necessary and forward to M & E data Manager 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations Analyst (MU) 	Updated data collection template	
3. Update Results Framework Database Typically by 15th April			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forward data collection template to the Head of M & E for review and approval 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M & E Data Manager 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and approve completed data collection template 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of M & E 	Approved data collection template	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update results framework database using completed template submitted by the Operations Analyst (MU) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M & E Data Manager 	Updated results framework database	N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notify the secretariat on the availability of data in the results framework database through the intranet 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> M & E Data Manager 	Notification on GPE intranet	

Annex 2 - FINAL Questionnaire

Standards	Questions	Response Items	Standards Coding	Possible Data Source(s)
General Information	Please answer to the following items	s: Beginning date of the JSR (mm/dd/yyyy): gi1: Ending date of JSR (mm/dd/yyyy): gi4i: Year under review for this JSR? gi2: First education JSR <u>of ESP/TEP implementation period?</u> gi4j: First (ever)education JSR in the country gi3a: Beginning year of ESP/TEP period covered (yyyy): gi3b: Ending year of ESP/TEP period covered (yyyy): gi4: <u>Sub-sectors covered in the ESP/TEP:</u> gi4a: Early childhood education gi4b: Primary education gi4c: Lower secondary education gi4d: Upper secondary education gi4e: TVET gi4f: Higher education gi4g: Non-formal education and adult literacy gi4h: ESP/TEP is sector wide	not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESP/TEP JSR Agenda
Control Question	What documents among those listed in column (E) did you use to answer the	cq1: JSR Terms of Reference cq2: JSR Agenda cq3: JSR list of participants. If	not applicable	Items bolded are the essential documents

	<p>questions in this assessment?</p> <p>PLEASE ALSO indicate any additional document(s) produced in-country that served as a source for the JSR, or as an output of it, which was used to inform this assessment.</p>	<p>yes, <i>please indicate below</i> if this was the tentative or actual list:</p> <p>cq3a: Tentative list of participants cq3b: Actual list of participants cq4 : JSR Report/Aide Memoire. This includes any document produced as an output of the JSR cq5: Previous JSR Report/Aide Memoire. This includes any document produced as an output of the JSR cq6: Education Sector Plan/Transitional Education Plan cq7: Annual Action Plan of the ESP/TEP cq8: Annual Implementation Report (any document that tracks comprehensively the education sector progress would qualify as an equivalent of the Annual Implementation Report, and can be used for this assessment) cq9: Additional document(s) used for this assessment. <i>Please list in the comments column (H)</i></p>		<p>needed to answer this questionnaire. Please ensure its compilation beforehand.</p>
<p>1. Participatory & Inclusive: The JSR includes effective participation from all education sector stakeholders and is conducted transparently. It sets the stage for a reinforced mutual accountability framework.</p>	<p>1. To what extent was the JSR inclusive? From which of the following categories was there participation during the JSR?</p>	<p>1a: Ministry/Ministries in charge of education at the national level. If yes, please indicate below which of these ministries participated: an1a1 Basic Education an1a2 TVET an1a3 Higher Education an1a4 Social Affairs/Gender an1a5 Any other ministry(ies) related to education at the national level that participated. Please list in the comments column (H) 1b: Ministry of Education at the regional/district level and/or regional authorities in charge of education 1c: Ministry of Finance and/or Budget 1d: Other ministries: Ministry of Planning, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Civil service etc. 1e: Development Partners: multilateral, bilateral agencies 1f: International CSOs 1g: Local CSOs 1h: Parents associations 1i: Teacher unions 1j: Universities/ academic institutions 1k: Private sector: companies funding education, foundations 1l: Non-public educational providers (Private school networks)</p>	<p>2 - Exceeding Quality Standard: Respondent answered "Yes" (code 1) to <u>ALL items</u></p> <p>1 - Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered "Yes" (code 1) to <u>all bolded items</u> a, b, c, e, f, g, h & i</p> <p>0 - Not Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered "No" (code 0) to <u>one or more of the bolded items</u> a, b, c, e, f, g, h & l</p> <p>98 - Inconclusive: Respondent answered, "I do not know" (code 98) to <u>one or more of the bolded items</u> a, b, c, e, f, g, h & i, and no "No" (code 0) in any of these same items</p> <p>99 - Not Applicable: Items are excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas if respondent answered, "Not applicable" (code 99) to <u>any item</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of JSR participants JSR Terms of Reference
<p>2. Evidence-based: JSR is informed by</p>	<p>2. Did the Annual Implementation Report</p>	<p>2a1: Brief situational analysis of review period with key</p>	<p>2 - Exceeding Quality Standard:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exclusively the Annual

<p>evidence including reliable education and financial data from the year under review, assessments of programs implementation, feedback from beneficiaries, etc.</p>	<p>include the following?</p> <p><i>PLEASE NOTE that control questions were added to increase the questionnaire reliability. Depending on your answers, some of the items are auto populated.</i></p> <p>* Examples of financial information at trend / outcome level (ideally all indicators should be covered):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Execution % of total government budget • Execution % of education budget • Share of education expenditure over the total domestic expenditure disaggregated by capital and recurrent spending • Education recurrent expenditure disaggregated by wage and non-wage • Education expenditure disaggregated by major source: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Regular Budget (ii) on-Budget aid, earmarked traceable (iii) off-budget aid (major source of, i.e. ODA) • Share of external aid vs domestic allocation • Projected domestic allocations <p>**Expenditures at program / activity level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expenditures by programs and activities classified in the Annual Action Plan (which should be able to integrate a full budget perimeter, including wage, recurrent non-wage, and capital) 	<p>sector indicators at the outcome level of the year under review</p> <p>2a2: Brief situational analysis of review period with key financial information* of the year under review (see notes in question)</p> <p>2b: Sector progress and results achieved through the implementation of the ESP/TEP action plans (review of programs/activities)</p> <p>2c1: Expenditures at program/activity level** covered by domestic funding (see notes in question)</p> <p>2c2: Expenditures at program/activity level** covered by external funding</p> <p>2d: Follow up on previous JSR recommendations</p> <p>2e: Any additional element(s) that the Annual Implementation Report includes that it is not listed above. Please list in the comments column (H)</p> <p>2f: Beyond the Annual Implementation Report, other document(s) other documents demonstrating JSR is evidence-based. Please list in the comments column (H)</p>	<p>Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to <u>ALL items</u></p> <p>1 - Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to <u>all bolded items</u> b & c (including c1 and c2)</p> <p>0 - Not Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “No” (code 0) or “Partial coverage” (code 97) to <u>one or more of the bolded items</u> b & c (including c1 and c2). This is also the case if on control question regarding the use of the Annual Implementation Report respondent answered “No, document does not exist” (all items are automatically coded as 0).</p> <p>98 - Inconclusive: On control question regarding the <u>use of the Annual Implementation Report</u>, respondent answered “No, document could not be obtained”, or “I do not know if document exists”, and all items were then coded as 98</p> <p>99 - Not Applicable: Item 2d is automatically coded as 99 and excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas, if respondent answered “1st JSR” in control question (no other item can be “Not Applicable”).</p>	<p>Implementation Report</p>
<p>3. Comprehensive: The JSR should address and cover all the sub-sectors (early childhood, primary, secondary, TVET, and higher education) addressed in the ESP, as well as non-formal education and adult literacy. It should also discuss all externally funded activities/programs (on/off budget, aligned, non-aligned etc.)</p>	<p>3. Did the JSR cover the full spectrum of the education sector? Which of the following items apply? These can be discussed during the JSR (as per in the JSR Agenda) or covered in the Annual Implementation Report.</p> <p><i>PLEASE NOTE that control questions were added to increase the questionnaire reliability. Depending on your answers, some of the items are auto populated.</i></p> <p>The spectrum should include all the sub-sector</p>	<p>3a: JSR (or Annual Implementation Report) systematically covers all sub-sectors, as reported in the ESP/TEP</p> <p>3b: The JSR (or Annual Implementation Report) discusses activities/programs, as reported in the ESP/TEP, and those implemented and financed by external partners</p> <p>3c: The JSR (or Annual Implementation Report) discusses externally funded activities/programs that are off-budget</p> <p>3d: The JSR (or Annual Implementation Report) discusses externally funded</p>	<p>2 - Exceeding Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to <u>ALL items</u></p> <p>1 - Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to <u>all bolded items</u> b</p> <p>0 - Not Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “No” (code 0) to <u>one or more of the bolded items</u> b</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JSR Agenda • JSR Report/Aide Memoire • Annual Implementation Report <p><u>Additional sources include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESP/TEP • Annual Action Plan

	programs/activities, including those funded both by domestic and external sources, and addressed in the ESP/TEP.	activities/programs that are off-plan	<p>98 - Inconclusive: Respondent answered, “I do not know” (code 98) to one or more of the bolded items b, and no “No” (code 0) in any of these same items</p> <p>99 - Not Applicable: Items are excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas if respondent answered, “Not applicable” (code 99) to any item</p>	
<p>4. A monitoring instrument: The JSR monitors sector performance and key indicators (including equity, efficiency and learning outcomes) to help better identify implementation issues and real achievements with respect to ESP/TEP implementation and overall sector progress.</p>	<p>4. Was the JSR based on the following items?</p> <p><i>PLEASE NOTE that control questions were added to improve the questionnaire reliability. Depending on your answers, some of the items are auto populated.</i></p>	<p>4a: Education data of the year under review. If yes, please indicate in the comments column (H) the year of the data used</p> <p>4b: Total budget expenditures (national budget)</p> <p>4c: Sector trends (outcome-level indicators)</p> <p>4d: Performance of program/activities (output-level indicators)</p> <p>4e: Education expenditures at the budget level</p> <p>4f: Education expenditures at the program level (as defined in the ESP/TEP)</p> <p>4g: International aid commitments and actual disbursements to the education sector</p> <p>4h: Implementation problem areas and weaknesses</p> <p>4i: Implementation achievements and good practices</p> <p>4j: Previous JSR recommendations</p> <p>4k: Monitoring of the indicators selected for the GPE variable part</p> <p>4l: Specific thematic session(s) during the JSR. If yes, please indicate below which ones: an4l1 Equity an4l2 Learning an4l3 Efficiency an4l4 Aid modalities an4l5 Aid effectiveness agenda an4l6 SDG4 and FFA an4l7 Any other thematic session(s). Please list in the comments column (H).</p> <p>4m: Any other item(s) on which the JSR was based that was not listed above. Please list in the comments column (H)</p>	<p>2 - Exceeding Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to more than the bolded items (all bolded items and at least one other)</p> <p>1 - Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to all bolded items c, d, e, f, h & i</p> <p>0 - Not Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered “No” (code 0) to one or more of the bolded items c, d, e, f, h & i</p> <p>98 - Inconclusive: Respondent answered, “I do not know” (code 98) to one or more of the bolded items c, d, e, f, h & i, and no “No” (code 0) in any of these same items</p> <p>99 - Not Applicable: Item 4j is automatically coded as 99 and excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas, if respondent answered “1st JSR” in control question (no other item can be “Not Applicable”).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JSR Agenda • JSR Report/Aide Memoire • Annual Implementation Report <p><u>Additional sources include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ESP/TEP • Annual Action Plan • Results Framework
<p>5. Anchored into a policy cycle: Recommendations from the JSR effectively feed into addressing weaknesses in the</p>	<p>5. What form do the JSR recommendations take?</p> <p><i>PLEASE NOTE that control questions were added to increase the questionnaire reliability. Depending on</i></p>	<p>5a: They are limited in number (judged as manageable by the CL)</p> <p>5b: They are clearly linked to the components of the ESP/TEP Action Plan and results framework</p>	<p>2 - Exceeding Quality Standard: Respondent answered “Yes” (code 1) to ALL items</p> <p>1 - Meeting Quality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JSR Report/Aide Memoire • Annual Action Plan

<p>ESP/TEP implementation so as to ensure it is being used as a planning instrument to influence future policy planning, design and the budget cycle. Dissemination of JSR recommendations incentivizes mutual accountability.</p>	<p><i>your answers, some of the items are auto populated.</i></p>	<p>5c: They are in the form of remedial actions to address the weaknesses in the ESP/TEP implementation 5d: They designate responsible parties for implementation or action 5e: They include a timeline for implementation and/or for leading to planning documents revision 5f: They replicate previous year recommendations</p>	<p>Standard: Respondent answered "Yes" (code 1) to <u>all bolded items</u> a, c & d</p> <p>0 - Not Meeting Quality Standard: Respondent answered "No" (code 0) to <u>one or more of the bolded items</u> a, c & d</p> <p>98 - Inconclusive: Respondent answered, "I do not know" (code 98) to <u>one or more of the bolded items</u> a, c & d</p> <p>99 - Not Applicable: Item 5f is automatically coded as 99 and excluded (not taken into account) from all the above formulas, if respondent answered "1st JSR" in control question (no other item can be "Not Applicable").</p>	
--	---	--	---	--