Results Framework: Indicator Technical Detail

Context note: This document provides technical detail on the 34 indicators proposed as part of ECW’s results framework to memorialize the work and recommendations made throughout the results framework design process.

For each indicator, the type (impact, beneficiary outcome, systemic outcome, output / activity), coverage (multi-year window, first response window, acceleration facility, EiE Sector, etc.), data source, full indicator name, results statement, rationale, technical guidance (where applicable), and phased investment (where applicable) were noted. The rationale for why each indicator was selected is below, incorporating specific guidance and steers from the ECW Technical Working Group (TWG), Task Team 2 on ECW’s Operational Model and Results Framework, and other key stakeholders and experts. Where indicators were adopted from peers such as GPE, UNICEF, the SDG4 indicators, etc., accepted Technical Guidance was incorporated for the ECW Secretariat to reference and refine.
1. # children/youth reached w/ ECW assistance, by gender, education level (CORE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type:</strong></th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-year and first response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong></td>
<td>Breakthrough Fund grantee administrative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Full Indicator name:** | Indicator #1 (CORE): Total number of children and youth in school or equivalent non-school based settings, including pre-primary education, reached with ECW assistance  
- Disaggregated by gender, levels of education, formal / non-formal, disability, and refugees, IDPs, and other minorities according to context where possible |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results statement:</strong></td>
<td>Impact – Within the first 5 years, of ECW, more than ten million crisis-affected girls, boys, and youth, inclusive of marginalized groups, will have improved learning opportunities that contribute to improved outcomes, with all reached by 2030, in line with SDG4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Rationale:** | Serves as a simple measure that clearly communicates the overall scale of learners benefitting from ECW assistance and tracks progress towards the top-line impact target of over 10 million children and youth reached in the first five years of ECW.  
While not technically an impact indicator, received strong feedback from Task Team 2 that ECW should have one top-line indicator aggregated across grantees that clearly communicates its reach and is visible to HLSG.  
Children or youth can be counted towards this impact indicator if ECW assistance contributed to any of the five ECW beneficiary outcomes: equity, access, quality, protection, or continuity. For example, ECW assistance could provide access to children who were previously out-of-school, but it can also improve quality of education through improved teacher training.  
The ECW Results Technical Working Group (TWG) noted this indicator is generally routinely collected in national governments' data systems and can be expected to be available in other grantees' data systems (noting that some countries in conflict situations such as Syria are currently severely limited in their ability to provide any data on their education system.)  
Disaggregation by disability, refugee, IDP, or minority status can be collected through administrative data systems but is generally not. The key challenge with disaggregating by disability is the need to define disability in a way that... |
allows for data collection that is consistent and coherent with international definitions.

Given these challenges, it was noted that disaggregation, particularly by disability and refugee / IDP / minority status, may not be possible in all contexts today, but that ECW should encourage and support grantees to build the capabilities to disaggregate data over time. It was recommended that grantees be asked to note to what extent they've been able to disaggregate data in the past and if they are able, disaggregation should be mandatory. It was also specifically suggested that ECW ask grantees to disaggregate by level of education not by age, to be consistent with how schools typically report data. Going forward, it was recommended that ECW consider additional factors for disaggregation specific to country context, such as ethnic group, socioeconomic status, geographic region, linguistic group, etc.

As an aside on measuring equity, the TWG advised that an aggregate indicator for equity is "almost a contradiction it itself," in that individual groups get lost in the aggregate. Gender parity indexes also mean very different things in different contexts and often give a false impression that progress is being made when it is not (i.e. growing problem of boys' attendance at the secondary level in mining regions or conflict-affected regions may actually improve country-wide gender parity scores). Thus, a disaggregation approach (instead of an index approach) was recommended for all programmatic indicators assessing ECW impact and beneficiary outcomes, where relevant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical guidance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recommend adopting USAID's methodology for their analogous Education in Crisis and Conflict (EiCC) indicator "Number of learners in primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings reached with USG education assistance" (shared excel document – not available online):

"A learner is an individual who is enrolled in an education program for the purpose of acquiring academic basic education skills or knowledge. Learners who are enrolled in formal primary school or the non-formal equivalent of primary school can be counted towards this indicator. This includes, but is not limited to, learners enrolled in government schools, NGO-run schools, religious schools, accelerated or alternative learning programs, so long as the school or program is designed to provide an education equivalent to the accepted primary-school curriculum.

Learners enrolled in kindergarten can be included in this number only if kindergarten is accepted and funded by the government as an integrated component of primary education." |
Learners should be counted if they are enrolled in primary or primary equivalent education (as defined above), and they directly benefit from USG education assistance designed to support student acquisition of academic basic education skills and knowledge. Examples of USG education assistance that fall into this category can include, but are not limited to: pedagogical training for teachers; providing teaching and learning materials (TLM); improving teacher attendance; providing a safe learning environment; and supporting an early grade reading intervention.

Examples of USG-supported education assistance that does not support student acquisition of academic basic education skills and knowledge include, but are not limited to: EMIS or assessment data collection; and administrative training for non-educators.

When calculating this indicator, each learner should be counted only once in data for the year being reported. In other words, if a learner benefits from two overlapping programs and each meets the criteria outlined here, the learner should be counted only once.

This indicator should report all individual learners who were reached during the year being reported, even if some of these learners may also have been counted in previous years. In other words, if a student was counted towards this indicator in previous fiscal year, the student can be counted towards the indicator again in the current fiscal year."

Recommend the following adjustments to USAID guidance:
- Replace USG assistance with ECW assistance
- Expand to include pre-primary, primary, and secondary education for children and youth ages 3-18

| Phased investment: | Data quality / availability – Develop standards, where necessary, to improve grantees' ability to disaggregate indicator data by gender, disability, refugees, IDPs, and other minorities (according to context). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Country out-of-school rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Full Indicator name: | Indicator #2: Proportion of ECW-supported countries meeting country-specific targets for: Out-of-school rate for children & young people in crisis and conflict-affected countries supported by ECW that are (a) of primary |
school age; (b) of lower secondary school age; (c) of upper secondary school age
- Disaggregated by gender where possible

**Results statement:**
Impact – Within the first 5 years, of ECW, more than ten million crisis-affected girls, boys, and youth, inclusive of marginalized groups, will have improved learning opportunities that contribute to improved outcomes, with all reached by 2030, in line with SDG4

**Rationale:**
ECW can impact even those communities that it does not directly serve through its other functions, such as fueling political commitment and building capacity at a national and local level.

ECW's impact on out-of-school rate is assessed through contribution to country-level measures, whereas its outcome on out-of-school rate focuses more narrowly on only those communities that ECW supports.

The TWG noted that while UIS data is limited to formal education and does not disaggregate by sub-populations beyond gender and level of education (e.g., refugees or specific geographic areas), the denominator does take into account massive movements of people including IDP's (internally displaced people) and refugees. The group did note, however, that sometimes there is a slight delay in capturing these population movements.

It was also noted that another limitation of UIS data is that it may be unavailable or severely out-dated during a crisis. Since impact is a measure of longer-term effect, ECW will assess out-of-school rate at the country level as soon as data becomes available, recognizing that may not be until the country begins recovery.

**Technical guidance:**
UIS indicator "Out-of-school rate (primary education, lower secondary education, upper secondary education)" is calculated according to the guidance laid out in the [Metadata for SDG4's thematic indicators](#):

"**Definition:** Children and young people in the official age range for the given level of education who are not enrolled in primary, secondary or higher levels of education. Children and young people who are enrolled in pre-primary education are considered to be out of school.

**Purpose:** To identify the size of the population in the official age range for the given level of education who are not enrolled in school in order that they can be better targeted and appropriate policies can be put in place to ensure they have access to education. Calculation method: The number of students of the official age for the given level of education enrolled in primary, secondary or higher levels of education is subtracted from the total population of the same age."
\[ \text{OSR}_n = \frac{\text{SAP}_n - \sum_{i=1}^{8} \text{E}_{i,AGn}}{\text{SAP}_n} \]

where

\( \text{OSR}_n \) = out-of-school rate for children and young people of the official age for level \( n \) of education

\( \text{SAP}_n \) = population of the official age for level \( n \) of education

\( \text{E}_{i,AGn} \) = enrolment in ISCED level \( i \) of children and young people of the official age for level \( n \) of education

**Interpretation:** The higher the number of out-of-school children and adolescents, the greater the need to focus on improving better access to education. Some children have never been in school or may not eventually enroll as late entrants. Other children may have initially enrolled but dropped out before reaching the intended age of completion of the given level. When disaggregated by sex, location and other characteristics, this indicator can identify excluded population groups.

**Type of data source:** Administrative data, household surveys

**Disaggregation:**

By age or age-group and sex (administrative data); by age or age-group and sex, location, and socio-economic status (household surveys). Disability status is not currently available in most household surveys but could be considered for future assessments.

**Data required:** Enrolment by single year of age in each level of education, population estimates by single year of age and data on the structure (entrance age and duration) of each level of education.

**Data sources:** Administrative data from schools or household survey data on enrolment by single year of age; population censuses and surveys for population estimates by single year of age (if using administrative data on enrolment); administrative data from ministries of education on the structure of the education system.

**Limitations and comments:** Inconsistencies between enrolment and population data from different sources may result in inaccurate estimates of out-of-school children and adolescents. Data from household surveys conducted late in the school year where ages are recorded at the enumeration date may result in over-estimates.

**Phased investment:** Data quality / availability – improve availability of UIS-collected SDG4 indicators in crisis contexts
### Full Indicator name:
Indicator #3a: Proportion of ECW-supported countries meeting country-specific targets for: Percentage of children under five (5) years of age who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning, and psychosocial wellbeing

### Results statement:
Impact – Within the first 5 years of ECW, more than ten million crisis-affected girls, boys, and youth, inclusive of marginalized groups, will have improved learning opportunities that contribute to improved outcomes, with all reached by 2030, in line with SDG4

### Rationale:
ECW can impact even those communities that it does not directly serve through its other functions, e.g., political commitment and building capacity at a national level.

ECW’s impact on developmental outcomes is assessed through contribution to country-level measures, whereas its outcome focuses on only those children/youth that ECW directly supports.

As with indicator 2, the TWG noted that a limitation of UIS data is that it may be unavailable or severely out-dated during a crisis. Since impact is a measure of longer-term effect, ECW will assess developmental outcomes at the country level as soon as data becomes available, recognizing that may not be until the country begins recovery.

### Technical guidance:
UIS indicator "Proportion of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex" calculated according to Metadata for SDG4’s thematic indicators:

"Definition: The MICS ECDI presently defines “on track” as the percentage of children aged 36-59 months who developmentally on-track in at least three of the following four domains: literacy-numeracy, physical, socio-emotional and learning. Other measures use different definitions, with varying empirically and conceptually driven perspectives on how best to define “on track”. There is not yet a globally-accepted definition of “developmentally on track.” Defining and measuring developmentally on track should be a goal for the next phase of development of this indicator. At present, the MICS Early Childhood Development Index defines “on track” as a child is developmentally on track in literacy-numeracy if they can identify at least 10 letters of the alphabet, read 4 simple words and recognise and name all numbers from 1 to 10. A child is developmentally on-track physically if they..."
can pick up small objects easily and are generally well enough to play. A child is developmentally on-track in socio-emotional development if they are able to undertake simple activities independently, get along with other children and do not usually kick, bite or hit other children or adults. A child is developmentally on-track in learning if they participate in any type of organized learning including early childhood education, kindergarten or community care. However, this definition is not universally accepted, and other measures use alternative definitions of “on track.”

**Purpose:** The indicator is a broad measure of children’s development and their preparedness to begin school. Available data for global tracking are typically collected from individual-level data through direct assessment of children in many regional or national-level assessments, or reported by mothers/primary caregivers or teachers, which are then used to calculate an indicator that represents a composite measure across a range of agreed characteristics in the areas of health, learning and psychosocial well-being.

**Calculation method:** In the MICS ECDI, the indicator is calculated as the percentage of children aged 36-59 months demonstrating age-appropriate levels of development in the areas being measured, according to the items used in the MICS. One commonly-accepted definition of “on track” has not yet been developed using national and regionally-developed standards for children’s learning and development.

\[
PCDT_{3t4} = \frac{CDT_{3t4}}{P_{3t4}}
\]

where:

- \(PCDT_{3t4}\) = percentage of children aged 3-4 years (36-59 months) who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being
- \(CDT_{3t4}\) = children aged 3-4 years (36-59 months) who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being
- \(P_{3t4}\) = population aged 3-4 years (36-59 months)

**Interpretation:** A high value indicates a large number of young children are well-prepared for starting primary school in the areas of health, learning and psychosocial well-being.

**Type of data source:** Household surveys or direct assessment of children, either in homes or schools depending on the measure.

**Disaggregation:** By age, sex, location, income, family background and by participation in early childhood education programmes. Disability status is not currently available in most household surveys but could be considered for
future assessments. Options for integrating disability into developmental status have not yet been developed.

**Data required:** The number of children aged 36-59 months demonstrating age-appropriate levels of development in the areas being measured and the total number of children in the same age group.

**Data sources:** Measures to capture children’s early childhood experiences have been used in multiple countries in representative samples include the Early Childhood Development Index from the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), WCARO Prototype in West Africa, PRIDI in Latin America, the East Asia and Pacific Child Development Scales, the Early Development Index and the Early Human Capacity Index. Newly-developed scales with two to three representative samples include the Measuring Early Learning Quality and Outcomes Scale, and IDELA.

**Limitations and comments:** Further methodological developmental work will be needed to ensure that the proposed measure reflects a commonly-agreed upon definition of “on track” that is aligned with national standards, is relevant to children in all parts of the world and accurately reflects "developmentally on track" in all countries. This requires establishment of normative developmental patterns, which has not yet taken place in most countries.

**Phased investment:** Data quality / availability – improve availability of UIS-collected SDG4 indicators in crisis contexts

---

### 3b. Country primary/lower-secondary learning outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Multi-year, where relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>UIS (where available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #3b: Proportion of ECW-supported countries meeting country-specific targets for: Proportion of children and young people (a) in Grades 2 or 3; (b) at the end of primary education; and (c) at the end of lower secondary education who achieved at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics

**Results statement:** Impact – Within the first 5 years, of ECW, more than ten million crisis-affected girls, boys, and youth, inclusive of marginalized groups, will have improved learning opportunities that contribute to improved outcomes, with all reached by 2030, in line with SDG4
**Rationale:**

ECW can impact even those communities that it does not directly serve through its other functions, e.g., political commitment and building capacity at a national level.

ECW's impact on developmental outcomes is assessed through contribution to country-level measures, whereas its outcome focuses on only those children/youth that ECW directly supports.

As with indicator 2 and 3a, the TWG noted that a limitation of UIS data is that it may be unavailable or severely out-dated during a crisis. Since impact is a measure of longer-term effect, ECW will assess learning outcomes at the country level as soon as data becomes available, recognizing that may not be until the country begins recovery.

**Technical guidance:**

UIS indicator "Proportion of children and young people (a) in Grade 2 or 3; (b) at the end of primary education; and (c) at the end of lower secondary education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading and (ii) mathematics, by sex" calculated according to Metadata for SDG4's thematic indicators:

"**Definition:** Percentage of children and young people in Grade 2 or 3 of primary education, at the end of primary education and the end of lower secondary education achieving at least a minimum proficiency level in (a) reading and (b) mathematics. The minimum proficiency level will be measured relative to new common reading and mathematics scales currently in development. Minimum proficiency level is the benchmark of basic knowledge in a domain (mathematics or reading) measured through learning assessments. For example, the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) reading test has six proficiency levels, of which Level 2 is described as the minimum proficiency level. In Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), there are four proficiency levels: Low, Intermediate, High and Advanced. Students reaching the Intermediate benchmark are able to apply basic knowledge in a variety of situations, similar to the idea of minimum proficiency. Currently, there are no common standards validated by the international community or countries. The indicator shows data published by each of the agencies and organizations specialised in cross-national learning assessments.

**Purpose:** The indicator is a direct measure of the learning outcomes achieved in the two subject areas at the end of the relevant stages of education.

**Calculation method:** The indicator is calculated as the percentage of children and/or young people at the relevant stage of education achieving or exceeding a pre-defined proficiency level in a given subject.
Performance above the minimum level, $P_{\text{tn},s,\text{above minimum}} = p$ where $p$ is the percentage of students in a learning assessment at stage of education $n$, in subject $s$ in any year ($t-i$) where $0 \leq i \leq 5$, who has achieved the level of proficiency that is greater than a pre-defined minimum standard, $S_{\text{min}}$. The minimum standard is defined by the global education community taking into consideration regional differences.

**Interpretation:** The three measurement points will have their own established minimum standard. There is only one threshold that divides students into above and below minimum.

(a) Below minimum is the proportion or percentage of students who do not achieve a minimum standard as set up by countries according to the globally-defined minimum competencies.

(b) Above minimum is the proportion or percentage of students who have achieved the minimum standards. Due to heterogeneity of performance levels set by national and cross-national assessments, these performance levels will have to be mapped to the globally-defined minimum performance levels. Once the performance levels are mapped, the global education community will be able to identify for each country the proportion or percentage of children who achieved minimum standards.

**Type of data source:** Learning assessments

**Disaggregation:** By age or age-group of students, sex, location, socio-economic status, migrant status and ethnicity. Disability status is not currently available in most national and cross-national learning assessments but could be considered for future assessments.

**Data required:** Performance level data from national and cross-national assessments Data sources: Various cross-national learning assessments including: Programme d’analyse des systèmes éducatifs de la CONFEMEN (PASEC), Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), Southern and Eastern Africa Consortium for Monitoring Educational Quality (SACMEQ), Tercer Estudio Regional Comparativo y Explicativo (TERCE) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS).

(a) Short-term strategy: Use national large-scale representative assessment data from crossnational assessments even though the performance levels may not be directly comparable.

(b) Medium-term strategy: Use a global reporting scale based on either a new test or the statistical linking of national, regional and cross-national assessments.
**Limitations and comments:** While data from many national assessments are available now, every country sets its own standards so the performance levels might not be comparable. One option is to link existing regional assessments based on a common framework. Furthermore, assessments are typically administered within school systems, the current indicators cover only those in school and the proportion of in-school target populations might vary from country to country due to varied out-of-school children populations. Assessing competencies of children and young people who are out of school would require household-based surveys. Assessing children in households is under consideration but may be very costly and difficult to administer and unlikely to be available on the scale needed within the next 3-5 years. Finally, the calculation of this indicator requires specific information on the ages of children participating in assessments to create globally-comparable data. The ages of children reported by the head of the household might not be consistent and reliable so the calculation of the indicator may be even more challenging. Due to the complication in assessing out-of-school children and the main focus on improving education system, the UIS is taking a stepping stone approach. It will concentrate on assessing children in school in the medium term, where much data are available, then develop more coherent implementation plan to assess out-of-school children in the longer term."

**Phased investment:** Data quality / availability – improve availability of UIS-collected SDG4 indicators in crisis contexts

---

### 4. Equivalent children/youth supported for a year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type:</strong></th>
<th>Beneficiary outcomes – Access, Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong></td>
<td>ECW grantee administrative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #4: Number of equivalent children and youth supported by ECW for a year of education

**Results statement:**

**Beneficiary outcomes:**

Access – In ECW supported areas and populations, more girls, boys, young women, and young men, are enrolled in school or other context-appropriate learning environments and regularly attend programming (disaggregated by gender, disability, refugees, IDP’s, minority status according to context)

Equity – Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context)
### Rationale:
The TWG recommended this indicator to provide an estimate of the full-time equivalent children fully educated by ECW across very different types of programs (e.g., those that provide full funding vs. those that provide a small amount of teacher training.). It accounts for differences in total average cost to educate a child across contexts and uses the best available data / estimates from UIS, ECW programs that fully fund a child's education, or other sources.

Additionally, this indicator is required by DFID to report against their Manifesto commitment. While ECW could report this indicator separately to DFID, the TWG recommended that ECW include it in the results framework for others who might also find it useful (as GPE does).

### Technical guidance:
Recommend adopting DFID’s methodology for their Manifesto commitment of helping 11 million children gain a decent education measured through their indicator "Number of children supported to gain a decent education", calculated according to the [UK government’s technical guidance](#): "This provides an estimate of the number of children supported by DFID to gain a better quality education. This tracks the full time equivalent number of children DFID has supported in school for at least a year. It consists of children who DFID:

-Fully educates or fully funds through school
- Supports the majority of their education, such as if children are only in school due to DFID support.
-Provides partial support to improve the education of children already in school, in which case a proportion of the child is counted based on the estimated proportion of their education attributed to DFID.

The estimate covers children in pre-primary, primary, lower and upper secondary, and children in both formal and non-formal schools and children provided with vocational or skills education. Children are counted if supported for at least a year in a Government school (or roughly its equivalent in non-Government education).

Countries are also asked to report on measures taken, and results achieved, to improve the quality of education and learning outcomes of the children supported. This indicator enables DFID to understand and track the number of children supported in education to report on the Manifesto commitment. The use of full time equivalent numbers of children supported provides a measure which is consistent across different countries and programmes, and ensures one supported child is at least equivalent to roughly a year’s worth of education. A quality education, including the ability to read, write and count, gives a child the chance to fully participate in society, and secure meaningful work. A more educated population supports economic growth, stability and family health."
**General Principles:** The general principle is to count all children whose education is benefiting from DFID funding. The full time equivalent number should be used when DFID is only providing partial support. This is to ensure consistency between very different types of education programmes, with very different intensities of support. The full time equivalent number is a proportion of children benefiting from DFID support based on an estimate of DFID’s contribution to their education over a year. This could be based on funding shares, learning outcomes, quality indicators or other relevant data sources. The approach taken will vary by programme depending on available data and the focus and expected impact of DFID support. Estimates, proxies or partial shares can be used when we don’t easily have the relevant information. When DFID is clearly providing the majority of funding or learning experience all children can be counted. All children in education can be counted from pre-school to upper secondary – ie typically up to 18 years. Older adults can be counted if they are attending education programmes designed for children (eg over age adults in school). We can also include vocational and skills training designed for this age group. Children should be counted if we are supporting them for roughly the equivalent of at least one year enrolled in a government school (in terms of curriculum, attendance and focus on learning). This may be less than 9 months full time for non-government schools if the data collected is based on attendance, rather than enrolment, or if the curriculum is more condensed. Relevant proportions should be taken when we are only providing a partial education (eg 20% of a child if we only support a child for a fifth of a school year)."

**Note:** More detail on technical definitions and data calculations for the following three types of education funding are provided at the link above:

- Education funding provided through the education budget
- Education funding provided outside the education budget where DFID is clearly providing the majority of funding or learning experience
- Other education funding provided outside the education budget

Link also includes detail on data sources, reporting roles, worked examples, baseline, return format, data disaggregation, data availability, time period / lag, quality assurance measures, interpretation of results, data quality and data issues.

**Recommend the following adjustments to DFID guidance:**

- Replace DFID with ECW
- Limit to children and youth ages 3-18 in crisis-affected contexts, excluding older adults

| Phased investment: | N/A |
### 5. Average attendance rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type:</strong></th>
<th>Beneficiary outcomes - Access, Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong></td>
<td>ECW grantee administrative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Full Indicator name:
Indicator #5: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: Average attendance rate for ECW-supported children and youth in formal or non-formal equivalent
- Disaggregated by gender, levels of education, formal vs. non-formal equivalent, disability, and refugees, IDPs, and other minorities according to context, where possible

#### Results statement:
Beneficiary outcomes:
Access – In ECW supported areas and populations, more girls, boys, young women, and young men, are enrolled in school or other context-appropriate learning environments and regularly attend programming (disaggregated by gender, disability, refugees, IDP’s, minority status according to context)

Equity – Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context)

#### Rationale:
Crucial to measure ongoing attendance beyond initial enrollment, especially in crisis conflicts, but challenging to do so. ECW can prioritize this area to "push the envelope" in innovative data collection methods.

TWG specified that attendance rates should focus on formal or non-formal equivalent programs, as attendance rates will be markedly different for accelerated programs.

It was also noted that students' attendance could be collected through administrative data systems but is not generally collected in "normal" education systems today and likely even less so in conflict situations. Different approaches to measuring attendance were discussed, including measuring attendance over the year (requiring grantees to collect data every day and record it into the system) and spot-checks of attendance level at specific points in time. Another potential approach suggested is to request monthly attendance records and measure the number of children/youth regularly attending above some threshold (e.g., 75% of the days assessed). The group noted that each approach has different time and resource
tradeoffs and suggested an acceleration facility investment to identify "what works" best for EiE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical guidance:</th>
<th>To be developed through phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phased investment:</td>
<td>New indicator / data platform – ECW will invest in data collection methodology / tools through the acceleration facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. ECW community out-of-school rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Beneficiary outcomes - Access, Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>Disaggregation of existing household survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Full Indicator name:   | Indicator #6: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: Out-of-school rate for children and youth in ECW-supported communities  
|                        | • Disaggregated by gender, levels of education, and disability, and refugees, IDPS, and other minorities according to context, where possible |
| Results statement:     | Beneficiary outcomes:  
|                        | Access – In ECW supported areas and populations, more girls, boys, young women, and young men, are enrolled in school or other context-appropriate learning environments and regularly attend programming (disaggregated by gender, disability, refugees, IDP’s, minority status according to context)  
|                        | Equity – Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context) |
| Rationale:            | Recommended that ECW track out-of-school rate at the ECW-supported community level in addition to at the country-level as available through UIS for a few reasons. As mentioned above, UIS data is often unavailable or outdated in crisis contexts. Additionally, ECW will often support a small centralized region so UIS country-level data will not be sufficient.  
|                        | To measure this indicator, the TWG felt that ECW-supported household surveys may be too costly and problematic in some crisis contexts with large migratory populations or safety concerns. Instead, the group recommended that where existing household surveys are in place, ECW partner with providers to narrow in on the areas ECW is supporting in the country. It was |
also specified that this indicator should be measured through sampling, not full-population data.

Disaggregating by gender, age groups, disability, and refugee / IDP / minority status helps monitor whether the most vulnerable children / youth are gaining access to education.

As mentioned above, the decision was made to track equity through disaggregation vs. a parity index to avoid false impression that progress is made when it is not (e.g., problems of boys' attendance in conflict could improve gender parity index).

**Technical guidance:** Recommend same guidance as [ECW Indicator #2 from Metadata for SDG4's thematic indicators (UIS)]

**Phased investment:** Data quality / availability – ECW will partner with existing household survey providers in crisis and conflict affected countries to increase data availability of OOS rates in ECW-supported communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7. Average instructional time</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Full Indicator name:** | Indicator #7: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: Average hours of instructional time in classroom per week on core subjects (reading and math), per INEE minimum standards for instruction/learning processes, across ECW supported programs |
| **Results statement:** | Beneficiary outcomes: Quality – ECW-supported girls, boys, young women, and young men achieve improved learning outcomes appropriate to their education level, including for reading, math, social and emotional learning, and life skills (disaggregated by gender, disability, refugees, IDP’s, minority status according to context)

Equity – Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context) |

| **Rationale:** | Goes beyond measures of teacher attendance to ensure that children and youth in ECW supported programs are receiving sufficient and quality instructional time by qualified staff. |
Strong feedback from TWG that instructional time in classroom focusing on core subjects such as math and reading should be used as a reasonable proxy for quality, especially in first response setting when infeasible to measure learning outcomes.

The group felt strongly that instructional time was superior to measuring teacher attendance or absenteeism for a few reasons. It was discussed that teachers may be in the classroom but not teaching, that measures such as pupil-teacher ratio have not been shown to indicate quality, and teacher absenteeism is generally poorly measured. However, the TWG cautioned that measuring instructional time may not be possible in all grantee contexts, and in those cases, teacher absenteeism should be used instead if possible. Finally, the TWG cautioned against encompassing too many considerations (e.g., quality, trained teachers) into a single indicator.

It was noted that this indicator could be collected in several ways: systematic collection from teachers every day and data entry into a monitoring system, spot checks in a sample of schools, or training of grantees to self-monitor using simple tools provided by ECW.

**Technical guidance:** Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed

Some guidance to consider Stalling’s Classroom Snapshot Observation System from the World Bank, which assesses instructional time spent on task vs. off task.

**Phased investment:** N/A

### 8a. ECW-supported pre-primary learning outcomes

**Type:** Beneficiary outcomes - Quality, Equity

**Coverage:** Multi-year programs addressing ECD

**Data source:** Learning assessments for ECW population

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #8a: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: Proportion of ECW-supported children under five (5) years of age who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning, and psychosocial well-being

- Disaggregated by gender and disability, and refugees, IDPS, and other minorities according to context, where possible

**Results statement:** Beneficiary outcomes: Quality – ECW-supported girls, boys, young women, and young men achieve improved learning outcomes appropriate to their education level, including
for reading, math, social and emotional learning, and life skills (disaggregated by gender, disability, refugees, IDP’s, minority status according to context)

Equity – Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context)

| Rationale: | Similarly to indicator 6, it was recommended that ECW track pre-primary developmental outcomes at the ECW-supported community level in addition to at the country-level as available through UIS due to data availability and focus on the appropriate geographic population.

Psychosocial and health outcomes were highlighted as key enablers of learning in this young population.

Across all learning outcome measures, the TWG noted that ECW should create outcomes that capture the developmental milestones that children and youth need to reach and not just the percentage increase or decrease. When organizations only focus on percent increase and percent decrease, they fail to see that in some contexts of very low baseline performance, children may exhibit very large percent learning gains in literacy and still not know how to read. Additionally, with the exception of some standards for fluency, the group felt that there this is an area where the fund can make a contribution.

The TWG also highlighted that existing learning assessments and agreed upon thresholds being used locally should be leveraged and that it is crucial for assessments to be context-specific. It was also specified that this indicator would be measured through sampling, not through full ECW-supported population data. |

| Technical guidance: | Recommend same guidance as Indicator #3a from Metadata for SDG4’s thematic indicator (UIS) |
| Phased investment: | Data quality / availability – ECW to work with grantees in proposal phase to outline M&E plan including existing pre-primary assessments and thresholds to leverage |
**8b. ECW-supported primary/ lower-secondary math and reading outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type:</strong></th>
<th>Beneficiary outcomes - Quality, Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong></td>
<td>Learning assessments for ECW population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #8b: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: Proportion of children and young people supported by ECW (a) in Grades 2 or 3; and (b) at the end of lower secondary education and (c) at the end of secondary education who achieve at least a minimum proficiency level in (i) reading, (ii) math, and (iii) social and emotional learning (SEL)

- Disaggregated by gender and disability, and refugees, IDPS, and other minorities according to context, where possible

**Results statement:** Beneficiary outcomes:

- Quality – ECW-supported girls, boys, young women, and young men achieve improved learning outcomes appropriate to their education level, including for reading, math, social and emotional learning, and life skills (disaggregated by gender, disability, refugees, IDP’s, minority status according to context)

- Equity – Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context)

**Rationale:** Similarly to indicator 6 and 8a, it was recommended that ECW track primary and lower-secondary learning outcomes at the ECW-supported community level in addition to at the country-level as available through UIS due to data availability and focus on the appropriate geographic population.

As with indicator 8a, ECW will assess proportion of children/youth meeting defined learning thresholds vs. increasing learning outcomes, leverage context-specific assessments and thresholds, and measure through sampling vs. full ECW-supported population data.

At a minimum ECW grantees will assess learning outcomes for reading, math, and social and emotional learning. TWG noted that to make progress on SDG4, which calls for global citizenship skills and the promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, ECW needs to recognize the importance of Socio-Emotional Skills (SEL) as a learning outcome. The group noted that one of the reasons why SEL often gets left out is because there aren’t good performance-based measures to capture these outcomes. ECW should set
the agenda by promoting the development of valid and reliable performance-based measures of SEL skills.

Initially, this indicator specified learning outcome measurements in grades 2 or 3, at the end of primary school, and at the end of lower-secondary school, for consistency with the SDG4 indicator (ECW indicator 3b). The TWG advised that ECW should focus on a smaller number of levels (e.g., grades 3 and 8) and simpler assessments (e.g., reading with comprehension / basic math rather than grade appropriate competencies) to reduce grantee burden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Technical guidance:</strong></th>
<th>Recommend same guidance as <a href="https://uis.unesco.org">Indicator #3b from Metadata for SDG4’s thematic indicator (UIS)</a> for reading and math learning outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phased investment:</strong></td>
<td>Data quality / availability – ECW to work with grantees in proposal phase to outline M&amp;E plan including existing learning assessments and thresholds to leverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New indicator / data platform – Develop the standards for social and emotional learning outcome assessments, through partners or acceleration facility investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**8c. ECW-supported youth/upper-secondary skill attainment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type:</strong></th>
<th>Beneficiary outcomes - Quality, Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong></td>
<td>Learning assessments for ECW population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #8c: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: Proportion of ECW-supported youth in upper-secondary education who meet minimum standards for skill attainment relevant to local context and aligned with the SDGs (e.g., employability, life skills)

- Disaggregated by gender and disability, and refugees, IDPS, and other minorities according to context, where possible

**Results statement:** Beneficiary outcomes:

Quality – ECW-supported girls, boys, young women, and young men achieve improved learning outcomes appropriate to their education level, including for reading, math, social and emotional learning, and life skills (disaggregated by gender, disability, refugees, IDP’s, minority status according to context)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Equity</strong> – Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> Similarly to indicator 6, 8a, and 8b, it was recommended that ECW track youth skill achievement at the ECW-supported community level in addition to at the country-level as available through UIS due to data availability and focus on the appropriate population. As with 8a and 8b, ECW will assess proportion of children/youth meeting defined learning thresholds vs. increasing learning outcomes, leverage context-specific assessments and thresholds, and measure through sampling vs. full ECW-supported population data. ECW will assess proportion of youth meeting defined thresholds for skill achievement in line with grantee’s program proposal and purpose. The TWG noted that attainment is usually associated with participation at a given educational level, whereas ‘achievement’ designates true learning. It was also noted that the SDG4 indicator on youth skill attainment focused on ICT skills (Information Communication Technology) is not always the most appropriate for crisis contexts. Instead, it was recommended that ECW should focus more broadly on skills that are crucial for crisis-affected young people to gain employment and become global citizens. These skills may include adult literacy, digital literacy, life skills, social &amp; emotional learning, and employability skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical guidance:</strong> To be developed through phased investment The TWG noted that skills attainment is currently measured by WB STEPs survey and PISA for development (although both are quite complex). OECD is also planning to develop a basic adult literacy survey for developing countries, which ECW could work with. SDG indicators include measures of ICT skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phased investment:</strong> New indicator / data platform – ECW can support development of standards through acceleration facility. In short-term, ECW will work with grantees in proposal phase to outline M&amp;E plan for young adult programming including skills assessments and minimum thresholds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9. Schools meeting safe learning standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Beneficiary outcomes - Protection, Equity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>ECW grantee self-assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Full Indicator name:
Indicator #9: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: % of ECW-supported schools that meet safe learning environment standards, including disaster risk reduction and gender-specific issues

#### Results statement:

**Beneficiary outcomes:**
- Protection – ECW-supported girls and boys receive safe, conflict- and disaster-sensitive education in line with existing and adopted standards in safe, gender-sensitive learning environments
- Equity – Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context)

#### Rationale:
In crisis zones, schools offer protection for children and youth. However, they are often targeted by combatants in conflict. It was recommended that ECW assess its grantees' schools and learning environments against a set of safe learning environment standards.

ECW can leverage existing safe learning environment standards used by Save the Children, UNHCR, and / or other partners. It was specified that ECW standards must include considerations around disaster risk reduction and gender-specific issues around sanitation, separate toilets, sanitary products, and sexual and gender based violence.

Initially, a menu of protection indicators were proposed, but the TWG recommended de-prioritizing to instead ensure crisp standards for this indicator.

In discussions around this indicator, it was noted that administrative data can only include incidents of sexual and gender based violence at or around schools that are actually reported. In crisis-contexts, higher incidence could either reflect higher violence or more trust in school authorities, the latter actually being positive. Hence, to measure actual violence, other modalities of measurement would be required. An alternative, simpler indicator would be to measure whether there is a mechanism in place to report incidence of sexual and gender based violence. This, then could be measured through administrative data, though is not routinely collected right now. It was also
noted that the SDG4 indicator measuring incidence of students experiencing bullying, corporal punishment, harassment, violence, sexual discrimination and abuse is currently measured through a World Health Organization (WHO) survey, not through school administrative data. Incidence of attacks on students, personnel and institutions can be reported through administrative data, but this measure is not routinely collected in existing data systems.

Again, the TWG felt it important to specify that this indicator would be measured through sampling, not full-population data.

---

**Technical guidance:**

Recommend leveraging [Quality Learning Environment Standards used by Save the Children](https://www.savethechildren.org) to assess their global indicator "% of learning sites supported showing progress on the Guiding Principles":

- **GP 1: Emotional and Psychological Protection**
  - 1.1 Child Safeguarding Policy/Code of conduct for learners and teachers in ensuring wellbeing is in place
  - 1.2 School has mechanism in place for receiving and responding to complaints
  - 1.3 Learning environments are free of discrimination, violence, intimidation, bullying and harassment
  - 1.4 The teacher interacts with all learners in a positive and respectful manner regardless of their background
  - 1.5 Teachers are trained in psychosocial support to detect cases of abuse or trauma among their students and provide support

- **GP 2: Physical Protection**
  - 2.1 An area or space for learning exists that is safe for all learners
  - 2.2 Safe drinking water is available for learners and staff
  - 2.3 Adequate sanitation facilities are available for all learners
  - 2.4 The play area is safe for all learners
  - 2.5 Learning environments are accessible to the populations they serve in terms of hours
  - 2.6 Learners participate in health-promotion programs
  - 2.7 A School Disaster Management Plan, addressing disasters with the strongest likelihood, is in place

- **GP 3: Active learning process, improved learning outcomes**
  - 3.1 Teachers are present for their classes
  - 3.2 Teachers have specialized training and national qualifications where they exist
  - 3.3 Teachers are provided continuous support to improve their practice in key areas specific to their role
- 3.4 Learning is supported through the use of relevant visual aids and other teaching materials
- 3.5 Teachers develop, follow and adapt lesson plans to the needs and abilities of learners in their classes
- 3.6 Teachers use mother tongue of the majority of learners to further explain key concepts and support learning
- 3.7 Teachers ask individual questions and interact with the learners
- 3.8 Teachers use some form of informal or formal learning assessment
- 3.9 Teachers are trained on child rights and child protection
- 3.10 Learners’ participation is ensured during development and implementation of teaching and learning activities
- 3.11 Learners participate actively in decision making activities in their schools
- 3.12 The learning environment encourages expression of child rights and learners are knowledgeable about their rights

- GP 4: Close collaboration between school & parents / community
  - SMC/PTA includes representatives from a cross-section of the community
  - Teachers and parents collaborate on key issues affecting the children’s learning process
  - 4.3 Parents and communities are trained in how they can support the children’s learning process

**Detailed sample scoring rubric on scale from Not Applicable (N/A), 1 = Not at all achieved, 2 = Partially achieved, 3 = Achieved, 4 = Exceeded Project/Program objectives or expectations**

Additional guidance provided by Save the Children noting latest thinking around QLE indicator:

"The Ppt. [link above] is a somewhat older document, so the info in there is not up to date. Also, the indicator as mentioned in the presentation is not what we use for EiE programming. In the ECHO/NMFA proposal, we are rather looking for: % of learning sites supported that show progress on the Guiding Principles. You could of course define in here what % of progress you would be expecting for a given context. This indicator gives a bit more flexibility in terms of achievements, as especially in emergencies it will be extremely difficult to ‘achieve’ Guiding Principles, let alone to achieve all 4.

We currently sometimes set separate indicators for Guiding Principles, for example in programmes where we are mainly focusing on one pillar of the QLE. E.g. when we are focusing on physical improvements of the school, we
in particular look at Pillar 2 of the QLE framework (Physical Safety), or when we are focusing in the project around wellbeing and protection, we would in particular look at scores on Pillar 1 (Emotional & Psychosocial Protection).

However, no new specific guidance is available for now, as we are currently in the process of updating/developing this. It will come together with the QLE revision (at Global Theme level on conceptual framework level), and with the QLE for EiE (SCN-led, including a programme guidance and data management package, i.e. school- and project toolkit).

For the revised framework the pillars remain largely the same, however the components within each pillar have been reduced. For QLE for EiE specifically we are focusing on making the components measurable on school level, so under each component there are further specifications on what we are looking for in terms of contributors to a quality learning environment. The framework is nearly finalized, however we are still discussing how to align with the QLE revision, as there are some differences of perspective there in how to move it forward."

It is recommended that the ECW M&E team reconnect with the Save the Children M&E team to obtain the latest framework once finalized.

| Phased investment: | N/A |

### 10. Survival rate

| Type: | Beneficiary outcomes - Continuity, Equity |
| Coverage: | Multi-year |
| Data source: | ECW grantee administrative data |

| Full Indicator name: | Indicator #10: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: Survival rate (% of pupils in first grade of education level expected to reach successive grades) for ECW-supported children & youth in (i) primary school and (ii) lower-secondary school
- Disaggregated by gender and disability, and refugees, IDPs, and other minorities according to context, where possible |
| Results statement: | Beneficiary outcomes: Continuity – ECW-supported girls and boys have greater continuity in their education, resulting in higher transition and completion rates through the ECW grant period and beyond (disaggregated by gender, disability, refugees, IDP’s, minority status according to context) |
| **Equity** | Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context) |
| **Rationale:** | One of the core purposes of ECW is to bridge the humanitarian and development divide and improve the predictability and sustainability of education funding in crisis. ECW will seek to support programs that have a long-term plan for sustainability.  
  
Given the length of protracted crises contexts ECW will operate in, ECW will measure survival rate to assess proportion of students progressing from one grade to the next.  
  
TWG suggested assessing survival rate in place of children transitioning from grades 3 to 4 or % of children over-age for grade. Specifically, there was guidance received to look at critical transition points, particularly between grades 1 and 2, 4 and 5, and 6 and 7.  
  
The TWG noted that the computation of survival rates generally does not require individual student tracking but instead can be done if numbers of repeaters and dropouts by grade are known. In many systems, dropouts can be computed based on enrollment and repeaters in successive years. In the ECW context, grantees may need extra effort to distinguish dropouts from transfers, but should normally not need individual tracking of students. It was also noted that it may not be feasible to define "survival" in accelerated or non-formal programs where grade levels are not consistent. |
| **Technical guidance:** | Recommend leveraging survival rate Metadata from UIS Millennium Development Goals Indicators:  
  
"**Definition:** The proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary education, known as the Survival Rate to last grade of primary, is the percentage of a cohort of pupils enrolled in grade 1 of the primary level of education in a given school year who are expected to reach the last grade of primary school, regardless of repetition.  
  
Primary education is defined by International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED97) as programs normally designed on a unit or project basis to give pupils a sound basic education in reading, writing and mathematics along with an elementary understanding of other subjects such as history, geography, natural science, social science, art and music.  
  
The indicator is typically estimated from data on enrolment and repetition by grade for two consecutive years, in a procedure called the reconstructed
cohort method. This method makes three assumptions: drop-outs never return to school; the promotion, repetition and drop-out rates observed in the last two years remain constant over the entire period in which the cohort is enrolled in school; and the same rates apply to all pupils enrolled in a given grade, regardless of whether they previously repeated a grade.

This method requires data on the number of enrolments and repeaters in each grade of primary education in two consecutive school years.

\[
SR_{g,i}^k = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{m} P_{g,i}^t}{E_g^k} \times 100
\]

Where:
\[P_{g,i}^t = E_{g,i}^{t+1} - R_{g,i}^{t+1}\]
\[i = \text{grade (1, 2, 3, ..., } \mu)\]
\[t = \text{year (1, 2, 3, ..., } \mu)\]
\[g = \text{pupil cohort.}\]

\[SR_{g,i}^k = \text{Survival Rate of pupil-cohort } g \text{ at grade } i \text{ for a reference year } k\]

\[P_g^k = \text{Total number of pupils belonging to a cohort } g \text{ at a reference year } k\]

\[P_{g,i}^t = \text{Promotes from } g^k \text{ who would join successive grades } i \text{ throughout successive years } t.\]

\[R_i^t = \text{Number of pupils repeating grade } i \text{ in school year } t.\]

The calculation is made by dividing the total number of pupils belonging to a school cohort who reach each successive grade of the specified level of education by the number of pupils in the school cohort (in this case the students originally enrolled in grade 1 of primary education) and multiplying the result by 100.

Comments and limitations: The indicator measures an education system’s success in retaining students from one grade to the next as well as its internal efficiency. It illustrates the situation regarding retention of pupils from grade to grade in schools, and conversely the magnitude of dropout by grade. Survival Rates approaching 100% indicate a high level of retention and low incidence of dropout. It is important to note that it does not imply that all children of school age complete primary education. The Survival Rate is a percentage of a cohort of pupils (i.e. children who have already entered school) and not a percentage of children of school age.

Various factors account for poor performance on this indicator, including low quality of schooling, high levels of grade repetition and the direct and indirect costs of schooling. Students’ progress to higher grades may also be limited by the availability of teachers, classrooms and/or educational materials.
Since the calculation of this indicator is based on pupil-flow rates, the reliability of the Survival Rate depends on the consistency of data on enrolment and repeaters in terms of coverage over time and across grades.

Given that this indicator is usually estimated using cohort analysis models that are based on a number of assumptions, care should be taken in using the results in comparisons. The method of computation has limitations in measuring the true degree to which school entrants survive through primary education because flows caused by re-entrants, grade skipping, migration or transfers during the school year are not adequately captured.

To complete the picture of primary completion, the indicator should be complemented by the intake rate to grade 1, because together these two indicators give a much better sense of the proportion of children in the population who complete primary education.

Sources of discrepancies between global and national figures: Country figures may differ from the international ones because of differences between the national education system and ISCED97; or differences in coverage (i.e. the extent to which different types of education – e.g. private or special education – or different types of programmes e.g. adult education or early childhood care and education - are included in one rather than the other).

Process of obtaining data: The UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) produces time series on school enrolment and repeaters based on data reported by education ministries or national statistical offices. These data are gathered through questionnaires sent annually to countries which are typically completed by ministries of education and/or national statistical offices. Countries are asked to report data according to the levels of education defined in ISCED97 to ensure international comparability of resulting indicators.

The data received by UIS are validated using electronic error detection systems that check for arithmetic errors & inconsistencies and trend analysis for implausible results. Queries are taken up with the country representatives reporting the data in order that corrections can be made (of errors) or explanations given (of implausible but correct results).

In addition, countries also have an opportunity to see and comment on the main indicators the UIS produces in an annual “country review” of indicators.

The UIS also, if necessary, adjusts nationally reported data in order to take account either of under-reporting (i.e. data gaps) or over-reporting (i.e. inclusion of education programs not covered by its surveys) before
calculating indicators. In such cases, the results – if published – will normally be designated as UIS estimates (denoted by ** in UIS publications).

Treatment of missing values: For the purposes of calculating the primary Net Enrollment Rate, the UIS estimates certain key items of data that may be missing or incomplete. The UIS may need to make one or more of the following:

- In all cases, in the first instance, estimates are based on evidence from the country itself (e.g. information from the data provider on the size of the missing component, via correspondence, publications or data on the ministry’s or National Statistical Office’s (NSO’s) Webpage, or via surveys conducted by other organisations). These figures may be published: as observed data (if the missing items are found in national source or the country submits them); or as national estimates (if the country is persuaded produce estimates and submit them in place of missing data); and

- Where no evidence is available for the reporting year from the country, estimates may be based on data already reported by the country in a previous year or on another data item which is available (e.g. total enrolments and repeaters in primary education) and clearly linked to the missing item. These figures are published as UIS estimates.

Over-reporting is corrected first, then under-reporting before estimating more detailed breakdowns of data such as the distributions of enrolments or repeaters by grade. Over- and under-reporting are typically adjusted by adding or subtracting a given percentage of enrolments thus assuming the same grade and sex distribution as for the reported enrolments.

Data availability: Survival rates produced by the UIS are available on an annual basis. Data are published 27 months after the end of the school reference year for countries with calendar school year and 33 months for countries with split school year, as the indicator is referenced to the earlier of the two years on which the reconstructed cohort method is based. A few countries, mainly from the second group, report more up-to-date data to the Institute and these are published more quickly (21 months after the end of the school year).

Regional and Global estimates: No regional and global averages are calculated for this indicator."

Recommend the following notes in addition to UIS guidance:

- ECW grantees would also assess the Survival Rate to the last grade of lower secondary school.
### Full Indicator name:
Indicator #11: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: Proportion of children who complete: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education
- Disaggregated by gender and disability, and refugees, IDPS, and other minorities according to context, where possible

### Results statement:
Beneficiary outcomes:
Continuity – ECW-supported girls and boys have greater continuity in their education, resulting in higher transition and completion rates through the ECW grant period and beyond (disaggregated by gender, disability, refugees, IDP’s, minority status according to context)

Equity – Marginalized groups supported by ECW have access to safe, high-quality learning environments that are inclusive and meet the unique needs of marginalized groups. The groups ECW will focus on are: girls and young women, disabled children and youth, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (according to context)

### Rationale:
A key goal of ECW will be to keep children on track and going to school in crisis, which often requires or is best done through informal or accelerated programming. As ECW support winds down, it will be important that children are transitioned to formal schools, where possible, and achieve completion.

The TWG considered an alternative indicator to assess proportion of ECW-supported children and youth transitioning from non-formal to formal or national examinations but ultimately agreed that that indicator could be problematic. It was recommended instead to use completion rates, as others argued that completion of national examinations does not necessarily indicate continuity.

### Technical guidance:
UIS indicator "Completion rate (primary education, lower secondary education, upper secondary education)" calculated according to [Metadata for SDG4's thematic indicators](#):
"Definition: Percentage of a cohort of children or young people aged 3-5 years above the intended age for the last grade of each level of education who have completed that grade. The intended age for the last grade of each level of education is the age at which pupils would enter the grade if they had started school at the official primary entrance age, had studied fulltime and had progressed without repeating or skipping a grade.

Purpose: The completion rate indicates how many persons in a given age group have completed primary education, lower secondary education or upper secondary education. It indicates how many children and adolescents enter school on time and progress through the education system without excessive delays.

Calculation method: The number of persons in the relevant age group who have completed the last grade of the given level of education is expressed as a percentage of the total population (in the survey sample) of the same age group. \( \text{CR}_n = \frac{\text{EAP}_n, AG(a+3\text{t}5)}{\text{PAG}(a+3\text{t}5)} \) where: \( \text{CR}_n = \text{completion rate for level } n \) of education \( \text{EAP}_n, AG(a+3\text{t}5) \) = population aged 3 to 5 years above the official entrance age \( a \) into the last grade of level \( n \) of education who completed level \( n \) \( \text{PAG}(a+3\text{t}5) \) = population aged 3 to 5 years above the official entrance \( a \) into the last grade of level \( n \) of education

Interpretation: A completion rate at or near 100% indicates that most or all children and adolescents have completed a level of education by the time they are 3 to 5 years older than the official age of entry into the last grade of the given level of education. A low completion rate indicates low or delayed entry into a given level of education, high dropout, high repetition, late completion, or a combination of these factors. To identify the causes of low completion rates, it is necessary to examine other indicators, for example the out-of-school rate, the gross intake ratio to the last grade, and the percentage of over-age children. When disaggregated by sex, location and other characteristics, this indicator can identify excluded population groups.

Type of data source: Population censuses, household surveys

Disaggregation: By age or age-group of students, sex, location, socio-economic status, level of education, and others as available in survey or census data. Disability status is not currently available in most household surveys but could be considered for future assessments. The options for disaggregation may be limited by the sample size in a survey.

Data required: Population in the relevant age group by the highest level of education completed; data on the structure (entrance age and duration) of each level of education.
**Data sources:** Population censuses and household surveys which collect data on the highest level of education completed by children and young people in a household, through self- or household declarations. In the former case, each household member above a certain age reports his or her own level of educational attainment. In the latter case, one person, usually the head of the household or another reference person, indicates the highest grade and/or level of education completed of each member of the household. Administrative data from ministries of education on the structure of the education system are also needed. Labour force surveys can serve as a source of data if they collect information for the age groups of concern. International sample surveys, such as Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS, [http://dhsprogram.com](http://dhsprogram.com)) or Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS, [http://mics.unicef.org](http://mics.unicef.org)), are another source. These surveys are designed to meet commonly agreed upon international data needs while also providing data for national policy purposes. These surveys are implemented on a regular basis in selected countries, on average every 3 to 5 years. They aim to assure cross-national comparability, although they often integrate national modules to suit specific country data needs. Modules from international surveys are sometimes added to other ongoing national sample surveys. Population censuses are another important source of attainment data but they are carried out less frequently than household surveys, often only once per decade. Data on attainment collected with surveys or censuses are usually mapped to ISCED levels post-enumeration.

**Limitations and comments:** National data on educational attainment are often collected and reported in reference to national systems of education. The mapping from a national classification to ISCED, needed for calculation of the completion rate, is not always straightforward and can cause discrepancies between measures of attainment in national and international data. Data collection and mapping to ISCED are more difficult for upper secondary education than lower levels of education because of the variety of providers and programs at the upper secondary level.

**Phased investment:** Data quality / availability – ECW to support additional follow up with children who transition schools or programs in ECW-supported crisis contexts
## 12. Presence of inclusive policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Systemic Outcome – Political Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>UNICEF, ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Full Indicator name:

Indicator #12: Proportion of ECW–supported countries meeting country-specific targets for:

- Girls' secondary education, in terms of enrollment, retention, and completion is recognized, targeted, being a budgeted education priority
- Policies on inclusive education covering children with disabilities
- Education sector policy/plan specifying prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools
- Policies on inclusive education covering refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs)

### Results statement:

Systemic outcome: ECW-supported beneficiary governments take political action to provide continuous, quality, and safe education to the most marginalized children and youth in crisis, including girls, young women, disabled persons, refugees, IDPs, and other minorities (according to context).

### Rationale:

Political commitment is a key driver of equity in education in countries affected by conflict and crisis. One of ECW's core five functions is influencing government policy to not just enhance continuous learning but also to ensure that girls, children and youth with disabilities, and other marginalized groups, such as displaced persons, receive equitable learning opportunities.

Most countries that ECW supports will be fragile or conflict affected; in most situations, ECW should seek to influence government policy on equitable education but recognize this indicator may not apply in all contexts.

The first three types of policies (girls' secondary education, inclusive education for children with disabilities, and prevention of gender-based violence) come from UNICEF's Strategic Plan Results Framework. The fourth type of policy was suggested by the TWG to ensure ECW advocates for the unique needs of refugee and IDP children. It was noted that the mandate for providing education to these children and youth often falls outside that of beneficiary governments' Ministries of Education.

### Technical guidance:

ECW indicators 12a, 12b, 12c are pulled from UNICEF's Strategic Plan Results Framework on Education. Each indicator is calculated through a number of sub-scores outlined in the UNICEF RAM Standard Indicators Education Guidance Notes (shared document – not available online):
ECW indicator 12a leverages UNICEF’s SP indicator "P5.e.5 Countries in which girls’ secondary education, in terms of enrolment, retention, and completion, is a recognized, targeted and budgeted education priority". UNICEF assesses this measure across 3 sub-scores: demand, resources, and supportive environment.

"e5a. Existence of strategies to create educational demand for girls’ secondary education

SP programme area – activity focus code: Equity– Demand

This indicator is the same as SMQ 30 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.5 (Dimension: Creating demand). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context-specific, targeted, and effective strategies based on formative research and evidence to address socio-cultural and financial barriers to promote girls’ participation and retention in secondary education are designed, implemented and monitored with a focus on: Strategic communication and community mobilization to address behavior change and discriminatory gendered social norms; &amp; social protection measures, including cash transfers, and availability of scholarships and stipends to incentivize school participation and retention of girls.</td>
<td>Context-specific, targeted, and effective strategies based on formative research and evidence to address one of the barriers - either socio-cultural or financial barriers - to promote girls’ participation and retention in secondary education are designed, implemented and monitored.</td>
<td>Generic strategies to address socio-cultural and/or financial barriers to promote girls’ participation and retention in secondary education exist, however their implementation is patchy and monitoring remains weak.</td>
<td>No formative research and identified strategies or plans exist to address socio-cultural and financial constraints to promote girls’ participation and retention in secondary education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"e5b. Existence of a supportive learning environment for girls’ secondary education

SP programme area – activity focus code: Equity– Enabling environment

This indicator is the same as SMQ 31 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.5 (Dimension: Supportive learning environment). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The national education policy/sector plan includes comprehensive support to gender-responsive learning environments with regard to improved: availability of teachers, including a growing pool of female</td>
<td>The national education policy/sector plan includes some support to gender-responsive learning environments with regard to improved: availability of teachers, including a growing pool of female</td>
<td>The national education policy/sector plan includes some support to gender-responsive learning environments with regard to improved: availability of teachers, including a growing pool of female</td>
<td>The national education policy/sector plan does not include any support to gender-responsive learning environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers, and quality of teaching; updated and gender-responsive curricula and learning materials, including expansion of STEM (science, technology, engineering & math) and life-skills learning opportunities; sanitation infrastructure and hygiene education including menstrual hygiene management (MHM); and the corresponding activities are fully implemented in most secondary schools.

growing pool of female teachers, and quality of teaching; updated and gender-responsive curricula and learning materials, including expansion of STEM learning opportunities; sanitation infrastructure and hygiene education including menstrual hygiene management (MHM); and the corresponding activities are fully implemented in most secondary schools.

growing pool of female teachers, and quality of teaching; updated and gender-responsive curricula and learning materials, including expansion of STEM learning opportunities; sanitation infrastructure and hygiene education including menstrual hygiene management (MHM); and the corresponding activities are at least partially implemented in secondary schools.

eSC. Existence of clear targets, well-defined focus and sufficient budget lines for girls’ secondary education

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Equity—Enabling environment

This indicator is the same as SMQ 32 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.5 (Dimension: Prioritisation and resource allocation). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National education strategy/sector plan: Prioritizes and identifies clear targets to improve access, retention, and learning in secondary education with a well-defined focus on girls’ education and gender equality; &amp; Supported by clear as well as sufficient budget lines.</td>
<td>National education strategy/sector plan: Prioritizes and identifies clear targets to improve at least one aspect of secondary education – access, retention, and learning - with a well-defined focus on girls’ education and gender equality; &amp; Supported by clear but insufficient budget lines.</td>
<td>National education strategy/sector plan: Prioritizes secondary education with a defined focus on girls’ education and gender equality, however no firm targets are identified; &amp; Allocated some funding through generic budget lines.</td>
<td>National education strategy or sector plan does not prioritize and identify targets to improve access, retention, and learning in secondary education with a defined focus on girls’ education and gender equality; and nor does it have any allocated budget.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ECW indicator 12b leverages UNICEF’s SP indicator P5.e.3 Countries with policies on inclusive education covering children with disabilities. UNICEF assesses this measure across 6 subscores: law/policy, physical environment, materials and communication, human resources, attitudes, and EMIS.
"e3a. Existence of appropriate law/policy explicitly mentioning the rights of children with disabilities to receive education

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Equity– Enabling environment

This indicator is the same as SMQ 20 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.3 (Dimension: Law/policy). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a law/policy establishing the right of all children to receive an education, with an explicit mention of children with disabilities. And also a national plan on inclusive education.</td>
<td>There is a law/policy establishing the right of all children to receive an education, with an explicit mention of children with disabilities.</td>
<td>There is a law/policy establishing the right of all children to attend school, which implicitly but not explicitly includes children with disabilities.</td>
<td>There is no law/policy establishing the right to education for children with disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e3b. Existence of a physical environment in schools that is appropriate for children with disabilities

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Equity– Supply

This indicator is the same as SMQ 21 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.3 (Dimension: Physical Environment). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All schools have accessible classrooms and/or reasonable accommodations that remove all physical barriers (including accessible toilets and recreation areas).</td>
<td>More than half of schools have accessible classrooms and toilets, at times because of an accessible design and at times because of makeshift adjustments.</td>
<td>Less than half of the schools are accessible (including toilets). Some schools may have accessible classrooms, or use makeshift ramps.</td>
<td>In general, schools are not accessible. Children with physical disabilities have great difficulty or are completely unable to access school facilities (including toilets).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e3c. Availability of materials and communication that support the inclusion of children with disabilities

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Equity– Supply

This indicator is the same as SMQ 22 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.3 (Dimension: Materials and Communication). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistive devices and materials are available in most regular schools. Books and other materials include</td>
<td>Assistive devices and materials are available in special schools but in less than half of regular schools. A few books and other</td>
<td>Assistive devices and materials are available in special schools, but not in regular schools. Little or no mention</td>
<td>Assistive devices and materials are generally not available in schools. Books and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>championing</td>
<td>established</td>
<td>initiating</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>positive references to children with disabilities</strong></td>
<td>materials include positive references to children with disabilities.</td>
<td>materials make no mention of children with disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e3d. Availability of appropriate human resources to support inclusive education, covering children with disabilities**

*SP programme area – activity focus code: Equity – Supply*

This indicator is the same as SMQ 23 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.3 (Dimension: Human Resources). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers and school administrators receive training on inclusive education. <em>All schools</em> have access to specialists on inclusive education for consultation. <em>Most children have access</em> to speech, physical and occupational therapists, as needed.</td>
<td>More than half of teachers and school administrators receive training on inclusive education. <em>More than half of schools have access</em> to specialists on inclusive education for consultation. <em>Some access</em> to speech and physical therapists exists.</td>
<td>Less than half of teachers and school administrators receive training on inclusive education. <em>Less than half of schools have access</em> to specialists on inclusive education for consultation. <em>No access</em> to speech and physical therapists exists.</td>
<td>Teachers and school administrators receive no training on inclusive education. Teachers have no specialists to consult with on issues pertaining to educating children with disabilities. <em>No access</em> to speech and physical therapists exists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e3e. Existence of curricula and support from teachers and school administrators that are inclusive of children with disabilities**

*SP programme area – activity focus code: Equity – Enabling environment*

This indicator is the same as SMQ 24 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.3 (Dimension: Attitudes). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers and school administrators <strong>support including</strong> children with disabilities in regular schools, and are willing to make significant adjustments to ease their inclusion. Curricula and classroom management allow for the <strong>flexibility</strong> of addressing individual students’ needs.</td>
<td>Teachers and school administrators <strong>do not object to including</strong> children with disabilities in regular schools, and are willing to make <strong>small adjustments</strong> to ease their inclusion.</td>
<td>Teachers and school administrators <strong>do not see the value of including</strong> children with disabilities in regular schools but do not make explicit objections. They <strong>do not feel it is their responsibility to make any adjustments</strong> to ease their inclusion.</td>
<td>Teachers and school administrators <strong>object to including</strong> children with disabilities in regular schools, and <strong>do not believe they should make any adjustments</strong> to ease their inclusion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**e3f. Existence of an EMIS that is inclusive of children with disabilities**

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Equity– Enabling environment  
This indicator is the same as SMQ 25 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.3 (Dimension: EMIS). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The routine EMIS contains data on children with disabilities, using ICF based definitions of disability. Reports are produced on enrolment of children with disabilities.</td>
<td>There are some data on children with disabilities in the school system, but it is characterized by medical diagnosis. Reports are produced on enrolment of children with disabilities.</td>
<td>There are some data on children with disabilities in the school system, but it is characterized by medical diagnosis. No reports on enrolment of children with disabilities are produced, except for special schools.</td>
<td>There are no data on children with disabilities in the routine EMIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECW indicator 12c leverages UNICEF’s SP indicator P5.e.4 Countries with an education sector policy or plan that specifies prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools. UNICEF assesses this measure across 4 sub-scores: legal/policy framework, prevention and response mechanisms, awareness, attitude and empowerment.**

"**e4a. Existence of well-defined legal/policy frameworks to address gender based violence in and around schools**

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Equity– Enabling environment  
This indicator is the same as SMQ 26 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.4 (Dimension: Legal/policy framework). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a well-defined legal and policy framework outlining state obligation to address gender-based violence and child protection across relevant ministries (e.g. gender, health, education, social justice, police etc.) in keeping with CEDAW &amp; CRC recommendations. The framework includes all of the following key elements for the provision of a safe and supportive learning environment in school: i) Legislation on free and compulsory basic education or more; ii) Teacher Service legislation defining limits on teacher conduct with children; iii) Identifying “kinds” of SRGBV (spanning sexual assault to bullying)</td>
<td>There is a nationally defined legal/policy framework to address gender-based violence and child protection across relevant ministries. The framework includes some of the key elements listed in Score 4. There is a budget for</td>
<td>There is a national legal/policy framework to address child protection across relevant ministries. The framework includes only a few of the key elements listed in Score 4 and there is a lack of resources for</td>
<td>There is no/a limited legal/policy framework to address child protection and provide safe and supportive learning environment in school for girls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by peers (including girls on girls) and psychological violence); iv) Criminalization of corporal punishment in schools; and v) Re-entry policy for pregnant school girls and adolescent mothers. There is a secure budget for implementing the framework.

### e4b. Education Sector Policy/Plan with quality prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Equity—Enabling environment

This indicator is the same as SMQ 27 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.4 (Dimension: Prevention and response mechanism). Holistic mechanisms) Countries with an education policy/sector plan that specify prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools (SRGBV). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holistic mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV are established and functioning in all primary and secondary schools.</strong> They include: i) Identification of “kinds” of violence; ii) Safe and standardized reporting mechanisms; iii) Defined disciplinary actions; and iv) Interventions that create a safe learning environment, including pre and in-service teacher training, related codes of conduct, curricula content.</td>
<td><strong>More than half of primary and secondary schools have established mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV. They include some of the key elements listed in Score 4.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV are only at a pilot phase in a small number of primary and secondary schools.</strong></td>
<td><strong>There are limited/ad hoc/no demonstrated attempts by the ministry of education and/or CSOs to support mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### e4c. Education Sector Policy/Plan that includes holistic institutional capacity building to improve awareness, attitude and empowerment to address gender-based violence in and around schools

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Equity—Enabling environment

This indicator is the same as SMQ 28 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.4 (Dimension: Awareness, attitude & empowerment). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>There is holistic institutional capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices that includes most of the following key elements: i) On-going sensitization of teachers, head</strong></td>
<td><strong>There is institutional capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pilot interventions to address SRGBV are supported by elements of institutional capacity-</strong></td>
<td><strong>There are limited/ad hoc/no demonstrated attempts by the ministry of education and/or CSOs to support institutional</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Championing (Score 4)
2. Established (Score 3)
3. Initiating (Score 2)
4. Weak (Score 1)
teachers and SMC/PTA members; ii) Counselling and support services for survivors of violence; iii) Mentorship programmes for girls; iv) Student participation in decision-making; and v) Enhanced involvement of local CSOs and communities.

change in behaviour and practices that includes some of the key elements listed in Score 4.

building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices.

capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices.

e4d. Education Sector Policy/Plan with quality data collection, availability and use to help address gender based violence in and around schools

SP programme area – activity focus code: Equity – Enabling environment

This indicator is the same as SMQ 29 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.4 (Dimension: Data collection, availability, and use). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

Championing (Score 4) | Established (Score 3) | Initiating (Score 2) | Weak (Score 1)
--- | --- | --- | ---
Data tracking on incidences of SRGBV and the provision of safe and supportive learning environments for girls is available on a regular basis and is used at all levels of administration (school, sub-region, region, national) as relevant. | Data tracking on incidences of SRGBV and the provision of safe and supportive learning environments for girls is available for most of the schools on a regular basis but not frequently used at the relevant levels of administration. | There are some data on SRGBV available for certain regions/schools as part of independent one-off surveys/projects/initiatives | There are no data available on SRGBV in the country."

Criteria to assess policies for displaced persons (12d) to be developed through phased investment

Phased investment: New indicator / data platform (For displaced persons policy only) – ECW will develop a new indicator, standards, and tracking mechanism for measurement of policies on inclusive education covering refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) through its acceleration facility

13. Domestic financing for education

Type: Systemic Outcome – Political Action

Coverage: Multi-year & first response

Data source: UIS

Full Indicator name: Indicator #13: Proportion of countries supported by ECW that have (a) increased their public expenditure on education or (b) maintained sector spending at 20% or above
**Results statement:** Systemic outcome: ECW-supported beneficiary governments take political action to provide continuous, quality, and safe education to the most marginalized children and youth in crisis, including girls, young women, disabled persons, refugees, IDPs, and other minorities (according to context).

**Rationale:** ECW will support countries in crisis for 3-5 years through multi-year window but will work to create sustainability of funding and continuity of learning for children and youth.

ECW will seek to influence government commitment to fund education during its presence in country, with the aspiration for countries to fund education at 20% of public expenditure or above.

Most countries that ECW supports will be fragile or conflict affected; in most situations, ECW should seek to influence government policy on equitable education but it was recognized this indicator may not apply in all contexts.

**Technical guidance:** Recommend adopting GPE’s methodology for their indicator "Proportion of DCPs that have (a) increased their public expenditure on education; or (b) maintained sector spending at 20% or above" (shared PDF document – not available online):

"**Definition:** This indicator is defined as the proportion of DCPs that, during their respective fiscal years, have either: (i) increased their public expenditure on education, as compared with a base year value, or (ii) have maintained public expenditure on education at 20% or above.

- A DCP is a developing country partner of the Global Partnership for Education.
- This indicator requires the calculation of the % of education expenditure at the country level, henceforth referred to as “DCP indicator”.
- Expenditures refer to actual expenditures by Governments, as opposed to provisional or budget expenditures.
- Public expenditures refer to all expenditures recorded in official budget documentation, including those funded from on-budget external grants or loans.
- Public expenditure on education (or education sector spending) includes both recurrent and capital expenditure from all public entities at all levels of education, and at all levels of government.
- Total public expenditure includes both recurrent and capital expenditures from public sources, excluding debt service payments.
- The terms capital/development/investment expenditure are used interchangeably (vs. re-current expenditure,)
**Reference period:** DCP fiscal year ending during the calendar year under consideration

**Periodicity:** Every year (i.e., 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020)

| Phased investment: | N/A |

## 14. Overall aid to EiE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Systemic Outcome - EiE funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>EiE sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>OCHA, Acc. Facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Indicator name:</th>
<th>Indicator #14: Overall annual funding to education in emergencies (total amount and as % of global humanitarian funding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results statement:</td>
<td>Systemic outcome: ECW advocacy and fundraising increase <strong>EiE funding</strong> globally, incl. total aid from humanitarian, development, and non-traditional sources, and as percentage of humanitarian funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td>Currently, there is a major data gap in understanding the flow of funds across the EiE sector broadly and what proportion flows from traditional versus non-traditional donors. The OCHA Financial Tracking System tracks reported humanitarian aid, but has several gaps, including development aid to EiE, incomplete refugee data, non-reported humanitarian aid, and aid from non-traditional donors. ECW can make catalytic investments to build a platform or similar functionality to collate financing data. Such a platform would enhance transparency to the donor community, especially in the case of underfunded or &quot;forgotten&quot; crises. The TWG advised that indicator should assess both total funding going to the sector and as a percentage of humanitarian funding. The group cautioned that assessment of overall EiE funding is usually focused on humanitarian funding and ignores development funding, so it will be important for ECW to build or support a data platform to enhance tracing and transparency of the full universe of EiE funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical guidance:</td>
<td>Recommend adopting UNICEF's indicator &quot;Percentage for education in Global Humanitarian Funding&quot; ECW indicators 12a, 12b, 12c are pulled from <a href="https://www.unicef.org/system/files/UNICEF%20Result%20Framework%202016.pdf">UNICEF's Strategic Plan Results Framework on Education</a>. Guidance is pulled from the SP Education Indicator Guidance (shared PDF document – not available online) :</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


"Source: OCHA Criteria for inclusion of reported humanitarian contributions into the Financial Tracking Service database, and for donor /appealing agency reporting to FTS September 2004)

Definition: Total payment or transfer of funds or in-kind goods from the donor towards the appealing agency, resulting from a commitment as humanitarian aid to education sector during a crisis or its aftermath, expressed as a percentage of total contribution of global humanitarian funding to all sectors (including agriculture, coordination and support services, economic recovery & infrastructure, education, food, heath, etc.) in a given contribution year.

Method of Computation: Divide total contribution (payment or transfer of in-kind goods) allocated to education in humanitarian context in a given contribution year by the global humanitarian funding for the same contribution year and multiply by 100. Contributions that are not sector specific e.g. “Sector not yet specified” and “Multi-sector” are pro-rated across sector specific amounts.

Formula:

\[
\%\text{GHFE} = \frac{GHFE}{TGHF} \times 100
\]

Where
\%\text{GHFE} is Education in Global Humanitarian Funding as a percentage of total Global Humanitarian Funding.
GHFE Total contribution to Education in Global Humanitarian Funding
TGHF Total Global Humanitarian Funding.

Universe of countries: UNICEF programme countries with data available within the last 6 years.

Source: UN OCHA

Responsible Unit: PD/Education

Quality standards: Total contribution to Education in Global Humanitarian Funding should include all payment or transfer of funds or in-kind goods occurred in addressing any education spending following an appeal. Donors and appealing agencies should have common guidelines for deciding what funding they must report to Financial Tracking Service (FTS) as their contribution to humanitarian aid.

Frequency of update: Annual.
**Disaggregation:** Not applicable.

**Guidance for measuring overall funding to Education in Emergencies to be developed through phased investment**

**Phased investment:**

New indicator/data platform - ECW may build a data platform to supplement the existing OCHA Financial Tracking System to include the funding streams that are currently missing.

---

## 15. Grants with sustainable funding sources

**Type:** Systemic Outcome – EiE funding

**Coverage:** Multi-year & first response

**Data source:** ECW Secretariat

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #15: Proportion of countries in a crisis context where ECW activities continuing beyond the grant period have sustainable funding sources after ECW grant period concludes

**Results statement:** Systemic outcome: ECW advocacy and fundraising increase EiE funding globally, incl. total aid from humanitarian, development, and non-traditional sources, and as percentage of humanitarian funding

**Rationale:** Building national-level capacity for sustainable funding, either through a development agency or national government, will be a key enabler of achieving continuity of education for children/youth in country. In order to improve the likelihood of sustainable funding for grantees, ECW will encourage them to incorporate transition plans for sustainability into their grant proposals, measured through Activity/Output indicator #29.

Within its own funding windows, ECW will consider crises with actors who have effectively delivered on projects funded in First Response in choosing multi-year window grantees

Since the presence of sustainable funding sources may not be known at time of grant completion, ECW may track this metric retrospectively updating grantees who achieve sustainable funding sources as data becomes known.

The TWG highlighted that this indicator assumes that if grantees have a transition plan for sustainable funding sources, children being supported by those funding sources will have continuity of educational opportunities.

**Technical guidance:** Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed

**Phased investment:** N/A
### 16. Proportion of appeals w/ education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Systemic Outcome – EiE funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>First response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>OCHA, UNHCR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #16: Proportion of humanitarian appeals that include an education component

**Results statement:** Systemic outcome: ECW advocacy and fundraising increase **EiE funding** globally, incl. total aid from humanitarian, development, and non-traditional sources, and as percentage of humanitarian funding

**Rationale:** Currently, education is often excluded from humanitarian appeals completely. Two of the modalities proposed in the first response window, small initial provision of funds and matching, are designed to incentivize the inclusion of education in humanitarian appeals.

**Technical guidance:** *Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed*

Baseline collected by analyzing Flash appeals and Humanitarian Response Plans on the OCHA website and Refugee Response Plans from the UNHCR website. The percentage that included appeals for education was calculated by dividing those with education included by the total number of appeals in that time period.

**Phased investment:** N/A

### 17. Inclusive, quality humanitarian & development plans (CORE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Systemic outcome – Jointly plan and coordinate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #17 (CORE): Proportion of ECW-supported countries with response plans (HRP and / or RRP, where relevant) and education sector plans (ESP or TEP, where relevant) meeting quality standards, and developed in consultation with all local actors, including Education Clusters, LEGs, refugee coordination groups, local civil society, and national governments, where applicable and appropriate.

**Results statement:** Systemic outcome: Existing national and local actors in ECW-supported countries, inclusive of LEGs, Clusters, refugee coordination groups, civil
society, and national governments (where appropriate and applicable) **jointly plan and coordinate** for preparedness, response, and implementation.

**Rationale:** The ECW platform should encourage the development of quality response and sector plans that are developed through inclusive processes. The indicator prioritizes one humanitarian education plan (either education component of a Humanitarian Response Plan or Refugee Response Plan, whichever is relevant to context) and one development education plan (Education Sector Plan or Transitional Education Plan whichever is relevant to context). Quality standards must incorporate a lens to future preparedness. This will be instrumental in preventing, where possible, worsening or reoccurrence of crises.

This indicator is meant to serve as a proxy measure for ECW's impact on bridging the humanitarian / development divide. In countries where the Global Education Cluster and LEG are both present (e.g., South Sudan), this indicator will assess to what extent Clusters consult with LEGS in drafting their HRP, to what extent Refugee Coordination Groups consult with LEGS and Clusters to draft their RRP, and to what extent LEGs consult with Clusters in drafting their TSP. Better consultation and coordination ensure resources are used most effectively to reach the greatest number of children and youth in need.

There was also some discussion around assessing both countries that are currently supported by ECW and those that were previously supported by ECW on this measure. This would help ECW understand if plans only meet standards only when Secretariat is providing ongoing support to local actors or if ECW has left a lasting impression on the coordination efforts and mindset in country.

TWG recommended considering GPE and UNICEF guidelines around ESPs and TEPs and deferring to Cluster/UNHCR standards for HRPs/RRPs.

**Technical guidance:** Recommend leveraging UNICEF's methodology for their indicator "P5.c.3 Countries with an education sector plan/policy that includes assessment and risk reduction" pulled from [UNICEF's Strategic Plan Results Framework on Education](https://www.unicef.org/). UNICEF assesses this measure across 3 sub-scores: risk assessment, comprehensive conflict/disaster risk reduction/CCA strategy that is operationalized, implemented, and monitored, and appropriate human and financial resources. The scoring methodology is outlined in the UNICEF RAM Standard Indicators Education Guidance Notes (shared document – not available online).

**c3a. Comprehensive and updated risk assessment of the education sector SP programme area – activity focus code:** Education in emergencies – Enabling environment
This indicator is the same as SMQ 17 and is part of SP indicator P5.c.3 (Dimension: Risk assessment). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a comprehensive and updated risk assessment of the education sector that includes: a conflict or political economy analysis; identification of likely hazards and their effect on the education system through a climate &amp; vulnerability mapping; &amp; a review of current Education Policies and curriculum content &amp; how they relate to conflict/DRR/CCA as well as of assets in education communities.</td>
<td>There is an incomplete risk assessment of the education sector that includes only some of the following pieces: a conflict or political economy analysis; identification of likely hazards and their effect on the education system through a climate and vulnerability mapping; and a review of current Education Policies and curriculum content &amp; how they relate to conflict/DRR/CCA as well as of assets in education communities.</td>
<td>There is an incomplete and outdated risk assessment of the education sector that includes only a few of the following pieces: a conflict or political economy analysis; identification of likely hazards and their effect on the education system through a climate and vulnerability mapping; and a review of current Education Policies and curriculum content &amp; how they relate to conflict/DRR/CCA as well as of assets in education communities.</td>
<td>There is no risk assessment of the education sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**c3b. Availability of a risk reduction strategy within the Education Sector Plan/Policy**

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Education in emergencies – Enabling environment

This indicator is the same as SMQ 18 and is part of SP indicator P5.c.3 (Dimension: Risk Reduction Strategy). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Education Sector Plan/Policy includes a relevant &amp; comprehensive conflict/DRR/CCA strategy based upon the risk assessment &amp; a strategic vision for relevant education in adversity contexts that is fully operationalized &amp; implemented to mitigate the conflict, disaster &amp; climate risks identified. The strategy includes capacity</td>
<td>The Education Sector Plan/Policy includes an incomplete conflict/DRR/CCA strategy &amp; a vision for relevant education in adverse contexts that is partially implemented to mitigate the conflict, disaster &amp; climate risks identified. The strategy includes some of the following: capacity development for education personnel, promotion</td>
<td>The Education Sector Plan/Policy includes an incomplete conflict/DRR/CCA strategy &amp; a vision for relevant education in adverse contexts that is poorly articulated or poorly implemented to mitigate the conflict, disaster and climate risks. The strategy includes only few of the following: capacity development for education personnel, promotion</td>
<td>There is no conflict/DRR/CCA strategy in the Education Sector Plan/Policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development for education personnel, promotion of community & children’s engagement, guidance on teaching content & resources, school construction standards, & linkages to other sectors (WASH, CP etc.). There is a monitoring & evaluation framework for the strategy & the strategy implementation is monitored at least twice a year.

There is no monitoring & evaluation framework for the implementation of the strategy or there is one but the strategy implementation is monitored less frequently than twice a year.

---

c3c. Allocation of human and financial resources to implement the conflict/DRR/CCA strategy

SP programme area – activity focus code: Education in emergencies – Enabling environment

This indicator is the same as SMQ 19 and is part of SP indicator P5.c.3 (Dimension: Human and Financial Resources). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are committed, earmarked and adequate human and financial resources to fully implement the conflict/DRR/CCA strategy.</td>
<td>There are committed, earmarked, adequate human and financial resources to implement the conflict/DRR/CCA strategy but they are not sufficient to fully implement the strategy.</td>
<td>The human and financial resources to implement the conflict/DRR/CCA strategy are far from what is necessary for a proper risk reduction.</td>
<td>There are no human and financial resources to implement conflict/DRR/CCA measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommend leveraging GPE's methodology for their indicator "16.a: Proportion of endorsed (a) education sector plans (ESP) or (b) transitional sector plans (TEPs) meeting quality standards" (shared PDF document – not available online).

"Definition: This indicator examines the number of endorsed Education Sector Plans (ESPs) or Transitional Plans (TEPs) meeting at least five out of a possible total of seven standards of “quality” for ESPs, and at least three out of a possible total of five standards for TEPs, as defined by the Global Partnership for Education, divided by the number of total endorsed ESPs and TEPs included in the group sample. In the context of this indicator:
• An “ESP” is by nature a national policy instrument, elaborated under the responsibility of Government, which provides a development vision for the education system, and outlines a coherent set of actionable strategies to implement reforms and reach development objectives.

• A “TEP” is a national policy instrument, elaborated under the responsibility of Government, similar to an ESP. TEPs differ from ESPs in a number of specificities. They (i) cover a shorter term (3 years in general), (ii) are targeted to a limited number of sub-sectors and priorities, and (iii) have stronger focus on system capacity. The TEP shall include a sound analysis of the current situation, using the best-available data. Implementation and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks must also be included in TEPs to assess whether the intended results are being achieved.

• “Endorsement” means that the Development Partners including the Civil Society commit to financially and technically support the implementation of a sector plan or transitional plan approved by the Government.

• “Quality,” as a vehicle for credibility, has been first defined in the Board Paper on the operationalization of the new funding model requirements. Further defining of the quality standards of ESP/TEP credibility was advanced by the Global Partnership for Education and UNESCO’s International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP). Seven credibility criteria have been devised for ESPs, and five for TEPs, on the basis of technical work and consultations with countries and global stakeholders in education and have been broadly communicated to GPE partners through the dissemination of ESP Preparation Guidelines. This set of criteria form a coherent definition of what is quality. In details, to be considered as of sufficient quality, an ESP shall be:
  o Guided by an overall vision: A sector plan, for instance through a mission statement, indicates overall direction, including (i) the government’s development policy, (ii) the approach the government will follow to reach its goal, and (iii) the principles and values that will guide this approach.
  o Strategic: A sector plan identifies the strategies for achieving the vision, including the human, technical, and financial capacities required, and it sets priorities.
  o Holistic: A sector plan covers all subsectors (early childhood education, primary, secondary, and higher education), and should also include non-formal education, as well as adult literacy. It recognizes the need for coherence among sub-sectors, with a specific attention to the levels attached to recognized education rights and compulsory schooling, and
reflects awareness that education takes place throughout life. The learner is defined as the central beneficiary of the education system, with recognized rights and needs.

- Evidence-based: It starts from an education sector analysis providing data and assessments that form the information base on which strategies and programs are developed.
- Achievable: A sector plan is based on an analysis of the current trends and thoughtful hypotheses for overcoming financial, technical, and political constraints to effective implementation. It should provide a framework for budget and management decisions. It is also recognized that strong ownership by key stakeholders largely determines ESP feasibility.
- Sensitive to the context: A sector plan includes an analysis of the vulnerabilities specific to a country. Vulnerabilities might for example include conflicts, disasters, and economic crises. An ESP/TEP must address preparedness, prevention, and risk mitigation in order to strengthen the resilience of the education system at all levels.
- Attentive to disparities: A sector plan should recognize that, within a country, there may be significant gender differences between girls and boys and inequalities between groups of students in their participation in education and the quality of education they receive. These groups may be defined for instance by their location, their socio-economic or ethnic characteristics, or their abilities. A credible sector plan must identify and attend to gender considerations across the plan, including where gender disparities intersect with other sources of disparity, and address the specific needs and opportunities of different groups.

**Reference period:** Calendar year

**Periodicity:** Every other year (i.e., 2018 and 2020)

Recommend leveraging existing standards used by Clusters and UNHCR to assess quality of HRPs and RRPs when developing technical guidance

| Phased investment: | N/A |
### 18. Countries w/ quality EMIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type:</strong></th>
<th>Systemic Outcome – Local systems-building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong></td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Indicator name:</strong></th>
<th>Indicator #18: Proportion of ECW-supported countries with a well-functioning Education Management Information System (EMIS), assessed based off of data quality and timeliness, disaggregation, and comprehensiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results statement:</strong></td>
<td>Systemic outcome: ECW supports local systems-building in ECW-supported countries through enhancements to national and local data systems, technical expertise, and delivery capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong></td>
<td>EMIS systems must be prioritized to ensure effective M&amp;E of local education systems. Further, effective EMIS systems are the foundation for strong learning assessment systems, which are critical for measuring several of the quality indicators in ECW’s results framework (notably 3a, 3b, 8a, 8b, and 8c). For the first few years of ECW, the TWG advised prioritizing an indicator to assess local EMIS vs. one to measure learning assessment systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical guidance:</strong></td>
<td>Recommend leveraging UNICEF’s methodology for their indicator &quot;P5.e.2 Countries with an Education Management Information System (EMIS) providing disaggregated data that allow the identification of barriers and bottlenecks that inhibit the realization of the rights of disadvantaged children&quot; pulled from UNICEF’s Strategic Plan Results Framework on Education. UNICEF assesses this measure across 3 sub-scores: data quality/timeliness, disaggregation, comprehensiveness. The scoring methodology is outlined in the UNICEF RAM Standard Indicators Education Guidance (shared PDF document – not available online)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"e2a. EMIS that provides quality and timely data

**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Education - General – Enabling environment

This indicator is the same as SMQ 37 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.2 (Dimension: Data Quality and Timeliness). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliable and relevant education data are collected and used by decision makers. EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are ready</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reliable and relevant education data are collected. EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education data are of questionable reliability and are not all relevant. EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education data are irregularly collected or even absent, and the quality of the data is poor. When they are collected, EMIS data (or statistical</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to be used less than 6 months after the beginning of the school year.  
ready to be used less than 3 months after the end of the school year.  
ready to be used less than one year after the end of the school year.  
yearbook) are ready to be used more than one year after the end of the school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is 100% response rate from schools (public + private) to the school census questionnaire. Response rates &amp; the assumptions used for estimating data of the missing schools are clearly indicated in the statistical yearbooks.</td>
<td>Between 50% &amp; 90% of schools (public + private) respond to the census questionnaire. Response rates are not published in the statistical yearbooks.</td>
<td>Response rates are not known or fewer than 50% of schools respond to the census questionnaire.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**e2c. EMIS that provides disaggregated data, including income/assets, disability and school physical environment**  
**SP programme area – activity focus code:** Equity – focus on girls’ and inclusive education – Enabling environment  
This indicator is the same as SMQ 39 and is part of SP indicator P5.e.2 (Dimension: Disaggregation). It should be reported on a 1-to-4 scale using the criteria below (0.5 ratings are accepted in case it is too difficult to make a choice)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Championing (Score 4)</th>
<th>Established (Score 3)</th>
<th>Initiating (Score 2)</th>
<th>Weak (Score 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMIS annually collects data on: children’s family income/assets, gender, urban/rural (consistently with the definition from national statistical office), children’s disabilities with at least 5 different types of disability (and using ICF based definitions of disability) and on schools’ physical environment and assistive devices for children with disabilities.</td>
<td>EMIS annually collects data on: gender, urban/rural, and children’s disabilities with at least 3 different types of disability but not on children’s family income/assets.</td>
<td>EMIS collects data on gender, urban/rural but not on children’s family income/assets, children’s disabilities or schools’ physical environment and assistive devices for children with disabilities.</td>
<td>No data are collected on gender, disability, children’s family income/ assets or urban/rural.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phased investment:** N/A
### 19. Local actors for technical support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Indicator name:</strong></th>
<th>Indicator #19: Proportion of ECW grantees who are increasing their use of local actors for contracted support of joint proposals and needs assessments (instead of contracting out to external actors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results statement:</strong></td>
<td>Systemic outcome: ECW supports <strong>local systems-building</strong> in ECW-supported countries through enhancements to national and local data systems, technical expertise, and delivery capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong></td>
<td>Measuring proportions of grantees that contract external technical support and expertise is a strong indicator of a grantee's technical capacity to perform such functions themselves or in partnership with local actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One goal of ECW is to foster and support technical capacity at the local level. Thus, ECW will ask grantees to report on the percentage of their technical support contracted out to local actors vs. external actors, when contracting support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was noted, however, that it is not necessarily a negative for a grantee to contract support. It is just preferred that that grantee contract to local actors to build capacity on the ground and encourage context-specific solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical guidance:</strong></td>
<td><em>Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phased investment:</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 20. Absorptive capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Indicator name:</strong></th>
<th>Indicator #20: Percentage of allocated regular resources for ECW-supported programs expended by grantees at end of the year (absorptive capacity), averaged across grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Results statement:** Systemic outcome: ECW supports **local systems-building** in ECW-supported countries through enhancements to national and local data systems, technical expertise, and delivery capacity

**Rationale:** Measuring percentage of funds expended by grantees and sub-grantees is an indicator of grantees' capacity to actually utilize funds and deliver educational interventions to children and youth given their current resourcing and staff in country.

While measuring this indicator may incentivize grantees to misreport spending or to spend funds on non-essential activities, ECW will manage by monitoring / auditing grants to ensure expenditure on agreed grant activities

**Technical guidance:** Recommend leveraging Global Fund's methodology for their indicator "KPI 7: Fund utilization" (shared document – not available online).

**Definition:**
- **Allocation utilization:** Proportion of allocation that has been committed or is forecast to be committed as a grant expense
- **Absorptive capacity:** Portion of grant budgets that have been reported by country program as spent on services delivered

**Rationale for use:** A resilient and sustainable system for health should be able to effectively use the full allocation of funds to deliver services to increase program impact. This will be measured in two ways:

- **Allocation utilization** provides high level view on the extent to which countries can use their allocation, and the Secretariat can optimize portfolio level investments.

- **Absorptive capacity** measures whether programs can spend the budgeted funds. Measure will focus on the top focus countries with strong links to ongoing initiatives to strengthen supply chains and to address other "absorption" challenges

**Coverage of reporting:** Allocation Utilization will cover whole portfolio, while absorptive capacity will cover selected countries

**Frequency of reporting:** Semi-annually

**Strengths & Limitations:** The Allocation utilization indicator risks two negative incentives: Over-commitment to meet allocation, re-direction of funds through portfolio optimization from portfolios with the greatest "need" to portfolios better able to absorb funds – without dealing with underlying health system constraints. These risks are controlled by other indicators
tracking absorption, cash balance, and alignment between investments and "need" (KPI 3)."

**Recommend the following adjustments to Global Fund guidance:**
- Focus on education vs. health system absorption
- Only assess absorptive capacity not allocation utilization

| Phased investment: | N/A |

### 21. Cluster performance monitoring

| **Type:** | Systemic Outcome – Local systems-building |
| **Coverage:** | EiE sector |
| **Data source:** | Global Education Cluster |

| **Full Indicator name:** | Indicator #21: Proportion of countries with a humanitarian coordinator (HC) (or Resident Coordinator/HC) designation whose country Education Cluster undergoes Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring (CCPM) |
| **Results statement:** | Systemic outcome: ECW supports **local systems-building** in ECW-supported countries through enhancements to national and local data systems, technical expertise, and delivery capacity |
| **Rationale:** | As part of the humanitarian program cycle, country Education Clusters are required to provide annual performance monitoring measures, but only a small fraction of those with RC / HC designation currently do. Increasing the proportion of country Education Clusters tracking performance will increase accountability and measurement capacity of local systems. |

The TWG noted the following clarifications regarding the Global Education Cluster:
- The Global Education Cluster (GEC) refers to the Global Cluster Coordinators (GCCs), Education Cluster Unit (ECU), the Rapid Response Team (RRT), and the Cluster Lead Agencies (CLA) which are ultimately accountable for the staffing of all those positions plus the positions in the field. The combination of the GCC + ECU + RRT is the Global Education Cluster Team, but the GEC in total is the sum of all CLA accountabilities.
The Resident Coordinator would be present in most development contexts. The HC is in humanitarian contexts. An RC/HC is an RC who has taken on the HC designation in the case of an emergency.

It was noted that only about ~10% of Education Clusters are doing performance monitoring currently. The aspiration of ECW is to increase this percentage going forward.

**Technical guidance:** Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed in consultation with Global Education Cluster

**Phased investment:** N/A

### 22. Cluster staffing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Systemic Outcome – Global systems-building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>EiE sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>Global Education Cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Indicator name:</td>
<td>Indicator #22: Proportion of countries with a humanitarian coordinator (HC) (or Resident Coordinator/HC) designation that are fully staffed by Cluster Lead Agencies (CLAs), with fully staffed meaning at least a Cluster coordinator and information management officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results statement:</td>
<td>Systemic outcome: ECW supports global systems-building by improving evidence generation, data disaggregation (e.g., by gender, refugees, IDPs, etc.) and increasing Education Cluster capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td>Global education cluster is highly under-resourced, yet it has an IASC mandate to coordinate EiE actors in country. The Cluster Lead Agencies (CLA) are tasked with deploying at least a coordinator and information manager to countries with an HC or RC/HC designation but are often unable to effectively serve all countries in need given lack of resourcing. It was also noted that this metric only tracks presence of support and does not assess the quality or amount of support provided. ECW will work with Cluster to determine resourcing needed by the Cluster to provide quality coordination support to all countries in crisis ahead of acceleration facility investment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TWG noted the following clarifications regarding the Global Education Cluster:
The Global Education Cluster (GEC) refers to the Global Cluster Coordinators (GCCs), Education Cluster Unit (ECU), the Rapid Response Team (RRT), and the Cluster Lead Agencies (CLA) which are ultimately accountable for the staffing of all those positions plus the positions in the field. The combination of the GCC + ECU + RRT is the Global Education Cluster Team, but the GEC in total is the sum of all CLA accountabilities.

The Resident Coordinator would be present in most development contexts. The HC is in humanitarian contexts. An RC/HC is an RC who has taken on the HC designation in the case of an emergency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical guidance:</th>
<th>Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed in consultation with Global Education Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phased investment:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Global EiE baselines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Systemic Outcome - Global systems-building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>Acceleration. facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>Global Education Cluster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Indicator name:</th>
<th>Indicator #23: Proportion of global baselines for key education crisis indicators identified and collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results statement:</td>
<td>Systemic outcome: ECW supports <strong>global systems-building</strong> by improving evidence generation, data disaggregation (e.g., by gender, refugees, IDPs, etc.) and increasing Education Cluster capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td>For new indicators that &quot;push the envelope&quot; on what is currently measured by UIS and others (e.g., social and emotional learning outcomes, overall funding to education in emergencies), invest in developing global baselines and creating a system and methodology for ongoing tracking. Need to coordinate with partners to identify appropriate indicators. This indicator was recommended in the ODI proposal paper as an indicative target in the high-level results framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical guidance:</td>
<td>To be developed through phased investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased investment:</td>
<td>New indicator / data platform – ECW to convene ECW partners (e.g., UIS, UNICEF, GPE) to adopt global standards and consider developing or contributing to a global platform to track indicators, building off of existing systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 24. Engagement with high-level officials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type:</strong></th>
<th>Activity/Output – Political advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong></td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong></td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Indicator name:</strong></th>
<th>Indicator #24: Number of crisis and conflict affected countries where high-level meetings took place between ECW leadership or HLSG members and senior officials within country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results statement:</strong></td>
<td>Activity/output: ECW HLSG and Secretariat conducts political advocacy to strengthen commitment by governments, donors, and humanitarian and development actors to increase proportion of crisis-affected children and youth, inclusive of girls, young women, disabled people, refugees, IDPs, and other minorities (according to context) receiving a quality education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Rationale:** | Number of live engagements between senior leaders is a strong indicator of ECW advocacy outputs that are likely to spur increasing political action by conflict and crisis affected governments.  

Given the limited number of grants ECW will be able to make through the Breakthrough Fund in early years, ECW can seek to influence political action through the political commitment function of the platform.  

It might take multiple senior-level meetings to effectively garner political commitment and thus political action. Additional action beyond meetings may be required. ECW will test the linkage between this output indicator and the political action systemic outcome in early years of the fund and refine the Theory of Change and associated indicators as necessary in future strategy periods. |
| **Technical guidance:** | Recommend leveraging GPE's methodology for their indicator "34: Number of advocacy events undertaken with partners and other external stakeholders to support the achievement of GPE's strategic goals and objectives" (shared PDF document – not available online):  

"Definition: Cumulative number of advocacy events undertaken with partners and other external stakeholders to support the achievement of GPE strategic goals and objectives.  
Advocacy events will be identified as activities that meet all of the following conditions:  
1. Engagement occurring within the fiscal year of analysis.  
2. Engagement is organized in collaboration with at least one other partner or external stake-holder and includes at least one participant whose mandate or responsibility for representing GPE is accepted by the participant and others engaged in the activity." |
3. Engagement is externally facing and regional, global, or cross-national of nature.
4. Engagement (a) with an objective relevant to GPE’s mission and the goals of GPE 2020 and (b) where the specific objective of participation is to generate momentum for these goals.

The phrasing of the indicator as being engagements ‘undertaken with partners and other external stakeholders’ is an incentive to collaborative advocacy effort, which in turn speaks to the overall objective of ‘strengthening the partnership.’

**Reference period:** Fiscal year

**Periodicity:** Every year (i.e. 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020) 

Recommend the following adjustments to GPE's guidance:

- Replace GPE with ECW
- Limit to meetings between ECW’s leadership or HLSG members and senior officials within beneficiary countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phased investment:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 25. ECW financing (total, non-traditional) (CORE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Activity/output – Raises substantial funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Full Indicator name:</strong></th>
<th>Indicator #25 (CORE): Total amount of financing to ECW and amount from non-traditional donors / through innovative financing mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results statement:</strong></td>
<td>Activity/output: <strong>ECW raises substantial funding</strong> to support its platform and to allow the disbursement of additional grants to support education in emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong></td>
<td>ECW was created with the aspiration to provide additionality of funding to education in emergencies. ECW strives to pursue a range of innovative financing sources, including private sector donations, while still ensuring an adequate magnitude of overall funding from all types of donors. Task Team 2 provided guidance to measure funds received by the ECW fund vs. funds committed by donors so that tracking is based on pledges fulfilled and funds available for disbursement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TWG also advised that ECW measuring total amount of non-traditional dollars raised vs. percentage of non-traditional dollars raised as to not penalize ECW should they receive a large donation from a traditional donor.

There was some discussion around a potential future indicator to measure dollars leveraged through ECW (e.g., through loan guarantees, public-private partnerships), but it was recommended not to add an additional indicator at this time.

The group also noted that in the case of GPE, the team originally thought the fund would focus on funding to the sector overall in its results framework but found that partners wanted to know specifics of GPE fundraising.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical guidance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Recommend leveraging GPE’s methodology for their indicator "26: Amount of financing to GPE from non-traditional donors (private sector, foundations, etc.), those who are first-time traditional donors to GPE, and through new financing mechanisms" (shared PDF document – not available online):

*Definition: This indicator measures cumulatively the contributions paid (i.e., receipts received) into the GPE Fund by non-traditional donors, first-time traditional donors to the GPE fund, and through new financing mechanisms. In the context of this indicator:

- “Non-traditional donors” comprise novel types of donors, which include non-DAC bilateral donors, the private sector, private foundations, and high Net Worth Individuals.
- “First-time traditional donors” are defined as DAC donors that have not donated to GPE as of the base year of 2011.
- “New financing mechanisms” are defined as additional, diversified financing mechanisms that are newly established following GPE’s strategic financing effort and did not exist nor were available through previous GPE replenishments (i.e., 2014 replenishment and before).

*Notes:

- The three categories of donors listed above are mutually exclusive.
- In relation to that point above, the financing received from novel types of donors (non-DAC bilateral donors, private sector, etc.) or from new financing mechanisms, as listed in the definition, would always be counted under the “non-traditional donors” and “new financing mechanisms” groups, respectively, whether they are first-time donors or not.
- The base year to consider whether a donor’s receipts should be counted under this indicator, is 2011. In other words, any donor that was not a donor as of 2011 should be counted under this indicator. |
**Reference period**: Fiscal year

**Periodicity**: Every Year (i.e., 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020”

**Recommend the following adjustments to GPE’s guidance:**
- Replace GPE with ECW
- Adjust base year to 2018

**Phased investment**: N/A

### 26. Grant-specific outputs (e.g., textbooks)

**Type**: Activity/Output – Breakthrough fund

**Coverage**: Multi-year & first response

**Data source**: ECW grantees Administrative data

**Full Indicator name**: Indicator #26: Menu of indicators to measure programmatic outputs, aggregated across grantees annually, such as:
- # of children and youth receiving individual learning materials (e.g., textbooks, notebooks, etc.)
- # of classrooms supported (e.g., blackboards, maps, school-in-a-box, WASH facilities, etc.)
- # of teachers/administrators trained, by gender (e.g., in psychosocial support, peace education, life skills, etc.)

**Results statement**: Activity/output: ECW makes grants through the **Breakthrough Fund**, representing 95% of ECW’s overall investments, in line with a strategy approved by the HLSG and to support inclusive, coordinated, and impactful in-country program delivery

**Rationale**: ECW will ask grantees to report on standard funding output indicators, common in education in emergency response efforts, as leading indicators of systemic and beneficiary outcomes.

The TWG noted that these types of indicators are routinely reported upon by grantees and that not all outputs will be consistent across grantees, limiting ability to aggregate. ECW will standardize menu of indicators and aggregate where possible, when grantees are delivering similar services. Additional indicators may be added on a grant-specific basis.

Instead of providing a very specific menu, the TWG recommended providing broader categories to be detailed further going forward.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical guidance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommend leveraging UNICEF's methodology for their programmatic output indicators below, pulled from <a href="https://www.unicef.org/education">UNICEF's Strategic Plan Results Framework on Education</a>. The indicator guidance is outlined in the UNICEF RAM Standard Indicators Education Guidance Notes (shared document – not available online) below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"**Indicator:** b3. Number of children provided with individual education materials funded by UNICEF SP programme area – activity focus code: Learning– supply  
This indicator is the same as SMQ 40

**Definition:** this indicator captures the number of children provided with individual education materials funded by UNICEF

**Method of computation:** The individual education materials to be considered are those materials that are intended to be used by one child e.g. textbooks, drawing books, back-to-school kits, notebooks, student desks and benches (to be counted per child seat), school bags, etc.

Children should not be double counted: any individual child should only be counted once. For example, if 2,500 children were provided with one textbook each and the same children were provided with one back-to-school kit each, the total number of children reached would be 2,500, while if different children were reached by the two interventions the total number would be 5,000.

**Indicator:** b4. Number of classrooms provided with classroom education materials funded by UNICEF SP programme area – activity focus code: Learning– supply  
This indicator the same indicator as SMQ 41

**Definition:** this indicator captures the number of classrooms provided with classroom education materials funded by UNICEF

**Method of computation:** The classroom education materials considered are those materials that benefit an entire classroom of children e.g. school-in-a-box, teachers’ guides, chalk boards, posters, maps, bookshelves etc.

Classrooms should not be double counted: any individual classroom should only be counted once. For example, if 200 classrooms were provided with one teachers’ guide each and the same classrooms were provided with one school-in-a-box each, the total number of classrooms reached would be 200, while if different classrooms were reached by the two interventions the total number would be 400."
Recommend leveraging USAID's methodology for their programmatic output indicators (shared excel document – not available online) below:

"Indicator: Number of primary or secondary textbooks and other teaching and learning materials (TLM) provided with ECW assistance

Definition: Textbooks and other teaching and learning materials (TLM) are the aids used by the educator to help in teaching/instructing effectively and the aids used by the learner/student to help in learning more effectively.

Some materials are designed, printed, and published. Other materials are purchased and distributed. For the purposes of this indicator, the same material should be counted only once, in its final stage of USG support. In the totals, materials should be counted only once. For example:

- One (1) teacher manual and one (1) student textbook are designed and developed with USG assistance.
- 2,000 copies of the teacher manual and 100,000 copies of the student textbook are printed and distributed with USG assistance.
- The total count would be 102,000 primary or secondary textbooks and other teaching and learning materials (TLM) provided with USG assistance. (2,000 teacher manuals + 100,000 student textbooks = 102,000 TLM)

Examples of TLM include, but are not limited to, the following: textbooks; student workbooks; supplementary reading books; educational tapes and CDs; library books; reference material in paper or electronic formats; support material for educational radio and TV broadcasts; teacher manuals and guides; etc.

“Sets” of small materials (e.g. flash cards; alphabet cards) should be counted as a single TLM rather than individuals TLMs. For example:

- One (1) complete set of alphabet flash cards contains 26 cards.
- 5,000 sets of alphabet flash cards (130,000 individual cards) are purchased and distributed with USG assistance.
- The total count would be 5,000 primary or secondary textbooks and other teaching and learning materials (TLM) provided with USG assistance.

Essentially, TLMs are associated with content embedded in the material itself. Materials and means of conveying content that have no content themselves are not included.
Examples of materials that are NOT counted include, but are not limited to, the following: pencils, pens, and other writing utensils; handouts used in training and professional development; chalk; chalkboards; slates; whiteboards; etc. These materials are not counted as TLM because they do not convey content in and of themselves.

**Indicator Type:** Output

**Reporting Type:** Number

**Use of this indicator:** This indicator will be used to monitor the overall scope of materials and products resulting from education investments. It will be used, along with other education-related standard indicators, to report progress and results in the education sector and supplement other reporting against the goals of the USAID Education Strategy.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Data Source:** Official government records, official reports from implementing partners

**Disaggregate:** N/A

**Recommend the following adjustments to UNICEF's guidance:**
- Replace UNICEF / USAID with ECW
- Expand and revise for selected menu of indicators

**Phased investment:** N/A

---

### 27. Variance from cost standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Activity/Output - Breakthrough fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source</td>
<td>TBD Potential standards funded through Acc. Facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #27: Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for variance from country-specific unit cost standards (e.g., for textbooks, construction, teacher salaries) - to be developed

- Disaggregated by refugee camps vs. host communities

**Results statement:** Activity/output: ECW makes grants through the **Breakthrough Fund**, representing 95% of ECW’s overall investments, in line with a strategy
approved by the HLSG and to support inclusive, coordinated, and impactful in-country program delivery

**Rationale:** ECW prioritizes value for money in its own operations and those of its grantees. Country-specific unit cost standards will be measured to assess variance over time. Increasing costs are not necessarily reason for alarm, but it is important for ECW to be aware of any unexpected cost increases and ascertain the reason for such variances.

Cost standards will likely differ across countries and may vary meaningfully within countries, especially in refugee camps vs. host communities. ECW will ask costs to be disaggregated by refugee camps vs. host communities and will assess if regional disaggregation is necessary and feasible.

The TWG did raise an open question to be explored further of whether unit costs are so context-specific that standards would not be useful.

**Technical guidance:** To be developed through phased investment

**Phased investment:** New indicator / data platform – ECW to invest in developing cost standards that are country-specific and will assess if regional disaggregation is necessary and feasible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28. Grants jointly coordinated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type:</strong> Activity/Output – Breakthrough fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong> Multi-year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong> ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #28: Proportion of ECW grant proposals that are inclusive of all local actors, including Education Clusters, LEGs, refugee coordination groups, local civil society, and national governments, where applicable and appropriate

**Results statement:** Activity/output: ECW makes grants through the Breakthrough Fund, representing 95% of ECW’s overall investments, in line with a strategy approved by the HLSG and to support inclusive, coordinated, and impactful in-country program delivery

**Rationale:** ECW should seek to build coordination at the country-level through its proposal and grant-making process. ECW proposals must build off existing systems and ensuring joint planning and response.

ECW’s Theory of Change articulates that better improvement on this output indicator will lead to strong coordination beyond ECW proposals to more
inclusive processes for developing humanitarian and development plans (measured by systematic outcome indicator #17).

**Technical guidance:**

Recommend expanding upon GPE’s methodology for their indicator "29: Proportion of GPE grants aligned to national systems" (shared PDF document – not available online):

**Definition:** This indicator examines whether GPE program grants are aligned to and use their developing country partners’ national systems. It uses a threshold of meeting at least 7 out of 10 criteria of alignment, as defined in the GPE methodology developed for this indicator. In the context of this indicator:

- “Alignment” is defined as basing support / funding modalities on developing country partners’ (DCPs) own operational systems, frameworks and procedures
- “Country systems” are understood to relate to a set of seven dimensions covering strategic, administrative, and financial systems of GPE DCPs, for which the concept of alignment is examined, as follows:
  - Plan
  - Budget
  - Treasury
  - Procurement
  - Accounting
  - Audit
  - Report
- For the purpose of this indicator, each of these seven dimensions contains 1 to 2 sub-points, formulated as questions, intended to cover the concept of alignment to national systems for the specific dimension.
- “GPE grants” are defined as GPE Education Sector Program Implementation Grants (ESPIGs) active during a given fiscal year and included in the ESPIG sample. These ESPIGs comprise all grants active in the FY regardless of whether: (a) they closed or not during the FY and (b) whether they fall or not under the new GPE funding model.

This methodology was derived from international best practice and the classification of dimensions of aid on budget a proposed by the Busan Task Force on Public Financial Management. In the revised Quality Assurance Review process, adapted to the New Funding Model, the Secretariat introduced a requirement to provide information on use of country systems through an analysis of the previous grant at the start of the development of a new program. In addition, a section on the use or non-use of country systems was added to ESPIG application form (provided below in Annex 1).
This provides a framework to analyze the use of country systems in all applications under the 2015-2018 Funding Model and compared to the applications that did not use this Model."

**Reference period:** Fiscal year  
**Periodicity:** Every year (i.e. 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020) "

**Recommend the following adjustments to GPE's guidance:**
- Replace GPE with ECW, ESPIGs with ECW multi-year windowgrant proposals
- Develop technical guidance for other groups beyond national governments: Education Clusters, Local Education Groups (LEGs), Refugee coordination groups, and local civil society, where relevant and appropriate

Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phased investment:</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## 29. Grant transition plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Activity/Output – Breakthrough fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>Multi-year and first response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Indicator name:</th>
<th>Indicator #29: Proportion of all ECW grant proposals approved in Breakthrough Fund with transition plans for sustainability after ECW grant period concludes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results statement:</td>
<td>Activity/output: ECW makes grants through the <strong>Breakthrough Fund</strong>, representing 95% of ECW’s overall investments, in line with a strategy approved by the HLSG and to support inclusive, coordinated, and impactful in-country program delivery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rationale: | While various factors affect whether a grantee is able to secure sustainable funding sources after the ECW grant period concludes, including other development actors and the beneficiary government, ECW can ensure that grantees develop a transition plan for sustainable funding as part of their proposal for ECW funding.  
In multi-year grants, there will be a lag between grant proposal approval and confirming a transition plan at the end of the grant period. Grants will include milestones related to transition planning which the ECW Secretariat will also support. |
ECW’s Theory of Change articulates that better improvement on this output indicator will lead to greater sustainability of ECW-supported activities continuing after the grant period (measured by systematic outcome indicator #15).

**Technical guidance:**
Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed

**Phased investment:**
N/A

---

### 30. Civil society funding

**Type:** Activity/Output – Breakthrough fund

**Coverage:** Multi-year and first response

**Data source:** ECW Secretariat

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #30: Proportion of countries where % of ECW funding to local civil society implementers either through direct grant agents or sub-grantees meets target laid out in Grand Bargain

**Results statement:** Activity/output: ECW makes grants through the Breakthrough Fund, representing 95% of ECW’s overall investments, in line with a strategy approved by the HLSG and to support inclusive, coordinated, and impactful in-country program delivery

**Rationale:** ECW aims to build local capacity in-country to enhance the sustainability and localization of programs that it funds. The Grand Bargain called for a substantial increase in international aid funding to be channeled to local civil society implementers.

While risk considerations may limit the proportion of local civil society that can be direct grantees, ECW will work with grantees to encourage local civil society inclusion.

**Technical guidance:**
Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed

**Phased investment:**
N/A

The 2020 target for ECW was set at 25% of funding to civil society implementers, in line with the Grand Bargain.
### 31. Acc. facility grant-specific results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Activity/Output – Acceleration facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>Acc facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>ECW acc. facility grantees, ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #31: Proportion of acceleration facility grantees assessed as "on track" with grant implementation, with the definition of "on track" to be defined through grant-specific performance indicators outlined in grant agreement

**Results statement:** Activity/output: Through the Acceleration facility (representing 5% of ECW’s investments), ECW makes catalytic investments in global and regional architecture, in line with its overall strategy

**Rationale:** Acceleration facility grants will differ markedly by the type of global or regional public good being invested in. Based on comparative analysis of other global funds focused on innovation and global products and services, performance metrics of each grant are likely to measure very different things. Thus, ECW will assess whether metrics were achieved, even if metrics differ by grantee.

Because it may be difficult to demonstrate aggregate achievements of Acceleration Facility if metrics differ, ECW strategy will lay out the way in which Acceleration Facility results contribute to overall vision

**Technical guidance:** Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed

**Phased investment:** N/A

### 32. ECW country baselines collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Activity/Output – Acceleration facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>ECW platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #32: Proportion of all ECW indicators for each ECW-supported country with baselines identified and collected

**Results statement:** Activity/output: Through the Acceleration facility (representing 5% of ECW’s investments), ECW makes catalytic investments in global and regional architecture, in line with its overall strategy
**Rationale:** ECW aspires for global baselines for key education crisis indicators. ECW can directly contribute to this global goal by first identifying and collecting baselines for all ECW indicators. Many indicators will require the fund's operation and grantee collection to establish. ECW will build these baselines over time for each country it supports, where applicable, and provide M&E support to grantees as needed and especially in the early years of the fund.

**Technical guidance:** Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed

It is recommended that this indicator be calculated with the following numerator and denominator:

- **Numerator:** number of country-level indicators where baselines are collected plus the number of global-level indicators where baselines are collected
- **Denominator:** total number of countries where given indicator is relevant times given indicator (summed for each country-level indicator) plus the total number of global-level indicators.

**Phased investment:** N/A

---

### 33. Total overhead (ECW and grant agents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type:</strong></th>
<th>Fund efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage:</strong></td>
<td>ECW platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data source:</strong></td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Full Indicator name:** Indicator #33: % of overhead costs (across ECW and grantees) as a ratio of total resources

**Results statement:** Activity/output: ECW efficiently approves, disburses, and manages grants to ensure value for money for ECW donors through fund management structures that are fit for purpose and an operational model that allows nimble decision making

**Rationale:** Donors expect a lean Secretariat to limit overhead costs and ensure sufficient portion of funds are going directly to beneficiaries in country or global goods in the case of the acceleration facility.

It was mentioned that one concern with this indicator is that measuring administrative support costs may inadvertently deter ECW from spending what is necessary to effectively administer grants. Thus, it was advised that this metric not to be used for evaluation of the Secretariat but instead to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical guidance:</th>
<th>Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: UNICEF uses a related indicator M2.1 Management/administration/development effectiveness support costs as a ratio of total resources, noted in UNICEF’s Strategic Plan Results Framework as a measure of Organizational effectiveness and efficiency. The technical guidance for that indicator was not obtained as part of this work and was not available online but could be requested from UNICEF in developing the technical guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phased investment:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 34. Time to disburse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type:</th>
<th>Fund efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coverage:</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source:</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Indicator name:</th>
<th>Indicator #34: Average number of days across grantees for ECW to i) disburse funds upon crisis onset in countries supported by ECW first response window and ii) disburse funds upon selection for proposal in countries supported by ECW multi-year window</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results statement:</td>
<td>Activity/output: ECW efficiently approves, disburses, and manages grants to ensure value for money for ECW donors through fund management structures that are fit for purpose and an operational model that allows nimble decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td>Rapid response time is crucial in the crisis contexts in which ECW operates. The first response window was designed to be nimble in its selection and disbursement processes. Thus, the time between crisis onset and fund disbursement should be short. The multi-year window has a more strategic selection process. Thus, time is measured from selection. The TWG advised that particularly for the multi-year window, it is important for ECW to measure the time from selection for proposal to fund disbursement to ensure accountability for ECW to manage the time it takes to review, score, and approve proposals. One limitation of this indicator is that it does not assess time from disbursement to grantees to program implementation and beneficiary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
enrollment. While it is ideal for funds to reach beneficiaries quickly, ECW recognizes that each context is different and sometimes longer implementation timelines are preferred for coordination / sustainability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Technical guidance:</strong></th>
<th><em>Not developed from peer indicator, technical guidance to be developed</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phased investment:</strong></td>
<td><em>N/A</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>