

EDUCATION CANNOT WAIT

ECW Results Framework - Indicator Guidance

17 July 2018

This document provides guidance on ECW indicators that are relevant to ECW grantees.

Please note the following:

- **Mandatory indicators should be reported upon by all grantees without exception**, even if the value is 0. In some cases, it is acknowledged that part of the disaggregation may be technically difficult and will only be undertaken if feasible – this is specified in this guidance.
- **Additional indicators should be reported upon if relevant** to the country context, technically feasible and compatible with existing monitoring frameworks. In some contexts, it may be best to use a slightly different indicator at country level if this means being a good team player with local partners and avoiding the creation of parallel indicators and reporting systems.

Note that while all additional indicators are important if grantees are to assess the effectiveness of education in emergencies programmes, several of them have so far almost never been measured in crisis-affected contexts. It is therefore advised that a grantee does not attempt to measure all additional indicators at once, unless it already has experience in doing so, but instead tries and expand current measurement efforts by including one, possibly two, additional indicators or by expanding disaggregation, as relevant and feasible.

Where indicators on the additional indicator list are hard to measure, the use of proxies as an intermediary step towards improved monitoring is encouraged. Some of these proxies are provided below (e.g. attendance rates), but further proxies may be used, including: i) measurement of the use of or satisfaction with ECW-supported inputs, such as textbooks or latrines, for example or ii) measurement of changes in knowledge after training (e.g. teachers' knowledge of appropriate pedagogy, students' knowledge of the code of conduct, etc.). Please note that to assess the result of an intervention, pre-tests and post-tests are often necessary.

Indicator list:

Impact indicators:

1. [Number of children/youth reached with ECW assistance \(mandatory\).](#)
2. [Country out-of-school rate.](#)
3. [Country pre-primary learning outcomes.](#)
4. [Country primary/lower-secondary learning outcomes.](#)

Outcome indicators:

5. [Average attendance rate for ECW-supported children/youth.](#)

6. [ECW-supported community out-of-school rate.](#)
7. [Average instructional time in ECW-supported schools.](#)
8. [Pre-primary learning outcomes of ECW-supported children.](#)
9. [Primary/lower-secondary math and reading outcomes of ECW-supported children.](#)
10. [Share of ECW-supported schools and learning environments meeting safe learning standards.](#)
11. [Primary/lower secondary survival rate in ECW-supported communities.](#)
12. [Primary/lower secondary completion rate in ECW-supported communities.](#)
13. [Country score for “presence of inclusive policies”](#) (regarding: girls’ secondary education, school-related gender based violence, children with disabilities, refugees and internally displaced persons).
14. [Domestic financing for education.](#)
15. [Country score for “presence of a quality EMIS”.](#)

Output indicators:

16. Grant specific outputs:
 - a. [Number of children and youth receiving individual learning materials](#) (textbooks, notebooks etc.) through ECW-supported programmes (mandatory).
 - b. [Number of classrooms supported](#) (blackboards, maps, school-in-a-box, WASH facilities, etc.) through ECW-supported programmes (mandatory).
 - c. [Number of teachers/administrators trained](#) (in psychosocial support, peace education, life skills, etc.) through ECW-supported programmes, by gender (mandatory).
 - d. [Number of teachers/administrators recruited/financially supported](#) through ECW-supported programmes, by gender (mandatory).
 - e. [Number of gender sensitive latrines constructed or rehabilitated](#) through ECW-supported programmes.
 - f. [Number of children and youth provided with learning materials in a language they understand](#) through ECW-supported programmes.
 - g. [Number of schools adopting/operationalizing a code of conduct](#) through ECW-supported programmes.

1. Number of children/youth reached with ECW assistance (mandatory)	
Type	Impact
Data source	ECW grantee data
Coverage	First Response & multi-year Resilience Programmes
Full Indicator name	Total number of children and youth in school or equivalent non-school based settings, including pre-primary education, reached with ECW assistance.
Disaggregation	<p>Grantees should disaggregate this indicator by gender, level of education and formal vs. non-formal settings. Disaggregation by disability and population group (refugee, IDPs, host populations, and other groups) may be more difficult but should be done where feasible.</p> <p>When disaggregation is not possible or specific groups are not targeted, estimates may be used, using current or expected proportions within the target population. The fact that estimates were used should be specified, and the rationale for estimates explained as feasible.</p>
Purpose	Communicate the overall number of learners benefitting from ECW assistance and track progress towards the top-line impact target of over 10 million children and youth reached in the first five years of ECW. The indicator also provides information regarding equity in programming.
Technical guidance	<p>The focus is on child beneficiaries. If, for instance, teachers are trained, what will be identified will be the number of children benefitting from that training, but the teachers themselves will not be counted as beneficiaries. This approach is consistent with that of USAID.</p> <p>For the sake of calculation, beneficiaries are separated into three groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Direct beneficiaries are direct recipients of inputs, e.g. school kits, scholarships, cash incentives, textbooks¹, etc. The number of direct beneficiaries is often equal to the number of inputs or sets of inputs (e.g. set of textbooks). - Intermediate beneficiaries are directly affected by downstream interventions on the school or learning environment: teacher training², school/classroom construction, materials for teachers, etc. The number of intermediate beneficiaries is the number of students who will interact with these inputs; in practice, it is estimated through the current or expected student/input ratio (e.g. pupil/teacher ratio, pupil/classroom ratio). For instance, the intermediate beneficiaries of 100 teachers receiving pre-service training is 100 x Pupil-Teacher Ratio. When classrooms are supported, the pupil/classroom ratio should be used³. The student/input ratio will as much as possible be specific to the regions, populations and situations targeted.

¹ Although textbooks are generally distributed to schools rather than students, students benefitting from textbooks are included here under direct beneficiaries.

² Pre-service teacher training or qualifying in-service training is included in this category, while other in-service training, which can be of very different lengths and contents, is included in the indirect beneficiary category, as an upstream improvement of the system.

³ At primary level when, most often, only one teacher teaches the students, this will be the same as the pupil teacher ratio. But when several teachers teach the same students, it is best to use the student/classroom ratio when available.

	<p>- Long term beneficiaries benefit from the intervention after the year of intervention. While the categories above relate to immediate beneficiaries, who are benefitting from the input (or the provision of that input) on the year of the intervention, some children will still benefit from trained teachers, built classrooms, or school books provided to the schools in the following years.</p> <p>- Indirect beneficiaries are more broadly the users of any system or environment improved by interventions having only an indirect impact on schools and students – e.g. beneficiaries of a change in education policies, children in a district whose inspectors are better trained etc.</p> <p>The present calculations will only include the above-defined direct and intermediate beneficiaries, and will exclude the last two categories.</p> <p>Double-counting: If the same children benefit from several interventions, they will only be counted once (e.g. students receiving school kits whose teachers are also trained by the programme). Caution will thus be given to targeted groups. Note however that if some beneficiaries are reached by the same intervention (or set of interventions) in two different years of the programme, they will be counted for each year in which the programme is targeting them.</p>
--	--

2. Country out-of-school rate	
Type	Impact
Data source	External data (UIS, government, household surveys)
Coverage	First Response & multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Out-of-school rate for children 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.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	Data should be disaggregated by gender, and may include further disaggregation where possible.
<i>Purpose</i>	Measure ECW’s impact on country-level out of school rates. This is the result of impact on ECW’s direct beneficiaries and indirect impact (through political commitment/capacity building) on communities it does not serve directly. Outcome level indicators focus more narrowly on the communities to which ECW provides direct support.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>Out-of-school rates reflect the share of children in the official age range for primary, lower secondary, or upper secondary education who are not enrolled in primary, lower or upper secondary education. Children who are enrolled in pre-primary education are considered out of school.</p> <p>Country-level out of school rates will be collected from external (non-grantee) data sources. UIS data can allow for better international comparisons and aggregation at the global level, if they are available and reliable⁴. But lack of availability or reliability of UIS data and/or the need to be a good team player</p>

⁴ UIS data use national enrolment figures and population figures from the UN population database. Population figures are corrected, where feasible, to account for displaced populations. However, in cases where important/recent population movements took place, population estimates may be inaccurate or outdated, which means that other data sources may be more reliable.

	<p>at country level and ensure coherence with agreed monitoring frameworks (e.g. education sector plan) may require the use of other data sources. These may be national administrative data and/or household survey data.</p> <p>Out of school rates can normally be disaggregated by gender whatever the data source, but further disaggregation may be possible, particularly if values come from household survey data.</p>
--	---

3. Country pre-primary learning outcomes	
Type	Impact
Data source	External data (UNICEF, national and international surveys)
Coverage	Multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Percentage of children under five (5) years of age who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning, and psychosocial wellbeing.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	This indicator may be disaggregated 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 should be considered if available in future assessments.
<i>Purpose</i>	Measure ECW’s impact on country-level early learning. This is the result of impact on ECW’s direct beneficiaries and indirect impact (through political commitment/capacity building) on communities it does not serve directly. Outcome level indicators focus more narrowly on the communities to which ECW provides direct support.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>Proportion of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex, as defined by the assessment tool.</p> <p>UNICEF’s Multiple indicator cluster survey (MICS) early childhood development index (ECDI) measures this indicator. It presently looks at children aged 36-59 months and defines “on track” as meeting agreed standards in at least three of the following four domains: literacy-numeracy, physical, socio-emotional and learning (see more details on standards by domain here).</p> <p>Other measures to capture children’s early childhood experiences have been used in multiple countries including 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.</p> <p>Grantees should consider what measures, if any, are available in their country-specific contexts and/or are foreseen. Existing/planned survey dates should allow for comparison between pre- and post-project pre-primary outcomes.</p>

4. Country primary/lower-secondary learning outcomes	
Type	Impact
Data source	External data (national/international learning assessment surveys, UIS when it becomes available)
Coverage	Multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	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.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	This indicator may be disaggregated by sex, location, age, income, family background or participation in early childhood programmes as feasible. Children with disabilities are often excluded from learning assessment surveys, and when they are not, reliable information on children’s disability status is rarely available. If, however, relevant information is collected, then disaggregation by disability should be considered.
<i>Purpose</i>	Measure ECW’s impact on country-level learning outcomes. This is the result of impact on ECW’s direct beneficiaries and indirect impact (through political commitment/capacity building) on communities it does not serve directly. Outcome level indicators focus more narrowly on the communities to which ECW provides direct support.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The source of information includes national or cross-national learning assessments, which could include the Programme d'Analyse des Systèmes Educatifs 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), Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), the Early Grade Reading and Math Assessments (EGRA, EGMA) and Literacy Boost. Further assessments evaluate learning outcomes of children in and out of school, including UWEZO, ASER and UNICEF’s Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (round 6 onward, if the learning module is selected by the country).</p> <p>Grantees should consider what measures, if any, are available in their country-specific contexts and/or are foreseen. Existing/planned survey dates should allow for comparison between pre- and post-project pre-primary outcomes. Comparability of results over time is not always feasible with all surveys (e.g. EGRA and EGMA results are not always comparable over time), and is a pre-requisite before an assessment can be used for this indicator.</p>

5. Average attendance rate for ECW-supported children/youth	
Type	Beneficiary outcomes
Data source	ECW grantee data
Coverage	First Response & multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Average attendance rate for ECW-supported children and youth in formal or non-formal equivalent.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	This indicator should be disaggregated by gender, level of education, formal vs. non-formal equivalent, disability status, refugee, IDP and host population, and other population groups relevant to the context, as feasible.
<i>Purpose</i>	Measure ongoing attendance beyond initial enrollment – a crucial parameter especially in crisis conflicts.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>Average number of days children are present in school divided by the expected number of days of schooling in the school year. Attendance rates may differ markedly between formal or non-formal equivalent programmes, and accelerated programmes, hence it is suggested that measurement may focus on the former.</p> <p>Possible approaches to measuring attendance include, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) 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. ii) Using monthly attendance records to measure attendance rates, or alternatively, the number of children/youth regularly attending above some threshold (e.g., 75% of the days assessed). <p>Costs/feasibility should be balanced with expected results reliability to decide on a specific measurement approach. Note that while, so far, no standardized methodology or tool is proposed to ECW grantees, these may be developed in the future.</p>

6. ECW-supported community out-of-school rate	
Type	Beneficiary outcomes
Data source	Disaggregation of existing household surveys (where feasible)
Coverage	First Response & multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Out-of-school rate for children and youth in ECW-supported communities.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	This indicator may be disaggregated 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 should be considered if available in future assessments.
<i>Purpose</i>	Track out-of-school rates in ECW-supported communities to measure direct results from ECW programmes.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	Percentage of children in the official age range for the level of education who are not enrolled in primary, lower or upper secondary education. Children who are enrolled in pre-primary education are considered out of school.

	<p>It is suggested to use existing household surveys that can provide representative samples for ECW-supported communities, as feasible, given that ECW-supported household surveys may be too costly and problematic in some crisis contexts with large migratory populations or safety concerns. Where surveys are in place, ECW grantees could ensure that data is disaggregated in a way that allows to obtain relevant information for ECW-supported communities. For some surveys that cover a significantly broader population sample, subsamples covering ECW-supported populations may be too small to be representative – in these cases oversampling of ECW-supported communities may be considered, as feasible in the country context.</p> <p>In some cases, other data sources such as UNHCR data or government administrative data will be available, and could be capitalized upon as feasible.</p> <p>Note that it is suggested 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 the gender parity index even though they reflect a worsening of the overall situation).</p>
--	---

7. Average instructional time in ECW-supported schools	
Type	Beneficiary outcomes
Data source	ECW grantee data
Coverage	First Response & multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Average hours of instructional time in classroom per week in core subjects (reading and math) across ECW supported programs.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	This indicator may be disaggregated by subject, level of education, and formal vs. non-formal equivalent, as feasible.
<i>Purpose</i>	<p>This measure goes beyond measures of student or teacher attendance to ensure that children and youth in ECW supported programs are receiving sufficient and quality instructional time by qualified staff.</p> <p>Instructional time in the classroom can be used as a reasonable proxy for quality, especially in first response settings when learning outcome assessments are not realistic.</p>
<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>Actual instruction time per week in core subjects (reading and math), in hours. This refers to hours during which teachers are in the classroom and actually engaged in instruction.</p> <p>Instructional time is superior to simply measuring teacher attendance or absenteeism, as for example teachers may be in the classroom but not teaching. However, measuring instructional time may not be possible in all contexts. In those cases, teacher absenteeism should be used instead if possible.</p> <p>Instructional time can be collected in several ways, including classroom observations of a sample of schools. Possible guidance to consider include Stalling's Classroom Snapshot Observation System from the World Bank, which assesses instructional time spent on task vs. off task. Other tools exist that can be capitalized upon.</p>

8. Pre-primary learning outcomes of ECW-supported children	
Type	Beneficiary outcomes
Data source	ECW grantee data – assessments for ECW-supported communities
Coverage	Multi-year Resilience Programmes
Full Indicator name	Proportion of ECW-supported children under five years of age who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning, and psychosocial well-being.
Disaggregation	This indicator may be disaggregated 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 should be considered if available in future assessments.
Purpose	Track pre-primary development outcomes in ECW-supported communities to measure direct results from ECW programmes. Psychosocial and health outcomes are key enablers of learning, particularly in young, crisis affected children.
Technical guidance	<p>Proportion of children under 5 years of age who are developmentally on track in health, learning and psychosocial well-being, by sex. UNICEF’s Multiple indicator cluster survey (MICS) early childhood development index (ECDI) presently looks at children aged 36-59 months and defines “on track” as meeting agreed standards in at least three of the following four domains: (see more details on standards by domain here). Other measures of pre-primary development outcomes are detailed under Indicator 3.</p> <p>National assessments of pre-primary development outcomes often do not exist in crisis-affected countries. Where they do, they often exclude crisis affected communities, and even where these are included, sample sizes for these communities may be too small to be representative. This means that grantees that wish to measure early learning outcomes for the communities they support will most likely have to undertake their own survey using existing assessment tools as an inspiration. In doing so, it will be important to consider the relevance of assessment contents and thresholds (i.e. who is considered “on track”) to ECW-supported communities, as well as integrate consideration of financial, technical and logistical feasibility. Simple, feasible, context-relevant assessments that can help improve future programming and/or assess the effectiveness of ECW-supported programmes may be more useful than complex assessments that put a heavy burden on grantees.</p>

9. Primary/ lower-secondary math and reading outcomes of ECW-supported children	
Type	Beneficiary outcomes
Data source	ECW grantee data – assessments for ECW-supported communities
Coverage	Multi-year Resilience Programmes
Full Indicator name	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).

<i>Disaggregation</i>	This indicator should be disaggregated by gender, level of education, formal vs. non-formal equivalent, disability status, refugee, IDP and host population, and other population groups relevant to the context, as feasible.
<i>Purpose</i>	Track primary and lower-secondary learning outcomes at the ECW-supported community level in addition to at the country-level. In addition to tracking learning in core subjects (reading and math), this indicator integrates Socio-Emotional Skills (SEL) as a key driver of a culture of peace and non-violence and global citizenship.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>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 and (iii) social and emotional learning (SEL).</p> <p>Measurement of learning outcomes on ECW-supported communities needs to be adapted to the context. For example, curriculum based assessments may not make sense in a situation in which most children have lost several years of schooling and/or many follow alternative curricula. Further, some assessments are well-adapted to providing a snapshot of academic performance, but may not be as useful to assess the effectiveness of ECW-supported programmes or to inform improvements in teaching and learning. Hence even in countries in which learning assessments are in place at the national level, it may be more meaningful to design a separate assessment for ECW-targeted communities.</p> <p>Given the difficulties in implementing learning assessments in crisis contexts, it may be useful to start with simple, small-scale assessments then consider scaling up at a later stage. Priorities would be on a small number of levels (e.g., grades 3 and 8) and simple assessments (e.g., reading with comprehension / basic math rather than grade appropriate competencies).</p> <p>Measurement of Socio-Emotional Skills (SEL) is similarly important but few assessments exist – though efforts are ongoing to develop and implement relevant assessments in crisis contexts. If needed, ECW may put interested grantees in contact with partners that have experience in this regard.</p>

10.Share of ECW-supported schools and learning environments meeting safe learning standards	
Type	Beneficiary outcomes
Data source	ECW grantee data
Coverage	First Response & multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Proportion of ECW-supported schools/learning environments that meet safe learning environment standards, including disaster risk reduction and gender-specific issues.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	Information may be disaggregated by level of education.
<i>Purpose</i>	In crisis zones, schools offer protection for children and youth. However, they are often targeted by combatants in conflict. It was therefore recommended that schools and learning environments supported by ECW be assessed against a set of safe learning environment standards.

<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>Percentage of ECW-supported schools that meet safe learning environment standards, including disaster risk reduction and gender-specific issues.</p> <p>No standardized ECW-guidance exists, but it is suggested that existing safe learning environment standards used by Save the Children (quality learning environment standards), UNHCR, UNICEF (child-friendly standards) and other partners can be leveraged. See an excerpt of standards used by different organizations in annex 1.</p> <p>It is advised that final criteria should include a <u>manageable number of items</u>, including elements related to disaster risk reduction and gender-specific issues around sanitation, separate toilets, sanitary products, and sexual and gender based violence. Schools may be considered as “meeting safe learning environment standards” if a minimum number of criteria are met. Assessments may be carried out in a sample of schools or, ideally, all schools if numbers supported are not too large. Yes/no answers often oversimplify reality so scales may be considered instead of a binary approach.</p> <p>If a more complex assessment is not feasible, simpler proxies may be considered e.g. the percentage of schools in which a mechanism to report incidents of sexual and gender based violence is in place, or the incidence of attacks on students, personnel and institutions.</p> <p>Note that records of incidents of sexual and gender based violence themselves are not an ideal proxy as they could be difficult to interpret: higher incidence could either reflect higher violence or more trust in school authorities, the latter actually being positive. A World Health Organization (WHO) survey exists that measures actual percentages of students experiencing bullying, corporal punishment, harassment, violence, sexual discrimination and abuse, but is unlikely to often be undertaken in crisis-affected contexts.</p>
---------------------------	---

11.Primary/lower secondary survival rate in ECW-supported communities	
Type	Beneficiary outcomes
Data source	ECW grantee data or data sources from humanitarian partners
Coverage	Multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Survival rate (% of pupils in the first grade of education expected to reach successive grades) for ECW-supported children & youth in (i) primary school and (ii) lower-secondary school.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	This indicator should be disaggregated by gender and level of education. It may also be disaggregated by disability status, refugee, IDP and host population, and other population groups relevant to the context, as feasible.
<i>Purpose</i>	Beyond simple access, measure retention of students and their progression through grades.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	Survival rate to the last grade of primary education: proportion of a cohort of pupils enrolled in the first grade of primary education in a given school year

who are expected to reach the last grade of primary school, regardless of repetition.

Survival rate to the last grade of lower secondary education: proportion of a cohort of pupils enrolled in the first grade of lower secondary education in a given school year who are expected to reach the last grade of lower secondary education, regardless of repetition.

Computation method:

Calculation of survival rates may be undertaken as follows:

If N_1 is the number of students in grade 1 in year 1, and R_1 the number of repeaters in grade 1 in year 1, then $N_1 - R_1$ is the number of non-repeaters in grade 1 and year 1. Similarly, if N_2 is the number of students in grade 2 in year 2, and R_2 the number of repeaters in grade 2 in year 2, then, $N_2 - R_2$ is the number of non-repeaters in grade 2 and year 2.

Survival between grade 1 and grade 2 can then be computed as the number of non-repeaters in year 2 and grade 2 divided by the number of non-repeaters in year 1 and grade 1, or:

$$(N_2 - R_2) / (N_1 - R_1)$$

Survival to the last grade of primary education is the product of the survival rates between grade 1 and 2, grade 2 and 3, etc. until the last grade of primary education. For example, if primary education is from grade 1 until grade 6, then survival to grade 6 will be equal to the product of survival between grade 1 and 2, grade 2 and 3, grade 3 and 4, grade 4 and 5, and grade 5 and 6.

At lower secondary level, the same computation can be used, except that survival is the product of survival rates between the first and last grades of lower secondary education. For example, if lower secondary education goes from grade 7 until grade 9, then survival in lower secondary education will be the product of survival between grade 7 and 8, and between grade 8 and 9.

The strength of this computation is that it does not require individual student tracking. One of the weaknesses of the computation, however, is that results can be affected by high transfer rates from ECW-supported schools to other schools. Hence, if many children come in and leave the schools, results may be significantly affected – a lot of new arrivals artificially inflating survival rates while a lot of departures will artificially depress survival rates.

Note that it may not be feasible to define "survival" in accelerated or non-formal programs that do not follow a standard progression by grades.

12.Primary/lower secondary completion rate in ECW-supported communities

Type	Beneficiary outcomes
Data source	ECW grantee data or data sources from humanitarian partners
Coverage	Multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Completion rates in: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	This indicator should be disaggregated by gender and level of education. It may also be disaggregated by disability status, refugee, IDP and host population, and other population groups relevant to the context, as feasible.
<i>Purpose</i>	This indicator helps track what proportion of children complete the different education levels. It is useful in traditional education programmes, and even more so for education in times of crisis, which often involves informal or accelerated programmes, that do not always allow children to transition to formal schools and complete their education. As ECW support winds down, it will be important that children gain the possibility to transition to formal schools and complete their education.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>Percentage of a cohort of children in ECW-supported communities who ultimately complete primary or lower secondary education.</p> <p>This may be calculated in two ways: based on household survey data, or based on administrative and population data, as a proxy, through the gross intake ratio to the last grade of primary or lower secondary education. To be computed based on household survey data, there needs to be a household survey that covers ECW-supported communities and is representative at that level. To be computed based on administrative and population data, there needs to be sufficient quality, up to date information on the number of children in ECW-supported communities that are of the expected age for the last grade of primary (resp. lower secondary) education.</p> <p>If computed based on household survey data: It will be computed as the percentage of a cohort of children 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.</p> <p>The completion rate the number of persons in the relevant age group who have completed the last grade of the given level of education expressed as a percentage of the total population (in the survey sample) of the same age group.</p> <p>If computed based on administrative data: it is calculated as the number of new entrants to the last grade of a given education divided by the total number of children of the intended age for the last grade of that level education. New entrants to the last grade of a given level education are computed as the total number of children enrolled in that grade, minus the number of repeaters.</p> <p>This calculation relies on up-to-date, quality population data by age and assumes that the population that is expected to attend ECW-supported schools (catchment area) is well-known.</p>

13. Presence of inclusive policies	
Type	Systemic outcomes
Data source	External data (UNICEF, humanitarian partners) or ECW-grantee data
Coverage	Multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	<p>This indicator is composed of 3 sub-indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Girls' secondary education, in terms of enrollment, retention, and completion is a recognized, targeted, and budgeted education priority. • There are policies on inclusive education covering children with disabilities. • The education sector policy/plan specifies prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools. • There are policies on inclusive education covering refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs).
<i>Disaggregation</i>	None
<i>Purpose</i>	<p>Measures political commitment to equity, as 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 learning but also to ensure that girls, children and youth with disabilities, and other marginalized groups, such as displaced persons, receive equitable learning opportunities.</p> <p>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 recognizes this indicator may not apply in all contexts.</p>
<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>ECW indicators on girls' education, children with disabilities and gender based violence are based on UNICEF's Strategic Plan Education Indicator Guidance. Scores on a given indicator are the average of scores over several dimensions, as detailed in annex 2.</p> <p>No standard assessment tool exists so far to assess policies for displaced persons. ECW intends to develop specific guidance in the future – until then, grantees may use their own criteria.</p>

14. Domestic financing for education	
Type	Systemic outcomes
Data source	External data (UNESCO Institute for Statistics, national data)
Coverage	Multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Share of public expenditure dedicated to education.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	None
<i>Purpose</i>	<p>Measure government commitment to fund education, beyond ECW's 3-5 years-long multi-year Resilience Programmes. ECW seeks to influence government commitment to fund education to create sustainability of funding and continuity of learning for children and youth, with the aspiration for countries to fund education at 20% of public expenditure or above.</p>
<i>Technical guidance</i>	Share of total public expenditures by governments (as opposed to provisional or budget expenditures) dedicated to education.

	Public expenditures refer to all expenditures recorded in official budget documentation, including those funded from on-budget external grants or loans. It includes both recurrent and capital expenditures from public sources, excluding debt service payments. Public expenditure on education (or education sector spending) also includes both recurrent and capital expenditure from all public entities at all levels of education, and at all levels of government. The terms capital/development/investment expenditure are used interchangeably (vs. recurrent expenditure). The reference period is the fiscal year ending during the calendar year under consideration.
--	--

15. Presence of a quality EMIS	
Type	Systemic outcomes
Data source	External data (UNICEF, humanitarian partners) or ECW-grantee data
Coverage	Multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name</i>	Country with a well-functioning Education Management Information System (EMIS), assessed based on data quality and timeliness, disaggregation, and comprehensiveness.
<i>Disaggregation</i>	None
<i>Purpose</i>	Measure the strengthening of EMIS systems to ensure effective M&E of local education systems.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	Based on the indicator on “well-functioning Education Management Information Systems” pulled from UNICEF's Strategic Plan Indicator Guidance on Education . Scores on a given indicator are the average of scores over several dimensions, as detailed in annex 3 .

16. Grant-specific outputs	
Type	Activity/output
Data source	ECW grantee data
Coverage	First Response & multi-year Resilience Programmes
<i>Full Indicator name:</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # 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.)
<i>Disaggregation</i>	Grantees should disaggregate this indicator by gender, level of education and formal vs. non-formal settings where relevant. Disaggregation by disability and population group (refugee, IDPs, host populations, and other groups) should be done if feasible.
<i>Purpose</i>	Report on standard output indicators, common in education in emergency response efforts, as leading indicators of systemic and beneficiary outcomes.
<i>Technical guidance</i>	<p>Indicator: <i>Number of children provided with individual education materials through ECW-supported programmes.</i></p> <p>This indicator captures the number of children provided with individual education materials through the programme. The individual education</p>

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: *Number of classrooms provided with classroom education materials through ECW-supported programmes.*

This indicator captures the number of classrooms provided with classroom education materials through ECW-supported programmes. 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.

Indicator: *Number of teachers/administrators trained, by gender (e.g., in psychosocial support, peace education, life skills, etc.)*

This indicator captures the number of teachers and/or education administrators trained through ECW-supported programmes.

Only training directly financed through ECW-supported programmes is considered. For example, if 25 trainers are trained through ECW-supported programmes with the expectation that they will train 40 teachers each – with that cascade training being paid for by the government, ECW cannot claim having trained 1,000 teachers, but only 25 trainers.

Teachers should not be double counted: any individual teacher should only be counted once. For example, if 200 teachers were trained in psychosocial support and the same teachers were trained in active pedagogy, the total number of teachers trained would be 200, while if different teachers were reached by the two interventions the total number would be 400.

“Teacher” here is taken in line with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics definition as any person employed full-time or part-time in an official capacity to guide and direct the learning experience of pupils and students, irrespective of their qualifications or the delivery mechanism, i.e. face-to-face and/or at a distance. Early childhood education facilitators are included, as are temporary, volunteer or community teachers.

“Administrators” refers to non-teaching education personnel such as headteachers, inspectors or ministry of education officials. Community members who are not teachers or non-teaching education personnel as defined above are not included. They may be reported upon separately.

Indicator: *Number of teachers/administrators recruited/financially supported through ECW-supported programmes, by gender (mandatory).*

This indicator captures the number of teachers and/or education administrators recruited and/or financially supported through ECW-supported programmes.

“Financial support” may cover provision of salaries, stipends or incentives, including provision of teachers’ full salaries in a transition period or provision of additional financial support to teachers to complement existing salaries, stipends or incentives. Partners that did not recruit the teachers/administrators but are providing them with financial support should count these teachers/administrators.

“Teacher” here is taken in line with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics definition as any person employed full-time or part-time in an official capacity to guide and direct the learning experience of pupils and students, irrespective of their qualifications or the delivery mechanism, i.e. face-to-face and/or at a distance. Early childhood education facilitators are included, as are temporary, volunteer or community teachers.

“Administrators” refers to non-teaching education personnel such as headteachers or inspectors.

Indicator: *Number of gender sensitive latrines constructed or rehabilitated through ECW-supported programmes.*

This indicator should be used if reporting on gender sensitive latrines, to ensure consistency of reporting.

Both gender sensitive latrines built and gender-sensitive latrines rehabilitated should be included. For the purpose of reporting, a “latrine” corresponds to an individual stall, or seat, or hole in the ground, etc. rather than to a set of such stalls/seats, etc. For example, if the standard latrine construction consists of 5 stalls and one washing station, the number of “latrines” reported for such a construction should be 5 and not 1.

If exact numbers are not known, estimates can be used, explaining these are estimates.

Indicator: *Number of children and youth provided with learning materials in a language they understand through ECW-supported programmes.*

This is a subset of the indicator above on children and youth provided with individual learning materials. If relevant in the crisis context, please report on the number of children and youth provided with learning materials in a language they understand. This language may be their mother tongue or a language that is commonly used by the children outside of the school. Please note that the “local language” of the area children live in may not be a language

children understand when these children are displaced/refugees from a country/area in which different languages are spoken.

Children provided with some learning materials in a language they understand (e.g. reading textbook in a language children understand but math textbooks in another language) should be counted but with a comment explaining the situation.

As with the indicator on individual learning materials, children receiving several learning materials in a language they understand should not be double counted.

Indicator: *Number of schools adopting/operationalizing a code of conduct through ECW-supported programmes.*

If the ECW programme works to develop or support codes of conduct, please report on this indicator, to ensure standardization of reporting (as otherwise some grantees may report on schools, others on teachers). The indicator should reflect activities aimed at ensuring adoption of a school code of conduct (regulating the conduct of teachers, headteachers and students) or its operationalization through induction or training on the code of conduct. Schools that already had a code of conduct prior to ECW's intervention and were not supported by ECW to ensure/strengthen its implementation should not be counted.

Annex 1: excerpts of standards used by Save the Children (quality learning environment standards), UNHCR and UNICEF related to safe learning environments

Relevant dimensions from Save the Children quality learning environment standards:

- Child Safeguarding Policy/Code of conduct for learners and teachers in ensuring wellbeing is in place.
- School has mechanism in place for receiving and responding to complaints.
- Learning environments are free of discrimination, violence, intimidation, bullying and harassment.
- The teacher interacts with all learners in a positive and respectful manner regardless of their background.
- Teachers are trained in psychosocial support to detect cases of abuse or trauma among their students and provide support.
- An area or space for learning exists that is safe for all learners.
- Safe drinking water is available for learners and staff.
- Adequate sanitation facilities are available for all learners.
- The play area is safe for all learners.
- Learning environments are accessible to the populations they serve in terms of hours.
- Learners participate in health-promotion programs.
- A School Disaster Management Plan, addressing disasters with the strongest likelihood, is in place.
- Teachers are trained on child rights and child protection.
- Learners participate actively in decision making activities in their schools.
- The learning environment encourages expression of child rights and learners are knowledgeable about their rights.
- School Management Committees/Parent Teacher Associations includes representatives from a cross-section of the community.

Relevant elements from UNICEF child friendly school checklist:

- Cooperates with other partners to promote and monitor the well-being and rights of all children; defends and protects all children from abuse and harm (as a sanctuary), both inside and outside the school.
- Eliminates gender stereotypes; provides facilities, curricula, and learning processes welcoming to girls.
- Does not stereotype, exclude, or discriminate on the basis of difference.
- Promotes mental and physical health: provides emotional support, encourages healthy behaviours and practices, and guarantees a hygienic, safe, secure, and joyful environment.
- Works with and strengthen families and helps children, parents and teachers establish harmonious, collaborative partnerships.
- Promotes community partnerships and networks focused on the rights and well-being of children.

List of criteria based on UNHCR documents (non-exhaustive):

- Establish and monitor participatory teacher codes of conduct, school policies that protect children from violence or corporal punishment in school, and programmes to combat bullying and discrimination, including Peace Education programmes.
- Facilitate representation of refugee parents in Parent Teachers Associations (PTAs) and school governance bodies.
- Establish community support for school participation, for example by encouraging community mechanisms that arrange to accompany groups of children to school if routes are considered unsafe.
- Provide safe learning environments with adequate WASH facilities, classroom infrastructure, and teaching and learning materials.
- Provide psychosocial training for education personnel to better equip them to identify and support children with significant psychosocial needs.
- Establish child protection monitoring mechanisms to minimize violence and discrimination against children in school.
- Support operations to consider the gender specific needs of children, such as safe school routes; gender-separated latrines with secure, private spaces for menstruating girls; Codes of Conduct that ensure harassment-free zones for both boys and girls; female teachers and role models.
- Share information on vaccination campaigns and other health services, and integrate health and nutrition education into teaching.
- Ensure access to dedicated, clean, gender-separated latrines, hand-washing facilities with soap, and safe drinking water.

Annex 2: Presence of Inclusive Policies - Guidance

Country where girls' secondary education, in terms of access, retention, and learning is a recognised, targeted and budgeted priority

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>Creating demand: 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; & social protection measures, including cash transfers, and availability of scholarships and stipends to incentivize school participation and retention of girls.</p>	<p>Creating demand: 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.</p>	<p>Creating demand: 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.</p>	<p>Creating demand: 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;</p>
<p>Supportive learning environment: 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 teachers, and quality of teaching; Updated and gender-responsive curricula and learning materials, including expansion of STEM (Science, technology, Engineering & Maths) and life-skills learning opportunities; Sanitation infrastructure and hygiene education including menstrual hygiene management; and, the corresponding activities are fully implemented in most secondary schools.</p>	<p>Supportive learning environment: 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 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; and, the corresponding activities are –at least partially- implemented in secondary schools.</p>	<p>Supportive learning environment: 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 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; But, the corresponding activities are not implemented in most secondary schools.</p>	<p>Supportive learning environment: The national education policy/sector plan does not include any support to gender-responsive learning environments</p>
<p>Prioritisation and resource allocation: 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; & Supported by clear as well as sufficient budget lines.</p>	<p>Prioritisation and resource allocation: 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; & Supported by clear but insufficient budget lines.</p>	<p>Prioritisation and resource allocation: National education strategy/sector plan: Prioritizes secondary education with a defined focus on girls' education and gender equality, however no firm targets are identified; & Allocated some funding through generic budget lines.</p>	<p>Prioritisation and resource allocation: 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.</p>

Countries with policies on inclusive education covering children with disabilities

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
a- Law/policy. 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 .	Law/policy. There is a law/policy establishing the right of all children to receive an education, with an explicit mention of children with disabilities.	Law/policy. There is a law/policy establishing the right of all children to attend school, which implicitly but not explicitly includes children with disabilities.	Law/policy. There is no law /policy establishing the right to education for children with disabilities
b- Physical Environment. All schools have accessible classrooms and/or reasonable accommodations that remove all physical barriers (including accessible toilets and recreation areas).	Physical Environment. More than half of schools have accessible classrooms and toilets, at times because of an accessible design and at times because of makeshift adjustments.	Physical Environment. Less than half of the schools are accessible (including toilets). Some schools may have accessible classrooms, or use makeshift ramps.	Physical Environment. In general, schools are not accessible . Children with physical disabilities have great difficulty or are completely unable to access school facilities (including toilets).
c- Materials and Communication. Assistive devices and materials are available in most regular schools . Books and other materials include positive references to children with disabilities	Materials and Communication. Assistive devices and materials are available in special schools but in less than half of regular schools . A few books and other materials include positive references to children with disabilities.	Materials and Communication. Assistive devices and materials are available in special schools, but not in regular schools . Little or no mention of disabled children appears in books or materials.	Materials and Communication. Assistive devices and materials are generally not available in schools . Books and other materials make no mention of children with disabilities.
d- Human Resources. Most teachers and school administrators receive training on inclusive education. All schools have access to specialists on inclusive education for consultation. Most children have access to speech, physical and occupational therapists, as needed.	Human Resources. More than half of teachers and school administrators receive training on inclusive education. More than half of schools have access to specialists on inclusive education for consultation. Some access to speech and physical therapists exists.	Human Resources. Less than half of teachers and school administrators receive training on inclusive education. Less than half of schools have access to specialists on inclusive education for consultation. No access to speech and physical therapists exists.	Human Resources. 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. No access to speech and physical therapists exists.
e- Attitudes. Teachers and school administrators support including children with disabilities in regular schools, and are willing to make significant adjustments to ease their inclusion. Curricula and classroom management allow for the flexibility of addressing individual students' needs.	Attitudes. Teachers and school administrators do not object to including children with disabilities in regular schools, and are willing to make small adjustments to ease their inclusion.	Attitudes. Teachers and school administrators do not see the value of including children with disabilities in regular schools but do not make explicit objections. They do not feel it is their responsibility to make any adjustments to ease their inclusion.	Attitudes. Teachers and school administrators object to including children with disabilities in regular schools, and do not believe they should make any adjustments to ease their inclusion.
f- EMIS. The routine EMIS contains data on children with disabilities, using ICF based definitions of disability . Reports are produced on enrolment of children with disabilities	EMIS. 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.	EMIS. 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.	EMIS. There are no data on children with disabilities in the routine EMIS.

Countries with an education policy/sector plan that specify prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
<p>Legal/policy framework. 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 & 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) Teachers Service legislation defining limits on teacher conduct with children; iii) Identifying “kinds” of SRGBV (spanning sexual assault to bullying 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.</p>	<p>Legal/policy framework. 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 implementing the framework at least partially.</p>	<p>Legal/policy framework. 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 implementing it properly.</p>	<p>Legal/policy framework. There is no/a limited legal/policy framework to address child protection and provide safe and supportive learning environment in school for girls.</p>
<p>Prevention and response mechanism. Holistic mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV are established and functioning in all primary and secondary schools. 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.</p>	<p>Prevention and response mechanism. 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.</p>	<p>Prevention and response mechanism. Mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV are only at a pilot phase in a small number of primary and secondary schools.</p>	<p>Prevention and response mechanism. There are limited/ad hoc/no demonstrated attempts by the ministry of education and/or CSOs to put in place mechanisms of prevention of and response to SRGBV.</p>
<p>Awareness, attitude & empowerment. 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 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.</p>	<p>Awareness, attitude & empowerment. There is institutional capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices that includes some of the key elements listed in Score 4.</p>	<p>Awareness, attitude & empowerment. Pilot interventions to address SRGBV are supported by elements of institutional capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices.</p>	<p>Awareness, attitude & empowerment. There are limited/ad hoc/ no demonstrated attempts by the ministry of education and/or CSOs to support institutional capacity-building to address discriminatory social norms to ensure systemic change in behaviour and practices.</p>
<p>Data collection, availability, and use: 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.</p>	<p>Data collection, availability, and use: 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.</p>	<p>Data collection, availability, and use: There are some data on SRGBV available for certain regions/schools as part of independent one-off surveys/projects/initiatives.</p>	<p>Data collection, availability, and use: There are no data available on SRGBV in the country.</p>

Annex 3: Well-functioning Education Management Information Systems - Guidance

Countries with well-functioning education management information systems providing disaggregated data that allow identification of barriers and bottlenecks that inhibit the realization of the rights of disadvantaged children

Championing (Score 4)	Established (Score 3)	Initiating (Score 2)	Weak (Score 1)
Data Quality and Timeliness. Reliable and relevant education data are collected and used by decision makers. EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are ready to be used less than 6 months after the beginning of the school year.	Data Quality and Timeliness. Reliable and relevant education data are collected. EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are ready to be used less than 3 months after the end of the school year.	Data Quality and Timeliness. Education data are of questionable reliability and are not all relevant. EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are ready to be used less than one year after the end of the school year.	Data Quality and Timeliness. Education data are irregularly collected or even absent , and the quality of the data is poor . When they are collected, EMIS data (or statistical yearbook) are ready to be used more than one year after the end of the school year.
Comprehensiveness. There is 100% response rate from schools (public + private) in returning the school census questionnaires.	Comprehensiveness. There is over 90% response rate from schools (public + private) in returning the school census questionnaires. Response rates and the assumptions used for estimating data of the missing schools are clearly indicated in the statistical yearbooks.	Comprehensiveness. There is between 50% and 90% of schools (public + private) responding to the census questionnaire. Response rates are not published in the statistical yearbooks.	Comprehensiveness. Response rates are not known or there are fewer than 50% of schools responding to the census questionnaire.
Disaggregation. 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	Disaggregation. 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.	Disaggregation. 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.	Disaggregation. No data are collected on gender, disability, children's family income/assets or urban/rural.