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This document provides an overview of the proposed ECW results framework, as well as the process and methodology used to develop it.

The overall objective was to align on a robust foundational results framework that can guide ECW's initial monitoring and evaluation activities. The results framework is intended to evolve over time, as ECW builds evidence and tests its Theory of Change.

The results framework was designed with deep engagement from a Technical Working Group (TWG), comprised of 14 technical experts nominated by Task Team 2 and representing 12 organizations and agencies.

- The framework was informed by a variety of inputs, including the ODI report, comparative analysis of peer results frameworks, and expert and stakeholder interviews.
- In addition, TWG members provided detailed technical input between November – January, including two group consultations.
- Input was also solicited via ECW's two design workshops and strategic guidance was provided by Task Team 2 and the ECW co-directors.

In addition to this overview, ongoing work is being performed to detail technical methodologies for each indicator, gather baseline data, and articulate M&E activities in different resource scenarios.
Executive Summary: ECW Results Framework

As a first step in developing ECW's results framework, the Theory of Change (TOC) proposed by ODI was refined to clarify linkages between the ECW platform's five strategic functions, outputs, systemic outcomes, beneficiary outcomes, and impact.

A comprehensive set of indicators was developed to allow ECW to test the TOC over time, leveraging existing data and sharing measurement effort across the ECW Secretariat and grantees.

- Results framework will be flexible to highly variable grantee contexts, recognizing that not all indicators will be relevant, available, or appropriate for a given context.
- Grant-specific log frames will be developed that link to the ECW results framework, and the Secretariat can support grantees to build monitoring capacity over time.
- Grantees must report on four indicators; five others encouraged where context and capabilities allow.

Within this comprehensive results framework, three core results were prioritized to communicate the success of the ECW platform and for HLSG focus

- As data and measurement improves, core indicators will evolve, with a focus on quality and equity

ECW will make phased investments through its Acceleration Facility to "push the envelope" over time where improved data quality, new indicators, or new data platforms are most critical.

- Balancing ECW's ambition with the need for a realistic measurement burden in early stages

Indicative targets have been identified where baseline data sources currently exist or baseline is assumed zero. Where data is not currently available, target-setting approach is recommended.
Results framework developed with guidance from TWG, workshop attendees, Task Team 2 & co-directors

**TWG Members**

- **DFID**: Sarah Hennell, Kate Greany
- **Dubai Cares**: Annina Mattsson
- **European Commission**: Robert Prouty
- **Global Education Cluster**: Maria Agnese Giordano
- **GPE**: Moritz Bilagher (GPE)
- **IRC**: Silvia Diazgranados Ferrans
- **MSI Inc. (formerly Save)**: Dr. Nitika Tolani
- **Norad**: Lene Leonhardsen
- **UNESCO Institute of Statistics**: Allison Kennedy
- **UNHCR**: Barbara Zeus
- **UNICEF**: Gabrielle Bonnet, Luc Gacougnolle
- **USAID**: Suezan Lee

**Setting the Stage**
- Oct 10–21
- Interviews with >50 stakeholders & experts
- Comparative analysis
- Upstream design decisions

**Defining the Frameworks**
- Oct 24–Dec 16
- Country consultations
- Indicator bank development
- Theory of Change & Indicators

**Operationalizing the Frameworks**
- Jan 3–Jan 27
- Stakeholder engagement
- Offline feedback from TWG
- Baselines & targets
- Results-based M&E system

**Workshop 1** (Nov 10-11)
- Upstream design questions

**TWG Meeting #1** (Dec 6)
- Refine Theory of Change, and discuss indicators

**Workshop 2** (Dec 15-16)
- Shared Theory of Change

**TT2 Review** (Jan 12)
- Shared Theory of Change

**SOG** (Jan 26)
- Co-director Review (Jan 18)

**TWG Meeting #2** (Jan 10)
- Finalize indicators, roadmap to baselines

**HLSG**
Key themes from stakeholder feedback

**Theory of change**

- Appetite in Workshop 1 to refine theory of change (TOC) from ODI proposal paper
  - Recommendation to amend impact statement to improve clarity and measurability
  - TWG input to rethink connection between outputs, fund outcomes, and program outcomes

- Positive feedback on revised theory of change at Workshop 2; recommendation to outline rationale for linkages across TOC, to be tested and refined over time

- SOG feedback to further articulate logic behind linkages and more explicitly call-out gender in ToC
  - Also guidance to revise impact statement to strive beyond education to longer-term livelihood

- Existing data sources may be limited and/or inappropriate for crisis contexts, requiring use of grantee-reported indicators and newly developed data collection mechanisms
  - Need to balance with grantee reporting burden – focus on indicators that are operationally meaningful, prioritize areas to "push the envelope," and allow flexibility for varying contexts

- Suggest that ECW select a few key indicators to aggregate at a global level

- Disaggregate by gender, level of education, disability, refugees, IDPs, and minorities (by context)

- Overarching feedback that in designing the initial framework, perfection can be the enemy of the good; ECW should test, learn, and refine, recognizing that failure is okay.
Results framework designed with the aspiration to fulfill these key principles

**Selective standardization**
Strive for **global meaningful quantitative** measures of success among partners and grantees where it counts

**Focus**
Focus management on only the most **meaningful impact indicators**

**Minimize burden**
Seek efficiency in the **M&E burden** placed on grantees

**Agenda-setting**
Prioritize a few key areas to **push the envelope** on results measurement, e.g., quality, beneficiary feedback on data collection

**Flexibility to local context**
Reflect the **on-the-ground reality** across contexts

**Transparency**
Measure **actionable and reliable** results to support accountability and board / donor decision making, reflecting the complex reality
Results framework methodology

## Refined Theory of Change

- Incorporated input from design workshops
- Ensured all key elements of ECW platform included
- Detailed linkages

## Developed set of indicators

- Created comprehensive set of indicators
  - Assembled "indicator bank" from partners
  - Identified indicators mapped to each element of ToC
  - Assessed current data availability

## Prioritized current indicators

- Prioritized 2-3 critical indicators to communicate ECW success
  - Based on guiding principles
  - Currently able to be measured with some reliability

## Phased investments

For areas where ECW could "push the envelope", created phased approach
- Areas to strengthen data quality / availability, as well as indicators
- Focus on improving top 2-3 measures, equity and quality
Strategic functions

**Inspire political commitment** with aim for greater equity, with emphasis on girls, young women, disabled persons, refugees, IDPs, & other minorities

**Raise significant additional funds** across interventions that equitably expand quality, safe, and continuous education

Unite humanitarian and development actors in support of joint planning & response

**Strengthen capacity** of individuals and institutions, of those leading EiE efforts

**Improve accountability** by building evidence and platforms to understand "what works" in EiE

ECW Activities & Outputs

**Political advocacy** with gov’ts, donors, and humanitarian development actors

**Fundraising** for ECW platform & coordinated with other actors

**Breakthrough Fund** First response & multi-year grants

**Acceleration Facility** Investments in global public goods

**Fund efficiency** Grants disbursed & managed efficiently

Systemic Outcomes

**Political action** puts policies in place to support continuous education for most marginalized children and youth

**Funding** for education in emergencies at the national & global level

**Joint planning & coordination**
- Preparedness
- Inclusive processes

**Local systems-building**
- National data system
- Technical expertise
- Delivery capacity

**Global and regional systems-building**
- Data & evidence
- Cluster capacity

Beneficiary Outcomes

**Equity**
Greater access and improved learning for most marginalized

**Continuity**
Greater educational continuity, yielding higher transition and completion rates

**Access**
Expanded access appropriate to affected girls and boys, resulting in higher enrollment, attendance, and retention rates

**Quality**
Improved learning outcomes achieved by girls, boys, and youth

**Protection**
Safe, conflict- and disaster-sensitive education for girls, boys, and youth

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

Note: All references to “most marginalized” include girls, young women, children and youth with disabilities, refugees, IDPs, and other minorities (according to context).

1. “Youth” inclusive of young women and young men under the age of 18. Target for girls is TBD based on a gender-based analysis.
Comprehensive set of indicators developed to enable Secretariat to test Theory of Change (see Appendix)

Summary (I / X): Impact indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Total number of children and youth in school or equivalent non-school based settings, including pre-primary education, reached with ECW assistance(^1)</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW grantee administrative data</td>
<td>Data quality/ Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaggregated by gender, levels of education, formal / non-formal, disability, and refugees, IDPs, and other minorities according to context, where possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Proportion of ECW-supported countries meeting country-specific targets for: Out-of-school rate for children &amp; 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</td>
<td>Multi-year, where relevant(^2)</td>
<td>UIS (where available)</td>
<td>Data quality/ Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaggregated by gender where possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Proportion of ECW-supported countries meeting country-specific targets for: Proportion of children and young people (disaggregated by gender) in crisis and conflict-affected countries supported by ECW meeting minimum proficiency level in learning outcomes measured across the following:</td>
<td>Multi-year, where relevant(^2)</td>
<td>UIS (where available)</td>
<td>Data quality/ Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b Percentage of children under five (5) years of age who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning, and psychosocial well-being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b 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</td>
<td>Multi-year, where relevant(^2)</td>
<td>UIS (where available)</td>
<td>Data quality/ Availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Assistance defined according to USAID methodology. While not technically an impact indicator, strong feedback from Task Team 2 that ECW should have at least one top-line indicator that clearly communicates its reach and is visible to MLO. 2. To be collected only for multi-year grantee where gaps exist across majority of country vs. small isolated region.
Core results & indicators prioritized to measure ECW's overall success, communicate externally, and focus HLSG

2-3 critical indicators prioritized for communication and HLSG focus
- Used to measure ECW's success as a fund and progress against "true north"

Comprehensive set of indicators used to monitor and test Theory of Change

Additional data and information that the Secretariat may collect to inform operational decisions

"Push the envelope" investments:
Areas where improved data quality, new indicators, or new data platforms will be required
Core results and indicators prioritized to measure ECW's overall success, communicate externally, and focus HLSG

Grantees

- Grantee proposes grant-specific results framework, linked to ECW results
- 4 indicators required – 2 programmatic, 2 operational
- 5 others encouraged where context and capabilities allow

Secretariat

- Track internal administrative and global measures
- Collate existing data
- Contract with external experts for evaluation or new data collection
- Invest in near-term priorities through acceleration facility

Partners

- Agree to share existing data for ECW-supported countries
- Partner to advance indicators over time, both in quality and availability
Recall: Proposed ECW core and reported indicators

### Core Indicators (near-term)

1. # children/youth reached w/ ECW assistance, by gender, education level
2. Engagement with high-level officials
17. Inclusive, quality humanitarian & development plans
25. ECW financing (total, non-traditional)

### OUTPUTS

- 24. Engagement with high-level officials
- 26. Grant-specific outputs (e.g., textbooks)
- 28. Grants jointly coordinated
- 29. Grant transition plans
- 30. Civil society funding
- 31. Acc. facility grant-specific results
- 32. ECW country baselines collected
- 33. Total overhead (ECW & grant agents)
- 34. Time to disburse

### Institutional Outcomes

- 12. Presence of inclusive policies
- 13. Domestic financing for education
- 15. Grants with sustainable funding sources
- 16. Proportion of appeals w/ education
- 18. Countries w/ quality EMIS
- 19. Local actors for technical support
- 20. Absorptive capacity
- 21. Cluster performance monitoring
- 22. Cluster staffing

### Beneficiary Outcomes

- 4. Equivalent children/youth supported for a year
- 6. ECW community out-of-school rate
- 7. Avg instructional time
- 8a. ECW-supported pre-primary learning outcomes
- 8b. ECW-supported primary/lower-secondary math and reading outcomes
- 9. Schools meeting safe learning standards
- 10. Survival rate
- 11. Completion rate

### Impact

- 2. Country out-of-school rate
- 3a. Country pre-primary learning outcomes
- 3b. Country primary/lower-secondary learning outcomes

### Measurement effort

- Breakthrough Fund Grantees (required)
- Breakthrough Fund Grantees (by context)
- Acc. facility grantees
- Secretariat
- Existing data sources

Aspire for core indicators to become more outcome- and quality-focused long-term; see next page.
Core results and indicators prioritized to measure ECW's overall success, communicate externally, and focus HLSG

Propose that core results and indicators should...

Be able to **assess general success** of the ECW platform

Strike a balance between **beneficiary and systemic outcomes**

Focus on the areas where ECW can be expected to **move the needle**

Cover key areas where ECW provides **additionality**

Be **measureable** with existing indicators / data collection methodologies

Core results and indicators based on principles

**Support children and youth**
- # children/youth reached with ECW assistance (by gender, education level, disability, refugees, IDPs, minority status, where possible)\(^1\)

**Raise funding for ECW**
- ECW financing (total, non-traditional)

**Bridge humanitarian development divide**
- Inclusive, quality humanitarian, development plans

**Support vulnerable children and youth**
- # reached w/ ECW assistance (by gender, education level, disability, refugees, IDPs, minority status)\(^1\)

**Provide quality education in crisis**
- ECW-supported learning outcomes appropriate to education level (by gender, education level, disability, refugees, IDPs, minority status)\(^1\)

**Increase overall funding to EiE**
- Overall aid to EiE (including humanitarian, development, and non-traditional funds)
Recall: To strengthen results measurement, suggest phased investments to develop & improve data collection

### Near-term
*Next ~5 years*

1. Disaggregation by gender, disability, refugees, IDPs¹, and other minority groups
2. ECW-supported pre-primary learning outcomes
3a. ECW-supported primary/ lower-secondary math and reading outcomes

### Longer-term
*~5-10 years*

2. Country out-of-school rate
3a. Country pre-primary learning outcomes
3b. Country primary/lower-secondary learning outcomes
6. ECW-supported community out-of-school rate
11. Completion rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New indicator / data platform</th>
<th>Improved data quality / avail.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Average attendance rate</td>
<td>1. Disaggregation by gender, disability, refugees, IDPs¹, and other minority groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Overall aid to EiE³</td>
<td>8a. ECW-supported primary/lower-secondary outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ECW may also rely on partners to advance some of these areas, especially longer-term agenda**

SDG Tier 2
Indicator conceptually clear, established methodology and standards available but data are *not regularly produced* by countries

SDG Tier 3
Indicator for which there are *no established methodology and standards* or methodology/standards are being developed/tested

---

1. Internally displaced persons; 2. Social and emotional learning; 3. Including humanitarian, development, non-traditional funding
Where baseline data exists, working to set indicative targets overall and for initial investment countries

Working to collect baseline data for five initial investment countries (Ethiopia, Chad, Yemen, Syria, Lebanon) where data sources already exist; recall:

2 Country out-of-school rate (UIS)
3 Country pre-primary & primary/lower-secondary learning outcomes (UIS)
3a Inclusive policies – 3 of 4 (UNICEF)
3b Domestic financing (UIS)
12 Proportion of appeals w/ education (FTS, UNHCR)
13 Countries with quality EMIS (UNICEF)
16 Cluster performance monitoring (Global Ed. Cluster)
21 Cluster staffing (Global Ed. Cluster)
22

Where baseline exists or is currently 0 (e.g., # of ECW-supported children), setting indicative targets *approach on following page*

- Adopting existing targets where they have already been set by ECW (e.g., ODI financing targets) or key partners
For remaining indicators, recommend target setting approach once baselines are collected

Three scenarios for baseline data

At the outset, three scenarios for available baseline data for a given indicator:

1. **Data sources currently exist** (e.g., UIS, UNICEF); data is available and relatively recent for relevant countries
2. **Baseline is assumed zero** at fund start because indicator measures "ECW-supported" activities
3. **Data is not available** because indicator is new, new data collection platform investments are needed and / or crisis context makes data collection infeasible

As new countries receive ECW support, baselines will need to be assessed for each ECW grantee / country

Considerations to set 5-year & annual targets

To set 5-year target ranges for countries / programs, recommend considering:

- **Pre-crisis levels**: Indicator level prior to crisis, esp. for conflict or natural disasters
- **Regional comparables**: Average and "best-in-class" in region (e.g., East Africa)
- **Developed country benchmarks**: May serve as aspiration

Assess trajectory that evidence would suggest achievable for annual targets:

- Gradual increase likely in protracted crises unlikely to recover quickly
- Flattening of progress over time may be favored in sudden onset or natural disaster
- Linear increase suggested for platform targets, less affected by external factors

After developing targets, step back to consider if targets are ambitious enough to deliver desired results
For remaining indicators, recommend target setting approach once baselines are collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Milestone 2018</th>
<th>Milestone 2019</th>
<th>Milestone 2020</th>
<th>Milestone 2021</th>
<th>Target 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total number of children and youth in school or equivalent non-school based settings reached with ECW assistance&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Grantee reported</td>
<td>Bi-annual</td>
<td>Total children and youth:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.36M</td>
<td>3.4M</td>
<td>6.12M</td>
<td>9.52M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.49M</td>
<td>1.31M</td>
<td>2.62M</td>
<td>4.49M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline timeframe = 2017</td>
<td>n = 5 countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Proportion of ECW-supported countries with response plans and education sector plans meeting quality standards, and developed in consultation with all relevant local actors, including Education Clusters, LEGs, refugee coordination groups, local civil society, and national governments, where applicable and appropriate&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>ECW Sec.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Overall:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline timeframe = 2017</td>
<td>n = 5 countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Total amount of funds raised by ECW and amount raised from non-traditional donors / through innovative financing mechanisms</td>
<td>ECW Sec.</td>
<td>Bi-annual</td>
<td>Overall:</td>
<td>$119M</td>
<td>$153M</td>
<td>$383M</td>
<td>$689M</td>
<td>$1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-traditional/financing mechanisms Baseline timeframe = 2016</td>
<td>$2.5M</td>
<td>$6.1M</td>
<td>$19.2M</td>
<td>$55.1M</td>
<td>$100M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary (I / X): Impact indicators

**IMPACT - Within the first 5 years of ECW, more than ten million crisis-affected girls, boys, and youth\(^1\), inclusive of marginalized groups, will have improved learning opportunities that contribute to improved outcomes, with all reached by 2030, in line with SDG4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Total number of children and youth in school or equivalent non-school based settings, including pre-primary education, reached with ECW assistance\(^1\)  
  - Disaggregated by gender, levels of education, formal / non-formal, disability, and refugees, IDPs, and other minorities according to context, where possible | Multi-year & first response | ECW grantee administrative data | Data quality/Availability |
| 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 | Multi-year, where relevant\(^2\) | UIS (where available) | Data quality/Availability |
| 3. Proportion of ECW-supported countries meeting country-specific targets for: Proportion of children and young people (disaggregated by gender) in crisis and conflict-affected countries supported by ECW meeting minimum proficiency level in learning outcomes measured across the following:  
- Percentage of children under five (5) years of age who are developmentally on track in terms of health, learning, and psychosocial well-being  
- 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 | Multi-year, where relevant\(^2\) | UIS (where available) | Data quality/Availability |

---

1. Assistance defined according to USAID methodology; While not technically an impact indicator, strong feedback from Task Team 2 that ECW should have at least one top-line indicator that clearly communicates its reach and is visible to HLSG.  
2. To be collected only for multi-year grantees where crisis extends across majority of country vs. small isolated region.
**BENEFICIARY OUTCOMES**

**Access** - Expanded access appropriate to affected girls and boys, resulting in higher enrollment, attendance, and retention rates

**Equity** - Greater access and improved learning for most marginalized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Number of equivalent children and youth supported by ECW for a year of education</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW grantee administrative data</td>
<td>New indicator / data platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaggregated by gender, levels of education, formal vs. non-formal equivalent, disability, and refugees, IDPS, and other minorities according to context, where possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: Out-of-school rate for children and youth in ECW-supported communities</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>Disaggregation of existing household survey</td>
<td>Data quality/ Availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary (III / X): Beneficiary outcome indicators

### Quality - Improved learning outcomes achieved by girls and boys

### Equity - Greater access and improved learning for most marginalized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> 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</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW grantee self-assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8a</strong> 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</td>
<td>Multi-year programs addressing ECD</td>
<td>Learning assessments for ECW population</td>
<td>Data quality/Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaggregated by gender and disability, and refugees, IDPS, and other minorities according to context, where possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8b</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>Learning assessments for ECW population</td>
<td>Data quality/Availability (for reading and math)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaggregated by gender and disability (where possible, &quot;push the envelope&quot; where not), and refugees, IDPS, and other minorities according to context, where possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New indicator/data platform (for SEL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8c</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>Learning assessments for ECW population</td>
<td>New indicator/data platform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary (IV / X): Beneficiary outcome indicators

### Protection - Safe, conflict- and disaster-sensitive education for girls, boys, and youth

**Equity - Greater access and improved learning for most marginalized**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of ECW grantees meeting program-specific targets for: % of ECW-supported schools observed that meet safe learning environment standards, including disaster risk reduction and gender-specific issues</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW grantee self-assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continuity - Greater educational continuity, yielding higher transition and completion rates

**Equity - Greater access and improved learning for most marginalized**

| 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 |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Proportion of children who complete: (a) primary education; (b) lower secondary education |
| Multi-year | ECW grantee administrative data | |
| Data quality/Availability | |

- Disaggregated by gender and disability (where possible, "push the envelope" where not), and refugees, IDPS, and other minorities according to context, where possible
### Summary (V / X): Systemic outcome indicators

#### SYSTEMIC OUTCOMES

**Political action puts policies in place to support continuous education for most marginalized children and youth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 Proportion of ECW-supported countries meeting country-specific targets for:</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>UNICEF, ECW Secretariat</td>
<td>New indicator/data platform <em>(For displaced persons policy only)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Girls’ secondary education, in terms of enrollment, retention, and completion is recognized, targeted, being a budgeted education priority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policies on inclusive education covering children with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education sector policy/plan specifying prevention and response mechanisms to address gender-based violence in and around schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policies on inclusive education covering refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Proportion of ECW-supported countries that have (a) increased their public expenditure on education; or (b) maintained sector spending at 20% or above</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>UIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Funding for education in emergencies at the national & global level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Overall aid funding to education in emergencies (total(^1) and as % of global humanitarian funding)</td>
<td>EiE sector</td>
<td>OCHA, Acc. facility</td>
<td>New indicator/data platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Proportion of humanitarian appeals that include an education component</td>
<td>First response</td>
<td>OCHA, UNHCR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Total aid should include, humanitarian, development, and non-traditional dollars flowing to education in emergencies
### Joint coordination and planning including preparedness and inclusive processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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(^1), 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.</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local systems-building, including national data systems, technical expertise, and delivery capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of ECW grantees who are increasing their use of local actors for contracted support of joint proposals and needs assessments (instead of contracting to external actors)</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW grantees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of allocated regular resources for ECW-supported programs expended by grantees at end of the year (absorptive capacity), averaged across grantees</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>ECW grantees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of countries with a humanitarian coordinator (HC) (or Resident Coordinator/HC) designation whose country Education Cluster undergoes Cluster Coordination Performance Monitoring (CCPM)</td>
<td>EiE sector</td>
<td>Global Education Cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: HRP = Humanitarian Response Plan; RRP = Refugee Response Plan; ESP = Education Sector Plan; TEP = Transitional Education Plan; 1. Quality standards to include preparedness/risk reduction; leverage existing GPE and UNICEF standards for ESPs and TEPs.
### Global and regional systems-building, including data & evidence and cluster capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>
<td>EiE Sector</td>
<td>Global Education Cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Proportion of global baselines for key education crisis indicators identified and collected</td>
<td>EiE Sector</td>
<td>Acc. facility</td>
<td>New indicator / data platform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary (VIII / X): Systemic indicators

### OUTPUTS

#### Political advocacy with governments, donors, and humanitarian and development actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of crisis- and conflict- affected countries where high-level meetings took place between ECW leadership or HLSG members and senior officials within country</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fundraising for ECW platform & coordinated with other actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total amount of financing to ECW and amount raised from non-traditional donors / through innovative financing mechanisms</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Breakthrough Fund – first response & multi-year grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong> Menu of indicators to measure programmatic outputs, aggregated across grantees annually, such as:</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW grantees Administrative data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of children and youth receiving individual learning materials (e.g., textbooks, notebooks, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of classrooms supported (e.g., blackboards, maps, school-in-a-box, WASH facilities, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• # of teachers/administrators trained, by gender (e.g., in psychosocial support, peace education, life skills, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong> 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</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>TBD Potential standards funded through Acc. Facility</td>
<td>New indicator / data platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disaggregated by refugee camps vs. host communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong> 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</td>
<td>Multi-year</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong> Proportion of ECW grant proposals approved in Breakthrough Fund with transition plans for sustainability after ECW grant period concludes</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong> 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</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Acceleration Facility – investments in global public goods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 Proportion of acceleration facility grantees assessed as &quot;on track&quot; with grant implementation, with the definition of &quot;on track&quot; to be defined through grant-specific performance indicators outlined in grant agreement</td>
<td>Acc facility</td>
<td>ECW acc. facility grantees, ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Proportion of all ECW indicators for each ECW-supported country with baselines identified and collected</td>
<td>ECW platform</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fund efficiency – grants disbursed & managed efficiently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Phased investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 % of overhead costs (across ECW and grantees) as a ratio of total resources</td>
<td>ECW platform</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>Multi-year &amp; first response</td>
<td>ECW Secretariat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>