

Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative

Final Synthesis Report
Volume 2 – Annexes

ANNEX C
THE INDICATIVE FRAMEWORK AND THE UPC TARGET

February 2010



COMPONENTS OF THE SYNTHESIS REPORT

VOLUME 1: MAIN REPORT

Executive Summary
Main Report

VOLUME 2: ANNEXES¹ AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annex A Timeline
Annex B Governance and Evolution of the FTI
Annex C The Indicative Framework and UPC
Annex D Summaries of Country Studies
Annex F Monitoring and Evaluation of the FTI
Annex G The FTI and Capacity Development
Annex H The FTI and Fragile States
Annex J Interviewee Analysis
Annex K Financing Gaps
Full Bibliography

VOLUME 3: APPENDICES I-IV

Appendix I Statistical Appendix
Appendix II Trends in Financing of Basic Education
Appendix III The Catalytic Fund
Appendix IV The Education Program Development Fund

VOLUME 4: APPENDIX V

Appendix V Note on Approach and Methods

VOLUME 5: APPENDICES VI-VIII

Appendix VI M&E Framework and Impact Analysis
Appendix VII Reforming the Catalytic Fund
Appendix VIII Findings against High Level Questions

¹ What was originally Annex E was later redesignated as Appendix VIII. Similarly Appendix VII was formerly designated Annex I. To minimise confusion, remaining annexes have kept their original letters.

Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	4
A Introduction	1
B The Indicative Framework: Origins and Purpose	1
C Global Reporting of IF Indicators	4
D Technical Note: Derivation of FTI Indicative Framework	4
E Use of the Indicative Framework in FTI Countries	7
F Universal Primary Completion (UPC) as the FTI indicator	13
References	16
Boxes	
Box C1 UPE vs. UPC – clarifying the concepts	13
Box C2 Primary Completion Rate – Issues of Definition and Data	15
Tables	
Table C1 FTI Indicative Framework Benchmarking Tool for EFA/ESPs	2
Table C2 Regression Analyses of Primary Completion Rate	5
Table C3 Use of Indicative Framework and UPC in Countries	7
Table C4 How was the Indicative Framework used in the case study countries?	10

Acronyms and Abbreviations

CF	Catalytic Fund
EFA	Education for All
EMIS	Education Management Information System
EPDF	Education Program Development Fund
ESP	Education Sector Plan
ESSP	Education Sector Support Programme
FTI	Fast Track Initiative
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GER	Gross Enrolment Rate
GMR	Global Monitoring Report
IF	Indicative Framework
KESSP	Kenya Education Sector Support Programme
LDG	Local Donor Group
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MOE	Ministry of Education
NBEDS	National Basic Education Strategy
NER	Net Enrolment Rate
NESP	National Education Sector Plan
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
ODA	Official Development Assistance
PDDEB	The Ten Year Basic Education Development Plan
PCR	Primary Completion Rate
PIF	Policy and Investment Framework
PISE	<i>Programme d'Investissement Sectoriel Education</i>
PNE	National Education Plan
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
Unicef	United Nations Children's Fund
UPC	Universal Primary Completion
UPE	Universal Primary Education
USD	United States Dollar

A. Introduction

C1. The *Indicative Framework* (IF) has been a centrepiece of the FTI's approach, while achieving *Universal Primary Completion* (UPC) has been its headline target. This Annex:

- comments on the derivation and validity of the IF;
- reviews the global availability of data on the IF indicators;
- summarises the use of the IF in the evaluation's case study countries; and
- comments on the concept and measurement of UPC.

B. The Indicative Framework: Origins and Purpose

C2. The FTI Framework document (FTI 2004) gave prominence to what it calls the FTI Indicative Framework,² described as: "a limited set of education policy, service, delivery and financial *benchmarks*" [emphasis added]. The full Indicative Framework is reproduced in Table C1 below, which also includes a column to show which of the indicators are reported by the Education for All Global Monitoring Report.

C3. The Indicative Framework derives directly from the analytical work by Bruns and her colleagues (Bruns et al 2003). From their analysis of primary completion rates across a sample of 55 low-income countries, argued that a relatively small set of key parameters "are important determinants" [emphasis added] of primary education outcomes: overall spending on primary education; average class size; average teacher salaries; spending on inputs other than teacher salaries; and the rate of repetition. They concluded that: "the overall level of resources is adequate and the distribution is balanced, education systems have the basic ingredients they need to perform well....Many chronic problems of low quality, inefficiency, and inequity...can be traced to imbalances in these key elements."

C4. Prior to its incorporation in the FTI Framework, the same analysis underpinned the Action Plan for EFA (World Bank 2002) which set the FTI in motion. In that document, however, the language was more forceful, referring to "norms".

C5. Nevertheless, Bruns et al also stressed the importance of a flexible approach, indicating that this framework is not sufficient for a credible EFA plan,³ and "must not be applied rigidly" [emphasis added], as:

- System-wide averages do not guarantee an efficient underlying distribution.
- Target parameters may not be optimal in different country contexts.
- The overall level and mix of resources do not guarantee the transformation of those resources into quality schools and higher student learning.

C6. The authors insisted that: "there will be many cases where they are culturally, institutionally, or financially inappropriate and rigid adherence to any particular target values must be avoided. The ultimate value of this framework is as a guide to the direction of reform, not as a dictate regarding where it should end."

² The term Framework was used for both the FTI instructions and for the set of indicators.

³ Which would need to extend beyond primary education and UPC.

Table C1 FTI Indicative Framework Benchmarking Tool for EFA/ESPs

Indicator	Average for some successful countries	Reported in the GMR ⁴
Resource mobilisation		
Public domestically-generated revenues as % of GDP	14-18	No
External grants as % of GDP	—	GMR reports total ODA and ODA per capita
Education share of budget (%)		Yes
<i>Defined as public recurrent spending on education as % of total public recurrent discretionary spending¹</i>		GMR reports on share of education in total public expenditure
Estimate including grants	20	No
Estimate excluding grants	20	No
Primary education share of education budget (%)	42–64	Yes
<i>Defined as public recurrent spending on primary education as % of total public recurrent spending on education, including grants²</i>		GMR reports on distribution of public current expenditure on education by level
Student flows		
Intake into first grade, total ³	100	Yes
Girls' intake rate	100	Yes
Boys' intake rate	100	Yes
Primary completion rate, total ⁴	100	No regular reporting on PCR. GMR reports Survival rate instead which is not equivalent.
Girls' completion rate	100	No
Boys' completion rate	100	No
% repeaters among primary school pupils	10 or less	Yes
Service delivery		
Pupil–teacher ratio in publicly-financed primary schools ⁵	40:1	Not reported for publically financed primary schools alone. Combined with private schools in GMR reporting.
Average annual salary of primary school teachers divided by GDP per capita: ⁶ (for countries with both civil service and contract teachers, use the weighted average salary)	3.5	No
Contract teachers		
Number of new contract teachers recruited this year		No
Total stock of contract teachers		No
Average salary civil service teachers		No
Number of new civil service teachers recruited this year		No
Total stock of civil service teachers		No
Average salary		No
Recurrent spending on items other than teacher	33	Yes

⁴ The absence of reporting of particular indicators is primarily due to the absence of international data, or the absence of specially commissioned data sets.

Indicator	Average for some successful countries	Reported in the GMR ⁴
remuneration as % of total recurrent spending on primary education ⁷		GMR reports on share of primary recurrent budget on teachers' salaries
Annual instructional hours		
<i>Estimated effective hours of schooling (not official hours) in publicly-financed primary schools</i>	850–1000	No
Private share of enrolments % of pupils enrolled in exclusively privately-financed primary schools	10 or less	Reports on % enrolment in private schools but the denominator includes government aided or financing private schools ⁸

Source: FTI 2004.

Notes:

(1) Public recurrent spending on education includes all spending through ministries or other government units providing primary and secondary schooling, vocational/technical education and higher education. It also includes public expenditures for education transferred to private and non-government providers and educational grants and subsidies to students or their families. Public recurrent discretionary spending is defined as public spending from all sources—including external grants—less debt service (interest payments only). The education share of total public recurrent spending should be presented both including and excluding external grants.

(2) This benchmark is pro-rated to the nationally defined length of the primary cycle, i.e. 42% if it is 5 years, 50%, if 6 years, 58% if 7 years, and 64% if 8 years. Countries whose basic education cycle is longer than 8 years are encouraged to report data for a primary-equivalent sub-cycle of 5 or 6 years.

(3) Defined as students enrolled in grade 1, net of repeaters, as a percentage of the population cohort at the official age of entry to first grade.

(4) GMR 2009, reports two survival rates (to Grade 5 and to last Grade) and a Primary Cohort Completion Rate which is defined "as the number of pupils who complete the final year of primary school, expressed as a percentage of the number who entered" (UNESCO 2009 p411).

(5) Includes all teachers on payroll, GMR says that their data is based upon "headcounts of pupils and teachers" (UNESCO 2009 p354). "Publicly-financed schools" refers to schools supported by government whether publicly or privately managed and all teachers fully paid by the government, either directly or indirectly.

(6) The average annual salary of primary school teachers – this includes salary and budgeted cost of benefits (i.e. pension, health services, transport, housing and other items paid for by the state) – divided by GDP per capita. For countries with a two-tier teacher contracting system, disaggregated information on teacher stocks, flows and average monthly salaries (in local currency units, with exchange rate, or in USD) should also be presented.

(7) Recurrent spending on items other than teacher remuneration includes all non-salary spending (e.g. teaching/learning materials, student assessment, school feeding, student stipends, etc) plus salaries of administrative and other personnel who are not classroom teachers.

(8) The GMR reports on private share which it defines as the number of pupils/students enrolled in private institutions that are not operated by the public authorities but are controlled and managed, whether for profit or not by private bodies such as NGOs, religious bodies, special interest groups, foundations or business enterprises (UNESCO 2009 p411).

C7. **Exhibit 14 in Volume 1 of this report** presents the Indicative Framework as it appeared in the Framework document (2004), highlighting the things that it hoped to achieve. The Indicative Framework has fulfilled a number of functions as laid out in FTI reference documents. The Indicative Framework was intended to be used as a tool to foster debate, to allow consistent monitoring and evaluation, and to assess the credibility of education sector plans. The intentions of the framework and the way in which it was used were however in some contexts quite different. This is illustrated at country level by Table C3 and Table C4, section E below. The origin of some of the confusion can perhaps be understood through the diverse understanding of how the Indicative Framework should be used to assess country plans. These range from: "technical benchmarks or "norms" against which countries' EFA plans may be evaluated and costed" (World Bank 2002 p15),

to "the sector plan is assessed in full consideration of the benchmarks of the FTI Indicative Framework as adapted locally" (FTI 2004 p6), to "Governments of partner countries [elaborate] an ESP that is generally compliant with the FTI Indicative Framework" (FTI 2009 p4). Despite the many references to the Indicative Framework providing only guidance, and therefore needing to be adapted to the country context, it has often been understood in a more prescriptive sense.

C. Global Reporting of IF Indicators

C8. The FTI has stressed the importance of monitoring the benchmarks in the Indicative Framework; even if they are not treated as rigid norms, they should be monitored. In view of the emphasis on these selected indicators, it is curious that the GMR does not make more use in its reporting of the "norms" put forward by the FTI IF. This illustrates the unavailability of the necessary data.

C9. The ways in which the FTI has defined some of the indicators within the Indicative Framework (see Table C1 above) are distinct from the indicators that are internationally available; therefore such data are not collected by the UIS. Examples include the private share of enrolments, defined by the percentage of pupils enrolled in exclusively privately-financed primary schools. Whilst the GMR reports on percentage enrolment in private schools, these figures include government aided or funded private schools. The data that the indicator requires on exclusively privately financed private schools are not easily available across countries.

D. Technical Note: Derivation of the FTI Indicative Framework

C10. The Indicative Framework was derived from a statistical analysis in Chapter 3 of *A Chance for Every Child* (Bruns et al 2003). The 55 IDA-eligible (low income) countries were grouped into four categories on the basis of their EFA "success", where success was defined as having a GER of 85% or above and a PCR of 70% or above:

- Group 1 included the 10 "high performing" countries that met those criteria;
- Group 2, the 8 "high inefficiency" countries with GER of 80% or above but PCR of 60% or lower;
- Group 3, the 7 "low coverage" countries with both GER and PCR 60% or lower;
- Group 4, the 24 countries that fell in between the cracks.⁵

C11. Using non-parametric tests, they tried to find whether there were statistically significant differences between these groups of countries in terms of four variables: average teacher salary as a multiple of per capita GDP, pupil-teacher ratio and average repetition rate and unit costs. They showed that there were statistical differences between Groups 1 and 2 in respect of the repetition rate, between Groups 1 and 3 in respect of the teacher salary and the repetition rate; and between Groups 2 and 3 in respect of the teacher salary and unit costs.

C12. Given that the four other variables have been chosen on a non-statistical basis, these are quite weak results to support the conclusion that:

this analysis confirmed that the three stylized groupings did in fact reflect statistically significant differences in primary completion rates and in four key underlying variables.

⁵ Making 49 in total; it is unclear what happened to the other 6 countries – presumably missing data.

Why are those four variables key? When for none of the four variables are there differences between *all* three groups. Moreover it is disingenuous to conclude from an analysis of differences between the characteristics of different groupings that the members of each of the groups are similar to each other.⁶

C13. In addition, regression analysis was used to evaluate the explanatory power of these variables in relation to the sample as a whole (i.e. across all four groups, omitting a further five countries with no data on PCR). This is based, on a regression equation between the primary completion rates around 2000, on primary completion rate around 1990, on the percentage of recurrent spending on education, the teachers' salaries and the repetition rates (see Bruns et al 2003, Table 3.2, p65). Their results, which are reproduced in columns 2 and 3 of Table C2 (a) below, were interpreted to mean that "high average teacher salaries: has been a constraint to school system expansion...that high repetition constrains primary completion progress" (ibid, p65). The comment that: "The regression variables explained about 80% of the variance" (ibid, p66) appears to be interpreted as showing that the variables included as explanatory factors are powerful determinants of the dependent variable (in this case the PCR around 2000). But, in fact the bulk of the variance in the PCR around 2000 is provided by the PCR in 1990. This is illustrated in Table C2 (b) where Model 1 including PCR 1990 as the only variable accounts for 84.3% of the variance in PCR 2000; and the addition of the other variables accounts for only an additional 0.8% (less than one hundredth of the amount accounted for by PCR 1990). Although we were unable to reproduce the values in their Table 3.2 (Bruns et al 2003, p65), the pattern of results would almost certainly have been similar.

Table C2 Regression Analyses of Primary Completion Rate

(a) Coefficients

	Bruns et al 2005		Our Result	
	Coefficients	T Stat	Coefficients	T Stat
Intercept	47.86	5.08	9.88	1.99
1990 PCR	0.40	4.14	0.81	9.19
Recurrent spending on primary education as % of GDP	12.28	3.90	3.87	1.42
Average Teacher Salary (as multiple of per capita GDP)	(4.49)	(4.02)		
Pupil teacher ratio	(0.01)	(0.04)		
Average repetition rate (%)	(0.72)	(3.46)		
R squared	0.81		0.71	
Observations	44		42	

(b) Analysis of R squareds

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.843	0.710	0.703	11.921
2	0.851	0.724	0.710	11.777
A	Predictors: (Constant), PCR 1990			
B	Predictors: (Constant), PCR 1990, Recurrent spending on primary			

⁶ Classify cars into four groups by their wheel trims: in a parallel analysis compare their engine cc, maximum speed, model type and you will obtain a similar result. The parallel conclusion – that the type of wheel trims is dependent on engine cc, maximum speed and model type – would be nonsense. In fact, where the argument that differences between groups is *prima facie* evidence that the constituent members of the groups are very similar has been used in courts of law, it has been dismissed (Carr-Hill 1973).

C14. Overall, therefore, the derivation of the Indicative Framework is statistically shaky: Bruns et al used a regression model on a small dataset to establish causality between educational outcomes and system characteristics. Given the complexity of the relationships involved, this use of statistics was not a good way to base the derivation of the IF.

C15. There are, nevertheless, obvious reasons why assessments of the effectiveness of government spending on education and on primary education should be concerned with the primary completion rate; and also why non-teacher salary spending should be relatively high as a proportion of all recurrent spending, and the average repetition rate should be low. But the reasons for a specific target for teacher salary, pupil-teacher ratio, instructional hours and construction costs are less clear and highly dependent on country context (see Fuller & Clarke 1994). The evidence for these indicators is very briefly reviewed below. At the same time there are also counting problems with some of the indicators and these are also briefly reviewed.

C16. Teacher salary – about 3.5 times GDP per capita: the argument here is about the affordability of primary teachers relative to the national budget; but, if that "rule" were followed, teachers would see their salaries as low and this would likely to lead to difficulties of recruitment and retention. Salary level is not necessarily a constraint if it is combined with accountability in teacher management.

C17. Pupil-teacher ratio – about 40:1: the best international evidence on the importance of the pupil teacher ratio is from the international assessment studies. But those are not concerned with primary completion rates but with assessment at particular levels in particular contexts. Moreover, the evidence from such studies is inconclusive even about the effect of the pupil-teacher ratio on grade specific achievement.

C18. Repetition rates: the calculation of repetition rates relies on the data on individual students being collected accurately and systematically; so that, for example, the student who drops out mid-year, only to re-enrol in the same grade (either in the same school or another school), is not recorded as a new entrant; and such students may be more common than repeaters. The lack of analytical categories with which to deal with this problem is one of the causes of a tendency to under-report repetition, over-estimate intakes from the population into the first grade, and over-estimate rates of dropping out (see Crouch 1991; Marshall 2003). Moreover, in countries where automatic progression is followed, low repetition is by no means related to quality.

C19. Annual hours of instruction – 850 or more. This is one of the more doubtful indicators as the evidence is not strong that increasing the number of instructional hours per se – without attention to quality – is beneficial (see Baker et al 2004). In the evaluation of the Chilean experiment of moving to full day schooling, Valenzuela (Valenzuela 2005) showed that there was a robust positive effect of the programme based on tests carried out before and after the reform; but the magnitude of the effect is small, raising doubts about cost effectiveness.

C20. In sum, in addition to the statistical flaws of their analysis, Bruns et al (Bruns et al 2003) focused on a number of easily quantifiable indicators leaving out several substantive aspects of quality that the IF in its current form has not encouraged countries to consider.⁷

⁷ Although a recent issue of the FTI Newsletter (September, 2009) highlighted that two indicators on reading skills would be added to the Indicative Framework. One indicator will be on reading in early grades (at end of grade 2) and a second on reading skills at the end of the primary cycle (as defined by the country).

They stressed that, although the IF can ensure that an education system has adequate resources and a good mix of core inputs, the management of these factors to produce learning at classroom level is what will produce student learning outcomes. The IF is a tool that must be used with caution and common sense. At country level, indicators need to be tested according to their relevance in that context and at the global level of the partnership decisions on funding should not be influenced by a dogmatic application of the IF. In short as recognised by Bruns et al 2003, the IF alone will not provide quality education at national level, school level and classroom level. Basing policy reform programmes on a set of indicators for which the justification is flawed (see C14 above), and for which the source data are often unreliable, can be a hindrance rather than a help. It would be better for the FTI to recognise more consistently the specificity of each country's context and to focus on improving the quality of the data sets already being used and collected globally.

E. Use of the Indicative Framework in FTI Countries

C21. This section reports on the ways in which the Indicative Framework has been interpreted and used in practice in the countries which were case studies for this evaluation. Table C3 provides a summary across the case study countries as to where the IF was used and in what context i.e. at what stage during the FTI story was the country endorsed, and whether they already had an ESP.

Table C3 Use of Indicative Framework and UPC in Countries

Country Case Study	Date endorsed	Was there an ESP before the country began FTI endorsement?	Did the ESP that was endorsed by the FTI use/refer to the Indicative Framework?	Did the ESP include indicators on UPC?	
				Before FTI	As a result of FTI?
Pakistan	Not endorsed ("analytical fast track")	Yes – but has not begun FTI endorsement process	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nigeria	Not endorsed ("analytical fast track")	Yes – 2006 National Framework for Education and FME 10 year plan. By 2009, 13 states have 10 year ESPs	N/A	No	No
Kenya	July 2005	Yes, KESSP stated in July 2005 (2005–2010)	The IF contains some overlap with the KESSP Results Framework with some of the same indicators used, however the link is not made explicit.	Yes	No
Ghana	March 2004	Yes – May 2003 first ESP	Yes – Ghana's ESP was commended by the LDG for its use of the IF as a benchmarking tool.	Yes	No ⁸

⁸ "The New Education Reform emphasises targets Universal Basic Completion (UBC of 11 years' duration) by 2015, *not* UPC" (Allsop et al 2010).

Country Case Study	Date endorsed	Was there an ESP before the country began FTI endorsement?	Did the ESP that was endorsed by the FTI use/refer to the Indicative Framework?	Did the ESP include indicators on UPC?	
				Before FTI	As a result of FTI?
Yemen	February 2003	No – but there was NBEDs (a sub-sector education strategy focusing on primary education) 2003–2015	The IF was not really relevant in Yemeni context – see ¶C22 below.	Yes	Unclear
Mozambique	Invited 2002, endorsed March 2003	Yes – ESSP implemented 1998–2005 focused on basic education	Used indicators but not the benchmarks.	Yes some	No
Cambodia	October 2006	Yes – latest ESP covers 2006–10	No ⁹	No	No – but is included on the FTI project
Burkina Faso	November 2002, but not endorsed for CF funding until 2007.	Yes – PDDEB 2008–2010	For initial endorsement the IF was not used (had not been propagated). For CF endorsement used indicators but not benchmarks	For initial 2002 endorsement – No. But for CF endorsement in 2007 – Yes	Yes
Nicaragua	November 2002	Yes – PNE – National Education Plan	No but was used for the version presented to the FTI. IF not compatible with what was happening in the sector so once proposal was endorsed not really used.	Yes	No
Vietnam (D)	Invited in June 2002, endorsed end 2003	Yes – EFA Strategic Development Plan 2001–2010. 2002 –secondary education master plan National EFA Plan – 2003–2015.	No	Yes ¹⁰	No
Ethiopia (D)	Invited in 2002, endorsed November 2004 but not eligible for CF funding	Yes – Education and Training Policy in 1994 and a series of medium term Education Sector Development programmes since 1997/98.	No	No	No ¹¹

⁹ As reason why the IF benchmarks were not used "a difference between the FTI IF suggested benchmarks and those quoted in ESSP and the CF project is that in most cases the latter are more micro level and responsibility can be efficiently assigned to departments and included in Departmental [Annual Work Plans]" (Purcell et al 2010).

¹⁰ "Vietnam had nearly achieved UPC at the time of FTI endorsement" (Bartholomew 2010).

¹¹ The plan now includes a UPC indicator – but its inclusion was not due to the but to budget support (DBS/PBS) frameworks stressing the importance of this. (Dom 2010)

Country Case Study	Date endorsed	Was there an ESP before the country began FTI endorsement?	Did the ESP that was endorsed by the FTI use/refer to the Indicative Framework?	Did the ESP include indicators on UPC?	
				Before FTI	As a result of FTI?
Uganda (D)	Not endorsed yet despite early invitation, 2002	Yes – latest prepared in 2003	No	No	N/A
Zambia (D)	Invited to join in 2002 but did not apply. Endorsed September 2008	Yes – Education Strategic Plan (2003–07) and Education National Implementation Framework (2008–10)	Not always appropriate so not main drivers of the plan.	No	No
Mali (D)	May 2007	Yes – PRODEC, 1998–2010 plus operational plans (PISE 1 and II)	Yes in part – the understanding at the time was that the plan presented for endorsement should be in line with the IF benchmarks.	Yes	No
Malawi (D)	Invited in 2004, not endorsed yet preparations started in 2006.	Yes – the PIF (1995–2005), re-published in 2001 for 2000–2015.	No	Yes	No
Rwanda (D)	November 2006	Yes – ESSP, rolling 5 year plan started in 2003. Education Sector Policy 2003	Most indicators were included	Yes ¹²	No
Moldova (D)	Invited November 2004. Endorsed May 2005.	Yes – Consolidated Strategy for the ESP.	IF is not used and bench marks seem irrelevant to Moldovan context. Government has its own IF.	No	No

C22. Table C3 aims to show the degree to which the FTI's emphasis upon the IF and UPC has had an impact at country level. The IF was aiming to influence education policy and planning and one indicator of the degree of influence is whether or not the IF and in particular the UPC indicator are referred to or used in the country's ESP. In most country case studies, the IF indicators have not been used to strengthen the monitoring of education sector plans (ESPs) (see Table C3). One of the main reasons for this was that in most countries their ESPs were already in place (see Table C3) when the country sought FTI endorsement. In countries in which IF benchmarks were used in their ESPs (Mali, Burkina Faso, Rwanda) this seemed to occur due to a misunderstanding concerning the requirements for endorsement (that plans had to be in line with the IF benchmarks). This confusion unfortunately led to the ESP targets being considered to be unrealistic by local donor groups and partner governments.

¹² "Regarding the IF, the indicators were already monitored in the ESSP, probably as a result of the influence of the 2003 CSR and therefore not directly in relation with the FTI" (Chiche, 2009, p.viii).

C23. As highlighted also in the review of 28 Education Sector Plans carried out by the FTI Secretariat in 2007 (FTI 2007) countries were not reliably using the Indicative Framework (only 64% of the 28 ESPs referenced the Indicative Framework). This evaluation's country case studies showed that it was also not being understood consistently. Despite insistence at global level that it was to act as guidance, some countries (e.g. Burkina Faso and Nicaragua) saw the IF as a necessary part of the Catalytic Fund application process. In some of the case study contexts the IF appeared less relevant: examples were Moldova, where the primary-aged population is decreasing, and Yemen where:

... whilst Yemen was lagging behind and struggling with each of the EFA goals, paradoxically, the FTI Indicative Framework parameters were actually close to the benchmarks in Yemen. Therefore the FTI Indicative Framework did not help to highlight key policy gaps, notably low efficiency in the use of resources; higher unit costs in the delivery of education services and demand-side constraints for access and retention in school. (Duret et al 2010)

C24. It was also interesting to see in the country studies in more detail exactly how the IF was used, and if it was not used why not. Table C4 below provides more detailed excerpts from the country studies about the use of the IF and illustrates the variety of interpretations and implementation of the IF across FTI countries.

Table C4 How was the Indicative Framework used in the case study countries?

Country	Use of the Indicative Framework
Pakistan	Pakistan's early contacts with the FTI Secretariat petered out. The federal Ministry of Education did prepare a set of targets against the IF, but this was never incorporated into national planning.
Nigeria	None of the FTI IF indicators are being monitored explicitly.
Kenya	The KESSP (endorsed in July 2005) framework for analysis and subsequent M&E included a number of the indicators included in the FTI Indicative Framework (IF), but did not link them to the IF.
Mozambique	Invited in 2002, and endorsed in March 2003. Some IF indicators were incorporated into the existing processes, but there was not a visible FTI influence in streamlining the demand for data or monitoring indicators. The present data system is not yet compatible with the IF indicators, as data is still collected with EP1 and EP2 split, and not integrated primary education.
Ghana	In terms of the IF indicators, most of the data that related to student flow indicators was collected. Ghana was endorsed in March 2004.
Cambodia	Endorsed in October 2006, the reliability of EMIS data was questioned by some, whilst other stakeholders felt strongly that the FTI indicator framework was being used too rigidly and prescriptively.
Yemen	<p>Endorsed in February 2003, the FTI IF indicators have never been considered at the national level in the monitoring of poverty reduction. It is difficult to know if the FTI IF could have influenced the high level M&E framework if the indicators had been routinely followed at the sub-sector level.</p> <p>The completion rate is not given as much as emphasis as traditional GER and NER and seems documented for MDG reporting only. The other FTI IF indicators have been clearly phased out over time. The retention rate to grade 6 disaggregated by gender is the only indicator reflecting the FTI IF which remains.</p> <p>The IF was relevant in Yemen in that it encouraged a consolidation of available information from different sources to set up a baseline year. Also the definition of a framework to monitor progress for the whole lower basic education sub-sector including indicators from the FTI IF helped align Yemen to internationally recognised indicators and practice.</p>

Country	Use of the Indicative Framework
Burkina Faso	<p>During discussions around endorsement in 2002, the World Bank argued that the credibility of Burkina Faso's FTI request would rely upon the objective criteria of the IF. Letters from the FTI Secretariat to Government also implied that the request was to be "consistent with" the IF benchmarks. The systematic reference to the IF to guide policy reforms aimed at addressing the key efficiency constraints in Burkina Faso was difficult for the Government to accept. It perceived the discussion as pressure to cut expenditure (recurrent expenditure through teachers' salaries, and capital expenditure through unit costs in school construction) and identified the IF as a new set of conditionalities in the same vein as those established during the structural adjustment period.</p> <p>However, in 2002, the Ministry of Education was just starting the implementation of its ESP and did not want to lose any opportunity to acquire additional resources that might enable the scaling up of the Plan. So finally, it submitted a request to the FTI in line with the IF 2015 benchmark and the objective of achieving UPC in 2015. This confusion from the Government about the purpose of the Indicative Framework may have been fed by a lack of clarity on the part of the external partners.</p> <p>The evolution towards more flexibility in 2007 has enhanced alignment with country needs and existing procedures and its relevance.</p> <p>The IF benchmarks on resource mobilisation have not contributed to the increased resources to education and basic education, since Burkina Faso was already allocating more than the benchmarks, and the main constraint was elsewhere, in increasing the resources available in the budget.</p>
Nicaragua	<p>Since being endorsed in November 2003, there has not been systematic and regular analysis of the IF indicators, although some of them are presented in partial form in almost all MoE analytical reports. This lack of production and analysis of the IF indicators represents a lost opportunity to progress against a common framework.</p> <p>The IF indicators have supported the monitoring of educational progress in the country, as they measure the main areas of progress such as enrolments, repetition and drop-outs. In order to have a complete overview, however, these indicators should be supplemented by indicators to measure quality.</p>
Vietnam (D)	<p>Invited in June 2002 and endorsed at the end of 2003. The Desk Study found no evidence that the IF was significantly used in dialogue between Vietnam and education donors. The 2005 PAD for Targeted Budget Support includes a reference to the fact that teachers' salaries in Vietnam, relative to GDP, were below the FTI IF benchmark.</p>
Ethiopia (D)	<p>Invited to join the FTI in June 2002, and endorsed in November 2004, but not eligible for CF funding.</p> <p>In relation to policy focus, the ESDP III includes new indicators and targets related to NER, and primary education (Grade 5 and Grade 8) completion (whereas ESDP I and still ESDP II targets were in terms of GER). However, this was not influenced by the FTI (directly at least).</p> <p>A number of the FTI Indicative Framework (IF) indicators have been monitored as part of the ESDP core set of indicators since the outset – albeit this is because they were identified locally as being relevant rather than because of their belonging to the set of FTI IF indicators. The coverage of the ESDP core set with regard to the FTI IF has improved over time (e.g. ESDP I and II monitored GER, whereas ESDP III monitors NER as the IF suggests), but this again was not linked to direct inputs from the FTI partnership and arose from country processes. The FTI IF indicators that are not regularly monitored to date are all those related to teachers (PTR is monitored), to instructional hours, and to the share of private enrolment.</p>
Uganda (D)	<p>The FTI Quality Support Review in early 2008 made a number of suggestions on performance reporting in Uganda, including that the Ministry develop an ESSP Results Framework for the Plan period, with performance targets and key outcome indicators. As with the earlier FTI inputs in this area, these suggestions appear to have not yet been acted on, and the FTI has had no discernible impact in this area.</p>

Country	Use of the Indicative Framework
Zambia (D)	<p>Although there was an awareness of the FTI Indicative Framework (IF) indicators, these were not the main drivers of the plan. There is also no mention of the FTI in the Joint Appraisal of the plan in 2002, nor does the plan itself refer to the FTI.</p> <p>The resource envelope was calculated by projecting domestic resources available from the GRZ budget and commitments by donors. In this instance the plan included specific targets for educational indicators for 2007 rather than EFA goals.</p>
Mali (D)	<p>The action plan for accelerating process towards UPE is the plan presented for endorsement by the FTI. Although it is based on existing documents and strategies (PRODEC, PISE, PRSP, Country Status Report), it required extensive revision of existing objectives and financing framework, in order to bring them in line with IF benchmarks, as it was understood was required by the FTI. Mali was then endorsed in May 2007.</p> <p>Efforts to ensure alignment with the Indicative Framework (IF) benchmarks led to extensive discussions on issues related to teacher remuneration, teacher training, contact hours, etc. Nevertheless it should be noted that these discussions were held often before Mali sought endorsement by the FTI and not specifically in relation with the endorsement process, mainly under the leadership of the World Bank.</p> <p>Regarding the mobilisation of domestic resources, the FTI had a marginal influence through the Indicative Framework (IF) benchmarks, in particular in highlighting the need to increase the share of resources going to primary education. Regarding the other benchmark of allocation of 20% of recurrent expenditure to education, Mali had already reached the benchmark IF value.</p> <p>Indicators of the IF have been included to the overall monitoring framework "in order to monitor the action plan for accelerating progress toward UPE.</p>
Malawi (D)	<p>Invited in 2004, and not yet endorsed although preparations started in 2006.</p> <p>Two reviews of the draft NESP and its financial framework were carried out partly using the FTI appraisal guidelines to provide recommendations to strengthen the NESP. The ESIP contains elements that are required for FTI endorsement. The FTI IF indicators were calculated for Malawi and compared with benchmark values in the government's 2006 Public Expenditure Review PER.</p> <p>Most of the IF indicators are not routinely monitored, but many (not the primary completion rate) are calculated periodically as part of analytical exercises e.g. the government's 2000 (PER).</p>
Rwanda (D)	<p>The FTI – through the appraisal process, which used the IF benchmarks as a point of reference – has contributed to an enhanced focus on the issues of completion and teacher management and motivation. This focus nevertheless initially mainly came from the 2003 Country Status Report, financed by the NETF and the WB, and carried out by the WB.</p> <p>The issue of teachers' salaries per se was not a major focus of the discussion during the appraisal in 2006 (the date of Rwanda's endorsement), since current salary expenditure per staff is around 3.3 times GDP per capita at primary level and 6 times GDP per capita at secondary level therefore in line with the IF benchmark.</p> <p>The IF benchmarks were used as a reference to promote a higher share of primary education in the education budget. Although local donors had long been insisting on the need to reduce the share of the education going to higher education, and key measures had already been taken by Government, the inclusion of this concern in the FTI appraisal contributed to giving it further weight.</p>
Moldova (D)	<p>Indicators focus mainly on the output level (number of students enrolled, number of schools, number of teachers) more than on quality outcomes. Indicative Framework indicators might have been more relevant for satisfying international databases but have not been used in Moldova.</p> <p>In Moldova there is no mention of the Indicative Framework in documentation relating to FTI implementation. The Country Information Form, which is submitted annually to the FTI, contains a table with a summary of indicators that is similar to that of the Indicative Framework. It is apparent that the indicators listed are neither used as targets nor collected for monitoring purposes.</p>

C25. It is clear from the examples provided in Table C4 that the Indicative Framework has had a useful impact by focusing policy discussions (Burkina Faso, Rwanda, Mozambique, Zambia, Malawi and Ghana). The nature of this debate on specific indicators has been influenced by the situation in country when FTI was first introduced. Such discussions have also been influenced by the way in which the Indicative Framework was perceived in country and its relevance to the country context. The country examples also serve to highlight how the Indicative Framework was not used consistently to monitor performance within or across countries that had been endorsed.

F. Universal Primary Completion (UPC) as the FTI indicator

C26. The concepts of UPC and Universal Primary Education (UPE) are often used interchangeably. However, right from the start of the FTI in the Action Plan, the importance of using UPC as opposed to UPE was stressed as key to reaching EFA. It was considered vital that children not only attended primary school but completed primary school in order to receive the quality of education envisaged by the EFA goals. Box C1 below clarifies the concepts.

Box C1 UPE vs. UPC – clarifying the concepts

The terms Universal Primary Education (UPE) and Universal Primary Completion (UPC) are often used interchangeably in casual conversation. (This was apparent in many of the interviews conducted for this evaluation.) Yet the Action Plan stressed the importance of using UPC rather than UPE as a measure of progress towards Education for All. Since children who did not complete primary school would not receive the quality of education envisaged by the EFA targets the Action Plan argued that "EFA must mean Universal Primary Completion".

Whilst the concept of UPC is undoubtedly consistent with the EFA goals, it may imply a much more demanding target to achieve MDG2, since the phrase "have access to and complete" does not necessarily mean UPC by 2015 in the sense measured. It might, for example, be interpreted to mean universal access to grade 1 in 2015 by children who all subsequently complete. This would be UPC by 2021 (for a six-year primary cycle). See the GMR for 2002 (UNESCO 2002) which spells out and discusses the many possible meanings of this phrase.

Formally, the Primary Completion Rate (PCR) is defined as: *the ratio of the total number of students successfully completing (or graduating from) the last year of primary school in a given year to the total number of children of official graduation age in the population* (this is the UN definition and matches the one used in the FTI Framework (FTI 2004). The concept is intuitively straightforward; in practice however, the PCR is tricky to calculate because (a) of possible ambiguities in recording the number of completers (the numerator), and (b) uncertainty about the relevant population cohort (the denominator).

There are also many practical difficulties in measuring UPC. These are discussed in Box C2 of this annex.

C27. Under the heading "Why EFA must mean Universal Primary Completion", the Action Plan argued that this was the first time EFA progress has been measured in terms of primary *completion* rather than enrolment. "This new indicator¹³ recognizes that true and sustainable learning begins to occur only after the completion of at least 5 to 6 years of primary education of reasonable quality." It acknowledged that UPC was a tougher target than, say, achieving a 100% Gross Enrolment Rate. This might "seem like moving back the goal post in a game that already appears almost lost. And yet, this is the goal stated in Dakar and reiterated as the education target in the MDGs".¹⁴

C28. However, others involved in the collection of data and education indicators argue that UPE implies a full cycle of primary education and therefore it is synonymous with UPC. International compacts made at Jomtien (1990) and Dakar (2000) were clear about the importance of completing primary school. The framework for action at Jomtien included targets on "universal access to and completion of primary education by the year 2000" (Ostveit 2000 .3). However, the re-branding that was pushed under FTI with the new term "UPC" could be deemed necessary as many countries had since Dakar begun to focus solely on enrolments as a measure of progress (and this is still an issue today).

C29. Table C3 above illustrates the patchy improvement on the use of UPC in Education Sector Plans in the case study countries. Even some countries that have been endorsed neglect to use UPC as an indicator within their ESP e.g. Moldova. Very few countries (Cambodia) that did not use UPC in their ESP prior to being involved in the FTI started using it as an indicator as a result of the FTI. Many more obviously looked to the Indicative Framework and its associated indicators as a necessary part of the endorsement process in order to access Catalytic Funds and so applied to varying degrees the UPC indicator prior to going for FTI endorsement e.g. Burkina Faso, Rwanda, Mali and Vietnam.

C30. As illustrated in Box C2 below, UPC as an indicator has developed and been used differently by different institutions. It has not always therefore accurately served to measure progress in the way that was originally intended.

¹³ Calculated as *the total number of pupils successfully completing the last year of primary school, in a given year, divided by the total number of children of official graduation age in the population*. The length of the primary cycle varies from country to country. In practice, 5 years has usually been used as the basis for calculating "survival rates" etc. and making cross-country comparisons on UPC.

¹⁴ It can be argued that this is not strictly true (see Box C1 on the different interpretations of UPE and UPC).

Box C2 Primary Completion Rate – Issues of Definition and Data

PCR Definition

The Primary Completion Rate (PCR) is defined as: *the ratio of the total number of students successfully completing (or graduating from) the last year of primary school in a given year to the total number of children of official graduation age in the population* (this is the UN definition and matches the one used in the FTI Framework).

The concept is intuitively straightforward but in practice the PCR is tricky to calculate because of possible ambiguities in recording the number of completers (the numerator) and uncertainty about the relevant population cohort (the denominator).

The UIS until recently published a proxy for the PCR under the name Gross Intake Rate to the last grade of primary. The EFA Global Monitoring Reports have been publishing a similar "Survival Rate" defined as: *total number of new entrants in the last grade of primary education, regardless of age, expressed as a percentage of the theoretical entrance age to the last grade*. The number of new entrants is the total number of new children in the last grade of primary minus the number of repeaters.

The latter definition is the one used by the World Bank and the FTI. Note that conceptually, the Primary Completion Rate should mean the percentage of a starting population cohort which, after allowing for deaths and migration into and out of the country, complete the primary cycle in the given country. This means that the correct denominator for the indicator should be the numbers of children of initial school-going age in the year that they should have entered school.

Apparent Variations in Reported Figures

All education indicators published in international reports are based on figures provided by UIS. Any difference may be due to :

- The use of different version of the UIS database, which is updated three times a year to provide data as timely as possible;
- The inclusion of national data where no US data is available (EdStats, Unicef).

Note also that EPDC (the Education Policy and Data Center) use a different approach basing what they call PCR on retrospectively reported educational attainment among different 5 year age groups from household surveys.

Measurement Problems

There are some obvious technical problems with any of these definitions:

- They rely on an estimate of the numbers of children in a single age year (see Note on Data Quality in [Appendix I](#)). This does not apply to the survey-based EPDC figures, but they face a different set of issues concerning possible survey bias. (see Carr-Hill 2005)
- The criteria for completing the final year may change from year to year.
- Children may be held back from the final grade of the primary cycle until parents or schools assess that they have a good chance of succeeding (evidence from several African countries).
- The age range of the cohort of students in the final year may change substantially from year to year when there has been a previous expansion (or contraction) on the intake rates; so that the extent to which it can be used to provide useful policy information is variable.

There are other practical and interpretative problems:

- Tracking children who shift between schools and jurisdictions within a country to know what happens to them.
- The criteria for what counts as a final pass and the policy towards repetition in earlier grades may change over time so that changes in the PCR become difficult to interpret.

References

- Baker et al 2004 *Instructional Time and National Achievement: Cross-National Evidence*. Prospects Vol. XXXIV, No. 3. David Baker, Roderigo Fabrega, Claudia Galindo, and Jacob Mishook, 2004.
- Allsop et al 2010 *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Ghana Country Study*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Terry Allsop, Ramlatu Attah, Tim Cammack and Eric Woods, February 2010
- Bartholomew 2010 *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Vietnam Country Desk Study*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ann Bartholomew, February 2010
- Bruns et al 2003 *Achieving Universal Primary Education for All by 2015: A Chance for Every Child*. Washington: World Bank. Barbara Bruns, Alain Mingat, and Ramahatra Rakotomalala, 2003.
- Carr-Hill 1973 *British Bombs: a critical analysis of modus operandi to Conference on Applied Statistics*. Hull: University of Hull. Roy Carr-Hill, 1973.
- Carr-Hill 2005 *Monitoring the Millennium Development Goals? Presented at ESDS Conference Social Inequality: Using Evidence from Data, 20th June 2005*. Roy Carr-Hill, June 2005.
- Crouch 1991 *A Simplified Linear programming Approach to Estimating Enrolment Transition Rates*. Economics of Education Review, Vol. 10, No. 3. Luis Crouch, 1991.
- Dom 2010 *Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative: Ethiopia Country Desk Study*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Catherine Dom, February 2010.
- Duret et al 2010 *Yemen Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Hassan Abdulmalik, Elsa Duret and Stephen Jones, February 2010.
- FTI 2004 *Accelerating progress towards quality universal primary education: Framework*. FTI, 2004.
- FTI 2007 *Strengthening Quality Assurance Mechanisms within the Fast Track Initiative: A review of the Twenty-eight Education Sector Plans*. FTI, 2008.
- FTI 2009 *EFA-FTI Governance of the Partnership*. FTI, March 2009.
- Fuller & Clarke 1994 *Raising School Effects While Ignoring Culture? Local Conditions and the Influence of Classroom Tools, Rule, and Pedagogy*. Review of Educational Research, Vol. 64, No. 1. Bruce Fuller and Prema Clarke, 1994.
- Marshall 2003 *Grade Repetition in Honduran Primary Schools*. In *International Journal of Educational Development*, Vol. 23, issue 6 November, pp.591–605. J. Marshall, 2003.
- Osttveit 2000 *Education For All: Ten Years after Jomtien*. S. Osttveit, in *Prospects*. 30:1. March 2000.
- Purcell et al 2010 *Cambodia Country Case Study. Mid-Term Evaluation of the EFA Fast Track Initiative*. Cambridge Education, Mokoro and OPM. Ray Purcell, Abby Riddell, George Taylor and Khieu Vicheanon, February 2010.

- UNESCO 2002 *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2002: Education For All – Is the World on Track?* UNESCO Publishing. UNESCO 2002.
- UNESCO 2009 *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2009: Overcoming Inequality – Why Governance Matters?* UNESCO Publishing, 2008.
- Valenzuela 2005 *Partial Evaluation of a Big Reform in the Chilean Education System: From a Half Day to a Full Day Schooling.* Draft (University of Michigan). J.P. Valenzuela, 2005,
- World Bank 2002 *Education for Dynamic Economies: Action Plan to Accelerate Progress Towards Education for All.* World Bank, 9 April 2002.