

Summative Evaluation of GPE's Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

TRIPLELINE

Inception Report

Prepared by Learn More, Triple Line, and Technopolis

April 2023

Document Control

Document title	Summative Evaluation of GPE's Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic: Inception Report
Reference no.	WOR-2469J
Prepared by	Saira Ali, Jessica Chu, Olaf Kooijmans, Lorenzo Newman, Alice Pelosi, Elizaveta Rusakova
Reviewed by	ZJ (Technopolis), CMP (Triple Line)
Date	14 April 2023

This report is the copyright of Global Partnership for Education and has been prepared by Triple Line Consulting under contract to the World Bank / Global Partnership for Education. The contents of this report may not be reproduced in whole or in part, nor passed to any other organization or person without the specific prior written permission of Global Partnership of Education Secretariat.

The views expressed in the report are entirely those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views or policies of Global Partnership for Education. Comments and discussion on items related to content and opinion should be addressed to the author, via 3L@tripleline.com.

Triple Line has used reasonable skill and care in checking the accuracy and completeness of information supplied by the client or third parties in the course of this project under which the report was produced. Triple Line is however unable to warrant either accuracy or completeness of such information supplied by the client or third parties, nor that it is fit for any purpose. Triple Line does not accept responsibility for any legal, commercial, or other consequences that may arise directly or indirectly as a result of the use by Triple Line of inaccurate or incomplete information supplied by the client or third parties in the course of this project or its inclusion in this report.

Contents	i
List of Abbreviations	iii
1 Introduction	1
2 Evaluation Context and Objectives	2
2.1 Background on the COVID-19 Pandemic and Education.....	2
2.2 GPE’s Response to COVID-19	3
2.3 Objectives of the Summative Evaluation.....	4
3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology	6
3.1 Overall Approach.....	6
3.1.1 <i>Portfolio Analysis</i>	6
3.1.2 <i>Case Studies</i>	7
3.1.3 <i>Gender, Equity and Social Inclusion Approach</i>	9
3.2 Evaluation Matrix	9
3.2.1 <i>Revisions to Evaluation Questions</i>	9
3.2.2 <i>Indicators</i>	11
3.3 Data Collection.....	11
3.3.1 <i>Desk Research: Primary analysis of key data and documents</i>	11
3.3.2 <i>Primary Data Collection: Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions</i>	14
3.4 Analysis and Synthesis	16
3.4.1 <i>Analysis</i>	16
3.4.2 <i>Synthesis</i>	17
3.5 Learning and Dissemination	17
3.6 Limitations.....	17
3.6.1 <i>Methodological Limitations</i>	17
3.6.2 <i>Practical Limitations</i>	18
4 Work Plan and Deliverables	19
4.1 Work Plan	19
4.2 Deliverables.....	19
5 Project Management	21
5.1 Evaluation Management	21
5.2 Safeguarding and Data Protection.....	21
5.3 Risk Management.....	22
Appendix 1: Glossary of Terms	23
Appendix 2: Detailed Evaluation Matrix	24
Appendix 3: Preliminary Desk Review	31
Appendix 4: CTL Initial Consultation Topic Guide (At Inception)	40
Appendix 5: Country Case Study Sampling Methodology	41
Appendix 6: Work Plan	44
Appendix 7: Final Report Outline (Draft)	45
Appendix 8: Triple Line’s Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment Policies and Procedures	46
Appendix 9: Risk Matrix	47

List of Abbreviations

AG	Accelerated Grant
CA	Coordinating Agency
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease of 2019
CS	Case Study
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CTL	Country Team Lead
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
FCDO	UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
GA	Grant Agent
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GG	Global Grant
GPE	The Global Partnership for Education
HDI	Human Development Index
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
KII	Key Informant Interview
KIX	Knowledge and Information Exchange
LEG	Local Education Group
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoE	Ministry of Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PA	Portfolio Analysis
PILC	Performance, Impact and Learning Committee
PG	Planning Grant
R&P	Results and Performance Team within the GPE Secretariat
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
US\$	United States Dollar (currency)
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization

1 Introduction

A consortium, led by Triple Line with partners Learn More and Technopolis, has been engaged to conduct a summative evaluation of the Global Partnership for Education's (GPE's) response to the COVID-19 pandemic and support to its partner countries.

This inception report sets out the methodology and detailed plans for implementing the evaluation, expanding on the high-level approach outlined in our technical proposal. The report has been informed by consultations with the GPE Secretariat, including Country Team Leads (CTLs) in addition to COVID-19 related background research and secondary document and data reviews.

The inception report is divided into the following sections:

- **Section 2** describes the **context** for the evaluation and its objectives. This includes a short introduction on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on education systems and an explanation of our understanding of GPE's response to the challenges emerged from the pandemic. The section then outlines the **objectives** of our evaluation.
- **Section 3** lays out our evaluation **approach and methodology** for conducting the summative evaluation, including the overall approach, revisions to evaluation questions, data collection strategy, analysis, approach to learning and dissemination and limitations.
- **Section 4** presents our **work plan and key deliverables** while **section 5** provides key **project management** details, including evaluation management, information on safeguarding and data protection and our risk management strategy.
- The report also includes **appendices** including: a glossary of terms, the detailed evaluation matrix with key evaluation questions, the results of our preliminary desk review, a draft evaluation CTL consultation topic guide, case study sampling methodology, our detailed work plan, the proposed final report outline, Triple Line's policy and protocols on preventing sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment and evaluation risk matrix.

2 Evaluation Context and Objectives

2.1 Background on the COVID-19 Pandemic and Education

This introductory section presents the results of research conducted in 2020 and 2021 on the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on education. These findings serve as a contextual backdrop for the inception report and, more generally, assist in identifying new potential areas of interest.

The COVID-19 pandemic has had a profound impact on education systems around the world, particularly in developing countries. With limited resources and infrastructure, many countries have struggled to adapt to the challenges posed by the outbreak and have been forced to implement measures such as school closures which have had a significant negative impact on students and teachers. The duration of school closures across the world varied. The regions with the greatest number of full days of school closures were: Latin America and Caribbean with an average of 158 days, South Asia with 146 days, and Eastern and Southern Africa with an average of 101 full days.¹ GPE partner countries were among the worst affected, with variations across countries. Twenty-three GPE partner countries including the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia and Niger experienced over 100 days of school closure, and at least eight including Pakistan, Nepal and Bangladesh had experienced between 200-450 days closed as of 2021. By comparison, Nicaragua experienced zero days of full closure.

Box 1: The Impact of COVID-19 on Learning Loss

The length and breadth of school closures have resulted in learning loss and knowledge gaps for the poorest and most vulnerable groups. Researchers have estimated that the impact of school closures could equate to more than a year of learning loss in countries such as Ethiopia and Pakistan.²

Learning loss has been found to be proportional to the length of school closures. Children between the ages of 9-11 who were out of school were up to 43 percentage points less likely to acquire foundational reading skills as compared to previous years. For example, in Pakistan research has shown substantial losses in math and reading ability³ and in Cambodia, in 2020, 25% fewer students could demonstrate basic proficiency in mathematics compared to the previous (pre-pandemic) year.⁴ Evidence suggests that South Asia had experienced some of the largest increases in learning poverty, with 78% of students lacking minimum literacy proficiency post-pandemic as compared to 60% pre-pandemic.

One important response to the COVID-19 pandemic-related school closures has been to implement remote learning approaches. Organizations such as the World Bank, UNESCO, UNICEF, and GPE promoted technologies such as online learning platforms to support continuous learning and remote lessons for students and for teacher training. However, connectivity remains a huge barrier to the implementation of remote learning methods. This has been true for students in some of the most remote and deprived areas, particularly when remote learning systems were implemented under time pressure and where education systems lacked the resources to provide students with access to the internet, laptops or smartphones needed to participate.⁴

Learning loss during COVID-19 has had a disproportionately negative effect on vulnerable groups of children. For instance, even with remote learning solutions, children who have a disability, live in rural locations or belong to marginalized groups were less likely to be able to access the necessary resources to learn. Furthermore, teachers lacked the training to deliver disability-inclusive education during school closures, resulting in fewer students with disabilities accessing at-home resources.⁵ There is also substantial evidence of the gendered impact of COVID-19 on learning (see Box 2). It is estimated that children without a supportive family network suffer disproportionately and that children whose mothers have not received an

1 For the period of March 2020 to February 2021. UNESCO. "COVID-19 and School Closures: One year of education disruption. (2021).

2 Fitzpatrick, R, Korin, A, and Riggall, A. "An International Review of Plans and Actions for School Reopening." Education Development Trust, 2020.

3 Giannini, S., Jenkins, R., and Saavedra, J. "Mission: Recovering Education 2021." UNICEF, UNESCO, and World Bank, 2021.

<https://www.unicef.org/media/98861/file/Mission%20-%20Recovering%20Education%20in%202021.pdf>

4 Joynes, Chris, Emma Gibbs, and Kate Simms. "An Overview of Emerging Country-Level Responses to Providing Educational Continuity under COVID-19: What's Working? What Isn't?" 2021. <https://edtechhub.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/EdTech-Hub-China-Report.pdf>.

5 IDDC. "Inclusive Education Task Group Response to COVID-19", 2020. <https://www.iddcconsortium.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/IDDC-Inclusive-Education-Task-Group-response-to-COVID-19.pdf>

education were less likely to have been encouraged to participate in their education during school closures, leading to gaps in achievement and disrupted learning.⁶

Box 2: The Gendered Effects of COVID-19

The gendered effects of the COVID-19 pandemic are well documented, with school closures widening the existing gap between boys and girls.⁶ Gender bias, stigma and societal roles have meant that learning was less likely to be a priority for girls than for boys during school closures. As a result of the pandemic, there have been an additional 31 million cases of gender-based violence against girls and seven million additional pregnancies during 2020. The Room to Read Girls' Education Program found that of its 24,000 participating girls, only 8% were able to continue studying or keep up with academic learning at home during school closures in 2020 as compared to previous years when at home learning was required, and 49% were at high risk of not returning to school.⁷

Access to technology outside of school for girls was limited due to gendered household attitudes and roles, costs and fears for security. The pandemic has exacerbated an already existing digital divide making girls experience a greater learning loss than boys.⁸

As a result, several countries, such as Rwanda, South Sudan, Malawi, Pakistan, Somalia and Ghana, have included measures to protect girls' education during the pandemic. In the case of Rwanda, policy measures were included in its COVID-19 response plan to ensure that pregnant adolescents were re-integrated into the national education system. South Sudan established referral systems for gender-based violence that link schools to health and other social services. Ghana's COVID-19 Coordinated Education Response Plan included communication campaigns to address norms and reduce gender-related barriers to studying during school closures.⁹

The aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic has brought to light many of the inefficiencies and inequalities of education systems globally. These are further exacerbated by shifts in public spending on education, where an estimated 40% of low- and lower-middle income countries reduced their education spending after the pandemic in 2020, resulting in an average reduction of real education spending of 13.5%.¹⁰

2.2 GPE's Response to COVID-19

GPE is a multi-stakeholder partnership and is the world's largest global fund solely dedicated to transforming education in lower-income countries. Working with 85+ partner countries, GPE mobilizes partnerships and investments to accelerate access, enhance learning outcomes, and promote gender equality through equitable, inclusive, and resilient education systems fit for the 21st century.

Following the declaration of the COVID-19 pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) on March 11, 2020, GPE rapidly mobilized to leverage funds to support partner countries to plan and implement effective education responses to the pandemic. On March 25, 2020, GPE announced its provision of \$8.8 million to UNICEF to support national response planning in 87 countries. By April 1, it had unlocked \$250 million to provide COVID-19 Accelerated Grants to support partner countries as well as a grant to enable key partner institutions (UNICEF, UNESCO, and the World Bank) to support a global knowledge sharing and learning response to COVID-19. On June 1, GPE increased its allocation to over \$500 million in response to the high demand for support, allowing the fund to expand its assistance to additional partner countries.

In total, GPE mobilized three types of grants to support partner countries in their endeavors to address the learning emergency and educational challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. Each type of grant is described in greater detail below. In addition to COVID-19-focused grants, GPE provided non-financial

6 UNESCO. "#HerEducationOurFuture: Keeping girls in the picture during and after the COVID-19 crisis", 2021.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000375707>

7 Room to Read, 'Room to Read's Girls' Education Risk Indicator', 2020. <https://reliefweb.int/attachments/aa3ebc3a-6e42-3f66-8d24-4ad885a7c2b0/Girls%E2%80%99%20Education%20Risk%20Indicator.pdf>

8 Aurino, E., Tsinigo, E., and Wolf, S. "Nudges to Improve Learning and Gender Parity: Preliminary findings on supporting parent-child educational engagement during COVID-19 using mobile phones". EdTech Hub, 2022. <https://docs.edtechhub.org/lib/PWU63GQS>

9 The World Bank, UNESCO, and UNICEF. *The State of the Global Education Crisis: A Path to Recovery*. Washington D.C., Paris, New York: The World Bank, UNESCO, and UNICEF, 2021.

10 Al-Samarrai, S., Cerdan-Infantes, P., Bigarinova, A., Bodmer, J., Anacleto Vital, M. J., Antoninis, M., Fouad Barakat, B., and Murakami, Y.

"Education finance watch 2021." World Bank Group, 2021. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/226481614027788096/Education-Finance-Watch-2021>

support, including but not limited to the generation of knowledge products through partnerships with the World Bank and GPE's Knowledge and Innovation Exchange (KIX) program.

1. COVID-19 Planning Grant ('Planning Grant' or PG)

A total of \$8.8 million was made available to UNICEF to support governments and local education groups (LEGs) to develop national COVID-19 response plans to facilitate system-wide, scaled-up responses to the COVID-19 crisis. A total of \$7.7 million of Planning Grant funding was disbursed by UNICEF to support the development of response plans in 87 countries, including 74 partner countries and 13 GPE-eligible countries¹¹, with the remaining funds used for its regional and head office coordination and technical support.¹²

Countries were provided either a \$70,000 or \$140,000 allocation to fund three types of interventions:

- Enhanced education system-level response to the pandemic
- Support to the planning and implementation of safe school operation and risk communication
- Enhanced knowledge sharing and capacity-building both for the current response and future pandemics.

GPE disbursed funds through UNICEF as the Grant Agent, who worked closely with governments and LEGs to determine activities most relevant to their needs. The grant further supported UNICEF to undertake activities at regional UNICEF offices including technical support, procurement, knowledge management, and capacity development. The Planning Grant closed in March 2021.

2. COVID-19 Accelerated Grant ('Accelerated Grant' or AG)

COVID-19 Accelerated Grants were designed to support partner countries to implement the plans developed through the COVID-19 Planning Grants. Accelerated Grants ranged from \$0.75 million to \$20 million; a total of \$467 million was allocated through grants to assist 66 GPE partner countries to address the immediate effects of the pandemic as well as plan for longer-term recovery. Grants were disbursed using a streamlined grant application and review process to expedite distribution. Funds were intended to target countries with the greatest need, with more than 50% of the funds disbursed allocated to partner countries affected by fragility and conflict and more than 50% of funding concentrated in low-income countries. Funding was also intended to align with the previous [GPE strategic goals](#) (GPE 2020) of learning, equity and systems strengthening as well as to target different phases of pandemic response, including mitigation and recovery.¹³ As of December 2022, all 66 Accelerated Grants had closed with a total of \$423.9 million funds utilized.¹⁴

3. Continuity of Learning Global Grant ('Global Grant' or GG)

GPE provided a further \$25 million to a consortium of UNESCO, UNICEF and the World Bank as Grant Agents to support knowledge sharing and learning on the COVID-19 pandemic aimed at igniting sector dialogue at the global level and identifying shared solutions and contributing to improved outcomes at the country level.

The funding was intended to support the partnership as a whole by building on existing initiatives to further support learning and evidence-generation and linking to other GPE-related initiatives such as KIX, which overall supported activities in 68 countries¹⁵. Funding supported three key intervention areas: global and regional coordination, learning continuity at scale for the most marginalized, and monitoring, evidence, learning and preparation for future emergencies. The grant period ran for just under two years, closing in February 2022.

2.3 Objectives of the Summative Evaluation

This summative evaluation builds on the work of the [formative evaluation](#) of GPE's early response to the pandemic which was finalized in November 2021. The formative evaluation utilized portfolio and grant data as well as stakeholder interviews conducted virtually in Afghanistan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ghana,

11 Countries eligible to join GPE but not yet formalized as partners.

12 Figures from the Completion Report for the Education Sector Plan Development Grant for COVID-19 Planning (2021).

13 More information on the breakdown of funds according to GPE 2020 strategic goals and country coverage can be found on the GPE website:

<https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/covid-19-response-mitigation-and-recovery-thematic-grant-allocation>

<https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/covid-19-accelerated-grants-implementation-progress-may-2022>

14 Data received from R&P team on 5 December 2022. The data from this source included utilization totals dating September 2022.

15 Figure is from the Completion Report for the COVID-19 Global Grant.

Lesotho, Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, and Senegal to examine the suitability of GPE support and grant mechanisms, the type and relevance of interventions undertaken by COVID-19 Accelerated Grants and the efficiency and early signs of effectiveness of the grants.

With the closure of all COVID-19 related grants, the overall objective of this evaluation is to conduct a **summative assessment of the GPE-mobilized support to partner countries**, which sought to help partner countries address the challenges caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on education systems and education services delivery.

The summative evaluation will cover GPE's COVID-19 related support from March 2020 onwards, examining all three grant types described in section 2.2.

In particular, the summative evaluation includes the following lines of enquiry:

- The **continuous relevance and coherence** of GPE's COVID-19 support provided to partner countries, including the overall suitability and continued relevance of the programs and activities supported by the three types of grants to the priorities, evolving needs, and capacity levels of partner countries (and other end users) and coherence with the national and international aid system.
- The **efficiency** of GPE's COVID-19 support and resources provided to partner countries in terms of timeliness, utilization of grant funds, implementation bottlenecks, management, support to building dialogue, and costs of interventions.
- The **effectiveness** of the three grant types in terms of meeting planned objectives, equity of results (particularly with regards to gender and vulnerable groups), effectiveness of the grants towards achieving results across key priority topics including equity, teaching and learning, systems resilience and (school) re-opening (each examined under both mitigation and recovery)¹⁶ and generating innovative practices.
- The **prospects for sustainability and potential for impact** of GPE's COVID-19 support with respect to building systems resilience at the partner country level, the potential for sustainability of solutions and outcomes.

Additionally, the summative evaluation aims to **identify promising practices** that contributed to the continuity of education service delivery during the COVID-19 pandemic and to **explain their underlying success factors**.

The insights generated from the summative evaluation will enable the GPE Secretariat to communicate the level of success of GPE's COVID-19 related efforts and to **draw lessons** from support provision in emergency contexts that will allow further strengthening of GPE's operational capacity and responsiveness to strengthening partner countries' resilience and ability to address future crises.

¹⁶ Revised categorisation of priority topics, based on COVID-19 costing/coding schema instead of the GPE 2025 priority topics.

3 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

3.1 Overall Approach

To conduct the summative evaluation of GPE's COVID-19 support, we propose a **mixed-methods evaluation** focused on the analysis of GPE's three grant types and how they have contributed to countries' improved mitigation and recovery efforts and overall resilience.¹⁷ Our mixed-methods approach will use a **portfolio analysis** to provide a portfolio-level lens as well as **case studies** which focused on each of the three types of grants. Both are underpinned by a **Gender, Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) approach**.

Our evaluation is guided by an **evaluation matrix** (detailed in Appendix 2), which outlines the key evaluation questions investigated in our evaluation (described in section 3.2) and our approach to answering each question - including which approach (portfolio analysis and case studies) will be applied - as well the applicable judgment criteria, indicators and data sources. Our evaluation draws upon both desk-based research of secondary data (including that generated by GPE) and primary data collection (described further in section 3.3).

In section 3.4, we outline how the evidence and findings from the case studies and portfolio analysis will be triangulated and synthesized to inform the evaluation's assessment of interventions supported through the COVID-19 grants and their achievements, the intended and unforeseen achievements for end users and service providers, the intended and unintended outcomes of the grants, and more broadly, the successes and areas of improvement of GPE's support modalities during the COVID-19 pandemic. Through each of these approaches, we will also examine the results achieved against GPE's key priority areas of Equity, Learning and Teaching, and Systems Resilience and specific to its COVID-19 efforts, each under Mitigation and Recovery.¹⁸

3.1.1 Portfolio Analysis

Portfolio analysis is an evidence generation method used to establish a consolidated and high-level snapshot of a given portfolio. In our evaluation, our portfolio analysis will examine GPE's COVID-19 financial and non-financial support provided through the 66 Accelerated Grants as well as the Planning Grant and Global Grant.

To conduct the portfolio analysis, the evaluation team will construct a **unified portfolio database** which will draw together data from GPE grant application and implementation documents, including grant completion reports, monitoring surveys, implementation data from the GPE Secretariat's GPEX database, Global Grant activity mapping and other reporting. Any other existing sources of data will be collated with existing GPE grant data to further enrich analysis if appropriate. Grants will form the unit of analysis for this database, although countries, interventions within the grants, and outputs/outcomes achieved through the grants may also be used as units of analysis based on need and data availability.

The portfolio analysis will allow us to quantitatively and qualitatively explore the links between grant support inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes delivered, as well as how, and in what contexts for all three grant types. It will also allow us to disaggregate findings by several key dimensions of our analysis including themes¹⁹, geographic region, country groupings (fragility, income status, HDI), implementation status, type of grant agent, implementing partners, end user-type and any other classification criteria which may be deemed relevant. This will allow us to examine the nuances of varied contexts. The role of underlying internal or external conditions/factors (such as changing pandemic contexts, timeliness of support, scope of financing, etc.) that have affected grant results will also be explored through available secondary data when feasible (in addition to primary data). The portfolio analysis will also assess how gender and inclusion were addressed in the portfolio of grants and what results were achieved, through disaggregation by gender and other vulnerability factor variables. This is possible because indicators featured in grant completion reports are disaggregated already.

¹⁷ Outputs and outcomes are identified in applications and approval letters, reporting documentation (periodic surveys and final reports) for all types of grants. Country-level outputs/outcomes for AG can be found in completion reports; for Global Grant - in High Level Matrix; for Planning- in the database on the use of Planning funds.

¹⁸ These key priority areas were defined under GPE's previous strategy (GPE 2020), which was valid at the time of the design of the COVID-19 support. We will apply the coding scheme developed by GPE for these key priorities as part of its coding and costing database to ensure consistency of reporting and alignment with core COVID-19 grant documentation such as grant completion reports.

¹⁹ This is possible because the portfolio data has been coded by the GPE Secretariat by type of intervention and theme (response and mitigation vs. recovery, and related subthemes). For instance, the evaluation will be able to report on the percentage of grants and grant expenditure directed towards a given theme at the grant application stage, or the percentage of theme-linked components/objectives meeting indicator targets.

Much of the descriptive data from grant reporting is already systematized in datasets. Where feasible²⁰, we will further code descriptive and qualitative data (such as in completion reports) using categorical (dummy) indicator variables and pre-established criteria or rubrics. For example, for evaluation sub-question 3.1d, *"Did the grants suffer any bottlenecks in terms of implementation and how well were these remediated?"*, we can develop rubrics for most commonly identified bottlenecks and challenges as per descriptive sections of completion reports (factors that hindered implementation, delays at the start and during implementation) and code grants "yes" or "no" based on whether the corresponding sections in their completion reports mention these bottlenecks.

Conducting portfolio-level quantitative and qualitative analyses will help inform indicators. For instance, for evaluation sub-question 3.1a, *"How timely was GPE to set up its support at the beginning of the pandemic and to mobilize it throughout?"*, the portfolio analysis can inform a relevant indicator such as "percentage of grants for which number of days taken from application to approval exceeded GPE anticipated timelines." We remain open to adding new indicators if new evidence or patterns emerge, particularly indicators that may capture potential for impact and change in outcomes over time.

The portfolio analysis is highly complementary with the case studies. Firstly, the portfolio analysis will inform the case study data collection by helping determine patterns in findings or contextualize a country's results against overall portfolio performance. This will allow the evaluation team to initiate case studies knowing where the challenges and successes in each country lie and where to probe during consultations. The case studies also serve to further nuance, complement, and contextualize portfolio data and corroborate findings along the evaluation's lines of inquiry, thus mitigating the portfolio analysis's inherent limitation that findings are only as reliable as the reporting data informing them.

3.1.2 Case Studies

For this evaluation, we will use case studies as an evidence generation method to conduct an in-depth exploration of GPE's support during COVID-19 through the lens of each of GPE's three grant types. We will look at cases at the country-level, which examine GPE's support cutting across all three grant types, as well as case studies that will specifically draw out evidence on the Global and Planning Grants.

3.1.2.1 Country Case Studies

We will use case studies focused on the country-level to explore the ways in which GPE's COVID-19 related support contributed to results. The country case studies will explore the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, potential for sustainability, and intended and unintended effects of GPE's COVID-19 related support (including through financial and non-financial support). This includes, but is not limited to, the Accelerated Grant and the Planning Grant (though the latter will also be the topic of a separate case study – see below).

Our sample for the country case studies comprises: **Bangladesh, Cameroon, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Ghana, Federated States of Micronesia, Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Tonga.**

We purposively selected a sample of 10 partner countries which represents countries with different geographic and socio-economic characteristics, as well as variation of experiences of known effects of COVID-19 on education systems (e.g., length of school closures). Furthermore, we considered partner countries which used different types of GPE COVID-19 support, Grant Agents, and variation in grant implementation progress ratings. Preliminary consultations with CTLs highlighted the importance and significance of the variation of Accelerated Grant and Planning Grant requests and implementation. For example, in some cases, the Grant Agent took significant initiative during the grant application process, while in other countries the LEG took charge, and elsewhere the Ministry of Education (MoE) was more proactive. Activities implemented, outputs, and outcomes also varied significantly by country context and needs. Appendix 5 provides greater detail on our sampling methodology and how we derived this list of 10 countries.

Country case studies will use a wide desk review of all relevant materials (for instance in-depth analysis of grant completion reports) and targeted consultations with the CTLs and individuals representing Grant Agents, Coordinating Agencies, implementing partners/MoEs, and other key members of countries' LEGs (such as civil society organizations (CSOs) and teacher associations) to investigate how activities were rolled out and under what conditions. We will use a snowball technique with these stakeholders to further identify case study participants, including representatives from school principals and teachers' associations, who

²⁰ We note that this will only be possible if there is consistency across countries in how completion reports are filled in.

can provide reliable narrative accounts of education service delivery and results. When needed, the evaluation team can deploy local researchers for these interviews.

Data on the results of GPE's COVID-19 support (e.g., attendance rates) will also inform the country case studies. They will be sourced through a review of existing databases, grant completion reports, existing country research including evaluation reports and other studies), and through consultations with stakeholders.

This data will be triangulated to form cohesive change narratives for each country, guided by the relevant evaluation questions from our evaluation matrix. Short case studies for each of the 10 sampled countries will be provided as an annex in the final report. Case study evidence will also be a core source for answering the evaluation questions (as set out in the evaluation matrix).

3.1.2.2 The Planning Grant Case Study

The Planning Grant served mainly to support countries to develop COVID-19 recovery plans, which in turn guided the design and roll-out of COVID-19 related projects, including Accelerated Grants. In addition to financing, the grants enabled extensive technical support from UNICEF (as the Grant Agent) in areas such as capacity development and knowledge management.

This case study will analyze 1) how the grant was managed centrally; 2) how the grant was implemented at the country level and with what results; 3) the extent to which the grant empowered countries to plan autonomously and coherently with their own needs; 4) whether the Planning Grant enabled synergies with other sources of funding; and 5) whether the Planning Grant ultimately encouraged system-wide, scaled-up responses to the COVID-19 crisis. The value and effects of the unique delivery modality mobilized for the Planning Grant (i.e., one single grant to 87 recipient countries) will also be examined.

This case study will combine a bird's eye view of the financial instrument with a thorough understanding of its effectiveness, efficiency, and relevance at the country level. This can only be understood by analyzing the combined effect of the Planning Grant and Accelerated Grant, Global Grant, and any other associated funding at country level.

The case study will be informed by a variety of sources including interviews at the country level (in the context of the 10 country case studies), desk review of Planning Grant documentation and reporting data, and interviews with the GPE Secretariat and the Grant Agent for the Planning Grant. It will also draw on pertinent portfolio analysis findings, for instance on the timeliness of Accelerated Grant application.

3.1.2.3 The Global Grant Case Study

The Global Grant was managed by grant agents UNESCO, UNICEF, and the World Bank to support a wide range of COVID-19 related knowledge sharing and learning activities at the regional level, many of which targeted specific countries.

The case study will analyze 1) whether these activities have been implemented effectively, coherently, and efficiently; 2) how they contributed to learning at the country level; 3) whether these activities have proved sustainable, continuing under new forms, often with new sources of funding.

The case study will adopt a high-level perspective to explore the relevance of the grant's design and efficiency of its roll-out, then shift to the regional and country levels to determine whether knowledge outputs contributed to mitigation and recovery. Several Global Grant initiatives were or have since been co-funded by other donors or supported the Grant Agent organizations' flagship programs implemented across the countries. Where relevant, special focus will be paid to the potential for sustainability of the activities funded. This case study will also highlight relevant success stories.

In addition to desk review, we will conduct dedicated interviews with the three Grant Agents to understand how and with what rationale knowledge outputs were produced, and possibly some ministries of education where applicable. Consultations taking place for the country-level case studies will also shed light on whether outputs targeting specific countries reached their intended audience and contributed to results. As many of the Global Grant's learning outputs are publicly available reports and platforms, Grant Agents may also be able to share data on usage statistics and downloads for many of the Global Grant-funded learning products. Effective delivery of these learning outputs can also be assessed through desk review and consultations with grant agents. In particular, the GPE Secretariat maintained periodic grant reporting (which includes indicators and other output/outcome related data), which will also form a key data source for this case study.

3.1.3 Gender, Equity and Social Inclusion Approach

Our GESI approach ensures that we are able to draw out implications for gender and equity by outlining how we will consider social inclusion principles²¹ and ensure that gender is hardwired at all stages throughout the evaluation:

- **Evaluation approach:** To determine the extent to which countries were successful in ensuring that girls or boys would not be disproportionately affected by the crisis and able to continue learning, we have applied a gender and equity lens to all relevant evaluation questions. For instance, this includes investigating how implementation affected girls and boys differently, and other vulnerable groups specifically. Continued relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and potential impact of GPE support will also be assessed in terms of gender and equity.
- **Data collection and secondary data:** Quantitative data will be disaggregated by gender, age, and other relevant demographic characteristics reflecting various forms of vulnerability, where this is available. Secondary quantitative data from grant reporting will be used to identify relevant socio-economic and demographic factors (e.g., drop-out rates, access to health, gender-based violence, safety, household composition and workload, and access to technology) to identify and explore gender-related issues exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. We will use interviews at the end user level (such as with CSOs, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and civil society actors) to explore whether the voices and needs of social groups that face discrimination based on gender, socio-economic status and disability were included in the planning and implementation of grants.
- **Data analysis:** The evaluation will analyze all disaggregated data shared by Grant Agents or other secondary data sources and all qualitative data to determine how GPE COVID-19 support ensured continuity of learning for girls/boys and other vulnerable groups and how implemented interventions considered and tackled contextual, intersectional factors and social norms that may have affected equal access to education during the COVID-19 pandemic, such as access to health, gender-based violence, safety, household composition, workload and access to technology. This analysis will be carried out through the portfolio analysis both in terms of OECD-DAC criteria and transversally in all priority themes.
- **Internal processes:** The composition of our evaluation team reflects a balance of gender, ages, roles and ethnicities. All evaluation consortium partners abide by high ethical standards of non-discrimination and gender policies that prevent gender discrimination and abuse in the workplace.

3.2 Evaluation Matrix

A detailed evaluation matrix (see Appendix 2) provides the framework which guides the evaluation. It allows us to systematically ensure that we have articulated and described the **key evaluation questions** explored in this study, the methods and data we will use to answer them, and the **judgment criteria** and **indicators** against which we will collect, measure, analyze and assess data to formulate our findings and recommendations.

3.2.1 Revisions to Evaluation Questions

The evaluation team carried out an extensive review of the evaluation questions framed in the Terms of Reference (TOR). Some of the evaluation questions proposed in the TOR have been revised or caveated, to reflect an updated understanding of GPE's strategic aims for this evaluation and our assessment of what data is available to inform findings. These changes are highlighted in the table below.

Table 1: Original evaluation questions requiring an adjusted approach for the summative evaluation.

Original question	Revisions
1. Relevance: Overall suitability – Did the design of GPE COVID-related grants (and the three grant mechanisms themselves) address country/end users' priorities, needs, and	1. Relevance - Overall suitability of GPE support: "1.1a Did the design of GPE COVID-19 related grants (and the 3 grant mechanisms themselves) <i>prove to be suitable</i> to countries' /end users' priorities, needs, and capacity levels to rapidly respond to and recover from the crisis?"

²¹ The process of improving the terms on which individuals and groups take part in society—improving the ability, opportunity, and dignity of those disadvantaged based on their identity (<https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/social-inclusion>)

Original question	Revisions
capacity levels to rapidly respond to and recover from the crisis?	The revised question emphasizes the retrospective nature of findings, compared to the formative evaluations' answers to a similar evaluation question
2. Coordination of efforts – Did GPE support help countries coordinate the overall response and rally and harmonize donors under a common national response plan, especially in weaker environments?	Question unchanged and included as sub-question under “Coherence 2.1: Did GPE’s support fit well within the COVID national and international aid ecosystems?”
3. Efficiency: Alignment - Did the GPE grants use countries’ own public financial/ procurement management systems? If they did, did this help with grant’s efficiency and effectiveness, as well as to strengthen countries’ management systems?	Question now included under “Efficiency 3.1: Was good stewardship of resources ensured in the management of GPE’s COVID-19 support?”
3. Efficiency: Costs - What were the costs and value for money of the interventions that the grants supported?	Question unchanged Though we will rely on the disaggregated budget data, the “value” of the COVID-19 support will only partially be understood through this research as GPE’s financial support was complemented by other sources, making it hard to quantify contribution. Simpler conclusions on the efficiency of COVID-19 support under various circumstances are a more feasible goal for this evaluation.
4. Effectiveness – Did the COVID grants meet their objectives and achieved results, especially for girls and vulnerable children?	Question unchanged Note that “objectives and achieved results” will be broken down by GPE priority themes (mitigation and recovery, each broken into equity, learning, and systems).
5. Impact (potential for) - Overall impact (and system resilience): Did the results achieved by the GPE COVID-19 grants create substantial change in the education systems’ pandemic response/ preparedness in how the end users were/will be able to face the pandemic/other crisis to continue their education?	Question unchanged Note that the evaluation may not uncover many findings as very little time has elapsed since the COVID-19 support and COVID-19 resilience and education needs are still evolving. We will rely on program documents’ stated objective on system preparedness and resilience planning to the extent possible.
6. GPE priority areas: How did countries deploy various GPE COVID-19 support and funding (from accelerated funding, planning and global grants), vis-à-vis GPE priority areas and what did they achieve?	Question removed. The ToR for this evaluation proposed a set of illustrative questions/prompts for each of the new GPE 2025 priority areas for investigation. Following discussions with the GPE Secretariat, we have agreed that this approach was not a priority for the evaluation. Instead, we will examine progress against the themes under which the grants were coded at their onset. These are categorized as mitigation and recovery, and are further broken down into equity, learning, and system resilience and reopening. We will evaluate the effectiveness of GPE’s COVID-19 support, breaking down objectives and results reached by these themes, asking whether the endline targets for the core indicators under each theme have been met. We will compare the efficacy ratings for each grant objective from the grant completion reports. Our analysis will leverage completion reports’ narratives on achievements for each component. As completion reports track whether objectives address the needs of girls and vulnerable groups, we will be able to account for this as well.

3.2.2 Indicators

In the evaluation matrix, indicators²² have been applied to assess each evaluation question. The purpose of these indicators is twofold. Firstly, they help guide the evaluators in responding to each evaluation question against standards of evidence. Secondly, indicators provide a yardstick for drawing lessons learned and recommendations. Indicators together provide anchor points on the basis of which a picture emerges to answer the main evaluation question.

Indicators may be quantitative, categorical, or qualitative. They are intuitive, verifiable measurements of whether a given result has been reached. For instance, a quantitative indicator might be “percentage of countries where target indicators for early childhood education-related interventions were met or exceeded”. A complementary, qualitative indicator might be “consistent case study evidence from implementing partners and end-user representatives that activities were adequately strengthened through GPE support”.

A preliminary, non-exhaustive set of potential indicators has been pre-defined for each question in this inception report’s detailed evaluation matrix²³ (Appendix 2). Where appropriate, indicator targets will reflect those suggested in grant reporting.

3.3 Desk Review and Data Collection

Building on our overall evaluation approach and evaluation matrix, our data collection strategy outlines the process for data collection and the data sources to be used for answering each evaluation question. Data will be gathered from multiple sources to best address the evaluation questions, allowing for triangulation of evidence and the provision of contextual, nuanced details on intervention activities with their achievements. To collect data for this evaluation, we will utilize **desk research** and **primary data collection** using key informant interviews (KIIs) and focus group discussions (FGDs).

3.3.1 Desk Research: Analysis of key data and documents

Desk research of project documentation will be used to identify the intended outcomes and conditions or examples of achievements, end users (intended and effective), activities, services providers, intervention/input costs and sources of funds, successes, and failures. This is the key source of data for the portfolio analysis and contributes to all three types of case studies.

In the inception phase, a preliminary review of key documents (see Appendix 3) was carried out to understand the nature of the data available for the evaluation. It contributed to an appraisal of the evaluation questions and our proposed methodology, as well as contributed to stakeholder mapping in the 10 sampled countries and for the planning and global grants, in order to identify and inform the sample for key informants for case study interviews (i.e., GPE Secretariat staff, Grant Agents, country-level stakeholders, involved in the implementation of supported interventions, or who have directly or indirectly benefitted from them). This mapping process was further validated by preliminary consultations with the CTLs for the 10 sampled case study countries.

To support the portfolio analysis, our desk research will systematically examine evidence of the achievement of outcomes and synthesis of key information from documents provided by the GPE Secretariat. It will focus on the following:

- **Composition of the grants and their aims (portfolio):** Understanding the composition of the three types of GPE COVID-19 support grants and the grants within the Accelerated Grant mechanism. This seeks to better understand the different interventions supported by geography, thematic areas of support, overall objectives, key activities and (expected) outcomes, Grant Agent, implementing partners, end user-type and/or any other classification criteria which may be deemed relevant. The data will help capture the diversity of interventions and related outcomes and will allow further analysis as part of the summative evaluation.
- **Financial inputs and their utilization (Accelerated Grants):** Collecting information on the financial inputs for the delivery of COVID-19 response activities during the period of support, focusing on the Accelerated

²² In a previous draft of the inception report, these were referred to as judgement criteria and featured in the evaluation matrix. The judgement criteria were summative assessments of whether a result had been met, on a three-point scoring scale.

²³ These may be revised during the evaluation in agreement with the R&P team.

Grant. This will include information on the size of interventions (in terms of budget), categorization according to thematic area of support (and linked with outcomes and varied financial performance metrics captured through the grant cycle such as disbursement and utilization). For the country case studies, additional financial and budgetary data will be sourced from public budget statements to assess domestic funding for education during COVID-19 years funding source (core funding/extra-budgetary funding), coordinator, status and implementing partners.

- **GPE monitoring data (portfolio):** We will work closely with the R&P team to utilize the latest qualitative information and quantitative data stemming from the GPE's grant monitoring systems and completion reports. This data will allow us to assess the extent to which intended goals have been achieved and the perceived relevance and coherence of the grants from the perspective of grant stakeholders.

Appendix 3 provides an overview of the documents reviewed during the inception phase. The table below provides a summary of our understanding of the documentation based on our initial analysis in the inception phase and how we intend to use it as part of the evaluation.

Table 1: Summary of assessment of project-level documentation and its contribution to the evaluation

Type of documentation	Information contained	Primary use
General documentation		
Board documentation on COVID-19 support	Meetings and overall description of COVID-19 support approach of the GPE Board.	To inform data collection tool design, ground our understanding of GPE's COVID-19 support and to address evaluation questions on Relevance and some aspects of Efficiency
Analysis on the implementation of GPE COVID-19 support, by GPE Secretariat	Database and situation reports by GPE related to overall GPE support or a particular type of grant	To ground our understanding of GPE's COVID-19 support and feed into case studies, and address evaluation questions on Effectiveness (Innovation and scaling up)
Reporting documentation and communication products, by GPE Secretariat	Reports, published success stories and lessons learnt compiled by GPE related to all the grants	
GPE Secretariat's technical publications related to COVID-19	GPE Secretariat technical papers and collaborative publications on effects of COVID-19 on education	To inform data collection tool design, ground our understanding of the context and GPE's COVID-19 support
Other relevant documentation	Relevant GPE guides on grants process and evaluation policy	
COVID-19 Accelerated Grants		
Grant information and implementation documentation	Guidelines on Accelerated Grants window, guidance on monitoring and evaluation of Accelerated Grants, database with intervention areas and activities for each Accelerated Grant recipient country	To feed into case studies and serve to address all evaluation questions related to AF grant
Administrative and country level data	Grant applications, quality assurance reports, grant approvals, countries' COVID-19 Response Plans for education sector, GPE Secretariat internal databases on grants tracking and meta data, coding/costing database	To feed into case studies and address evaluation question on Relevance for AF grant case studies

Reporting documentation	Monitoring reports, survey results database, individual grant completion reports and aggregated database, financial performance database	To feed into portfolio analysis, case studies and address all evaluation questions related to AF grant
--------------------------------	--	--

Continuity of Learning Global Grant

Grant information and implementation documentation	Proposal from Grant Agents, database mapping of activities for Global Grant and budgeting	To feed into Global Grant Case Study and address evaluation questions related to the Global Grant
---	---	---

Administrative documentation	Applications, CEO approval letters with implementation plans and request for extension	To feed into case studies and address evaluation questions on Relevance, to feed into portfolio analysis to address some sub-questions on Efficiency (requests for extension)
-------------------------------------	--	---

Reporting documentation	Periodic reports and end-of-grant report on status of implementation, reached progress, budget data	To feed into portfolio analysis and address all evaluation questions related to the Global Grant
--------------------------------	---	--

Documentation on Global Grant deliverables and actual deliverables²⁴	Description representation of activities and outputs in components and sub-components of the Global Grant	To feed into Global Grant Case Study and address evaluation questions on Efficacy, Effectiveness and Impact
--	---	---

COVID-19 Planning Grant

Grant information and implementation documentation	Operational guidance for the grant, database on use of Planning Grants funds in each country	To feed into Planning Grant Case Study and address evaluation questions on Relevance
---	--	--

Administrative documentation	UNICEF's proposal, approval of the Planning Grant with the list of planned activities	To feed into Planning Grant Case Study and address evaluation questions on Relevance
-------------------------------------	---	--

Reporting documentation	UNICEF tracker surveys, completion report and qualitative completion data	To feed into the portfolio analysis, Planning Grant Case Study and address all evaluation questions related to the Planning Grant
--------------------------------	---	---

Non-financial support

Knowledge products	Knowledge products created by GPE such as guidance for Education Sector Monitoring and lessons learnt from COVID-19 crisis	To inform data collection tool design, ground our understanding of the context and GPE's COVID-19 support
---------------------------	--	---

Documents related to GPE Knowledge and Innovation Exchange (KIX) Observatory	Reports synthesizing evidence on different topics related to the development and management of the KIX Observatory on COVID-19 Responses in educational systems of 41 GPE partner countries in Africa	To feed into AF grant case studies of countries in Africa and inform Global Grant desk review
---	---	---

²⁴ The evaluation team will request download and visualization data as well as existing evaluation for the Global Grant outputs from grant agents.

3.3.2 Primary Data Collection: Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions

The main source of primary data will be remote KIIs and FGDs.²⁵ For country case studies, this will allow us to gather contextual information and stakeholder perspectives with key representatives from the different stakeholder groups. This is expected to yield understanding of the interventions supported through the GPE COVID-19 grants and reflections on relevance, coherence, effectiveness, and efficiency across diverse settings. KIIs are further expected to provide insights on potential impact and key changes in the country context and to identify any factors of influence on the implementation of interventions and outcomes generated. Remote FGDs (or KIIs where more appropriate) will also be used to validate data on outcomes with end user groups.

Relevant stakeholders for interview were identified through the desk-based stakeholder mapping exercise (described in section 3.3.1) as well as through a small sample of consultations with CTLs in the sampled case countries (see Appendix 4 for the tool used for this).

Table 4 below outlines our proposed sample for primary data collection, including global stakeholders, country-level stakeholders, and sampling at the end user level, and our rationale for data collection across these groups. We anticipate collecting data across over 80 data collection points (i.e., an individual or a representative of a group of end users) across the global, country, and end user levels.

Table 2: Suggested sampling for primary data collection

Category	Rationale	Sampling
Global stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> GPE Secretariat COVID response leadership team GPE Secretariat Country Team Lead, Education Specialist, Grant Operations Officer GPE Secretariat Regional Managers and Grant Operations Team Lead GPE Secretariat Planning Grant lead GPE Secretariat Global Grant and KIX lead Grant Agent for Planning Grant Three Grant Agents for Global Grant Select respondents representing other COVID-19 response mechanisms (such as Education Cannot Wait) 	<p>We may include group interviews as relevant to include a broad range of voices on a singular topic. We intend to interview a minimum of 8 stakeholders at the global level, focusing primarily on the Planning Grant and the Global Grant.</p> <p>GPE Secretariat CTLs, Education Specialist, and Grant Operations Officer will be interviewed as part of the country 10 case studies.</p>	8 KIIs or FGDs where appropriate
Country-level stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinating Agency Grant Agent Ministry of Education (sections: Planning, Finance & Budget, Policy, Teacher) or other Implementing Partner where relevant Other Central Government Ministries and Authorities playing key role in COVID-19 response e.g., Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Health, National Planning Commission, etc. 	<p>For the 10 country case studies, we will conduct deep dives to develop and substantiate outcomes (impact stories) and to exemplify particular trends of change or draw attention to particular grant features or outcomes.</p> <p>For each case study, we will aim to interview key informants from five broad groupings.</p>	5 KIIs per country, or FGDs if appropriate

If appropriate:

²⁵ Our original proposal included the use of an online quantitative survey. However, given the potential difficulty in accessing respondents at the end user level and stakeholder level (e.g., grant agents), we propose to not conduct a quantitative online survey, as it is anticipated that the response rate would be low. Instead, the evaluation will utilize the extensive project documentation, which includes regular surveys, and a portfolio analysis in order to generate quantitative evidence to support the evaluation.

Category	Rationale	Sampling
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant country partners from LEG (e.g., CSOs and teacher association if not covered below, Education Cluster representative) National researchers/experts 		
End user-level stakeholders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Civil society actors, including NGOs, CSOs Government education institutions, such as teachers service commission, teacher training colleges School Management Committees, teachers' associations²⁶ 	<p>Used to obtain insights from key country-level stakeholders, particularly those involved in the roll out of AG activities and end user groups.</p> <p>Given that the GPE support addresses sector-wide and country-wide challenges and the number of end users is large and diverse, it will be challenging to conduct individual interviews with a representative sample of direct end users such as children and parents. Instead, we will speak to <i>representatives</i> of groups who may speak on behalf of end users.</p> <p>Online focus groups will bring together small groups of stakeholders in order to identify and assess the outcomes explored by the summative evaluation.</p>	<p>3 FGDs or KIIs per country</p> <p>FGDs will have 5-7 participants</p>

Selection of End User-Level Respondents for the Country Case Studies

It may not always be possible or appropriate to speak directly with the end users themselves if they represent a broad range of users reached such as children or teachers. Instead, we will move up the chain to identify key stakeholders, such as end user representatives or those who may be able to speak on behalf of actual end users, who are able to validate the key outputs (such as students reached, or teachers trained) and outcomes of the service delivery activities supported by Accelerated Grants.

To identify suitable respondents, we will closely examine grant completion reports (or where not available, grant proposals/program document and monitoring information) to understand and map the chain of stakeholders involved from activity or service delivery down to the end users. These stakeholder maps will be generated as the inception report is finalized and will be validated with support from CTLs. We will rely on introductions provided by CTLs to key country-level stakeholders such as the Grant Agent and Coordinating Agency, where we will further detail our stakeholder maps by working with them to identify appropriate individuals or representatives from the organizations or groups of end users.

Design of Data Collection Protocols

Ethical data collection and management is a fundamental duty in our evaluations, especially when data may concern children. We follow GPE's guidelines for evaluations to be conducted with adherence to the highest ethical principles. Key principles of our data collection protocols include:

- Data minimization:** We will gather additional data only where it demonstrably contributes to the overall assignment and where it can be ensured the process does not put people at risk.
- Informed and voluntary consent:** For all participants in our evaluation, we will ensure they understand the purpose of any research and how data will be used. We will emphasize that participation is voluntary, can be withdrawn at any point, and ensure that consent is freely given before starting any interview. Protocols for this will be included as part of our data collection tools.

Although unlikely to be required for this evaluation, all data collection involving children will involve both consent (from parents or guardians) and individual assent and be conducted in the presence of a third

²⁶ Interviewing teacher associations will provide the evaluation team with information to triangulate with secondary sources; however, since participating teachers will not be a representative sample of targeted teachers, the evidence they will provide will be anecdotal.

party or guardian by a researcher who has undergone the relevant security checks. More information on this is set out in Appendix 8 and in Triple Line's Child Protection Policy.

- **Privacy and confidentiality:** Informants will receive a clear commitment to confidentiality and explanation that all data will be anonymized, including the processes we will undertake to do so. All data will be stored and de-identified (e.g., removed of any identifying features and secured using a password protected key) and stored within Triple Line's secured SharePoint site. Further data security precautions, such as full anonymization, will be undertaken to ensure the privacy and well-being of particularly vulnerable groups.
- **Respect for cultural sensitivities and human rights:** We will ensure that data is collected with respect for cultural sensitivities and human rights, which includes ensuring that data is collected in an appropriate language. We will also ensure that data collection does not put research participants or researchers at risk. We will consult with relevant country-level stakeholders (including CTLs and Grant Agents), and where appropriate, local research teams, to understand any harm which could arise in specific data collection contexts and create plans to avoid this. Special measures to ensure the safety of participants might include providing alternative ways to participate, arranging for follow-up interviews in a different location or time, or offering accessible versions of background project information.

The design of the interview protocols and tools will follow closely from the evaluation matrix to ensure that we do not collect more information than is required to answer the evaluation questions. The protocols will follow the finalization of the evaluation matrix and will be shared with the R&P team for review ahead of the start of data collection.

To ensure that the interviews do not overburden respondents, interviews will be limited to 45-60 minutes each, while FGDs may be extended to 90 minutes with prior agreement from participants. These will generally be conducted remotely where there is adequate connectivity. Where possible, we will work with our consortium's country offices or trusted associate researchers to support data collection.

3.4 Analysis and Synthesis

3.4.1 Analysis

Portfolio Level Analysis

Analysis methods used to extract findings from the portfolio-level data will include:

- **Descriptive statistics** to describe data and provide context to the analysis (e.g., Number of children reached for each intervention).
- **Cross-tabulations** to disaggregate portfolio data by breaking down the frequency distribution of given data by two or more variables (e.g., Intervention funding broken down by theme and region) to answer many of the more complex, cross-cutting evaluation questions.
- **Qualitative analysis** to organize, code and analyze qualitative data from varied grant documents and monitoring reports at the portfolio level.
- Elements of **qualitative comparative analysis** to look for patterns or dissimilarities ("compare and contrast") across the 10 country case studies.
- **Composite indicators** may be developed only on rare occasions and in cases when found appropriate by combining existing data sources (e.g., a cost-effectiveness indicator can be constructed by dividing an intervention indicator such as children reached by a funding indicator, such as total intervention funding). These will be reported only where appropriate and with accompanying contextualization. For instance, composite indicators on project financing will be accompanied by data on financing by external funders.

The portfolio analysis will help to capture the diversity of interventions and related outcomes. The analysis will be presented and summarized by key statistics which will be visualized and interpreted through a narrative. The analysis will also feed into the country case studies and inform the KIIs and FGDs for further contextualization of findings and sense-making of outcomes.

Case Studies

For the analysis within our case studies, we will triangulate our primary data collected with secondary data such as government reports, reporting data, data shared by Grant Agents and other country-level stakeholders on outcomes, and research/studies on how the end users were being reached. Each case study will be analyzed firstly as a standalone case study. Country cases will then be examined cumulatively, building on one another to answer the evaluation questions in the body of the report. They will also be used illustratively, taking the form of 12 short standalone case study reports as well as vignettes of country and grant-specific narratives for inclusion in the evaluation report to demonstrate findings against key outcomes or priority areas.

3.4.2 Synthesis

Finally, informed by the evaluation matrix, we will look across the findings from our case studies and portfolio analysis to generate and synthesize meaningful findings. The team will triangulate between these sources, allowing us to answer evaluation questions pertaining to relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and potential for sustainability and impact of GPE's support.

This process will also take place iteratively. An initial portfolio analysis will serve to inform the design of the case studies. Following the conduct of our case studies, we will update the portfolio analysis with the remaining Accelerated Grant project completion reports, allowing us to reflect on the findings from the case studies prior to completing the portfolio analysis with the additional information which has since become available (see section 3.6.2 for further information on completion report timing.)

3.5 Learning and Dissemination

We will hold dissemination and learning events to build engagement with our findings, lessons learned, and recommendations in order to support wider organizational and country-level learning. The specific audience and therefore organization of learning events will be determined by the nature of the evaluation findings and recommendations; therefore, we propose to use the period following the emerging findings presentation (approximately July 2023) to further refine our learning and dissemination plan. For the time being, our plan will include the following events:

- An **emerging findings workshop** with the R&P team and other Secretariat participants to be determined in consultation with R&P as outlined above, in which we will present early evidence and initial conclusions for validation.
- A **recommendations co-creation workshop** to help further refine a set of recommendations drafted by the evaluation team. This would involve selected staff from across the Secretariat.
- Following the finalization of the report, we will hold **findings presentations** with the following three groups: the Secretariat Management Team, the Performance, Impact and Learning Committee (PILC) and the GPE Board.
- We will hold two or three **learning events** to reach a wider audience. The audience, and therefore the most effective modality to reach them, will be agreed with the R&P team. We anticipate that the audience will include the broader Secretariat, including the country and grants teams, the wider international education or education-in-emergencies community, or country-level stakeholders such as members of LEGs.

3.6 Limitations

Overall, covering the full scope of this evaluation is achievable though ambitious. While our evaluation approach seeks to mitigate against these challenges by relying on existing monitoring and reporting data to capture results, triangulating across different sources of both primary and secondary data, and linking data collection to an evaluation matrix, some methodological and practical limitations remain. They are listed below:

3.6.1 Methodological Limitations

- **Contribution:** It may be challenging to assess the impact of GPE's support and make exact contribution claims, particularly since other development partners may have mobilized similar emergency support to continue education provision during the COVID-19 pandemic to GPE partner countries. In the evaluation

questions, examining or implying causal attributions will be challenging as we cannot control for spillover effects (i.e., outcomes/impact generated by external factors or actions of other stakeholders).

- **Case study comparisons:** Given the limited number of countries sampled for the case studies, it may not be possible to compare findings across the countries. The strong differences between each country's context, combined with the limited data availability, means we will likely only be able to provide context-specific and even anecdotal evidence as to what works under different circumstances.
- **End user data and sampling:** To verify the effectiveness of grant interventions (particularly regarding service delivery), the evaluation will rely on CTLs and Grant Agents/Coordinating Agencies to identify end-user representatives for consultations and suggests relevant secondary data to provided evidence of results. However, there will be a challenge in maintaining a consistent standard of data collection across the 10 country case studies. Unless countries themselves have conducted reliable assessments of the efficacy of their interventions, this evaluation will not be able to provide robust evidence on quality of service-delivery and outcomes regarding teaching and learning. The evaluation will, where possible, note when such information is missing, as this can also be a finding. Grant Agents' role in identifying stakeholders for consultations means sampling will vary across countries. End-user representative availabilities will vary, and it is likely that, for practical reasons, FGDs will be conducted in some countries and not in others. Moreover, relevant secondary data may be available in some cases but not in others. This will limit the extent to which we can extrapolate findings across the cases and portfolio.

3.6.2 Practical Limitations

- **Access to respondents due to timing and staff turnover:** The COVID-19 Planning Grant concluded in March 2021, the Global Grant in February 2022 and COVID-19 Accelerated Grants had a staggered closure with the final grants closing in December 2022. As a result, some of the stakeholders might be difficult to reach or might exhibit recall bias due to the lapse of time since grant closure. We also anticipate staff turnover in the organizations involved in grant management and implementation, which may cause difficulties in reaching the key informants. However, fairly extensive data has been collected by GPE throughout the course of the grants which cover a number of grant implementation details. For all grants, the evaluation will triangulate primary data collected with documentation that covers the grant design, roll-out process, and the findings from the formative evaluation.
- **Global Grant case study:** A challenge for the Global Grant case study will be understanding how outcomes have served end users at the country level. Country-level stakeholders such as MoE officials may not be aware of specific learning outputs for the Global Grant, most of which were aimed at a regional rather than country audience. The learning and dialogue generated by these outputs is also less likely to be fully recollected by global stakeholders who were not involved in producing them.

Receipt of completion reports: Project completion reports are critical sources of data to account for project-level outcomes, particularly for Accelerated Grants. These followed a staggered closure, whereby the final date for closure was December 2022. Therefore, we anticipate that up to 22 project completion reports will not be submitted until June 30, 2023 (as Grant Agents have six months following closure to submit final reports). We have set a hard deadline for the receipt of project documentation for analysis for July 7, 2023. Any data that follows this date will not be included as part of the evaluation to ensure that there is sufficient time allowed for analysis and reporting. Where possible, we will work closely with the R&P team to mitigate against any late receipt of reports. Strategies to mitigate this include proactive support from the R&P team to work with CTLs and grant agents to ensure timely submission of reports.

In addition, we anticipate that some case study countries will not have submitted their project completion reports prior to the start of case study data collection. For these, and in the event (some of the) grant completion reports would not be submitted by the hard deadline of July 7, 2023, the evaluation team will conduct an additional interview with Grant Agents or other relevant stakeholders to solicit data that would otherwise be found in project completion reports. This is built on the assumption that while Grant Agents may not have yet submitted the reports, they will already have access to the data required to complete the report and are willing/able to make these data available to the evaluation team.

4 Work Plan and Deliverables

4.1 Work Plan

Our initial work plan from the proposal has been revised to reflect the updates to our methodology and the shifts in the timelines for the inception phase. We have reviewed the timelines to ensure they remain feasible while still meeting key learning and accountability checkpoints. The following amendments to the timeline are proposed:

- **Data collection:** Accommodating the late start to the evaluation, the data collection with KIs with GPE Secretariat and Grant Agents/Coordinating Agencies will be shifted to follow the inception phase. This indicates a delay of up to one month. This delay is not expected to affect the start of case study data collection, which will proceed from March to May as planned.
- **Data cut-off:** As indicated in section 3, the cut-off for any project data, including completion reports, will be July 7, 2023. This is intended to accommodate the final remaining completion reports submitted on June 30, 2023. This will be a hard deadline to ensure that there is adequate time for analysis, reporting and drafting to conclude by August 2023. For reports that are pertinent to country case studies, mitigation measures have been proposed (see section 3.7) to allow data collection to proceed without a project completion report.

Further changes have been made to adjust reporting timelines in order to accommodate the final project completion report submission date, affecting the submission of the evaluation draft reports and for dissemination and learning activities (September 2023 – January 2024). A detailed workplan can be found in Appendix 6.

4.2 Deliverables

The proposed remaining outputs for this assignment are summarized below.

Table 3: Summary of summative evaluation deliverables

Output	Specifications	Timelines
Emerging Findings Workshop and Slide Deck of Findings	Slide deck that describes the emerging findings. The deck will firstly be used to present emerging findings and then updated to include finalized findings for subsequent learning meetings.	w/c July 19, 2023
Evaluation Report – First Draft	Draft 1 report (maximum 40 pages excluding annexes). This will be an edited report, but not expected to have undergone further design (ahead of publication). This draft will contain essential annexes, including drafts of the 10 country case studies and the Planning Grant and Global Grant case studies. It will exclude non-essential annexes, executive summary, and recommendations. Appendix 7 contains our suggested outline for the final report. The outline will be discussed and agreed with the R&P team in the coming weeks.	August 4, 2023
Evaluation Report – Second Draft	Draft 2 report. This will include completed analysis and findings, without executive summary and recommendations.	August 25, 2023
Recommendations Co-Creation Workshop and revised Slide Deck of Findings	Revised slide deck with updated findings and conclusions	w/c September 11, 2023
Evaluation Report – Third Draft	Draft 3 report. This will include the full draft with executive summary and annexes.	September 22, 2023
Evaluation Report – Final Draft	Final report to PILC - including French version of the Executive Summary.	October 2, 2023

Report will also be translated into French following finalization.

Final Slide Deck for Findings Presentations	Finalized slide deck of complete evaluation findings.	October 2, 2023
Findings Presentations	3 presentations of finalized findings, including for the Secretariat Management Team, the PILC and the Board.	September 2023 – December 2023
Learning Events	2-3 learning events (including related PPT/handouts) with broader Secretariat, program community, and any other relevant stakeholder group.	October 2023 - January 2024

5 Project Management

5.1 Evaluation Management

The management team for the evaluation consists of the Evaluation Manager, Jessica Chu, and the Project Director, Clarissa Poulson, both of whom work for the organization which holds the contract, Triple Line Consulting. The Evaluation Manager leads all aspects of operational delivery, resource management and work plans, with the Project Director holding ultimate responsibility for the delivery of the assignment and quality assurance.

To ensure the delivery of high-quality deliverables, Triple Line draws upon our in-house team for support on editorial and graphical inputs, proofreading for accuracy, editing for consistency and standard of language and structure, and formatting. All deliverables to GPE will undergo a two-step review process involving the Project Director and an additional senior-level reviewer to ensure high quality presentation of all deliverables.

The evaluation team meets on a weekly basis to review activities and ensure progress is made on key technical activities. These meetings also serve as the first point of management of any anticipated issues, such as changes to the work plan, changes in the status of risks, or changes to team resourcing and personnel. Issues and decision-making points will be discussed in a weekly meeting with the evaluation team and the R&P team. Any issues that have repercussions to budget or compliance will be raised by the Project Director or Evaluation Manager with the R&P team directly.

5.2 Safeguarding and Data Protection

Safeguarding

Where the evaluation will be conducting primary research (whether by the core team or through closely associated, locally based researchers), individuals will be fully acquainted with Triple Line's policies and procedures on sexual exploration, abuse and harassment (SEAH), which include our Code of Conduct, Child Protection Policy, Safeguarding Policy, and Guidance on Reporting Concerns (whistleblowing). Further information on these policies can be found in Appendix 8. SEAH risks and mitigation measures are also described in Appendix 9 on Risk Management.

Data Protection and Management

All evaluation data, including project data and primary data collected as part of the evaluation, is subject to Triple Line's **Data Protection and Security Policy**. This policy protects all personal and corporate data and has been developed in accordance with the UK Data Protection Act (2018) which is compliant with the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Key provisions relevant to this assignment include:

- **Para 10 – Handling of Project Data.** All parties with access to Project Data are responsible for ensuring the implementation of systems to deter, detect and resist intrusion and unauthorized access to data. This includes encryption control for data that is stored as well as data that is shared or transmitted.
- **Para 11 – Handling Sensitive and Confidential Client Data.** Where a program is dealing with confidential data, higher levels of security may be needed such as encrypting documents, using watermarks, password-protecting, or restrictions around emailing, printing and using cloud-based services.

This policy also sets out guidelines and processes used to ensure that all data is handled with the utmost care and responsibility in order to avoid loss, damage, or inappropriate access, including compliance with applicable legal, regulatory, and international obligations.

Under this policy, project data will not be stored, copied, or shared by any team member other than as far as is necessary for providing the services and obligations under the agreed service to GPE. The sharing of information follows the need-to-know principle and depends on the sensitivity of information. All parties with access to Project Data are responsible for ensuring the implementation of systems to deter, detect and resist intrusion and unauthorized access to data. A number of mechanisms to do this can be found within our Data Protection and Security Policy.

At the close of the evaluation, any information that will not be made freely available in the public domain will be destroyed in a way that prohibits reconstitution.

5.3 Risk Management

We have developed a risk matrix to accompany our evaluation (see Appendix 9), which includes a description of the identified risks for this evaluation and our mitigation strategies. Our approach and methodology build on Triple Line's existing risk management approach to all projects and programs we implement and evaluate. Our system ensures risks are identified and managed at the right level and reported to the management team in a timely manner in accordance with a standardized procedure. Each risk is given a rating that factors in likelihood and impact to determine a mitigation strategy. We take steps to ensure that all risks have a clear risk response plan.

The evaluation risk matrix will be reviewed on a bi-weekly basis. Where actions are needed earlier, discussions with GPE Secretariat will take place immediately to address any emerging risks and put mitigation plans in place.

Appendix 1: Glossary of Terms

Activity	Set of tasks foreseen in a programmatic intervention, made possible by inputs including funding and human resources, usually carried out by a grant agent.
End user	Ultimate targeted recipients of an intervention. In this context, mostly children and their communities, as well as teachers. In some cases, organizations such as government bodies and a community center can be thought of as an end user.
Case Study	<p>An empirical inquiry on a contemporary phenomenon set within its real-world context. Case study research assumes that examining the context and other complex conditions related to the case being studied are integral to understanding the case. This is achieved through a range of research methods, including both qualitative and quantitative.</p> <p>Case studies can have several purposes, for instance, they can be explorative – generating hypotheses for other research components; illustrative – showcasing general research findings in a particular context; comparative – contrasting a program’s implementation across contexts to answer specific research questions around what works when; or cumulative – answering research questions through their combined findings.</p>
Impact	Long-term effects of a programmatic intervention’s outcomes. In this context, demonstrable learning gains accrued beyond the duration of programmatic interventions.
Outcome	Visible effects of the programmatic interventions resulting from outputs. In this case, evidence that children participating in and benefiting from learning activities or that teachers trained are in fact acquiring and applying new skills.
Output	Verifiable delivery of programmatic interventions. In this context, children or teachers being reached by activities.
Service Delivery	Whole suite of activities and services provided to end users (in the context of GPE COVID-19 support, end users entail children and teachers) by implementers of interventions (government agencies, NGOs, public and private actors).

Appendix 2: Detailed Evaluation Matrix

Notes:

- For each sub-question, country examples and quotes from partners will be provided as illustrations (AG, GG, PG).
- Qualitative evidence from grant completion reports' lessons learned and recommendations; delays at the start and during implementation, factors that facilitated and hindered implementation (AG,GG); challenges during implementation (PG) will be harvested and presented consistently in the report.
- Underlying causes for specific patterns and events (i.e., the “why”) will be systematically explained in the report.

	Evaluation Question	Sub-Question	Judgement Criteria	CS/PA	Indicators	Data Sources
1. Relevance & Design	1.1 How well did GPE's COVID-19 related support meet the needs of partner countries to address the ongoing crisis?	Overall suitability of GPE support 1.1a: Did the <u>design</u> of GPE COVID-19 related grants (and the 3 grant mechanisms themselves) prove to be suitable to countries / end-users' priorities, needs, and capacity levels to rapidly respond to and recover from the crisis? (AG, GG, PG)	The design of COVID-19-related grants addressed partner countries' priorities (AG, GG, PG)	CS	Consistent qualitative evidence of GPE support from desk review and KIIs helping address country priorities, including the ones related to gender equality/girls and vulnerable groups (AG, GG, PG) Qualitative evidence from grant applications referring to priorities outlined in emergency plans (aligned with emergency plans), including priorities related to gender equality/girls and vulnerable groups (AG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CS KIIs with CTL, GA, CA, MoE • Grant applications (AG, GG, PG) • Emergency plans (for each country)
			The design of COVID-19 related grants addressed partner countries' needs in developing emergency response plans and interventions/solutions , especially those related to gender quality/girls and vulnerable groups (AG, GG, PG)	CS	Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs of GPE support helping address country needs, including the ones related to gender equality/girls and vulnerable groups (AG, GG, PG) Qualitative evidence from grant applications referring to emergency plans (aligned with emergency plans), including countries' needs, especially those needs related to gender equality/girls and vulnerable groups (AG, GG, PG) Consistent qualitative evidence from CS grant design documentation and KIIs that COVID-19 response interventions intentionally identified and addressed intersectional, pre-existing power structures, gender roles and stereotypes (AG, GG, PG) Consistent case study evidence that GG support tools encouraged the development of knowledge outputs addressing issues related to gender or vulnerable groups (GG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIIs with CTL, GA, CA, MoE • Grant applications (AG, GG, PG) • Emergency plans (for each country) • GPE grant design documentation (AG, GG, PG)
				PA	% of grants where stakeholders stated that the activities and outputs funded by the grant met their needs as coded by qualitative evidence from completion reports on (AG) % of countries taking measures to address targeted needs of girls, boys, and vulnerable groups in specific activities supported by Planning Grant (PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion reports (AG, PG) • Completion report database (AG)

		The design of COVID-19 related grants addressed partner countries' capacity levels (AG, PG)	CS	<p>Consistent qualitative evidence from CS desk review and KIs that proposals included assessment of country capacities and that proposed grant interventions were tailored to varied levels of capacity at country level (AG, PG)</p> <p>Consistent qualitative evidence from grant proposals that the design of activities was aligned with countries' capacity levels (AG)</p> <p>Consistent qualitative evidence of countries with equal or improved capacity of designing and managing COVID response, including gender response (AG, PG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIs with GPE Secretariat, CTLs, GA, CA • Desk review of Board documentation on COVID-19 support and other documentation assessing country capacity to a certain extent (such as Guidelines for COVID-19 AG window) to determine to what extent country capacity was factored into GPE's support design and implementation (AG, PG) • Grant applications (AG, PG)
	<p>Continued relevance of GPE support</p> <p>1.1b: How successful was GPE in ensuring that its <u>instruments of support and mechanisms remain continuously appropriate</u> and valuable with regards to their modality, focus, amount, processes, etc. given changing COVID-19 contexts / emerging needs throughout and beyond the pandemic? (AG, GG, PG)</p>	Adaptive capacity of GPE instruments and mechanisms ensured continued relevance of support throughout the pandemic (AG, GG, PG)	CS	<p>Consistent qualitative evidence from CS documentation and KIs of GPE support (financial and non-financial) being flexible enough to meet emerging needs, especially of girls and vulnerable groups/in terms of gender equality (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>Consistent qualitative evidence based on a review of grant revisions and variations in the timeline, workplan, budgeting, scope (including addressing gender equality/girls and vulnerable groups) (AG, GG, PG) to assess GPE's adaptability to ensure continued relevance</p> <p>Qualitative evidence on the level of relevance of the activities supported by PG (PG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIs with GPE Secretariat, CTLs, GAs, CAs, MoE • Grant applications (AG, GG, PG) • Requests for extensions and related Secretariat checklists (AG, GG, PG) • Completion reports (AG, GG, PG)
			PA	<p>Most common types of minor/major revisions as coded per descriptive section on revision from completion reports (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>Average number of revisions per grant (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>% of grants which assessed Continued Relevance of grant activities to country needs as 'High', 'Substantial', 'Modest', 'Negligible' compared to weighted assessment of corresponding qualifying comments (AG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion reports (Sections on Relevance and its qualifying comment, delays, revisions) (AG, GG) • Requests for extensions where relevant (AG, GG, PG) • Completion report (section I.2 Regional initiatives to benefit all countries, i.e., levels of relevance of supported initiatives) (PG) • Comparison with KIs will inform as to whether adaptation mechanisms were put in place and sustained during the implementation and the level of satisfaction with these mechanisms
2. Coherence	2.1 Did GPE's support fit well within the COVID national and international aid ecosystems?	<p>Coordination of efforts</p> <p>2.1a: Did GPE support help countries coordinate the overall response and rally and harmonize donors under a common national response plan, especially in weaker</p> <p>GPE support rallied partners around national emergency plans (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>GPE grant interventions were harmonized with other agencies/donors' COVID-19 support and</p>	CS	<p>Consistent qualitative evidence from CS documentation and KIs on COVID-19 grants and other support (i) rallying partners around the emergency plans (ii) being harmonized with other COVID-19 support at country level or regional/global ecosystems and leveraging complementary support (if relevant). (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>Consistent qualitative evidence from CS documentation and KIs and evidence of collaboration between partners in grant completion report, including in areas addressing the learning crisis of girls and vulnerable groups (GG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIs with GPE Secretariat, GA, CA, MoE • Secondary literature review on other ongoing programs to determine level of alignment and non-duplication of efforts (AG, GG, PG)

		environments? (AG, GG, PG)	activities at country level (and regional/global levels where relevant) (AG, GG, PG) Global Grant leveraged complementary support from global and regional partner ecosystems (GG)	PA	% of grants with evidence on mobilization of complementary support from other sources (AG, GG, PG) Qualitative evidence of activities for/in which complementary support was applied (AG, GG, PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion reports relevant sections (partnerships, private sector, foundations, financial/in-kind) (AG, GG) Completion report (section on Funding) (PG)
3. Efficiency	3.1 Was good stewardship of resources ensured in the management of GPE's COVID-19 support?	Overall efficiency 3.1a: To what extent were grant processes implemented in a timely manner and were the costs reasonable for the outputs/outcomes achieved? (AG, GG)	Grant processes were implemented in a timely manner (AG, GG) Grant resources (inputs) translated into outputs or intermediate results (AG, GG)	PA	% of grants which assessed Overall Efficiency as 'High', 'Substantial', 'Modest', or 'Negligible' (AG, GG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion reports (overall efficiency sections and their qualifying comments) (AG, GG) Completion reports database (AG)
		Timeliness 3.1b: How timely was GPE to set up its support at the beginning of the pandemic and to mobilize it throughout? (AG, GG, PG)	GPE response (design, set up, allocation and approval for grants) to the pandemic was timely (AG, GG, PG) Release of GPE grant funds was timely throughout the pandemic (AG)	PA	N. of days taken from: Application to approval (AG, GG, PG) Expected application date (set by GPE) and actual application date (AG, GG, PG) Grant approval and the release of funds to designated Grant throughout the pandemic (AG, GG, PG) Grant approval to the start of implementation of activities (AG) (To be benchmarked against typical timing for other GPE grants)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report of the meeting of the Board of Directors on GPE COVID-19 response (Timeline of implementation, ANNEX A: Next Phase of GPE's COVID-19 Response) (AG, GG, PG) COVID-19 AG Timeline Tracker (expected application date, date application was received, reviewed, days from application review to submitted to EO, days from application to approval etc.) (AG, GG) GPE Grant Implementation database (detailing delay in approval and signing of the grant application; estimated and actual grant start date; original, expected, and actual grand closing date) (AG) Grant application (if data is not available in the databases, mainly for PG) (AG, GG, PG)
		Utilization of grant funds 3.1c: How timely were disbursed funds utilized by grant agents throughout the implementation of the grant? (AG, GG)	Disbursed funds were utilized consistently with the timeline of grant implementation ("grant implementation on/off track"), with minimal effects on eventual achievements by grant close (AG, GG) Off-track grants outlined and	PA	% of grants on- and off-track in terms of fund utilization halfway through implementation and at its final stage (disaggregated by region, income, fragility status, grant agents and others if relevant) (AG) % of off-track grants in terms of fund utilization requesting revisions, and/or with unspent funds by grant close (AG) Variance in fund utilization timing throughout GG grant implementation (GG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Historical utilization data for COVID-19 AFs (AG) Completion reports (factors that hindered implementation, delays at start and during implementation) (AG) Periodic surveys (Budget utilization) (GG)

		addressed the reasons for delays and factors that hindered implementation (AG)		For off-track grants, the above indicators will be cross-tabulated with the frequency of revisions, reasons for delays, and efficacy ratings, as coded by the evaluation team (AG)	
	Implementation issues 3.1d: Did the grants suffer any bottlenecks in terms of implementation and how well were these remediated? (AG, GG, PG)	Grant implementation bottlenecks were identified (AG, GG, PG)	CS	Consistent qualitative evidence from Secretariat documentation and KIIs on existing or emerged bottlenecks during implementation that are being addressed, the adequacy of actions deployed to remediate inhibiting factors, and their relative degree of success (AG, GG, PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIIs with GPE Secretariat GAs, CAs, MoE • Report meeting of the Board of Directors on GPE COVID-19 response (Timeline of implementation, ANNEX A: Next Phase of GPE's COVID-19 Response), Lessons Learnt and Situation Reports (AG, GG, PG) • PA evidence of the emerged bottlenecks will be used to analyze the ways of dealing with them through KII (AG, GG, PG)
		Grant implementation bottlenecks were adequately and successfully addressed (AG, GG, PG)	PA	% of grants that requested extensions, restructuring and average # of extensions/restructuring requested – comprised under “major and minor” revisions (AG, GG, PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion reports (Section on delays, factors that hindered/facilitated implementation, lessons learned, recommendations) (AG, GG), (Challenges encountered during implementation) (PG) • Monitoring surveys (GG)_ • Completion report database (AG) • Data from R&P team on grant delays/progress • Extension requests (AG, GG, PG)
	Management 3.1e: Did GPE's instruments and Grant Agent's COVID-19 practices support sound intervention management to ensure adequate stewardship of resources and successful partnering? (AG, GG, PG)	Division of roles and responsibilities at country level was well defined (AG, PG, GG case studies)	CS	Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs that: (i) set-up reporting procedures have improved countries' ability to mobilize/manage GPE's support; (ii) roles and responsibilities at country level were well defined and contributed to smooth implementation of activities; (iii) completion report and Core Indicators templates have allowed to reflect and unfold main grants results; (iv) learning from monitoring evidence took place and contributed to implementation success (AG, GG, PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIIs with CTLs, GAs, CAs, MoE, implementing partners • Templates for completion reports and Core Indicators templates for all types of grants to identify if they allowed for grants results to unfold well and clearly (AG, GG, PG)
		GAs and country-level actors managed GPE's financial support efficiently (AG, GG, PG)	PA	% of countries that reported misuse of funds, and among those % misused funds to the total grant amount (AG, GG, PG) % of countries filling in/submitting all periodic surveys (AG, GG, PG) % of countries submitting full completion reports with the Annex of Results Framework and Core Indicators table (AG) Qualitative evidence from progress surveys and completion reports that stakeholders used monitoring evidence for course correction (AG, GG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion reports database (sections on misuse of funds) (AG) • Completion reports (sections on misuse of funds) (AG, PG, GG) • COVID-19 AG Grant Tracker on Progress Surveys (AG) • Overview of GPE questions from Tracker Survey (based on the data submitted from UNICEF country offices between April 27 - August 25, 2020) (PG) • Periodic surveys (AG, GG)
	Dialogue 3.1f: Did GPE's convening power and COVID-19 support help improve inclusive sectoral and	GPE's global and country-level responses to COVID-19 were convened through an inclusive	CS	Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs with GA on increased, improved stakeholder engagement thanks to GPE support, especially across sectors, with MoF, decentralized entities, local communities, and lesser-included and vulnerable groups (AG, GG, PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIIs/FGDs with CTLs, GA, CA, MoE, implementing partners, and end-user representatives • Completion reports (Private sector engagement) (AG, GG)

	<p>cross-sectoral dialogue at country / global levels around pandemic-related needs and strategies? (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p><i>(Country governments national/subnational, local education groups, emergency clusters, civil society organizations, teacher associations)</i></p>	<p>consultative process (AG, GG, PG)</p>		<p>Qualitative evidence on how inclusive dialogue over planning/response process improved crises response and country ownership (PG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion report (I.3. Strategic collaboration and partnerships leveraged) (PG) 	
			PA	<p>% of grants which indicated use of the private sector partnership for planning and design of grant activities (not only for implementation of activities) (AG)</p> <p>% of knowledge products planned/designed in consultations with country stakeholders (GG)</p> <p>% of countries that reported consultations with private sector or cross-sectoral country-level stakeholders (PG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion reports (Private sector engagement) (AG, GG) Completion report (I.3. Strategic collaboration and partnerships leveraged) (PG) 	
	<p>Costs</p> <p>3.1g: What were the costs and value-for-money of the interventions that the grants supported? (AG, GG)</p> <p>NB. Not relevant for planning grant as there is no cost per output defined</p>	<p>Reasonable unit costs for interventions and services delivered (AG)</p> <p>Cost sharing between GPE and GG consortium was efficient (GG)</p>	PA	<p>A range, an average of dollar value cost for interventions, disaggregated by themes (AG)</p> <p>% unit costs meeting or exceeding relevant benchmarks, disaggregated across intervention types/themes, contexts (AG, GG)</p> <p>Nr. End users reached per dollar spent under each theme disaggregated by gender (AG, GG)</p> <p>Qualitative assessment of the extent to which costs sharing was efficient for the outputs/outcomes achieved (GG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion report database (II.2 Efficiency, core indicators,) (AG) Coding and costing database (activities and their costs under different themes of Mitigation and Recovery) compared with Results framework or Core Indicators endline targets (AG) Grant completion reports (II.2 Efficiency) and end-of-grant budget utilization (GG) 	
4. Effectiveness	<p>4.1 Did the COVID-19 grants meet their objectives and achieved results, especially in terms of gender equality and for girls and vulnerable children?</p>	<p>Overall efficacy</p> <p>4.1a: To what extent did the grants meet their planned objectives, including at country level and for gender equality/girls and vulnerable groups? (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>4.1b: Were there any differential effects and results of the grants with respect to vulnerable groups and particularly girls within those groups? (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>4.1c: What was the distribution of grant objectives under each theme “System resilience and reopening”, “Learning”, and “Equity” under Mitigation and</p>	<p>COVID-19 grants achieved their planned objectives (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>Mitigation and recovery-focused core indicators achieved their endline targets (AG)</p> <p>Outputs from the Global Grant were made available to countries (GG)</p>	CS	<p>Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs (including secondary data and end-user consultations) of service delivery outputs achieved and country-level results achieved, particularly on gender equality or reaching girls and other vulnerable groups – and whether these were expected or unexpected (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>Consolidated high-level results matrix for Global Grant outputs (objectives and activities targeting girls and vulnerable groups) (GG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> KIIs/FGDs with CTL, GA, CA, MoE, implementing partners, and end-user representatives. Periodic surveys and grant completion reports (AG, GG, PG)
				PA	<p>% of grants which assessed Overall Efficacy of the grant as ‘High’, ‘Substantial’, ‘Modest’, ‘Negligible’ compared to weighted assessment of corresponding qualifying comments (AG, GG)</p> <p>% of grants with planned components on “System resilience and reopening”, “Learning”, and “Equity” under Mitigation and Recovery + absolute/% grant costs per theme (AG)</p> <p>% of grants with core indicators on “System resilience and reopening”, “Learning”, and “Equity” etc. under Mitigation and Recovery, which achieved their endline targets (AG)</p> <p>% differences in grant indicator actuals data vs baseline targets, disaggregated by thematic areas, delays incurred during implementation, etc. (AG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coding/costing database (AG) Completion reports database (AG) Completion reports (different sections depending on the grant - results frameworks, core indicators, sections on factors that hindered/facilitated implementation; challenges during implementation; objectives and activities targeting girls and vulnerable groups, section on gender-responsive and equity-focused country COVID-19 response plans, grant implementation assessment) (AG, GG, PG) Periodic surveys if relevant (GG)

		Recovery in absolute number and in terms of costs per theme? (AG) 4.1d: How effective were grants in achieving thematic indicators endline targets under each theme “System resilience and reopening”, “Learning”, and “Equity” under Mitigation and Recovery? (AG)			% of countries which fully met, partially met or did not meet their objective for the specific activities (PG)	
		Innovation and scaling-up 4.1e: Which innovative practices were piloted, and with what level of success? (AG, GG, PG)	COVID-19 grant supported deployment of innovative practices to ensure continued learning during the pandemic, especially those specifically beneficial for vulnerable groups, girls, and gender equality (AG, GG, PG) Innovative practices piloted have the potential for scaling-up (AG, GG, PG)	CS	Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs of innovative practices (in context) for continuing learning during the pandemic (AG, GG, PG) Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs on the level of success and the potential for scaling-up of the piloted innovative practices (AG, GG, PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learnt and success stories (AG) • External evaluation reports (AG) • KIIs with CTLs, GA, CA, implementing partners, MoEs, end users
				PA	% of grants that have mentioned innovative practices adopted / implemented / used with GPE’s support, especially those that benefitted gender equality/girls and vulnerable groups in their completion reports (AG, GG, PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion reports (Lessons learnt section on innovations) (AG, GG) • Completion reports database objectives and core indicators (AG) • Completion report (any mention of innovation) (PG)
5. Impact (potential for)	5.1 What is the (potential for) impact of the COVID-19 grants?	Overall impact on beneficiaries 5.1a: To what extent are end users able to face the pandemic / other crises ensuring continuation of their education? (AG, GG, PG)	End users including girls and vulnerable groups are better equipped to continue their education (AG, GG, PG)	CS	Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs that end users make use of new learning methods and innovations to ensure continuation of their education (AG, GG, PG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIIs with CTLs, GA, CA, MoE, LEGs and end users such as teacher associations, student associations • Completion reports (relevant sections) (AG, GG, PG) • Secondary lit review (country level policy documentation, sector plans, organizational establishment) (AG, GG, PG)
			Global Grant outputs are being used by relevant stakeholders beyond the pandemic (GG)	CS	Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs that MoEs and other institutions use outputs at country and regional level (GG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIIs with GPE Secretariat, GA, MoE
				PA	# of end users accessing outputs (disaggregated data) (GG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion report (GG) • Download and visualization data for GG learning outputs (to be provided by GAs) to determine if and how GG outputs were embedded in emergency response (GG). • Periodic surveys if relevant (GG)

	<p>Building back better</p> <p>5.1b: Did GPE support result in 'building-back-better systems', longer-term technology solutions, addressing learning gaps? (AG, GG, PG)</p>	<p>Countries have changed their approach to delivering education and learning services (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>Countries have adopted best-practice solutions to remediate learning loss (AG, GG, PG)</p>	CS	<p>Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review, completion reports and KIIs of countries planning and implementing build-back-better solutions as a result of GPE's support and their level of success (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs of expected and unexpected outcomes on the creation of solutions/strategies to build back better systems after pandemic component (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>Examples of countries that have improved education system resilience thanks to GPE-supported COVID interventions (AG, GG, PG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIIs with CTL, GA, CA, MoE • Relevant secondary documentation referenced by consulted stakeholders (AG, GG, PG) • Completion reports (sections on Extent of government capacity development) (AG, GG)
	<p>Systems resilience</p> <p>5.1c: To what extent have systems institutionalized response and preparedness in their planning and sector management? (AG, GG, PG)</p> <p>(e.g., integrating preparedness into sector plans or establishing capacities in the ministry to manage crisis response in the future)</p>	<p>The education system is more resilient – in terms of preparedness and prevention, and has updated plans and strategies with integrated emergency response components (AG, GG, PG)</p>	CS	<p>Consistent qualitative evidence from desk review and KIIs that education systems (i) institutionalized learning from the responses in their planning and sector management, and (ii) further integrated a preparedness and prevention focus on their planning processes (AG, GG, PG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KIIs with GPE Secretariat, CTLs, GA, CA, MoE, teacher associations, teacher training, LEGs • Completion reports (relevant sections) (AG, GG, PG) • Secondary lit review (country level policy documentation, sector plans, organizational establishment) (AG, GG, PG) • Meeting of the Board of Directors on GPE COVID-19 response (mention of use of existing national capacities/ assets) (AG, GG, PG)
			PA	<p>Most common type of grant activities planned to improve government capacity for resilience building and the actual activities which improved government capacities in this area coded as per descriptive section “Extent of government capacity development” in completion reports (AG, GG)</p> <p>Most common ways in which government capacities for resilience building was improved (AG, GG, PG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion report database (AG) • Completion reports (relevant sections) (AG, GG, PG) • Periodic surveys if relevant (GG)

Appendix 3: Preliminary Desk Review

Type of documentation	Relevant information	Analysis
GPE Secretariat documentation related to all grants		
Board documentation on COVID-19 support		
Meeting of the Board of Directors on GPE COVID-19 response	Meeting of the Board of Directors March 31, 2020, to approve a new accelerated funding window in response to COVID-19. Discussion of background and next steps of GPE's COVID-19 Response.	To inform data collection tools design, ground our understanding of GPE's COVID-19 support and serve to address evaluation questions on Relevance and some aspects of Efficiency
Meeting of the Board of Directors on GPE COVID-19 Additional Financing	Meeting of the Board of Directors May 29, 2020, to discuss additional financing (background and rationale, proposed allocation of resources) to the COVID-19 accelerated grants window, along with a revised allocation approach.	
GPE and COVID-19 Factsheet December 2020	Brief factsheet with response timeline, funding for education response and recovery, examples of the support.	
Analysis and review documentation on the GPE COVID-19 support by GPE Secretariat		
GPE Grant Implementation database	Grants database listing all types of grants open and closed, including COVID-19 Accelerated Grants and Global Grants (sorting out by EPIG (COVID-19-AG) in the column E "Grant type"). Information on grant operations officer, funding modality, grant amount, grant approval/start/closing etc.	To ground our understanding of GPE's COVID-19 support and feed into case studies, and address evaluation questions on Effectiveness (Innovation and scaling up)
GPE Periodic Situation Reports	Secretariat's weekly situation reports, starting on 1 April 2020, to share critical information on the impact on the countries' education and GPE's responses to the evolving pandemic. The content of the sitreps is different and has changed over time. In general, early timeline sitreps covered the situation of countries, implications for GPE's ongoing grants and plan of GPE's response. Later reports summarized GPE's COVID-19-related grants' performance, particularly COVID-19 accelerated grants and global grants to a certain extent.	
GPE Brief Evidence Note: Approaches to Ensuring Learning Continuity during COVID-19 Crisis	Note as a starting point for thinking about COVID-19 response planning and programming with the following sections: Continue learning, protect children and the education workforce, assessment and monitoring of student learning, and include the most marginalized.	
Reporting documentation by GPE:		
Lessons learnt and Success stories Presentation Initial Lessons Learnt August 25, 2020	Lessons learned on what worked/could be improved on the partnership, with common themes across approved grants (such as Distance Learning, Girls' Education, Children with Disabilities, Psychosocial support, Teacher Support and others), Lessons learned on the grant process, Stories of the countries.	To ground our understanding of GPE's COVID-19 support and feed into case studies, and address evaluation questions on Effectiveness (Innovation and scaling up)
Stories of Resilience during the COVID-19 Pandemic	Success stories on how children continued learning with GPE support in Eastern Caribbean, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Pakistan, Senegal, Somalia, Tanzania, Tonga, Zambia.	
Grant Status Reports Grant Status Reports 2020 and Annex	Overall report on all GPE grants in 2020 including GPE COVID-19 support grants (Sections 4 and 5). Annexes with the List of the grants, Grant performance analyses, list of KIX Global Grantees.	

Type of documentation	Relevant information	Analysis
Grant Status Reports 2021 and Annex	Overall report on all GPE grants in 2021 including GPE's COVID-19 Response, Gender Equality, Learning Partnership work.	
Formative Evaluation of GPE's Support for Response to the COVID-19 Crisis	Formative Evaluation (final version as of November 2021) with sections on impacts of COVID-19 on the education sector, methodology and tools, finding and analysis, potential areas of focus for the proposed summative evaluation of GPE's COVID-19 Accelerated Grants response, conclusions and recommendations.	
GPE's publication related to COVID-19:		
Simulating the Impact of COVID-19 on Education Systems by 2023	Report from October 2020 on potential impact of COVID-19 on Education systems by 2023 with the recommendation for GPE support (sharing good practices, upstream, delivery and financial support).	To inform data collection tool design, ground our understanding of the context and GPE's COVID-19 support
Effects of COVID-19 on GPE's Education Sector Program Implementation Grants	Rapid Review from September 2021 of the effects of COVID-19 on GPE's education sector program implementation with sections on progress towards results, grant flexibility, grant coordination and management, discussion and actions to consider.	
Other relevant documentation:		
Country-Level Guide. Recommended education sector and GPE grants processes	This guide provides a general overview of the GPE country-level operational model and processes. It can be used as a tool to navigate GPE processes at different stages of the sector-planning and grant-level cycles. This overview primarily targets local education groups including developing country partners, development partners and civil society organizations.	To inform data collection tool design, ground our understanding of the context and GPE's COVID-19 support
Policy on Education Sector Program Implementation Grants, May 2020	Management and administration of education sector program implementation grants (ESPIGs) including program implementation period, reporting requirements, revisions to programs.	
GPE's Evaluation Policy	Principles of evaluation in GPE, evaluation criteria, minimum standards for commissioning and funding evaluations, roles and responsibilities.	
COVID-19 Accelerated Grants		
Grant information and implementation documentation:		
Guidelines for COVID-19 Accelerated Funding Window and Frequently Asked Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COVID-19 Accelerated Funding Guidelines from August 2020 with information on: • Eligibility criteria, implementation period and funding, activities eligible for funding. • Procedures for application and approval. • Reporting and revisions. • Annexes (Annex 1. Country allocation amounts linked to school aged population, Annex 2. Program standards for assessment of COVID-19 accelerated funding applications (country grants)). 	To feed into CS and serve to address all evaluation questions for Accelerated Grant evaluation.
Guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation of Grants Financed through the GPE COVID-19 Accelerated Funding Window	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring and evaluation guidelines. • Core indicators for mitigation and response, indicators for recovery. • Annex I: Incorporating a gender lens in monitoring and evaluation. • Annex II: Illustrative indicators for grant results frameworks. • Annex III: Implementation progress surveys. 	

Type of documentation	Relevant information	Analysis
Thematic Grant Allocation: COVID-19 Accelerated Grant Response: Mitigation and Recovery Thematic Grant Allocation (data)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-page brief with grant allocation by thematic areas. 	
Codebook and methodology	COVID-19 Response: Mitigation and Recovery Thematic Codes. This codebook shows the types of activities coded under each theme discussed in the coding chapter. Thematic categories have been harmonized with those found in the latest World Bank theme taxonomy for most categories. Some categories not found in the WB taxonomy are specific to GPE's focus on equity.	
Re-coding and costing database with the themes/components for each country	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excel database on accelerated grant activities with costing, coding master sheets, sheet for each country: Costing master sheet with the list of activities and the amount of grant allocated to each of the themes for each country (mitigation/recovery, equity/learning, other components for each country, admin costs, private sector partnership). Coding master sheet with the description of components/activities within each theme for each country. 	
Database with Accelerated Grant countries for sampling	<p>Database with the main information on each accelerated grant country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Country Profile and COVID-19 accelerated grant information. Mapped with GG Component 1: Regional and Global Learning Platform (UNESCO); mapped with GG Component 2: Learning Continuity at Scale. Implementation progress/completion, overlap with samples of other evaluations (data source: evaluation reports), progress in GPE2025. 	
GPE's COVID-19 Emergency Funding: Application Highlights	Main activities that the grant will be spent on for each accelerated grant country and description of the activities that will take place in each applicant country and within each identified theme.	
Administrative and country-level data:		
Countries' COVID-19 Response Plans for Education	Education sector response plans to COVID-19. The format and the content of the plan is different for each country and can be found in each country's folder.	To feed into case studies and address evaluation question on Relevance for Accelerated Grants case studies
Applications and grant approval letters for each country	<p>Application and grant approval letter for each country is located in each country's folder and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application (differs depending on the grant agent/country): overview of the proposal (duration, dates, donor, project outcomes, focus population, implementing partners, policy partners), situation analysis, project description, implementation plan/schedule, strategic/implementation partners, risks management/sustainability, performance monitoring/reporting, external threats, results framework. Approval letter: official decision of Chief Executive Officer, requests for report-back, reporting and reprogramming conditions 	
COVID-19 Accelerated Grant Timeline Tracker	Tracking of dates and time for the application processing: dates for receive, review, submission to Executive Officer, approval; number of days from the approval to the start of grant implementation.	
Historical utilization of Accelerated Grant	Database with the amount of grant utilized each month by each accelerated grant country.	

Type of documentation	Relevant information	Analysis
Gender database for Accelerated Grant	Gender specific information for accelerated grant activities in each country: identified challenges and proposed interventions for girls' education/gender in program documents for each country; comments on whether the program addresses girls education/gender issues, according to the internal review's matrix and proposed intervention.	
Reporting documentation:		
Databases tracking reporting process, quarterly, six-monthly and completion reports: COVID-19 Accelerated Grant Tracker on Progress Surveys	Database tracking dates of submission and reporting periods, comments for first and second quarterly surveys, first and second six-monthly surveys.	To feed into portfolio analysis, case studies and address all evaluation questions related to Accelerated Funding Grant.
AG Monitoring Survey summary	Database tracking surveys with latest survey period submission, number of surveys received and expected.	
Completion Reports aggregate database	Database tracking completion report processes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links to the reports and dates for submission. • Availability/unavailability with the comments for reporting on each objective. • Overall rating for some evaluation criteria. • Comments on grant delays, partnership, SEAH cases, major lessons learned and recommendations. • Reporting on core indicators (% and number) for baseline, actual and end target. 	
Quarterly reports: Quarterly report template Filled in Quarterly Reports	The number of filled-in quarterly reports is different for each country and can be found in each country's folder. Reports contain information on ratings from previous and current reporting period, reporting per component, impact stories and the reporting on core indicators as relevant.	
Six-monthly reports: Six-monthly report template Filled in Six-monthly Reports	The number of filled-in six-monthly reports is different for each country and can be found in each country's folder. Reports contain background information, disbursement, implementation progress, reporting per component, impact stories and the reporting on core indicators as relevant.	
Completion reports	Completion reports are available for some countries and are to be expected to be sent to other ones, they can be found in each country's folder. Reports contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the grant and background and instructions. • Assessment of grant implementation (efficacy, efficiency, relevance, private sector engagement, safeguarding, lessons and recommendations). • Use of funds (reprogramming and extension, misuse of funds, unspent funds). • Monitoring and evaluation data (results framework per objectives and outputs, core indicators endline reporting). 	

Type of documentation	Relevant information	Analysis
External Evaluation reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> External UNICEF country-level evaluation available only for some countries: Democratic Republic of Congo – evaluation of Project "Providing alternative ways to continue learning in a safe and protective environment for 13.9 million children and adolescents aged 3-15 years affected by COVID-19 in DRC". Cote d'Ivoire – evaluation of distance course and reopening of schools in the context of COVID-19 crisis. Djibouti - structured sectoral response based primarily on its existing experience in distance learning. Tanzania – parent survey "What Did Children Do During School Closure?" 	
Continuity of Learning Global Grants		
Grant information and implementation documentation:		
Brief for the GPE COVID-19 Global Grant to UNESCO, UNICEF & the World Bank and Frequently Asked Questions (October 7, 2020) on the grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief information on the objective, scope, key activities. FAQ on global grants, relationship with other initiatives, reporting and indicators, budgeting, pilot countries, application of subcomponents and their activities, knowledge dissemination. 	To feed into Global Grant Case Study and address evaluation questions related to the Global Grant
GPE's Education response to COVID-19: UNESCO, UNICEF, World Bank Joint Proposal for a Consortium of Grant Agents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Background and problem identification, objectives, response and strategies. Management structure, partnerships and reporting. Main key intervention areas and activities (global and regional coordination, learning continuity at scale that reaches the most marginalized, monitoring, evidence, learning and preparation for future emergencies). Work plan and monitoring plan, indicative implementation plan. Summary budget disaggregated by components, sub-components and years. List of indicators. 	
Database mapping of activities for Global Grant	Memo for mapping global grants by components/subcomponents, sources, countries and activities.	
Detailed budget for Global Grant	Budget template disaggregated by grant agents, component/sub-component/activity and years.	
Administrative documentation:		
Applications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting participants and date, grant summary, and information. Decision language, detailed implementation plan, updated results framework, detailed budget. 	To feed into case studies and address evaluation questions on Relevance, to feed into portfolio analysis to address some sub-questions on Efficiency (requests for extension)
CEO Approval Letters Approval of Accelerated Funding to Strengthen GPE's Global and Regional Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic, April 22, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of initial allocation for a COVID-19 accelerated funding request in the amount of US\$7,500,000 representing 30% of the proposal amount. Division of allocation between grant agents, decision language, detailed implementation plan, updated results framework, detailed budget. 	
Approval of Accelerated Funding to Strengthen GPE's Global and Regional Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic, June 16, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of the second allocation for a COVID-19 accelerated funding request in the amount of US\$12,500,000 representing 50% of the proposal amount. Division of allocation between grant agents, decision language, relevance and likelihood of impact, program design, implementation arrangements and readiness, monitoring, evaluation and learning, risk assessment. 	

Type of documentation	Relevant information	Analysis
Approval of Accelerated Funding to Strengthen GPE's Global and Regional Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic, September 30, 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approval of third and final allocation for a COVID-19 accelerated funding request in the amount of US\$5,000,000 representing 20% of the proposal amount. Division of allocation between grant agents. 	
Third Tranche Funds Request	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Third tranche funds request with the description of dates, activities and outputs with the description of key developments in the 1st, 2nd phases. 	
Request for No-cost Extension Request No objection Closing date extension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official letter request for no-cost extension by the consortium of UNICEF, UNESCO and World Bank. Notification of no objection to the no-cost extension request by GPE Secretariat. Information on the date of extension for grant extension from 31st October 2021 to 28th February 2022. 	
Reporting documentation:		
Bi-monthly reports	Reports with a simple traffic light style assessment of progress against the components, outputs, activities and sub-activities in the detailed implementation plan for each grant agent with the status and comments regarding the progress.	To feed into portfolio analysis and address all evaluation questions related to the Global Grant
1st bi-monthly report May-June 2020 Related documentation (flow of funds UNICEF and UNESCO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first bimonthly report with the standard structure described above for May and June 2020. The date of the report is July 31, 2020. Explanation of flow of funds for UNESCO and UNICEF. 	
2nd bi-monthly report July-September 2020 Consolidated budget execution through September 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The second bimonthly report with the standard structure described above for July-September 2020. Date of the report is October 2, 2020 Additional sections: Section V – updated results framework to report against core indicators for July-September (incl. baseline, end target of Oct. 2021, and supporting documentation), Section VI – budget utilization as of 30th September. Consolidated budget execution for 1st and 2nd phases by components. 	
3rd bi-monthly report November-December 2020 Budget utilization as of January 31, 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The third bimonthly report with the standard structure described above for November-December 2020. The date of the report is January 29, 2021. Includes plan for upcoming impact stories and a summary of private sector engagement in country-level activities. Additional sections: Section V – updated results framework to report against core indicators for July-September (incl. baseline, previous and current values, end target of Oct. 2021, and supporting documentation); Section VI – budget utilization updated and provided by the end of February. 	
Six-monthly reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports include SECTION I-III (first part) survey questions with a simple traffic light style assessment of progress at the subcomponent level, and status; SECTION III (second part)-V – changes to the program (if any); financial management, procurement, safeguards, and other fiduciary issues; status of progress on previously raised issues; lessons learned; regional and country collaboration, and private sector engagement in country-level activities; and risks and risk mitigation; SECTION VI – an updated Results Framework to report against core indicators (including baseline, current value, and supporting information); SECTION VII – budget utilization. 	
1st six-monthly report May-October 2020 Related documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First report with all the sections in standard survey format for the period from May to October 2020. Five Annexes: Annex 1 Proposal, Annex 2 Implementation Plan by components, activities etc. and the timeline for them, Annex 3 Budget, Annex 4 Six-Monthly report template, Annex 5 Detailed assessment of global grant six-monthly report by Consortium (general progress, assessment of reporting accuracy and comments on reporting). 	

Type of documentation	Relevant information	Analysis
2nd six-monthly report November 2020-April 2021 Related documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second report with all the sections as in standard survey format for the period November 2020 to April 2021. Status and dissemination of Global Public Goods developed by the World Bank, UNICEF and UNESCO as of May 21, 2021, with information on events, blog/impact stories, webinars, social media campaigns, capacity building events for each product, component, activity. 	
3rd six-monthly report May-October 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Third report with all the sections as in standard survey format for the period from May to October 2021. 	
Quarterly Implementation Progress Survey, May-July 2021	Report that comprise of SECTIONS I-IV survey questions with a simple traffic light style assessment of progress at the subcomponent level, to report on major progress during the period of May-July 2021, provide the plan for upcoming blogs and stories, and a summary of private sector engagement in country-level activities; SECTION V – an updated results framework to report against core indicators for the period of May-July 2021 (including baseline, previous values, current values, target of Oct. 2021, and supporting information); SECTION VI – updated budget utilization as of end of July.	
End-of-grant Report End-of-grant Report and Budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments on the status of implementation of activities by components/subcomponents as of 28th February 2022. Report on and learn from progress in the implementation of Global Gran. Budget utilization as of February 28th, 2022 Information on the grant, contact details of Grant Agent staff, background, assessment of grant implementation (efficacy, efficiency, relevance, private sector engagements, safeguarding, lessons and recommendations), use of funds (reprogramming and extension, reporting on misuse of funds, unspent funds), monitoring and evaluation data 	
High level Results Matrix	Overall outputs and corresponding performance indicators for each component and output.	
Documentation on Global Grant deliverables:		
Database with information, documentation, links of Global Grant Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of all the components, sub-components, activities within Global Grant Description of subcomponent, each activity and the lead agency for it Corresponding key deliverable and relevant document/information (with link if applicable) 	To feed into Global Grant Case Study and address evaluation questions on Efficacy, Effectiveness and Impact
COVID-19 Planning Grants		
Grant information and implementation documentation:		
UNICEF's Operational Guidance for the Planning COVID-19 grant	List of the menu of activities in three key intervention areas.	To feed into Planning Grant Case Study and address evaluation questions on Relevance
Database on use of GPE Planning funds	Qualitative description of the activities that GPE planning grant funds were used on by Response Categories (Response Planning/ Support to MoE; Risk analysis/ assessment; Safe School Operations; Design and preparation of alternative education delivery systems; Establishing monitoring systems; Planning for recovery, reopening of schools) and by countries.	
Administrative documentation:		
UNICEF's Proposal for the multi-country Planning COVID-19 grant	General information on the planning grants with the list of planned activities.	

Type of documentation	Relevant information	Analysis
	UNICEF proposed response and strategies, UNICEF vision, objectives, key intervention areas, planned geographic focus, budget and roadmap, outline of reporting.	To feed into Planning Grant Case Study and address evaluation questions on Relevance
Secretariat's approval for Planning Grant	Participants of the approval meeting, grant information, summary of the request, decision of the GPE Secretariat; discussion points; revised parts of the proposal (financial, programmatic and technical aspects, knowledge sharing and reporting, timeline).	
Reporting documentation:		
Survey UNICEF Global Tracker: COVID-19 National Responses in Education	Questions of UNICEF survey on high-level overview of how your country is responding to the COVID-19 emergency in education (request to be updated weekly).	To feed into the portfolio analysis, Planning Grant Case Study and address all evaluation questions related to the Planning Grant
Overview of GPE questions from Tracker Survey (based on the data submitted from UNICEF country offices between April 27 - August 25, 2020)	Track of responses to the UNICEF Global Tracker and response rate by countries and intervention types between April 27 - August 25, 2020.	
Completion Report for Education Sector Plan Development Grant (Planning) for COVID-19 Planning June 30, 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of the grant. • Assessment of grant completion by three key intervention areas, description of activities supported at the level of UNICEF regional offices, strategic collaboration and partnership leveraged, Interactions between countries' COVID-19 response plans and ongoing sectoral activities, Gender-responsive and equity-focused country COVID-19 response plans). • Use of funds (overall assessment, Reprogramming and extension, reporting on misuse of funds, Unspent funds, Additional funding leveraged). 	
Non-financial support		
Created knowledge products:		
Joint Education Sector Monitoring in the context of COVID-19, November 2021	Guidance is a part of GPE efforts to support governments and partners in monitoring education delivery. Guidelines regard four types of content which offer diverse types of support from high level to technical, practical support.	To inform data collection tool design, ground our understanding of the context and GPE's COVID-19 support.
Pivoting to Inclusion Leveraging Lessons from the COVID-19 Crisis for Learners with Disabilities	Report on Leveraging Lessons from the COVID-19 Crisis for Learners with Disabilities.	
Documents related to GPE Knowledge and Innovation Exchange (KIX) Observatory on COVID-19 Responses in Africa's Educational Systems:		
Teacher Training and Support in Africa during the COVID-19	The report synthesizes available evidence on the policies and practices of 40 sub-Saharan African (SSA) partner countries of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) with respect to teacher training and support during the COVID-19 pandemic.	To feed into CS for countries in Africa.
Learning Assessment during the COVID-19 Pandemic in Africa	The report aims to provide decision-makers, donors, and education practitioners with emerging evidence on education policy and practice responses to the pandemic in Africa.	

Type of documentation	Relevant information	Analysis
School Reopening in Africa during the COVID-19 Pandemic	The report synthesizes available policy and practice evidence on school reopening in 40 African partner countries of the Global Partnership for Education.	
Financing Education in Africa during the COVID-19 Pandemic	The report identifies education financing gaps and challenges, and emerging evidence on what education systems in these countries are experiencing as a result of COVID-19 and persistent funding constraints. The report concludes with five recommendations for GPE partner countries and development actors.	
Teaching and Learner Well-being during the COVID-19 Pandemic	The brief which examines issues and provides success stories as well as key interventions and recommendations – focused on two major areas Teachers and teaching during COVID-19; Learner well-being during COVID-19.	

Appendix 4: CTL Initial Consultation Topic Guide (At Inception)

Name of the interviewee(s)	
Role(s)	
Date of the interview	
Interviewer	
Note(s):	

This consultation session is part of the Summative Evaluation of GPE's COVID-19 Support, as mandated by our Board. It follows an external formative evaluation which was released in 2021. This external summative evaluation is conducted by a consortium of education and evaluation specialists including Learn More, Technopolis, and led by Triple Line. The R&P team is managing this evaluation. The evaluation seeks to:

- Understand how continuously relevant, coherent, efficient, effective, and impactful GPE's support to partner countries has been throughout the COVID-19 crisis, and what are the prospects for sustainability of outputs/outcomes financed and strategies developed, so as to allow the GPE Secretariat to communicate on the level of success of GPE's COVID-19-related efforts.
- Identify promising practices during COVID-19 and explain their underlying success factors.
- Formulate lessons to improve its operations for crisis response.

Ten countries have been selected as case studies as part of this evaluation, including _____. We will be collecting primary data in the form of key informant interviews and focus group discussions with key stakeholders who have been involved in the

The purpose of the consultation today is to have a high-level overview of the types of stakeholders who have been involved in the design, application and implementation of the GPE COVID-19 Planning and Accelerated Grants. This information will feed into the design of the evaluation and in particular, the inception report.

Following the inception phase, we will engage with you to more specifically map the relevant stakeholders in _____ country case study in order to begin the process of reaching out to organize data collection.

Consultation areas

- Which stakeholders were involved in the Accelerated Grants?
 - What roles did they play?
 - Do roles and stakeholders differ across the design, application and implementation phase?
 - Are the stakeholders related to the Grant Agent? Government partners? Were any other bodies involved?
 - Did these stakeholders have any involvement in the implementation of the Planning Grant?
- What types of stakeholders would be relevant in order to validate the achievements of the objectives set out for the Accelerated Grant? (This could be stakeholders who are either involved in the collection or collation of data to support M&E reporting or stakeholders who can validate the presence of the outcome).
- Are there any other key players that will be relevant for the evaluation?

Appendix 5: Country Case Study Sampling Methodology

GPE's COVID-19 support covers 87 countries spanning a wide range of characteristics and contexts. Each country was impacted by the pandemic in its own unique way and received different types and amounts of support from GPE at different times and under different conditions. Some have carried out activities satisfactorily, others less so. Many countries have not submitted their grant completion reports or may not do so during this evaluation. Moreover, some countries are also undergoing other evaluations in parallel and should not be sampled, if possible, to avoid interview fatigue.

To ensure an overall balanced sample of country case studies, we applied a purposive stratified sampling methodology across these and other factors. The sampling criteria used for this exercise are grouped below into high, medium, and low priority levels for reference:

Criterion	Category	Details and priority rationale
High priority level		
Diversity in Location	Country characteristics	Sample from within each continent that is represented, relative to the number of countries per continent. ²⁷ Country sampling should account for different regions as per GPE Constituencies to be relevant to neighboring countries not selected in the sample.
Diversity in fragility level	Country characteristics	We want to account for the breadth of possible interactions between COVID-19 and other fragility factors ²⁸ . Resilience to the pandemic, and consequent COVID-19 support needs and use, may depend on additional fragility factors, though these are addressed by other forms of support.
Diversity in school closure duration (full and total days closed)	COVID-19-related educational outcomes	We aim to sample across UNESCO's indicators on the School Closures Caused by the COVID-19 Pandemic ²⁹ . Duration of school closures varies greatly and may significantly impact the need for COVID-19 support and its usefulness.
Diversity in implementation progress ratings	GPE support focus and implementation	We aim to sample across the GPE Secretariat's most recent rating of each country's progress towards full implementation of Accelerated Grants – unsatisfactory, moderately satisfactory, and satisfactory. Varying speeds of implementation of the Accelerated Grant may reflect a diversity in implementation models and underlying capacities.
Diversity in Grant Agents	GPE support focus and implementation	We aim to sample across the eight different grant agents working across the 66 Accelerated Grant recipient countries, proportionate to their involvement (e.g. – UNICEF as Grant Agent covers approximately 50% of countries with COVID-19 Accelerated Grants, so 50% of countries sampled would ideally have UNICEF as their Grant Agent). Choice of Grant Agent may have a significant effect on grant management.
Diversity in Accelerated Grant volume	GPE support focus and implementation	We aim to sample across countries receiving a range of sums through the Accelerated Grant facility. Given that the US\$500 million Accelerated Grant forms approximately 90% of total COVID-19 support funding, it should be prioritized in sampling. The diversity volume of funding accessed by each country might reflect a diversity in scale of results; however it may be less reflective of diversity in type of impact or effectiveness relative to cost.
Diversity in availability of Accelerated Grant completion reports	GPE country data availability	We aim to exclude countries where these completion reports for COVID-19 accelerated grants will not be available. Countries with no completion reports or late due date for completion report submission will have less data to report on.
Medium priority level		
Diversity in net learning loss	COVID-19 related educational outcomes	We aim to sample across an indicator of how much students' progress has been held up during the pandemic. Most potential data sources for this are still not widely available for GPE partner countries for 2019 – 2022, the period in question. The most up-to-date and relevant proxy for learning outcomes loss appears to be change in net enrolment rates (percentage change in 2021 in comparison with 2019 or 2020). ³⁰ Differences in learning loss may reflect the diversity of challenging contexts in which COVID-19 support was provided, or even varying degrees of impact, though the school closure duration strata may address this already.

27 As commonly used in GPE database by GPE Constituencies from <https://assets.globalpartnership.org/s3fs-public/2012-11-Board-Constituency-Compositionprocessed.pdf?VersionId=9HmKWbwmDOnfv8.u2CtXQZ38T4PBr11R>

28 As per List of GPE partner countries affected by fragility and conflict as of August 2022. Retrieved from <https://www.globalpartnership.org/content/list-gpe-partner-countries-affected-fragility-and-conflict>

29 As per Dashboards on the Global Monitoring of School Closures Caused by the COVID-19 Pandemic. Retrieved from <https://covid19.uis.unesco.org/global-monitoring-school-closures-covid19/>

30 We have checked and compared the availability of data for the period of 2019-2022 for three variables (net enrolment rate; number of out-of-school children of primary and of primary and secondary school; survival rate till the last grade of primary school; drop-out rate). Net enrolment rate was found to be the variable with the most data available.

Diversity in distance learning method and grant allocation	GPE support focus and implementation	We aim to sample across a mix of countries with differing proportions of grant allocation on medium/high tech, low tech, and no tech. Depending on context, different combinations may yield different learning outcomes, so should be represented in the study. However, this is likely already somewhat correlated with income levels and is not the only one form, or coding, of support offered by GPE.
Low priority level		
Diversity in income levels	Country characteristics	We aim to sample across the World Bank's classification of income levels. Income level diversity does not vary greatly among GPE countries and is likely to be randomized to a significant extent through correlation with the strata identified above.
Diversity in Accelerated Grant expenditure type	GPE support focus and implementation	We aim to sample across countries based on relative expenditure in thematic grant allocation (we advise splitting within the thematic grant allocation category to avoid complexity). Varying combinations of percentage of Accelerated Grant allocation represent quite different uses of grant funding and should both be accounted for.
Inclusion of countries where country success stories are available	GPE country data availability	We try to include countries where success stories are available. Availability of country success stories will facilitate data collection but is a secondary consideration compared to the technical strata identified above.
Avoid countries where other evaluations are ongoing,	GPE country data availability	We try to avoid countries where other evaluations are ongoing, specifically the Multiplier Evaluation, the Thematic and Country Level Evaluations, and the evaluation conducted by the Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network (MOPAN). While this factor is important from an evaluation management standpoint, it is secondary to the more technical strata identified above. Countries may be excluded on the basis of inclusion in other evaluations.
Inclusion of countries where enough country data is available	GPE country data availability	We will try to include countries where grant completion reports have been shared or are forthcoming, and where at least three periodic surveys are available. This will facilitate data collection and analysis.

Based on this prioritization, the case study sample countries are:

- Bangladesh
- Cameroon
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Democratic Republic of Congo
- Ethiopia
- Ghana
- Micronesia
- Mozambique
- Nicaragua
- Tonga

A detailed list matching each country against relevant criteria is provided on the following page.

		High priority						Medium priority				Low priority						
	Country Name	School closure: Days fully closed	School closure: Days total (full and partial)	Implementation progress ratings	Grant Agent	AF grant facility volume	Due date for submission of completion report (Data source: ESPIG as of 18 AUG 2022)	Diversity in net learning loss (% change in net enrollment rate from 2021 to 2019)*	Percentage of AF grant allocated to No tech distance learning programs	Percentage of AF grant allocated to Low tech distance learning programs	Percentage of AF grant allocated to Mid/ High tech distance learning programs	Income Level	Percentage of AF grant allocated to Mitigation, to date	Percentage of AF grant allocated to Recovery, to date	Success stories	Participating in External Multiplier Evaluation	Participated in Formative COVID19 evaluation	Actual number of survey submitted (Compiled surveys file (29 AUG 2022))
1	Bangladesh	442	602	Moderately Satisfactory	WB	15 004 140	30.06.2023		2,63%	1,88%	5,04%	Lower middle income	25,17%	71,89%				3
2	Cote d'Ivoire	46	90	Satisfactory	UNICEF	11 000 000	Submitted	-0,1614	0,00%	1,20%	0,00%	Lower middle income	6,27%	56,00%				3
3	Cameroon	56	127	Satisfactory	UNESCO	11 000 000	30.03.2023		7,44%	6,96%	6,96%	Lower middle income	39,46%	57,99%	Yes			5
4	Congo, Democratic Republic of	168	231	Highly Satisfactory	UNICEF	15 000 001	Submitted		7,09%	1,39%	1,39%	Low income	52,57%	42,52%			Yes	4
5	Ghana	68	270	Satisfactory	WB	15 000 000	Submitted	-5,16725	6,67%	10,67%	5,33%	Lower middle income	58,33%	40,33%	Yes		Yes	4
6	Micronesia, Federated States of	76	168	Moderately Unsatisfactory	UNICEF	750 000	30.04.2023	-1,45055	8,72%	9,35%	0,00%	Lower middle income	53,07%	29,93%				4
7	Nicaragua	0	105	Satisfactory	WB	7 000 000	30.04.2023		4,56%	0,00%	11,06%	Lower middle income	56,47%	40,24%				2
8	Mozambique	218	369	Satisfactory	UNICEF	14 999 990	Submitted	1,5363	0,00%	1,15%	1,15%	Low income	10,07%	36,60%	Yes			4
9	Tonga	53	90	Highly Satisfactory	Save the Children Australia	749 983	Submitted	-0,27993	2,4%	11,68%	11,68%	Upper middle income	80,13%	0,74%	Yes			4
10	Ethiopia	149	433	Moderately Satisfactory	WB	15 000 000	30.03.2023	1,00504	5,04%	6,35%	0,00%	Low income	24,49%	74,51%				3
Alternative options for sampling																		
11	Haiti	128	219	Satisfactory	UNICEF	6 999 863	30.11.2022		15,47%	0,00%	0,00%	Low income	49,62%	45,49%				4
12	Mauritania	164	164	Satisfactory	IsDB	3 500 000	15.05.2023		10,95%	10,95%	10,95%	Lower middle income	71,89%	23,11%				3
13	Myanmar	414	548	Moderately Satisfactory	UNICEF	11 000 000	30.06.2023		1,56%	0,00%	1,56%	Lower middle income	38,91%	58,44%				5
14	Uganda	460	622	Satisfactory	WB	14 700 001	Submitted		11,12%	3,75%	0,78%	Low income	53,11%	46,89%				5
15	Afghanistan	243	455	Satisfactory	UNICEF	11 000 000	Submitted		0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	Low income	44,06%	55,94%			Yes	5

Appendix 6: Work Plan

Summative Evaluation of GPE's COVID-19 Response Workplan (Revised March 2023)	Design			Implementation												
	Oct-22	Nov-22	Dec-22	Jan-23	Feb-23	Mar-23	Apr-23	May-23	Jun-23	Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	Jan-24
1. EVALUATION DESIGN																
1.01 Kick-off meeting and preparation																
1.02 Preliminary document review																
1.03 Stakeholder analysis and initial consultations																
1.04 EQs, methodology and tool development																
1.05 Portfolio analysis and sampling																
1.06 Evaluability assessment																
1.07 Write Inception Report																
1.08 Finalise Inception Report																
2. DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS & REPORTING																
2.01 Portfolio analysis and literature review																
2.02 KIs with Global Stakeholders																
2.03 KIs with Country-Level Stakeholders																
2.04 KIs with End Users/End User Representatives																
2.05 Case studies analysis and write-up																
Cut off for documentation analysis																
2.06 Data analysis, team verification workshop																
2.06 Revision of analysis with final portfolio analysis																
2.08 Write Evaluation Report and internal Q/A																
2.09 Revise Evaluation Report																
2.10 Finalise Evaluation Report																
3. DISSEMINATION & LEARNING																
3.01 Emerging findings workshop and slide deck of emerging findings																
3.02 Plan all presentations and learning events; refine slide deck																
3.03 Co-creation of recommendations workshop and revision of slide deck																
3.04 Presentation and discussion: Secretariat Management Team																
3.05 Presentation and discussion: PLC																
3.06 Presentation and discussion: Board																
3.07 Learning events (x2-3)																
MILESTONES AND DELIVERABLES																
Inception Report draft																
Inception Report final																
Slide-deck draft																
Slide-deck final																
Evaluation Report draft																
Evaluation Report final																

Appendix 7: Final Report Outline (Draft)

The evaluation team proposes the following tentative final report outline. The report will be no longer than 40 pages (not including annexes). The final outline will be agreed upon with the GPE Secretariat's R&P team.

Title: Summative Evaluation of GPE's Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic

List of Abbreviations

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

1.1 Context

1.2 Background

2. Methodology

2.1 Overview of Approach

2.2 Data Collected

2.3 Limitations

3. Findings

3.1 Relevance of GPE's Response

3.2 Coherence of GPE's Response

3.3 Efficiency of GPE's Response

3.4 Effectiveness of GPE's Response

3.5 Potential for impact of GPE's Response

4. Conclusions, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations

Annex 1. Detailed methodology and evaluability assessment, including data collection tools

Annex 2. Evaluation matrix

Annex 3. Literature review

Annex 4. Portfolio analysis

Annex 5. Case studies

Annex 5.1 Country case studies

Annex 5.2 Planning Grant case study

Annex 5.3 Global Grant case study

Appendix 8: Triple Line's Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment Policies and Procedures

We note that GPE has a zero-tolerance policy against all forms of sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH) in line with its SEAH policy.

In this annex, we describe our SEAH policies and procedures that guide this evaluation and identify potential SEAH risks and mitigation measures (see Appendix 9).

Triple Line's SEAH policies and procedures

Triple Line has the following policies in place to manage SEAH risks, including risks associated with direct contact with children and other stakeholders at the community level.

Our **Code of Conduct** includes provision to adopt a rigorous stance on all human rights abuse, including sexual exploitation and abuse, modern slavery, and human trafficking.

This includes the commitment to:

- Promote a 'zero tolerance' approach to all forms of human rights infringements including sexual exploitation and abuse, sexual harassment, modern slavery, and human trafficking;
- Immediately report to the relevant authority any known act of human rights abuse, including sexual exploitation and abuse, modern slavery, or human trafficking committed by its employees, contractors, partnering firms or any third-party agent in the course of their commission on any lead, bid or project;
- Suspend any employee or supplier suspected of partaking/aiding/abetting/failing to recognize or notify Triple Line of any forms of human rights abuse, including sexual exploitation and abuse, modern slavery and/or human trafficking, and subsequently terminating their contract should any later investigation find they have acted in direct contravention of our 'Code of Conduct'.

Our **Child Protection Policy** sets out our professional duty to ensure that the children we work with are safe from harm and that any concerns that emerge through our work are addressed. This includes ensuring that:

- in addition to the security checks that all Triple Line employees and consultant are subject to upon recruitment (which meet Her Majesty's Government Baseline Personnel Security Standard), all employees who work with children have current enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks.
- This includes all research participants who will be informed about who to contact if they have any concerns about Triple Line employees or consultants.

It also sets out procedures for responding to and reporting a child protection issue should one be encountered.

Our **Safeguarding Policy** sets out measures for ensuring everyone, including children and at-risk adults, are protected from harm that arises from interacting with our staff, team members, or programs. This includes responsibilities with regard to child safeguarding, adult safeguarding and protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA).

Our guidance on **Reporting Concerns** (whistleblowing) sets out Triple Line's procedure for dealing with all reports of behavior that we may believe to be in breach of Triple Line's policies, including safeguarding against sexual abuse and exploitation; bullying and harassment, including sexual harassment; Code of Conduct; child protection; and modern slavery.

Appendix 9: Risk Matrix

Note: Likelihood: H = highly likely; M = moderately likely; L = low

Impact: H = high; M = moderate; L = low

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
External Context			
Political (or other forms of) insecurity (e.g., acts of terrorism, armed conflict, crime or civil unrest), or natural disaster / manmade hazards reduces the availability of key informants to participate in case studies.	L	M-H	<p>We have considered this as part of our sampling criteria, excluding potential cases where respondents may not be available for remote interview due to political or contextual factors.</p> <p>We will flag to the R&P team at the earliest convenience to discuss if problems emerge (e.g., rapid changes to the context of any of the selected case study countries) in order to allow remedial steps (e.g., reduction in scope where possible.)</p>
Methodology			
Low stakeholder engagement as part of case studies, particularly at the country-level, resulting from either high staff turnover at the Grant Agent or stakeholder/ end user level, as a result of project closure, etc.	M	M-H	<p>Engage with CTLs from the start to conduct stakeholder mapping and to identify any anticipated gaps in required respondents. This was also considered as part of the sampling process to initially identify any unfeasible case studies based on respondent availability.</p> <p>An informal stakeholder engagement strategy will be devised with input from CTLs to ensure that we are working through existing mechanisms or with existing knowledge of how best to approach respondents and garner engagement.</p> <p>At the start of any respondent engagement, we will ensure that the purpose and questions of the interview are articulated proactively to streamline engagement and reduce research fatigue.</p>
Late submission of key sources of project data (e.g., completion reports).	H	M-H	<p>Case study sampling includes expected completion report due date as a sampling criterion, in order to minimize the impact of delayed reporting timeline.</p> <p>Close contact with the R&P team to monitor likelihood of late submissions, in order to create data mitigation plans. For case studies, late project completion report submission may require conducting 1:1 interviews with Grant Agents and others involved in grant reporting or country-level stakeholders for access to data directly in lieu of waiting for reports to be written.</p>
Delivery			
Genuine learning (generating and reflecting on evidence and applying lessons) might be squeezed out by other pressures and expectations;	L	H	<p>Close collaboration with R&P team and initial consultation sessions to better understand the learning questions from key stakeholders.</p> <p>Ensure check-in points throughout the evaluation to revisit and realign on the learning strategy as needed, based on any changes to timeline or contexts for learning opportunities, including with the GPE Secretariat's newly formed learning cross-team.</p>

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
synchronization needed with other learning efforts.			
Missing data (including from Accelerated Grant completion reports) means that the evidence base may be insufficient to properly address some questions at the end of the assignment.	L	L	<p>Ensure strong engagement with the R&P team from the start, setting the tone for close consultation and fit between evaluation design and evaluation needs. Regular updates and feedback to ensure that data collection is on track and is responsive to any changing needs. Regular team updates and close monitoring by GPE Secretariat to ensure that all grant completion reports are due in time, by June 2023.</p> <p>Steer from the R&P team so that the evaluation team engages with the right people (audience) at the right time.</p>
Delays to delivery of workplan; budget over-runs for evaluation team.	M-H	M	<p>Review of methodology and scope in the inception phase. Use of sampling techniques to produce efficiencies in document reviews. Close monitoring of team inputs and careful planning. We will flag to the R&P team at the earliest convenience to discuss if problems emerge in order to allow remedial steps (e.g., reduction in scope where possible.)</p>
Evaluation team members not available when needed or due to illness, accident etc.	L	M	<p>Good planning to anticipate problems (e.g., work pressures). If necessary, we will replace team member inputs from a) within the team; b) within the consortium (including other evaluators engaged in the TCLE); or c) trusted associates. Any changes in key team members will be discussed with GPE prior to replacement.</p>
Safeguards			
Evaluation activity causes unintentional harm or risk to informants (and/or thereby reputational risk to Triple Line or GPE).	L	H	<p>We will obtain informed consent ahead of any data collected.</p> <p>We have safeguarding and ethical research protocols put in place. If any in-country data collectors are engaged, we will provide training and pre-briefing, incorporating safeguarding.</p>
Local team member (e.g., in-country data collector) personal safety compromised during field work or travel.	L	H	<p>Triple Line has robust duty of care policies and procedures, including escalation and emergency procedures. A risk assessment will be conducted if in-country data collection is used.</p>
A member of the evaluation team seeks to exploit their position to carry out SEAH	L	H	<p>Robust safeguarding measures in place and all team members are aware of these, and familiar with reporting procedures. Where primary data collection will be collected, due diligence will be carried out on any in person data collectors, with enhanced due diligence (e.g., DBS check) carried out where engagement with children or vulnerable individuals is expected.</p> <p>All consultations with vulnerable individuals including children are carried out with a third party and/or responsible adult present.</p>

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation
Evaluation activities bring potential perpetrators of SEAH into contact with vulnerable individuals	L	H	Evaluations will not bring third parties into contact with children and vulnerable individuals (e.g., in FGDs) where there are power imbalances that could be exploited.
Team members carry out SEAH due to lack of awareness, or permissive cultural norms	L	H	Clear expectations on staff, volunteers, partners and associates on professional and personal conduct are set. Where evaluation activities are being carried out in high-risk contexts for SEAH, training and awareness-raising is provided for all team members to understand what constitutes SEAH.
Context-related factors indicate heightened risk of SEAH	L	H	Enhanced due diligence and safeguarding will be in place where personnel are deployed away from their usual location/country of residence to remote/rural location/s or to a humanitarian or emergency setting, and where high-risk activities take place (e.g., construction/infrastructure activities, disaster response).
Mistrust on the part of target interviewees who are reluctant and fearful of engaging or put at risk through the evaluation.	L	M-H	Application of our ethical approach and ensure that no respondent feels under pressure to be interviewed. Where relevant, ensure that experienced, trained female as well as male researchers who speak local languages interview stakeholders either face-to-face, in FGDs or virtually – whichever is most appropriate. We will not pressure individuals or groups to engage and will recognize that reluctance to speak is a finding in and of itself.
Data stored or collected for the evaluation is inappropriately accessed	L-M	M	All data for the evaluation, including primary data collected and GPE data and documents used as part of the evaluation will remain securely stored on privately accessed SharePoint sites of GPE or Triple Line. Access will only be granted to core evaluation team members, who in abiding by Triple Line's Data Protection and Cyber Security Policy, will not download the data. All access to SharePoint sites is granted only through company-registered Microsoft 365 logins which use two-factor authentication.